

Philip Hughes

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH To the Eve of the Reformation

*This is a MBS Library best viewed by Micro Book Studio.
You may download it at*

<http://www.microbookstudio.com>

■ [VOL. 1](#)

■ [VOL.](#)
[2: 313-](#)
[1274](#)

■ [VOL.](#)
[3:](#)
[1274-](#)
[1520](#)

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH To the Eve of the Reformation

by Philip Hughes

Vol. 1

Main Index

- [CHAPTER 1: THE WORLD IN WHICH THE CHURCH WAS FOUNDED](#)
- [CHAPTER 2: THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH](#)
- [CHAPTER 3: THE FIRST CONTACTS WITH THE PAGAN RELIGIOUS WORLD.](#)
- [CHAPTER 4: THE CRISES OF THE THIRD CENTURY](#)
- [CHAPTER 5: THE WAY OF CHRISTIAN LIFE](#)
- [CHAPTER 6: THE CHURCH AND THE PAGAN ROMAN EMPIRE](#)
- [CHAPTER 7: THE ARIANS, 318-359](#)
- [CHAPTER 8: THE CATHOLIC RESTORATION. 359-382](#)
- [CHAPTER 9: ROME AND THE CATHOLIC EAST. 381-453](#)

■ **CHAPTER 10: THE TRADITIONAL FAITH AND
THE IMPERIAL POLICY**

■ *Previous Index*

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH To the Eve of the Reformation

by Philip Hughes

Vol. 2: 313-1274

Main Index

- CHAPTER 1: THE CHURCH IN THE WEST DURING THE LAST CENTURY OF THE IMPERIAL UNITY, 313-30
- CHAPTER 2: THE CHURCH AND THE DISRUPTION OF THE IMPERIAL UNITY, 395-537
- CHAPTER 3: ST. GREGORY THE GREAT AND THE BEGINNINGS OF RESTORATION
- CHAPTER 4: THE CHURCH AND THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE, 714-814
- CHAPTER 5: THE SIEGE OF CHRISTENDOM, 814-1046
- CHAPTER 6: THE RESTORATION OF SPIRITUAL INDEPENDENCE, 1046-1123
- CHAPTER 7: THE AGE OF ST. BERNARD, 1123-1181
- CHAPTER 8: THE CRISIS OF THE MIDDLE AGES, 1181-1198

- **CHAPTER 9: INNOCENT III AND THE CATHOLIC REACTION, 1198-1216**
- **CHAPTER 10: THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY: ACHIEVEMENT AND PROBLEMS, 1216-1274.**

- ***Previous Index***

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH To the Eve of the Reformation

by Philip Hughes

Vol. 3: 1274-1520

Main Index

- [CHAPTER 1: GESTA PER FRANCOS, 1270-1314](#)
- [CHAPTER 2: 'THE AVIGNON CAPTIVITY', 1314-1362](#)
- [CHAPTER 3: THE RETURN OF ST. PETER TO ROME, 1362-1420](#)
- [CHAPTER 4: FIFTY CRITICAL YEARS, 1420-1471](#)
- [CHAPTER 5: 'FACILIS DESCENSUS. . .' 1471-1517](#)

■ [*Previous Index*](#)

CHAPTER 1: THE WORLD IN WHICH THE CHURCH WAS FOUNDED

Index

[1. THE ROMAN IMPERIAL UNITY](#)

[2. THE PAGAN RELIGIONS OF THE ROMANO-HELLENISTIC CULTURE](#)

[3. THE RELIGION OF THE JEWS](#)

[4. TENDENCIES IN THE RELIGIOUS WORLD OF THE FIRST CENTURY A.D.](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 2: THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH

Index

1. THE FOUNDER

2. THE FIRST GENERATION

NOTE A: THE END OF JEWISH CHRISTIANITY

NOTE B: ST. PETER AT ROME

-
- *Previous Index*

CHAPTER 3: THE FIRST CONTACTS WITH THE PAGAN RELIGIOUS WORLD.

Index

[1. THE RELIGIOUS WORLD OF THE SECOND CENTURY](#)

[2. THE FIRST APOLOGISTS](#)

[3. THE Gnostics AND THE CHURCH](#)

[4. ST. IRENAEUS OF LYONS](#)

[5. MARCION -- MONTANISM](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 4: THE CRISES OF THE THIRD CENTURY

Index

INTRODUCTION

1. THE EASTER CONTROVERSY

2. MONARCHIANS -- SABELLIUS -- ST. HIPPOLYTUS

3. THE PENITENTIAL CONTROVERSY -- ST. CALIXTUS I

4. THE SCHISM OF NOVATIAN

5. ST. CYPRIAN AND ROME

6. THE SCHOOL OF ALEXANDRIA -- ORIGEN

7. MITHRAISM

8. THE MANICHEES

9. DENIS OF ALEXANDRIA -- PAUL OF SAMOSATA

▪ *Previous Index*

CHAPTER 5: THE WAY OF CHRISTIAN LIFE

Index

INTRODUCTION

-
- *Previous Index*

CHAPTER 6: THE CHURCH AND THE PAGAN ROMAN EMPIRE

Index

[1. THE STATE -- HOSTILE AND TOLERANT](#)

[2. THE STATE DE-PAGANISED](#)

[NOTE C: THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF THE
PERSECUTING STATE](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 7: THE ARIANS, 318-359

Index

INTRODUCTION

-
- *Previous Index*

CHAPTER 8: THE CATHOLIC RESTORATION. 359-382

Index

INTRODUCTION

-
- *Previous Index*

CHAPTER 9: ROME AND THE CATHOLIC EAST. 381-453

Index

[1. THE PRIMACY OF HONOUR. 381-419](#)

[2. EPHESUS. 427-433](#)

[3. CHALCEDON. 446-452](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 10: THE TRADITIONAL FAITH AND THE IMPERIAL POLICY

Index

[1. THE AFTERMATH OF CHALCEDON. 452-518](#)

[2. JUSTINIAN. 527-565](#)

[3. BYZANTINE CATHOLICISM. 565-711](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 1: THE CHURCH IN THE WEST DURING THE LAST CENTURY OF THE IMPERIAL UNITY, 313-30

Index

[1. THE DONATIST SCHISM, 311-393](#)

[2. ST. AUGUSTINE AND THE DONATIST SCHISM](#)

[3. ST. AUGUSTINE AND THE HERESY OF
PELAGIUS](#)

[4. THE INFLUENCE OF ST. AUGUSTINE](#)

[5. PRISCILLIAN](#)

[6. THE ROMAN SEE AND THE WESTERN
CHURCHES](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 2:THE CHURCH AND THE DISRUPTION OF THE IMPERIAL UNITY, 395-537

Index

[1. THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SITUATION IN THE
FOURTH CENTURY: DIOCLETIAN TO
THEODOSIUS, 284-395](#)

[2. SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CHANGES DURING
THE FIFTH CENTURY, 395-526](#)

[3. THE CHURCHES OF THE WEST DURING THE
CRISIS SPAIN, AFRICA, GAUL](#)

[4. THE ROMAN SEE AND ITALY](#)

[5. ST. PATRICK AND THE CONVERSION OF THE
IRISH](#)

[6. ST. BENEDICT AND THE HOLY RULE](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 3: ST. GREGORY THE GREAT AND THE BEGINNINGS OF RESTORATION

Index

[1. ST. GREGORY, FOUNDER OF THE MIDDLE AGES](#)

[2. ITALY, GAUL AND SPAIN IN THE CENTURY OF ST. GREGORY](#)

[3. THE CHURCH IN ROMAN BRITAIN: THE CONVERSION OF THE ENGLISH, 313-735](#)

[4. MAHOMET AND THE RISE OF ISLAM](#)

[5. SPANISH CATHOLICISM AND ST. ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, 589-711](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 4: THE CHURCH AND THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE, 714-814

Index

[1. THE HERESY OF THE ICONOCLASTS](#)

[2. THE WORK OF ST. BONIFACE](#)

[3. THE ORIGIN OF THE PAPAL STATE](#)

[4. THE FIRST YEARS OF THE PAPAL STATE](#)

[5. CHARLEMAGNE, 768-814](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 5: THE SIEGE OF CHRISTENDOM, 814-1046

Index

[1. THE BREAK-UP OF CHARLEMAGNE'S EMPIRE, 814-888](#)

[2. CAROLINGIAN CATHOLICISM: PIETY, LEARNING, MISSIONS](#)

[3. EASTERN CATHOLICISM: THE END OF ICONOCLASM: THE SCHISM OF PHOTIUS: 813-925](#)

[4. THE ROMAN SEE AND THE DISSOLUTION OF THE EMPIRE, 814-900](#)

[5. THE ROMAN SEE AND THE ANARCHY, 900-1046](#)

[6. CATHOLIC LIFE DURING THE ANARCHY: ABUSES, REFORMERS, MISSIONARY CONQUESTS](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 6: THE RESTORATION OF SPIRITUAL INDEPENDENCE, 1046-1123

Index

[1. THE MOVEMENT OF REFORM AND ST. GREGORY VII, 1046-1123](#)

[2. THE SCHISM OF CERULARIUS](#)

[3. . THE OFFENSIVE AGAINST ISLAM: SICILY, SPAIN, THE EAST. 106-1099](#)

[4. THE MONASTIC RENAISSANCE: CHARTREUSE, CITEAUX, PREMONTRE](#)

[5. THE RENAISSANCE OF CATHOLIC THOUGHT](#)

[6. THE FIRST GENERAL COUNCIL IN THE WEST](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 7: THE AGE OF ST. BERNARD, 1123-1181

Index

1. ST. BERNARD

2. THE PROGRESS OF CATHOLIC THOUGHT: ABELARD -- GILBERT OF LA PORREE -- HUGH OF ST. VICTOR -- PETER LOMBARD -- GRATIAN -- ROLAND BANDINELLI

3. THE ROMAN SEE IN THE GENERATION AFTER THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS, 1123-1153

4. THE LATIN EAST, 1100-1151

5. THE IMPERIAL MENACE TO THE FREEDOM OF RELIGION: (I) FREDERICK BARBAROSSA AND ALEXANDER III, 1154-1177

6. THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF 1179

▪ *Previous Index*

CHAPTER 8: THE CRISIS OF THE MIDDLE AGES, 1181-1198

Index

[1. THE IMPERIAL MENACE TO THE FREEDOM OF RELIGION: \(2\) THE EMPEROR HENRY VI](#)

[2. THE DISASTERS IN THE LATIN EAST, 1150-1197](#)

[3. CATHOLIC THOUGHT: THE MENACE OF ARISTOTLE AND AVERROES](#)

[4. ANTI-CLERICALISM, HERESY AND ANTI-CATHOLICISM: WALDENSES, JOACHIM OF FLORA, ALBIGENSES](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 9: INNOCENT III AND THE CATHOLIC REACTION, 1198-1216

Index

[1. THE CRUSADE AGAINST THE ALBIGENSES](#)

[2. ST. DOMINIC AND THE FRIARS PREACHERS](#)

[3. ST. FRANCIS AND THE FRIARS MINOR](#)

[4. INNOCENT III AND THE CATHOLIC PRINCES](#)

[5. INNOCENT III AND THE LATIN EAST](#)

[6. INNOCENT III AND THE REFORM OF CATHOLIC LIFE: THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF 1215](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 10: THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY: ACHIEVEMENT AND PROBLEMS, 1216-1274.

Index

1. THE IMPERIAL MENACE TO THE FREEDOM OF
RELIGION: (3) THE EMPEROR FREDERICK II.

2. THE CRUSADE OF ST. LOUIS IX, 1247-1254

3. INNOCENT IV AND THE PAPAL MONARCHY

4. THE END OF THE HOHENSTAUFEN: URBAN IV,
CLEMENT IV AND CHARLES OF ANJOU

5. THE INQUISITION

6. THE TRIUMPH OF THE CATHOLIC
INTELLIGENCE: ST. BONAVENTURE, ST. ALBERT
THE GREAT, ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

▪ *Previous Index*

CHAPTER 1: GESTA PER FRANCO, 1270-1314

Index

[1. BL. GREGORY X AND THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF LYONS, 1270-1276](#)

[2. THE SHADOW OF ANJOU, 1276-1285](#)

[3. FRANCE AND THE SICILIAN WAR, 1285-1294](#)

[4. BONIFACE VIII, 1294-1303](#)

[5. PHILIP THE FAIR'S LAST VICTORY, 1303-1314](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 2: 'THE AVIGNON CAPTIVITY', 1314-1362

Index

[1. CRISIS IN THE WORLD OF THOUGHT i. The Problem of Church and State](#)

[2. THE TROUBLED TIMES OF JOHN XXII i. The Friars Minor](#)

[3. THE AVIGNON REGIME i. The Centralised Administration](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 3: THE RETURN OF ST. PETER TO ROME, 1362-1420

Index

[1. INFELIX ITALIA, 1305--1367](#)

[2. THE POPES LEAVE AVIGNON, 1362-1378](#)

[3. CHRISTIAN LIFE, MYSTICS, THINKERS](#)

[4. THE SCHISM OF THE WEST, 1378-1409 i. The Two Conclaves of 1378.](#)

[5. THE CHURCH UNDER THE COUNCILS, 1409-1418 i. Pisa, 1409](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 4: FIFTY CRITICAL YEARS, 1420-1471

Index

[1. THE MENACE OF HERESY AND SCHISM, 1420-1449](#)

[2. THE RETURN OF ISLAM, 1291-1481](#)

[3. THE RETURN OF THE ANCIENT WORLD](#)

▪ [Previous Index](#)

CHAPTER 5: 'FACILIS DESCENSUS. . .' 1471-1517

Index

1. A PAPACY OF PRINCES

SIXTUS IV

INNOCENT VIII

ALEXANDER VI

JULIUS II

LEO X

2. CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THOUGHT, 1471-1517

3. LUTHER

▪ *Previous Index*



A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH To the Eve of the Reformation

by Philip Hughes

Vol. 1: -711

CHAPTER 1: THE WORLD IN WHICH THE CHURCH WAS FOUNDED

1. THE ROMAN IMPERIAL UNITY

IT is not possible to understand the early history of the Church without some knowledge of the political and cultural world into which the Church came, of the Roman Empire, that is to say, as it was in the century which followed the Battle of Actium (31 B. C.), of Hellenism, of the older pre-Hellenistic civilisation still alive below the surface, and of the rich diversity of the Empire's religions. The Empire in which the first Christian propagandists worked was a vast state whose forty provinces took in roughly all Europe west of the Rhine and south of the Danube, with the island of Britain, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Arabia and Egypt and the north coast of Africa thence to the Atlantic. Rome, its central capital city, had begun its history as a city-state. Then, as the head of a league of similar local states, as the chief state of an Italian federation, it had acquired, in little more than a century and a half, in a variety of ways, province by province, the greatest of antique Empires. Spain, Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica were the spoil of the wars with Carthage. The best part of Asia Minor came through the will of the last of its native kings. Gaul was the product of Julius Caesar's military genius. Syria, Palestine and the rest of Asia Minor of that of his rival, Pompey. Egypt was the conquest of Augustus himself. Much of the East came with little native resistance: Gaul, on the other hand, cost nine years of Caesar's campaigns; Italy was only reconciled to Roman hegemony after the bloody Social War (90-88 B.C.), while in Spain two centuries elapsed between the first occupation and the final definitive victories.

The provinces differed as much in the character of their pre-Roman civilisation as they differed in the circumstances which had subdued them to the Roman power; and hence they differed no less greatly in the degree to which the Roman power "romanised" them. In Greece and Asia, Rome subdued politically peoples who were, culturally, her superiors. In Syria, and especially in Egypt, there was a civilisation older still than that of Greece, "hellenised" now for several centuries; in Gaul a native Celtic civilisation, of yet another type; in Spain a population of fierce local clans where each separate valley was a new, separate people. Greece and Asia were politically organised, famous for their cities, centuries before Roman history began; while in the West it was Rome who introduced the "city," and, in many western provinces, cities were rare even centuries after the Roman occupation.

From the days when she was merely the head of a league of Italian city-states, Rome had shown unique capacity for combining diversity in union, a political flexibility always ready to find new relationships on which to build alliances. Hence in the Empire, where no part was less firmly bound to Rome than another, and every part as firmly as possible, each part was yet bound by special links forged by the special circumstances of its conquest. All were equally subject; but in the manner of the subjection and in its implications there was diversity. To the immense population of this vast state the empire gave two hundred years of internal peace -- an achievement that has had few parallels in history. It developed the Hellenistic civilisation it found in possession, and brought that civilisation -- the best material civilisation the world had ever known -- to countries which otherwise, in East and West alike, would never have known it. It was through the Roman town -- the *civitas*, the city, that is, and the surrounding countryside attached to it -- that this work of civilisation was accomplished. For the city was no mere agglomeration of buildings, its population nothing more than the association of a few thousand or a hundred thousand individuals. The Roman towns were, as far as the thing was possible within the structure of the Empire, city-states, conscious of their existence as such, each with its own personality, centres of strong local patriotism and self-confidence [] In varying degrees the towns were all of them self-governing, independent of the central government's bureaucracy except for certain taxes and the provision of

recruits for the army. From this point of view the Empire was a vast federation of self-governing cities. The constitution of this local state varied according to its charter. There was provision always for magistrates who acted as judges, settled the local taxes and collected them, saw to the upkeep of roads and the post. The magistrates were elected, as was also the city's senate; and the elections were realities. There was, finally, in the city, the popular assembly; year by year representatives of all the cities of a province met at the provincial capital for the solemn rites with which the Emperor and the Genius of Rome were worshipped.

This Provincial Assembly also came in time to have a political importance. It became, for example, the organ through which complaints were made to the emperor. For the centre of the empire, its ruler, was the city of Rome, still in theory a republic of which the emperor was but the chief magistrate. When after a century of terrible civil wars -- Marius, Sulla, Pompey, Julius Caesar, Antony -- the victory of Actium (31 B.C.) left Caesar's nephew, Octavian, sole master of the Roman world, he was able to build on the ruins of the old republic, where an aristocratic senate had been omnipotent, a new state. The form of the old he carefully preserved, but the reality was the rule of a military chief, an autocrat obeyed by virtue of personal oath of allegiance. The basis of his power was his victorious army, and thence derived one of the empire's great problems: how to keep this army of professional long-service volunteers, who yet were citizens, from interfering in political life for its own profit. Here the personality of the reigning emperor mattered enormously, and while Augustus' first successor Tiberius (14-37) succeeded as Augustus himself had done, five emperors, within sixty years of the death of Augustus, had died violently at the hands of the troops and civil war had revived again (68-69). There followed a century of capable rulers -- Vespasian to Marcus Aurelius (69-180), and then in 192 the army, increasingly out of hand, brought about another century of civil wars and finally a reorganisation of the Imperium, under Diocletian and Constantine, that made it a new thing. It is this Empire of the Antonines, either functioning (98-180), or in dissolution (180-284), that is the political background of primitive Christianity.

But the emperor was much more than the chief magistrate of the republic, omnipotent because he commanded an army that was

bound to him by personal ties. He was the direct ruler of many of the provinces -- Egypt, one of the wealthiest, was practically a vast imperial estate. There had thus grown up inevitably a great corps of the emperor's personal servants, paid to watch over his personal and imperial interests throughout the provinces -- to gather monies due to him, to administer his properties, to safeguard his interests in the multitude of cities against distant local rapacity or indifference, to execute his decrees and to see that others observed his laws. Here was a whole superstructure of offices and officials, concerned principally with Finance and Law, and of this, as well as of the army, the emperor was the absolute chief. The chief authors of this system were Claudius (41-54), Vespasian (69-78), and Hadrian (117-138). Inevitably, with the passing years, the importance of this imperial bureaucracy grew. Duties of supervising local government were laid upon it, and in the end the local elective governments came to be of secondary importance beside the paid, Rome-appointed official. In somewhat similar fashion the Law too developed, the emperor being omni-competent and his decisions becoming a source of law, judicial and administrative. When to this is added the development of the religious cultus of the emperor it will be easily understood how by the fourth century the Roman Emperor had become an absolute monarch of the pre-classical, oriental type.

The Roman Empire was not merely one politically, it was one also in culture; and this second unity outlasted the first, survived indeed to be a main foundation of all subsequent culture, to influence the Church in no small degree, sometimes aiding, sometimes hindering the development of her institutions, her expansion and her very doctrines. Politically the Empire was Roman; culturally it was, not Greek, but Hellenistic.

This Hellenistic Culture was the product of the political conquest of the East by the Macedonian king, Alexander the Great (336-323 B.C.).

The Macedonians, though the language they spoke was undoubtedly a Greek dialect, and though they were probably Greeks by blood, were none the less reckoned barbarians by the Greeks of the classic culture. The Macedonian conquest of the East was therefore, from its beginning, a victory for a "Grecianism" that had never been purely classical, for a culture

almost entirely Greek but a culture already mixed, and ready therefore to adapt itself to other cultures. The opportunity came with Alexander's conquest of the Persian Empire.

Persia had menaced the Greek civilisation -- that is, roughly, all that we know as "the East," had seemed bound inevitably to replace in the West all that we know as "the West" -- for a century and a half already when Alexander became king, 336 B. C. The lack of unity among the Greek city-states, the wars between them -- the long Peloponnesian War 431-403 B.C. -- were an eternal invitation to Persian aggression. To defend the West against this, unity was essential; and to unite Greece in a league directed by himself was the aim of Philip of Macedon (360-336). By 337 he had accomplished it. The following year, however, he was assassinated, and it was Philip's son, Alexander, who led the alliance to victory. The story of his conquests reads like a fairy tale, Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia and Persia itself, and even beyond the Indus -- in thirteen years he was master of the world from the Himalayas to the Adriatic. Then, unexpectedly, he died, thirty-three years of age.

That his Empire should descend intact to his baby son was not to be expected. It became, naturally, the much-disputed spoil of his leading generals, and thus Macedonian dynasties were established in Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt -- the only parts of the conquest that concern this story. These original dynasties vanished, the kingdoms were divided still further. From Syria were formed Armenia, Cappadocia, Pontus and Bithynia within a hundred and fifty years. The Celts came in (278 B.C.) and established themselves in Galatia, while the impotent Seleucid kings looked on from Antioch, and in self-defence against the invaders the natives established the Kingdom of Pergamum. Finally into Persia itself came the Parthians, "the Turks of Antiquity," destined to harass and wear down the Roman Empire for centuries. Thus, with Greek or Macedonian dynasties ruling, the hellenising of the East was only a matter of time. By the time of the Roman Conquest it was largely accomplished, and thenceforward Rome is the agent of Hellenism's expansion in the West.

Alexander had dreamed of a real union of all the races he conquered, their fusion into one new people. He had planned the

administration of his Empire on this principle and had himself married a Persian. This fusion of Europe and Asia on a basis of Greek culture, Hellenism did not achieve; nor did it ever make Greeks of the Orientals. Nevertheless it transformed the East for centuries, and for this transformation the chief credit once more is Alexander's. He promised to be as great a ruler as he had been a general in the field. His conquests he welcomed as enlarging the scope and opportunity for the development of the Greek mind, the spread of Greek ideas and ideals of life, of the Greek scientific achievement. Aristotle had been his tutor and the cultural sequel to his conquest was natural. He was the world's great city founder, and the seventy which claim him as their founder were all of them Greek in form and spirit, so many active centres whence diffused Greek thought and life. Alexander's successors were, in this respect, his enthusiastic imitators. A vast scheme of colonisation went with the foundations, and soon the East was filled with Greek traders, Greek artisans, Greeks to organise and exploit native talent, native industry, and especially land. The superiority of Greek methods and policies whether in diplomacy, in politics, or in the exploitation of natural resources, brought a new age of prosperity and peace to the East -- to the profit indeed principally of the Greeks. The East -- Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt -- became one vast market, Greek controlled.

At the head of this new hellenised world were the Greek rulers, secure because conquerors, and more stable still because they inherited, for their native subjects, the divinity acknowledged in the native kings they had dispossessed. Between these Greek rulers and their native subjects there grew up a new, extensive and wealthy middle class of commercials, industrials and middle men of all kinds. This class again was almost entirely Greek. The centres of its wealth were the hellenised towns; and the natives, dispossessed, were bound to the soil, a despised and impoverished class. Between the town and the country, drained for its advantage, here was inevitably a chronic hostility, and an allied hostility between natives and foreigners. The new social and political strain gave to the old native religions a new importance -- they were the one means left for the corporate expression of "national" feeling. Of all these countries Egypt affords the best example of this oppression, for in Egypt the government owned and controlled everything -- agriculture, industry, trade. The country was one vast royal estate, its people

the ruler's slaves or serfs.

Hellenism, then, was but a veneer, its cities a superstructure. There was never any real fusion between Greeks and natives, although the higher classes of the natives were almost always Greek in thought, speech and habits of life. Nevertheless, although the older life still ran on, below the surface and beyond the attention of this Greek-educated world, the hellenistic veneer was universal and the unity it gave, through the centuries before the political unity was achieved and for long after that political unity was lost, was very real. Such is the value of Greek thought even when it exists, as in Hellenism, in combination with non-Greek elements. All through this cultural Empire all who were educated -- and indeed the whole population of the towns -- were Greek in speech; they read the same classical poets, saw the same classical plays, listened to the same classical oratory, studied the same classical thinkers. Their schools, their gymnasia, their temples, their theatres, their very cities were of the one type. They shared the one common, cultural ideal, what the Romans were to call humanitas, the gift proper to this culture, for lack of which the rest of the world was "barbarian," and with this they shared the complementary notion of the "civilised world." This culture had the same attraction for those outside it as, in later centuries, the material order and prosperity of the Roman Empire had for the Germanic tribes beyond the frontier. The powerful ideas latent in it travelled far beyond the limits of the material expansion of the race -- and, much later, they were to assist in that re-birth of the East which characterised the late Empire and early Middle Ages, Sassanian Persia for example, and the Arabia of Mohammed.

In religion Hellenism helped to spread the new idea of a connection between religion and morality -- the result partly of contact with eastern religions -- and the idea also of a relation between present conduct and the life after death. It assisted the development and spread of Greek mystery religions from Italy to Egypt and the Caucasus. It favoured the gradual introduction of Eastern cults into the Greek world. In Art and Letters the Hellenistic Age adds the Comedy of Manners, the Mime, a satirical, topical "revue", and the first of the Idylls, those idealisations of country life by the products of town civilisation in which every sophisticated culture delights. We can note, too, a new intelligent, scientific interest in the non- Greek peoples,

no longer dismissed, undiscussed, as "barbarians;" and the appearance in history of another characteristic product of sophistication, the myth of the "noble savage." Hellenism produced, also, romances and fairy tales, influenced here by the East. One feature all these forms of literary activity share -- they are the product of careful attention to literary form. The history of the "writer by profession" has begun, of the study of language, of letters, of the History of Letters, of the first public libraries. The use of books spreads; to possess books becomes the mark of a gentleman and the book trade develops. Historians especially flourish, are in demand even, and each monarchy, each city has' its official historiographer. Translations are popular and translators busy. One subject that occupies them is the Sacred Books of the Eastern Religions. The Bible is now for the first time translated into Greek -- the Septuagint.

Of the hellenistic achievement in Architecture, Sculpture, Painting, its systematic and scientific town-planning -- which gives to the West its first well-ordered towns -- we can only make a mention. It is an age also of scientific discovery, and of amazing inventions through the application of the natural sciences-especially is there progress in Anatomy, in Physiology, in Astronomy, Mathematics and Mechanics. It is an age of learning, and an age where learning becomes the concern of the State. Schools, libraries, learned societies even -- at Alexandria the Museum-arc maintained at the State's expense. All this is, in the main, the product of Greek culture working in an immensely wider field, and in that field influencing, slowly and never completely, but influencing none the less, the ancient East. In one respect only does the East in return seriously influence the Greek culture, in the point where that culture was so poor in thought as to be childish -- its religion. Here Hellenism truly is debtor to the East.

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



2. THE PAGAN RELIGIONS OF THE ROMANO-HELLENISTIC CULTURE

" The teachings of Christianity are to-day so familiar, they have dominated our philosophy so powerfully and for so long a time, that it is only with difficulty that we can realise their superhuman character. To regain that notion we must for a moment tear ourselves from this Christian world where we live, and mix once more with the Jewish and pagan crowd to whom the apostles first preached the gospel. There, without at first paying heed to the new teaching that is about to make itself heard, we must listen to the chatter of the crowd as it surges about us, and through the popular legends and the speculation of the elite, strive to reach religious beliefs as the disciples of Jesus encountered them. Then when the voice of these new teachers does reach our ears we shall recapture something of that note of newness with which their message seized on those who first heard it." []

We may distinguish roughly three main religious influences in that world into which Catholicism came. There were first of all the religions associated with the culture of classic antiquity, of Greece that is, and Rome. There were the religions which originated in the pre-Roman culture of the Empire, Celtic religions in the West and -- much more important in the history of the Church -- the ancient religions of the East. Of these last, one, by its nature a religion apart, demands special treatment. It is the third of these main religious currents -- the religion of the Jewish people.

The Jews were but a fraction of the Empire's huge population, and outside that fraction flourished the amorphous thing we conveniently label Paganism. On the surface Paganism presented, throughout the Empire, the more or less uniform aspect of the Romano-Hellenic cults which had become the fashionable thing with the expansion and centralisation of the imperial system. But just as the older culture and older social tradition survived beneath the new political structure, so there survived too the older religious beliefs and practices. The religion of any given city then, of any given family, even of the individual, would present a curiously rich diversity in which

could be distinguished, strata by strata, the remains of more than one religious development and conquest.

The Greek contribution to this world of religions was twofold. There were the earlier beliefs, animistic and anthropomorphic which grew and developed through centuries of whose history we know little or nothing, and which are best known to us through the epic poetry. There were the numerous beliefs and systems that grew up in reaction against this primitive naturalistic religion.

The earlier religion saw a superhuman power at work in the play of natural forces and their products. Trees, streams, sky and air, the earth itself were revered as the effects of the superhuman, finally identified with the superhuman, and as such personified and worshipped. Some of these naturalistic gods were conceived as having human form; and gradually, from out this vast number of the gods so conceived, a few, absorbing the functions of the less important, came to be considered as ruling, in a more or less ordered hierarchy, this supernatural construction. With them were associated lesser gods -- the deified achievements of humanity -- the heroes. With each god, demi-god and hero went the appropriate myth, and to each was paid his due worship. This cult was a public, community affair, a matter of ritual acts. Sacrifices placated the divinity, oracles discovered its will, and at times magic arts constrained it. Ritual acts were the affair of the priests -- their sole function. Fixed dogmatic teaching there was none; nor did these religions provide any sanctions for the morality of conduct. "Doctrine mattered little. The ritual practices were the real affair of religion. It was ritual that was of obligation, an obligation generally of extreme urgency."

There was a vague belief in a future life that was the same for all mankind, a few lucky descendants of the Olympian gods excepted; for this future life was hardly conceived as a thing to be coveted. The words Homer puts into the mouth of Achilles are but an expression of a despair as widespread as the mythologies themselves: "Better to be the most wretched slave on earth than among the dead to be the King of all." In the heaven where dwelt the divinities of this unmoral, anthropomorphic religion, life was the life of earth; and with human virtues, human vices -- and among them the most human

of all -- found there their celestial counterpart. Violence, covetousness, treachery, injustice and an anarchy of sex morality played their part in the life of the divine patron as habitually, as unashamedly and as unremorsefully as in the lives of the worst of his earthly clients.

With any development of intellectual life the growth of reaction against such a religion could only be a matter of time. The mythology, thanks to the gifted race's imagination and to its literary genius, became at once the source and inspiration of all that was most characteristic in the national life, and, accepted in its main lines wherever the race spread, the basis of whatever unity it possessed. But the effect of imaginative and artistic development was to humanise the gods until they became indistinguishable from creatures, and presently, for the intellectuals, little more than the playthings of the race's brilliant fantasy. When to the early poets there succeeded the first philosophers, and the later critical dramatic poetry, the inevitable antagonism between Greek religion and the Greek intelligence began to show rapidly. Zeus, Hera, Artemis, Apollo and Aphrodite; Furies, Nymphs, Pan and the Satyrs could not forever dominate any human intelligence; and the Greek intelligence was soon to show itself in a strength and acuteness never since surpassed.

The first product of the reaction was the spread, side by side with the ancient public religions, of new secret cults, open only to the initiated, in which the dissatisfaction with the older cults' puerilities and the newly-aroused intellectual speculation found something of satisfaction. These were the Mystery Religions and the Orphic cults.

The Mysteries were magnificently organised dramatic spectacles, dramas in which were represented the most primitive of the myths, through which -- and not through any dogmatic teaching or special esoteric revelation -- the candidate was initiated into a new assurance of his present acceptability to the god and of his future eternal happiness in a world to come. He prepared himself for the event by ritual purification in the sea or in the appointed river, by fasts and special abstinences. He was sworn to secrecy; he offered the appointed sacrifices; he was fed with the mysterious sacred food; and then, in the night that followed, spectator of the sacred mysterious drama, he

became one with the blessed body of the elect.

The Orphic cults all developed about the same time: roughly, it is in the sixth century before Christ that their first historical traces can be found. Orphic religion is at once a mystery and a philosophy. Man is a being in whom there works a dual principle. From the Titans, from whose ashes he partly derives, he inherits a principle of evil. From the god Dionysos, slain and devoured by the Titans -- the crime for which they merited destruction-he inherits a principle that is good. Whence the necessity for man to free himself from the evil element of his nature, so that what is divine in him may triumph. This emancipation is the object of the Orphic rites. They include repeated purifications; sacrifices where no blood is shed; the dramatic representation of the myth of the slaying of Dionysos, in which the candidates devour the raw flesh of the bull in whose form he is presented as being slain; and, finally, the revelation to the newly-initiated of the infallible, sacred, saving formula which will secure him safe passage through the nether world. The natural anxiety for a happy future life finds an assurance; and with these theories of man as a fallen god and of the saving rites of purification, the idea of morality for the first time enters Greek religion. These teachings, and the ceremonial effect of the mysteries' setting, made of the new movement a formidable rival to the futile formalism which preceded

A more direct blow to its life was the criticism of the new moral philosophy. "Never did people of so advanced a culture have so childish a religion," says M. Cumont; and the culture was about to destroy that religion for ever, as a force in the lives of that elite whose leisure for thought makes it the arbiter of a people's destiny. In the wake of this new religious movement, then, there followed a moralist criticism of the old cults which mocked at the domestic absurdities of Olympus and heaped on the Olympians the reproach of all the misery of the world they were conceived as ruling. Belief in such gods is futile, a waste of life, the greatest of follies. Such is the inevitable conclusion, and if in Sophocles and Aeschylus the genius of poetry remained conservatively loyal, in the plays of Euripides the new criticism found an exponent as powerful and profound as his appeal was popular. The moral problems of personal responsibility for which Orphic religion offered a solution passed into the philosophical discussion of the day, and became for a long time

one of its most popular topics. Through the personality of Socrates, and the art of Plato, moral philosophy bred a new notion of righteous living and a noble idealism of life which, owing nothing to the older religion's inspiration, could not, from its very superiority to that religion's ideals, be anything else than a force making for its destruction. The new philosophy offered to men a better way; and if it led to an imitation in life of the divine, it did so without the aid of the old beliefs, using the rites, where they were used, simply as symbols of civic duty.

Speculative Philosophy completed the work of destruction. Where the moral theorists laid bare the inferiority and uselessness of the ancient cults, the rationalists who accompanied and followed them broke up, with the acid critique of their direct attack, whatever hold they might have on reason. This movement reached its perfection in the work of Aristotle (384-322) whose genius built up a vast encyclopaedia of knowledge in which religion and morality found their place, based this time on critical reasoning from observed facts.

Greek Thought and the official Greek religion henceforth went their separate ways. At its best the Thought was immensely superior to the Cults, and even though in the centuries that followed the golden age Philosophy declined and decayed, the cults never recovered their one-time uncontested supremacy. The conquests of Alexander the Great, which opened new spheres of influence to Greek culture, spread its medley of religions and philosophies throughout the East. Oriental religions in turn affected the religion of the conquerors, and with the political revolutions brought about the last stage of religious transformation. The old official religion had been too intimately associated with the local city-state not to lose some of its importance when the city-state fell. Alexander, on his death, was ranked among the gods -- an example only too quickly followed in the case of his multitude of successors in all the countries into which his vast Empire was partitioned. The myths ceased to have any meaning other than mythical; and slowly Greek religion took its place as one element among many in the great movement which, throughout the Empire, was slowly fusing all beliefs and cults into one amorphous unmeaning thing.

As with the Greeks of Homeric times, so it was with the Romans; their earliest religion was animist in its basis. Natural forces, air,

fire, water, the sky, the lightning and the storm -- these manifestations of superhuman power, won a reverence from that association, and were envisaged as the manifestations of the divine personalities who dwelt in them. More peculiarly Roman, and more in keeping with the Roman character, was the notion of the divinity as the guardian of life, the patron of all its actions. From this notion sprang a whole host of minor deities; for every act of life had its appropriate deity, under whose invocation and with whose aid, the life was lived, the action performed. So in infancy it was Educa that taught the child to eat, and Potina to drink. Cuba watched over his cradle, and while Ossipago strengthened his bones and Carna his flesh, Statanus secured that he stood upright and Abeona that he walked. Fabulinus, Farinus and Locutius initiated him in the art of speech, Terduca cared for him as he went to school and Domiduca as he returned. . . and others of the vast army assisted at every act of every stage of adolescence and maturity.

A second particularity of this early Roman religion was its domestic character. The Roman family was itself a sacred thing. Each member had his guardian deity; the Lar Familiaris guarded the field in which the house was built, and in the house itself the shrine of the Penates, with its daily ritual of oblations, was the very centre of family life. The strength of the domestic religion was shown perhaps most of all in the cult of the dead -- a cult designed to placate the shades of the departed, to supply their wants in the life to which they had gone, and, in the last development, to establish a communion and intercourse between them and the worshippers.

But the gods of the Romans -- even, originally, the major gods Jupiter, Juno and the rest -- were powers rather than persons. The practical, unimaginative character of the people coloured its religion. There was no speculation as to the nature of the gods, no imaginative mythology, no artistic representation, no temples even. Religion, like the world of fact, was something to be used, not a theme for meditation. The Roman, in whom the notion of contract was instinctive, dealt with his gods accordingly. The appointed ritual produced the ordained effect; and all his service of the gods was wholly legalist, wholly formalist, the careful execution of man's share of the bilateral agreement. Mysticism, love of the gods, devotion -- in the usual sense of the --; word -- could have no place in such a religion; and Cicero was never

truer to tradition than when he defined sanctity as the science of ritual.

With this legalist spirit, there went the kindred notion of authority. Not that there was any priestly caste. The priest is no more than a master of ceremonies, seeing to the exact observance of the rite. In the domestic cults it was the head of the house who officiated, and in the public cults it was the magistrates or the colleges of priests assimilated to them. But Roman religion was a political thing. The city was the family developed, and was itself a sacred thing, a holy place. Hence not only was the supervision of domestic cults a duty of its magistrates, but as the city developed, as it conquered its weaker neighbours, the victory had a religious character and it was in the imposition and acceptance of the Roman religion that the new political gains were consolidated. Thus by a development very different from that which followed the Greek conquest of the East under Alexander, the Roman gods entered as victors into the pantheon of whatever people the Romans overcame. It was a trait in their religious mentality in which the later cult of the State, or of the emperor, was to find a strong foundation. Civic Authority and Religion went ever together, but with the State in unquestioned primacy. The priesthood had no influence in political life. Rather it was the politician who usurped the priesthood.

As the Roman city grew in importance, other forces began slowly to influence its religious development, of which by far the most important were from Greece. From the sixth century B.C. the tide flowed ever more strongly, and Greek Anthropomorphism with its mythology entered into rivalry with the impersonal native Roman austerity. Greek rites too were introduced despite repeated prohibitions, and presently, in the usual way, the new foreign deities were adapted to and identified with the ancient gods of the fatherland. With the Greek religions came, too, the Greek scepticism; and in Rome, as in Greece, the mythology reacted unfavourably on the religion that bred it, once philosophical criticism was free to deal with the mythology.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



3. THE RELIGION OF THE JEWS

Against all the hundred religions of antiquity the religion of the Jews stands out a thing unique. Alone of them all it has survived. Zeus and Minerva, Osiris, Astarte, gods of the East and of the West are long since merely names; but to this day the Jews survive and the God Whom they worshipped in the far off centuries when these other cults too had their millions of devotees is still their God, worshipped now not only by Jews but by hundreds of millions of every race and nation.

By its subsequent history, then, the religion of ancient Jewry is a thing apart. It is no less clearly distinguished from the rest by the doctrine which is its core, and by the historic character of its origin. Judaism was the revelation made by God to a particular people; the revelation of a doctrine concerning Himself, of a moral teaching, and of the fact of their own special relation to Him with the promise to them of a special role in all subsequent ages. The history of the Jewish people is the development of the tradition of this revelation. By that revelation, which from the beginning is consistently presented as the free act of the Divine goodwill, the race is constituted a sanctuary wherein lie safeguarded the true belief in the only God, the true principles of moral conduct and the tradition of God's promise. Within this sanctuary of the chosen race the divinely revealed religion lives, and develops as from an internal principle; its implications brought out, its detail defined, in later revelations through nearly two thousand years.

There is only one God, who is master of the world and the source of law, just, moral. He represents in Himself an ideal of moral perfection and insists on its reflection in the lives of all He associates with Himself. He is not, then, indifferent to the moral quality of men's actions, but from the beginning demands of them truth and obedience to His law. This "ethical monotheism" survived and developed in a world whose spirit and tendencies were so hostile to it that the mere survival is "a phenomenon unique of its kind. . . . It is a feat greater than the men who bring it about, and, contrasting as it does with the milieu wherein it is produced, puts the ordinary logic of history to flight." For this monotheism is, with the Jews, the popular belief. It is not a

higher teaching in which only the elite of these people are initiated.

It was to Abraham -- the chief of a group of Hebrews living in Chaldea -- that, in a world rocking in political convulsion, the revelation was made. He obeyed the call, accepted the charge, believed the promise; and left, with his people, the moral decadence that lay around. To God he and they were now specially covenanted, and thereby separated from the rest of mankind. With this separation the history of Jewry begins. The development falls naturally into two uneven periods divided by the political destruction of the Jewish nation under the Babylonian kings (586 B.C.), and in the first and greater half of the development we may reckon roughly three principal stages. These are the primitive revelation to Abraham; the second revelation and re-organisation under Moses; and the work of preservation through the Prophets.

Moses, the leader personally called by God to whom first God makes known His nature in His name -- Yahweh (He Who Is) is the restorer of Abraham's tradition which, in the centuries of his descendants' slavery to Egypt, had almost perished. Moses it is who leads the people from Egypt and in the forty years of their wanderings makes a nation of this loose association of Abraham's children. Throughout, and consistently, he acts as the agent of Yahweh in obedience to frequent and explicit divine directions. But his influence in history is greater still as the divinely directed legislator. Here the traditional revelation is expressed once more, but with a new protective precision; and, with a wealth of detail, its moral principles are applied to the Hebrew's everyday life. Yahweh is God, and Yahweh alone is God. Israel is Yahweh's people, His property; and if there is an alliance between Him and them, once more it is His good will and choice that is its foundation. He is the God of holiness of life, the enemy of violence and injustice. The sexual aberrations so closely and so universally interwoven with the contemporary idea of religious practice, are particularly obnoxious; and He exacts from all a purity of soul of which the carefully ordained bodily purity is but the sign. Throughout all the multitude of detailed observances there runs this idea of personal holiness as the end of life. The spirit of filial fear is to be the spirit of their observance and from the beginning the duty of charity and love of one's fellows is enforced. The law, its ideals and its motives,

is for all; whence its power as the instrument of this people's moral and religious education. Its theocratic character, and the repeated insistence, whether in matters of ritual or of legal prescription as generally understood, on the supreme importance of the inner law of mind and conscience, safeguard it from the deadening effect that is the sure end of all mere codes of right behaviour. In this insistence Jewish law is unique, as it is unique in its aim of personal sanctification.

The cult remains, in principle, the same as that revealed to Abraham: prayer and sacrifice. Human sacrifices are from the beginning forbidden, and there is an emphatic prohibition of any attempt to represent in images Yahweh who is a spirit. The sacrifices are offered in one place only, before the Ark of the Alliance a chest of cedar wood that holds the sensible memorials of the divine dealings with Moses. There is an elaborate official ritual and a priestly caste, hereditary in one of the twelve tribes.

Moses is the man of his people's period of transition -- ruling and teaching for the forty years that lie between their leaving Egypt and their arrival in "the Promised Land," the Canaan to which Yahweh, centuries before, had directed Abraham. Their arrival and the death of Moses came together; and with their entry into this new country came a violent religious reaction. The temptation to abandon their austere religion, once escaped from the desert that was its natural setting, was strong. The Jews lived now in an easier, more generous land where everything called to the senses; and the native religions which, on every side, canonised moral corruption, afforded them an example which they imitated only too readily. Hence with their new political and social relations periods of apostasy, more or less open, from the worship of Yahweh; an ever-present danger of corruption of that worship and its teaching; and, in the new little kingdom, a more or less general moral decay.

So it was to be for some centuries: a never ending struggle between the traditional "ethical monotheism" and the inviting appeals of sense; but never does the tradition, doctrinal or moral, wholly disappear and unlike, for example, the Philistines, the Hebrews retain their individuality: they are never absorbed by the civilisations around them. This survival was due to the labours of the Prophets, spiritual free-lances whom from time to

time Yahweh raised up to preserve the tradition and to develop it. At every critical moment of the kingdom's history they appeared, Yahweh's messengers, speaking in His name, attesting the authenticity of their message by miracles and prophecies. Careless of the dignity or office of the guilty, they denounced unsparingly the moral corruption and the defections from Mosaic orthodoxy, recalling unceasingly the special vocation of the Jews and their special duties towards Yahweh who had called them. In times of political defeats they taught from contemporary events the lesson of Yahweh as God outraged by man's sin and punishing for man's correction. Salvation, reconciliation with God, Who was the nation's life, was possible through penance -- for along with the notion of divine justice the Prophets developed, too, the correlative idea of the divine pity for man and the idea of Yahweh's special fatherly care for the Jews. More than ever is the holiness of God insisted on, of Yahweh, Who is the God not only of Israel but of all mankind, Master of the tyrants whom He suffered to oppress them as truly as He is Master of the defeated and broken nation. Wickedness will be punished, no matter what the race of the wrongdoer; and Israel is encouraged to submit with resignation to the divine justice, with an affectionate, filial piety that discerns the love behind a father's wrath. As the inevitable catastrophe draws on, the denunciation of wickedness in high places grows ever more severe, and the sternest critics of religious abuses are here no philosophers from outside but Yahweh's own accredited ambassadors. And with the increasing vehemence of the reproach, the spirituality of the message grows ever deeper. More and more do the Prophets develop the notion that it is the piety and fidelity of the individual that is the one security for the present, the one hope for the future. Finally Nabuchodonosor captures the Holy City; the Temple that is the one centre of religious life is destroyed, and the last remnant of the people carried off into captivity; and in the midst of the lamentations and the cruelty of the oppressors, there comes from the broken heart of Israel the Prayer of Jeremias, the most sublime of testimonies to the ideal of the individual life with God, the highest moral achievement of all the earlier Old Testament writings.

The Prophets had yet another role. They kept ever before the mind of the Jew, and never more than in these hours of defeat, the promises made of old to Abraham that from his race there

should one day come the glory of the world; and in their successive reminders the promises became ever more precise. For the faithlessness of His people had not alienated Yahweh for ever. Present disaster is but the means to their betterment and closer union with Him. Far from being unmindful of His ancient promises of a Saviour, He chooses the present time of catastrophe to renew them yet more splendidly, and thereby to heighten and spiritualise His chosen people's hope.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



4. TENDENCIES IN THE RELIGIOUS WORLD OF THE FIRST CENTURY A.D.

It remains, before we come to the story of the new religion, to note some of the tendencies at work, when it appeared, in the old religions whose leading features we have surveyed. The new religion came into existence on the morrow of a political revolution whose effect was world-wide, the transformation into a personal autocracy of the oligarchy which, through the power of Rome, controlled civilisation. That revolution was itself the last of a succession which, through nearly three centuries, had slowly changed the main conditions of social life, and in changing these had influenced the religious ideas and practices of a whole world. In those three hundred years there had been at work a continuous steady pressure working towards the political unity of civilisation, and destroying, as it progressed, the multitudinous barriers to freedom of thought and intercourse which the rivalry of a hundred states and cultures had thrown up in sheer self-defence. It had worked most powerfully for a more generous philosophical conception of man's relation to his fellows, and had even given the beginnings of a setting of fact to such philosophical theories as that of the universal brotherhood of men. This gentle and more generous spirit passed from the philosophers to the very citadel of particularism and privilege -- the law, and the revolution was reflected in the first western legislation that can truly be called social.

And, it needs no stating, this new force, bred of a new political and social unity, influenced no less strikingly the traditional notions of religion. For the intellectuals of Paganism there was that new thing the moral philosophy of the Stoics; and while some turned in desperation from the critic-riddled mythologies to the despair of scepticism, the neo-Pythagorean philosophies with their teaching of a divine providence and their liturgy of healing and purification attracted others. In this pagan elite we have the spectacle of a doctrinal enthusiasm reflected in, and influenced by, every form of intellectual activity, seeking restlessly but untiringly a system which will satisfy both intellect and heart. One of the most striking examples perhaps of this coincident doubt and desire, of the prevalent alternation of credulity and scepticism is Cicero. Cicero, conservative and

respectful to tradition -- no embittered liberal in revolt like Lucretius -- who, in one mood, invoking his genius to move the people to gratitude for Jove's safeguarding of Rome can speak as a theologian, appears in quite another guise in his philosophical writings and his private correspondence. Do the gods exist? The question, self-found, he proceeds to discuss it. "No doubt it is hard to say 'no', if the matter is discussed in a public reunion. Amongst ourselves. . . nothing easier than to say 'no.' I am myself one of the pontiffs. I really believe we ought to preserve with jealous devotion all the ceremonial of the public cult. For all that, I should like to be able to prove to myself that the gods do exist, not the mere likelihood of their existence but to prove it as a certainty. I have so many difficulties troubling me in this matter that sometimes I come to think that really there are no gods." The like interest, the same anxious desire, finds an echo in all that was best in the literature of the time. Virgil, Plutarch, and Seneca most of all, reflect it in a kind of continuous ground rhythm that once in a while rising to the surface swells their genius to its full.

What of the crowd, the vast mass of Pagans? Here, too, the new spirit of brotherhood showed itself in the innumerable associations -- collegia -- for mutual assistance.

We note, too, the decline of certain cults. But the traditional paganism survives, still a force if only in the weight of its inertia. Especially does it survive in the local cults, the worship of the special protecting gods of the town, of the professions and trades and of the family, and in the cult of the dead. Local patriotism is here their inspiration, and their ritual observances become a matter of civic duty -- a reflection in religious matters of the rich and varied municipal life that was for so long the Empire's main strength; and the obligation of worship presses universally on every citizen. Even the elite who find their spiritual salvation in far different ways bow in practice to the prevailing spirit; and Seneca can end a devastating criticism of the cult of the gods of the Capitol with the practical recommendation that every wise man will worship them, not that this pleases the gods, but because it is commanded by the law.

And this traditional paganism remained for the mass of its clients substantially the same, anthropomorphic, a hero-worship, a magical cult, undoctrinal, unmoral, idolatrous.

Philosophers might, by allegorising, seek to refine and purify it; they might give the myths a higher meaning through symbolic interpretations. But philosophers are rare. The average man has his bread to earn and lacking the time, if not the aptitude, for speculation, gives himself generally to the practice of life as he finds his fellows practising it. Hence polytheism survives the criticism of the thinkers, and the myths their ridicule; and idolatry remains so widespread, so universal a fact of life, that the pagan elite can mock at it as unsparingly as the later Christian Fathers. And with the universal idolatry there still flourished the old superstition and the old obscenity which the idolatry preached, only too often, from a hundred divine examples. "I am well aware," the words are those of a pagan, Denis of Halicarnassus, "that many philosophers explain allegorically the greater part of these filthy fables. But this philosophy is the possession of a very few only. The mass of mankind, the ordinary folk, accept the stories in their worst sense. Either they despise gods whose lives are so depraved, or, since the gods themselves are shown not to abstain from them, they come to the pitch that they do not recoil from the very vilest of vicious deeds." It is not unfair to say that the survival of this old classic paganism was due "in great part to the feebleness of its control over moral conduct, character and the passions, to the sanction it gave to every surrender to the beast that sleeps, alas, at the heart of each one of us."

Paganism's idea of God had in it no element of grandeur, of holiness, of sanctity; and in its practice, adoration and love could find no place. It was in fact little but a mentality, an attitude of mind which went with a certain routine of ritual. Though it accompanied every action of life, it did so only as an empty gesture, barren of influence, powerless to affect life itself or thought. Nevertheless the founder of the new political regime, Augustus, saw in it a means of control, a source of power, which, patronised, fostered, protected by the state, might become, because of its universal diffusion through the vast empire of so many races and tongues, a permanent reserve of support. Hence his vigorous and continued attempts to restore and reform it; his rich endowment of its temples; and his own public assiduity, and that of his successors, in the observance of its rites. There is attributed to one of his counsellors, Maecenas, a speech which sums up the new state policy in religious matters "Honour the gods according to the customs of

your forefathers, see to it that others honour them too. As for those who would introduce among you any strange novelties of religion, hate them and let them feel your hatred. . . ." Such novelties there were indeed to be, for underneath the universal state-protected Hellenistic Paganism the old cults of Egypt and the East were once more slowly stirring. With their ideas of spiritual purification, of redemption from sin, and of personal immortality, expressed in a ritual incomparably seductive, these cults were later to do much to transform, yet once more, the religion of the populace; but for yet another century they were to move only very slowly, their influence as yet hardly felt outside the underworld of the great cities of the East. Of greater immediate importance, in the first century A.D., was the new cult of the State itself, now in course of slow transformation to a worship of the reigning Emperor, and rapidly becoming the most popular cult of all.

Emperor worship was not a Roman invention. It appears, long before Rome was a power, in ancient Egypt, and it was sufficiently widespread throughout the East for Alexander to use it as a means of consolidating his conquests. The generals, who on his death divided up his Empire among themselves, took the practice as part of the legacy and it was already an established tradition when, in turn, these kingdoms fell before the Roman power. Roman philosophy, associating immortality with the great heroes of humanity -- an immortality they shared with the gods -- may have prepared the way in the west. For the hero lives for ever with the gods, soon he comes to be likened to them, to be considered after death as one of them. But once more it is in the east that the beginnings are to be found, in the cult there rendered to the different generals and proconsuls. Thus at the beginning of the second century Flaminius, the conqueror of the Macedonians, is associated in 196 at Chalcis with the cult of Herakles and Apollo. A century later the custom is general and Cicero can cite a cult of Verres as a count in his famous indictment, and make it a boast that he himself refused the proffered divine honours during his proconsulship of Cilicia. The Civil War helped greatly in the development of the practice, and the assassination of Julius Caesar was the occasion of the first official divinisation, the law of 44 B.C. which decreed to the dead hero the title of "Divine." In the Civil Wars which filled the next few years the rival leaders generously appropriated to themselves like honours -- all but Octavian. With characteristic

caution he waited until with his final victory the honours came to him more surely than if they had been self-conferred. The title of Augustus conferred by the Senate in 27 B.C. had in it already something of the divine, and soon there began at Rome a private cult of the Genius of Augustus. In the provinces progress was more rapid, and altars were erected even during his lifetime to Augustus himself, though at Rome itself it was not customary, for yet another century or more, so to deify the reigning sovereign.

With the emperor there was associated in the ritual the goddess Rome; and presently the two became confounded and, worshipping the emperor, the citizen worshipped his country. It was not merely in a spirit of servility and flattery that this new imperial cult originated and developed. Round it there clustered from the beginning a host of nobler associations. There was thankfulness for the peace and prosperity that succeeded a century of bloody civil war, appreciation of Augustus as the deliverer from an age of anarchy; there was something of the sentiment of pride of race, almost of patriotism; and in this cult all the popular veneration for the majesty of the State's power found a natural and congenial expression, until in the end it became the very touchstone of loyalty and good citizenship. It was of all cults the most popular; and, excelling all others in the pomp that surrounded its celebrations and in the prestige of its priesthood, more than any other it came to stand as the established religion of the State.

It is not, however, in the development of any one particular religion that the most characteristic feature of the religious life of this age is to be sought. More significant, and of ultimately greater importance, is the tendency of all these cults to amalgamate. The new political unity; Rome's new role as the capital of that new unity, the city where the vast Empire's innumerable religions were to meet and to live together, and through which as through a great clearing house of culture the hundred fashions of thought and life were to pass, and to return, refashioned, to the distant provinces; the quasi-official propaganda of the Roman religions; all fostered this new levelling tendency. Rome had conquered Carthage and Greece, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt, and in turn those ancient civilisations, like some captive mistress, were to enslave their conqueror. The subject peoples brought with them into the

Empire their gods as they brought their other cultural habits, and the strangers soon appeared in every city side by side with the native deities, sometimes in rivalry, sometimes roughly identified by a similarity of myth or an identity of divine function. Sometimes the different religions co-existed in a strange companionship that was unconscious of basic incompatibility, or again, combining, they gave rise to newer cults.

This tendency to assimilate and level the cults of the world, which was at work throughout the countries ringed around the Mediterranean Sea, began unmistakably to show itself after the conquests of Alexander. It developed with ever increasing vigour for the next four or five centuries. The nature of the pagan cults assisted the development. They lacked organisation, lacked a body of religious doctrine and consequently there was in them no place for anything corresponding to an Act of Faith. The clients of the different gods were not therefore "members" of the cults as a Christian is a "member" of his Church. Remembering also that Paganism's one obligation was observance of ritual, it is easy to understand the speedy development of this syncretist tendency. Nothing could have been more congenial to the nature of Paganism. But it would be erroneous to suppose that Syncretism made for greater simplicity, for a real unity that would take the place of the old confusing multiplicity of gods and cults. The final result of the movement was confusion greater than ever. It introduced new complexities, and, by its juxtaposition of gods, multiplying ever more and more the number of dwellers on Olympus, it made rather for polytheism more and more hopelessly. For the one Jupiter whom the ancient Roman knew, there were now, to the delight of the sceptic, half a dozen -- as often as not rivals -- to conciliate whom simultaneously called for considerable tact on the part of the pious. So for example Xenophon records how, on his return from Asia, he sacrificed in turn to Zeus Eleutherios and to Zeus Basileus. All in vain. Matters were rather worse than before. He learnt from one learned in such affairs that the jealousy of Zeus Meilichios was the obstacle, and hastening to propitiate the last, he finally received an answer to his prayers. Thanks to the syncretist development "Ideas become more indistinct; but no single idea of divinity clearly emerges. This theocrasia. . . did nothing for monotheism but a great deal for scepticism and the darkest superstitions."

In the six hundred years that lay between Nabuchodonosor's final destruction of their ancient kingdom and the coming of Christianity, the Jews had suffered under a series of political revolutions. Their Babylonian conquerors had fallen to the Persians, and the Persians to Alexander. Alexander's Greek successors had, by their attempted suppression of Judaism, roused a revolt that resulted in an independent Jewish state and finally this had fallen to the Romans. Each of the political systems under which the Jews had lived had left its mark on national characteristics, but none had effected a change equal to that which resulted from the years of exile that followed the conquest of Nabuchodonosor. The exiles were indeed allowed to return by the Persian who conquered Nabuchodonosor's hapless descendant, but the Jewry of post-exilic times was a new thing, and the restored national life was no mere resumption of the old.

Henceforth there were indeed to be two Jewries, for not all the exiles returned, and from the Babylonian captivity the historian has ever before him this dual development of the race and its religion. The colonies of those who chose permanently to exile themselves from Palestine were for the most part, originally, in the valley of the Euphrates the land of the captivity; but later, and especially in the years that followed the conquests and death of Alexander, it was the countries of the hellenic culture, more particularly Egypt, that attracted them and Alexandria itself became a second Jerusalem. With the Roman conquest of the East, and the consequent political unity of the whole Mediterranean world, the Jews spread into the Latin West. All the Mediterranean countries now knew them, as they themselves could boast. There was a colony of 10,000 (men alone) at Rome in the reign of Tiberius (A.D. 14-37) and about the same time they are reckoned at one in seven of the population of Egypt. Harnack estimates that they formed 7 per cent. of the total population of the Empire in the reign of Augustus.

The Jewry of Palestine and that of the Dispersion are equally important in a study of Christian origins, for the Palestinian Jewry was the birthplace and cradle of the new religion, and the Jewry of the Dispersion was its first means of propaganda, the bridge by which it entered the world of Paganism outside Palestine. The two Jewries were greatly affected by every phase of contemporary religious development; they were affected in

widely different ways. For the exiles who returned to Palestine, there had followed a full restoration of the forms of the pre-exilic religious life. Jerusalem was once again the Holy City, the Temple was rebuilt, and the prescribed routine of daily sacrifice and ritual prayers was resumed as though no calamity of war had ever interrupted it. The main effect upon this Jewry of the contact with the religions of their conquerors, had been to strengthen and confirm its own traditional faith. Especially were these Jews strengthened in their hold on the doctrine that Yahweh is God and is alone God. The old fight of the Prophets against idolatry is never again to need renewing. In none of the Prophets who follow the captivity is there any reference to it as a national sin. Yahweh is more clearly seen as the Creator and Preserver of all mankind, and if known in an especial manner to the Jews, knowable to the rest by His work of creation and His providence. More than ever is emphasis laid on the fact that He is the God of Holiness, of Justice in the moral sense, requiring in this an imitation of Himself in those He has created. The political catastrophe has served to emphasize that something more is required for future salvation than the mere fact of birth into the race of His choice.

Man is body and soul, is immortal, and around his relations with Yahweh his Creator, through the Law set for his observance, there now begins a whole world of new speculation and thought. Man's universal inclination to evil, his weakness in the presence of temptation to wrong-doing, are a legacy from the failure of the first of mankind, Adam. But the weakness is not fatal. An observance of the Law is possible and will ensure salvation. Observance of the Law is possible, but it is increasingly difficult; for one of the chief results of the exile has been a cult of the Law for its own sake, a cult that has gradually overlaid its first simple austerity with a mass of deduced precepts such that only the scholar trained in the Law can safely find his way through the mazes, and the Law begins to cover the minutest detail of all the myriad acts of life. To teach the law, to interpret it, there has gradually grown up the "corps" of the Scribes. They are an extra-levitical religious force, standing to the priesthood much as the new law cult stands to the Temple liturgy of sacrifice; and the foundation of their prestige is their service in the dark days of the captivity, when, deprived of that liturgy, Jewish piety was saved by study and meditation on the Divine Law.

This cult of the Law was now perhaps the chief force in the religious life of the Palestine Jewry, and in its most enthusiastic devotees developing ever more surely into a barren and exaggerated formalism. It was not, however, the only force in that life; and the Jew, torn between the consciousness of his own weakness and the austere fact of the well-nigh unobservable Law, about which the Scribes in their many schools disputed, turned for consolation and encouragement to the mercy of the Law's author. Since the captivity there had gradually developed the notion of an individual responsibility in spiritual matters, and along with this a sense of Yahweh's providence as a quality by reason of which men, not merely in the mass, as a chosen nation, but even as individuals, were important and matter for the Divine Concern. Side by side with the cult of the Law there was a cult of the Psalms; and in the interior life thus fed and stimulated, the pious Jew escaped at once the deadening formalism of a merely external law observance, and the consequences of a fatal identification of the Divine Lawgiver with His unauthorised human commentators.

The role of the prophet diminished; and with the death of Malachi there began a long period of four centuries in which the Jew, while the different pagan empires disputed his kingdom among themselves, lived spiritually on the riches of his past, giving himself to the twin cults of the Law and the life of interior holiness and to meditation on the manner and the time of the next showing forth of Yahweh's mercy -- the looked for coming of the Messiah. Here speculation was rich and varied indeed, much of it stimulated and coloured by pagan motives of eschatology, and related almost always to the anticipated end of Yahweh's earthly creation. Sometimes the coming of the promised Saviour is expected as coincident with the end of the world, as the judgment of Yahweh through him on His defeated enemies. Another school looked for the Saviour's reign as an earthly preliminary to the promised eternity of bliss. After his victory over Yahweh's enemies, he will, as ruler of the world, transform it through justice and peace, judging mankind and allotting to each his punishment or reward. The wicked shall be punished for ever in flames, the good be received into paradise, a high place where they shall see Yahweh and rejoice with Him for ever. The Messiah himself was conceived as a great prince to be sent by God to establish His kingdom on earth, as a warrior and judge, as the king who will reign eternally. Generally, too, he

is conceived as already existing, awaiting the day of his coming; but he is never conceived as himself divine, nor did the general conception ever associate with his coming and the execution of his mission the idea of vicarious suffering and expiation.

For this Palestinian Judaism the conquests of Alexander were the beginning of much new development. The hellenistic culture which thereafter spread over all the semitic East could not leave it untouched. From Alexander himself, and from the Ptolemies to whom Palestine fell as a province on Alexander's death, their religious institutions had nothing but protection. But the victory of the dynasty of the Seleucid rulers of Antioch (198) brought about, with the change of ruler, the novelty of an aggressive movement on the part of the state to hellenise not merely the secular culture of the Jews but their religion also. The Jews were to syncretise Judaism at the order of the hellenic Paganism that was now their master. A national insurrection was the consequence; and after a series of bloody wars the Jews, under the heroic Judas Maccabeus, not only secured their threatened religious independence, but shook themselves free of the rule of the foreigner. The new political independence lasted for a century until, in 63 B.C., Jerusalem fell to Pompey's armies and Rome. It was a century of religious revival. The hellenistic influences of the pre-Maccabean generations did indeed survive, especially among the families of what may be called the ecclesiastical nobility, and those from whose ranks the leaders in public life were recruited. This was the party of the Sadducees, who reduced observance of the Law to the minimum of what was actually written, and rationalised, as far as they could, the ancient beliefs. Sadducees formed a tiny colony of Hellenism in the very heart of Jewry, controlling political life through their wealth and through their command of the high priesthood which money had brought them.

This attitude of compromise with the foreign culture was, however, the attitude of the few; and the mass of the nation followed rather the influence of those jealous doctors of the Law, the Scribes. Striving to keep themselves clear of the pagan culture's corrupting influence, they "separated" themselves from its every manifestation -- whence the later name by which they were called, and called themselves, Pharisees, the Separated. Their spiritual lineage was from the heroes who had formed the armies of Maccabeus, and the traditional religious patriotism of

the sect won it a deep and constant influence with the mass of the Jews.

The Judaism of the Dispersion is best studied as it appeared in Alexandria its most influential centre, the second city of the Empire, the Metropolis of the East, the capital of the Dispersion, and for the Jew the second Jerusalem. It is hard to exaggerate the importance of the fact of the Dispersion in the early history of the Catholic Church. From Antioch to Italy and through Gaul to Spain the chain of Jewish colonies spread, and it was around these islands of belief in the pagan sea that the first Christian groups were formed. Through the loosely federated colonies of the Dispersion the new religion was to find a material facility of propaganda such as no other religion could hope to possess. In the colonies of the Dispersion the Jews lived their own life. They did not intermarry with the surrounding Gentiles, and, careful of their traditional cult of morality, they habitually avoided the amusements that were the core of the pagan social life -- the theatres, the circus, the baths. They were exempt from the charge of public office as they were debarred from military service; and as members of a privileged religion their synagogues received protection and they themselves were judged according to their own law.

It was nevertheless, impossible for them to live entirely uninfluenced by their surroundings. They became Greek speaking, for example, and forgot their Hebrew to such an extent that it was necessary for their own use to have their sacred writings translated into Greek -- whence the Septuagint. With the new language they entered into contact with all the rich variety of the world's most gifted civilisation. Greece, its literature, its philosophy, its spirit of speculation on fundamental things, now lay open to the scholars and thinkers of the Dispersion. Were they to close their minds to the new influence, to shut it out as a thing necessarily accursed, in the fashion of many of their compatriots in Palestine? -- or was there not a means of conciliating what was good in it with their own traditions, and so of enlarging the sphere of their influence without surrendering what was vital to their faith? The thinkers of Alexandrian Judaism chose the latter alternative, and using Greek Philosophy to universalise the Law, strove to create an entente where the corrected philosophy and the Law, philosophically explained, should be seen as two aspects of the same unity. The

Jewish faith remained the same thing, with its eternal foundations of monotheism and the personal immortality of the individual soul. The best of Greek philosophy accorded here with Jewish belief; and while the Jew accepted the philosophical allegorising of the Greek myths and fables that made of them merely a vehicle for the teaching of abstract truths, he was prepared, in the same accommodating spirit, to explain allegorically, the contents of his own sacred books. It is the idea hidden behind the fact that is the all-important thing; the fact related is secondary. Greek Philosophy thus becomes a religion, accepting the principle of the supernatural; Judaism, without ceasing to be a religion, will be a philosophy, "searching beneath the word revealed, the reasonable teaching it covers."

Religious ceremonial and liturgy lost much of their importance in this presentation of Judaism, except in so far as they were symbols of truth; the old notion of the true religion as meant exclusively for the chosen race disappears, and most important of all, the concept of the promised Saviour changes fundamentally. For these philosophically minded Jews it is no longer a warrior, judge or king, who is to restore the kingdom and wreak vengeance on the enemies of Yahweh, but a triumphant, all-conquering true doctrine. Allied to this change is another in the teaching about the end of the world. Here, though the idea of a personal judgment is preserved, the teaching lacks the picturesque extravagance characteristic of the Palestinian apocalypses. Punishment or reward follows immediately on death and judgment, and the lot then assigned is irremediable, eternal.

The greatest thinker among these Jews of the Dispersion was undoubtedly Philo (25 B.C.-A.D. 41) and it is in his writings that we can best see the aims and achievement of the movement and measure how far the one fell short of the other. Here, more fully than elsewhere, can we study the process by which, interpreting allegorically the sacred books of the Jews, these thinkers strove to find in the Law of Moses the principles and the completion of the philosophical and religious systems of Greece, much as Heraclitus, [] strove to read Stoicism into Homer. It is an astonishing combination of Judaism with the leading ideas of Platonic and Stoic philosophy, learned but vague, lacking unity, and disconcertingly contradictory even in essentials. The body is essentially evil and by its contact with the soul inevitably soils

the higher principle and leads it to sin. Man cannot therefore escape sin. To live well is the end of life and morality the most important part of philosophy. Of himself man cannot live a virtuous life. His goodness is the gift of God. Man knows God -- and ordinarily can only know Him -- by His works, and in His attributes; but by ascetic practices and assiduous study he can arrive at the direct knowledge of God which is ecstasy. In this, the momentarily intuitive vision of God upon earth, man, lifted above the good of merely intellectual knowledge, reaches to the very essence of God and comprehends in Him the unspeakable unity of all.

Of redemption from sin, of satisfaction for sin, there is not a word; and the ecstasy held out as the end of life, is, from the intellectual nature of the process which leads to it, a privilege which necessarily can only fall to scholars and thinkers. On the other hand, although the traditional monotheism remains intact, the use of the allegorical method of interpreting the sacred writings -- a practice borrowed from Stoicism -- was bound to weaken the value of the writings as records of historical fact; and in the very success of the effort to justify the Jewish faith by Greek philosophy there lay the danger of compromising the unique character of that faith as the revealed religion of Yahweh the one true God.

The new religion preached by Jesus Christ came then into a world where religious questions were already eagerly discussed. To satisfy the universal feeling of religious desire in its myriad aspirations and hopes, a host of rival cults and philosophies, preached by enthusiastic devotees, already competed. They did not die at the sudden coming of the new thing. Far from dying they survived; some of them to flourish even more than hitherto, some of them to vex, some to assist it: all of them in one way or another to condition its development. In the particularism of Palestinian Jewry it met its first great foe; and when, thanks to this struggle, its own separate character was established, the Pharisaic spirit survived in the first Christians themselves, to menace from within the free development of the new truth. Alexandrian Judaism was more friendly, but in its very friendliness was danger, for it did not always recognise the exclusiveness which was of the new faith's essence; and the spirit in which, sometimes unfortunately, it strove to reconcile the prophets and the philosophers, survived in the first great

school of Christian teachers, to assist, and sometimes seriously to thwart, the philosophical exposition of that faith too. In Paganism the new religion was to find a frank and open enemy, violent and aggressive in its political aspects, inevitably so in the developing novelty of Emperor-worship, and the most slowly worsted enemy of all in the traditional rural cults -- cults to the lateness of whose overthrow there stands for witness the curious fact that one of our modern terms for heathen is the Roman word for rustic -- paganus.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 2: THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH

1. THE FOUNDER

THE new religion whose early history is the subject of this book, has for its origin the attested fact of the birth, at Bethlehem, an unimportant town of the Roman province of Judaea, of Jesus Christ. His mother Mary and her husband Joseph, were of Galilee and it was the business of the imperial census, in the Roman year 749, which brought them travelling at this most unsuitable of times so far from their poor home. The goal of their journey was barely reached when, in an outhouse of one of the overcrowded inns of the little hill town, Mary gave birth to her Son. The life that there began is the foundation of the Church.

The Child's destiny had been foretold to His mother by the angel of Yahweh who announced to her the coming miraculous conception through the direct operation Or the Most High. To Joseph, too, was given like explanatory vision and prophecy. The Child was to save His people from their sins, whence the name Joseph was charged to impose on Him -- Jesus.

The documentary sources of our knowledge of that life are the writings of the immediate disciples of Jesus, set down within a generation of the end of His earthly life, the collection which we call compendiously the New Testament. Around the genuineness of these writings, the truthfulness of those who composed them, their value as records, a vast amount of controversy has raged. The study of the questions raised by that controversy belongs properly to a more specialised science than General Church History which must here make its own the findings of Scripture scholarship. The position assumed here is that the New Testament writings are what they propose themselves to be-authentic records of trustworthy contemporary witnesses. What kind of thing is the religion those writings describe? The first difficulty before the enquirer is that the writings do not profess to describe any religion at all, but are supplementary to the basic knowledge which they presuppose. The collection is made up of a variety of things. There are short accounts of the life and death of Jesus Christ; there is an

account of the spread of His teaching in the first generation after His earthly life ended; there is a book of mysterious prophecy; and a number of letters written by His principal lieutenants explaining particular difficulties or correcting special errors in belief or practice. The New Testament can thus in no sense be regarded as a systematic exposition of the religion taught by Jesus Christ. It provides, none the less, a wealth of information about this new religion and its Founder sufficient for the historian's purpose, sufficient, that is to say, to make clear the new thing's nature.

As a religion it is alone of its kind. It is a revelation; it is a rule of conduct; it is a doctrine; it is an organisation; and in each of these aspects it is something new. This new revelation is the fulfilment of Yahweh's repeated pledge to Israel. Jesus is the long promised Saviour Who shall rout Yahweh's ancient enemy and restore Mankind to its original amity with the Creator. Jesus is the Messiah. Finally He through Whom this revelation is made, the Teacher, the Founder, is yet something infinitely beyond. He is the object of His disciple's faith, no mere prophet of Yahweh, even the greatest, but Yahweh's Son, God Himself incarnate. []

The religion of Jesus Christ is no revolutionary thing, new in all its parts, built up on the ruins of some older thing destroyed to make way for it. It is, by its Founder's express declaration, the perfect fulfilment of the ideas and ideals already foreshadowed in Judaism; and the body of the New Testament religion is built round an idea already so familiar as to be a commonplace of Jewish piety, the Kingdom or Reign of Yahweh. "Jesus came into Galilee proclaiming the good news of the Kingdom of God" is the New Testament's first description of the divine Teacher's activity. But this Preacher of the Kingdom of God has no attachments to any of the contemporary teachers who, interpreting the messianic prophecies in material terms, eagerly dispute the details of the future King's earthly triumph. Such a kingdom has no place in the teaching of Christ. The kingdom as now announced is not the political triumph of Yahweh's chosen people over their Gentile oppressors; it is not even a restoration of the kingdom of David. It is the reign of Yahweh in men's hearts. The citizens of this kingdom are those in whose heart Yahweh reigns, and such citizenship is not a privilege of race, nor the reward of merit. It is offered to all ! Repentance, faith, simple childlike humility are the disposing conditions. For the

subjects of this new reign of God, the old ideals of holiness and moral goodness revealed by Yahweh to the Jews remain in all their force. The Law is not abolished but, lived in the new spirit -- the spirit of the kingdom -- is transformed in this its final fulfilment. More important than obedience to the letter of the law is the spirit in which the law is kept, and the new spirit is the spirit of loving dedication of self to Yahweh, the love of all mankind in imitation of Yahweh's universal love and for Yahweh's sake. Yahweh, the King, is revealed as the loving Father of those He rules. It is as "Our Father" that -- in the one prayer Jesus taught His followers -- the disciple is bidden to address Him. As a father He cannot but give good things to the children who ask. He cares for the birds, the very flowers of the field and His children's every hair. Even His children's ingratitude and rebellion cannot destroy Yahweh's love; and Jesus tells the parable of the Prodigal Son to bring home the supreme truth of this love that only the sinner's own obstinacy can withdraw him from this eternal love's effect. Man's love -- of God, of his fellows -- must strive to imitate Yahweh's love. It must be complete, selfless, universal, not the product of chance association, of similarity of race, or of the hope of gain. Everything for God, for God's sake from Whom all love has come. The "reign" is necessarily an intimate, interior thing in man's very heart and will, its very existence calling for the continual conscious union of the disciple's soul with Yahweh. On this interior submission all else depends. Obedience to Yahweh's commands, then, is no mere legalist obedience, but, because of the motive which shapes it, of the spirit which gives rise to it, a means of ever closer union. Yahweh's love, which is the foundation of the Kingdom, is, too, its final object and, consummated in eternity, the soul's ultimate reward. It is impossible to exaggerate the part of Love in this revelation of Jesus Christ.

The reign will be established slowly, gradually. Like the leaven in meal, like the seed buried out of sight, it will grow silently in a man's heart, in the world. Its victory is the outcome not of violence, nor of external force, but of Love's slow persuasion. No sudden burst of enthusiasm, then, will suffice for its establishment. A steady, persevering will alone provides the necessary foundation. For the Kingdom will make high demands upon its subjects. It is a treasure hidden, a pearl of surpassing value, to possess which when he hears of it a man will sell all he

has. In a matter where anything short of absolute selflessness menaces the whole good work, the disciple must be tested, disciplined, must try himself by surrender, until self be no more. All is asked of him to whom all will be given. Where is this giving up of self to end? For each disciple where Yahweh wills it. The extreme sacrifices -- of property, of family life, of life itself -- though commended as the perfect thing, are not prescribed as equally necessary to all. There is a way of Precept as well as this higher way of Counsel. But for all, to whichever way Yahweh calls them, there is the same spirit in which they must serve -- the spirit of renouncement, self-forgetfulness, service of others, love, humility and all for Yahweh's sake, in conscious imitation of Him. The ideal is summed up in a phrase of startling realism "If any one will come after me let him deny himself, take up his cross daily, and follow me." [] And for all there is, too, the duty of continuous prayer -- for prayer, once more, is no mere external rite but a hidden interior act of union with God, its model the "Our Father." If His demands are far-reaching Yahweh's patience with those who stumble as they strive is revealed as infinite; and for the repentant, no matter what the degree of their offending, His mercy has no limits. So, too, must the disciple forgive those who injure him, forgive them endlessly, love even his enemies, bless them that hate him, pray for his persecutors and those who despoil his good name. So shall he show himself the child of his Father in Heaven.

The disciple's willing acceptance of the reign, his faithfulness to its spirit, are rewarded even in this life by the peace for which man's innermost being yearns, and which is only possible to the man on whose affections self has ceased effectively to make demands, and by an ever-closer union with God. In the world to come there is the consummation of the union with God begun in His Kingdom on earth. Goodness and happiness then go together, and goodness is the renunciation of self and the service of others for Yahweh's sake, in a union with Him inspired by love for Him. This last qualification is all important. The spirit informing the new ideal of conduct raises it above the mere humanitarianism which, sooner or later, calls for human compensation, and can never reach perfect disinterestedness, be perfectly safe in practice for the souls who dedicate themselves to it.

In the nineteen hundred years that have gone by since Jesus

preached His gospel, the phrases in which He set it have become the commonplaces of mankind. All men use them, all pay them the homage of lip-service at least. It is, on this account, difficult to understand, unless we meditate historically, how great a novelty such teaching was when it was first given. What are, if too often unpractised, the acknowledged commonplaces of modern moral idealism none the less, were then truths startling in their novelty, and, because alive, disconcerting. Nor can we ever hope to see their effect as it was produced unless we continually bear in mind Who He was that taught -- a man truly, but a Man who was God, a man through Whose real Humanity-human body, human soul, human mind, human will, human charm -- a Divine Person acted. Only when read with this all important fact in mind -- that Jesus Christ is God incarnate--does the story of that earthly life take on the fullness of its meaning, and the reasonableness of the steep ascetic recommendation become clear. It is a share in what He Himself enjoys that He offers to those who will follow Him. Some higher motive than the merely human must inform their allegiance. Only by rallying to His high demands can the disciple become that to which God's high ambitions destines him.

Jesus then teaches, through the new revelation of the Kingdom, a doctrine of social brotherhood which, because it is based on the transcendent truth of Yahweh's essential Love (never before so perfectly revealed), reaches the very heights of idealism. And this divinely ideal spirit is proposed as the normal habit for all mankind. There is no man in whose soul it cannot be realised, no man whose heart it cannot touch, whose life it cannot transform. The philosophers, at their best, spoke only to a tiny minority of trained minds, chosen spirits. Jesus speaks to all. For it is not by mere individual effort that citizenship is first achieved, nor does the Kingdom develop from even the best of human intentions, from the strongest of human wills. As it is more than a human morality, so the Divine shares in every state of its growth. "Without me you can do nothing" are the divine Master's own words to those who accept Him. Their good-will, their faith, are to be informed by a higher, divine life, and transformed thereby, made capable of the supernatural activities which alone can serve and maintain the new life. This new life -- which alone makes possible the translation into act of the new rule of conduct -- is the divine life by which Jesus lives Himself, and in which, by their new association with Jesus, the disciples

mysteriously share. Jesus is the vine, they are its branches. With Him, as the greatest of all His followers is to say a few years later, they form one body, He the head, they the limbs.

The new revelation is not then -- for all the universality of its appeal, promise, and plan -- intended to achieve its end through individual conversation merely. The individual converted, in allegiance to the new Kingdom, reaches the destined perfection through his new status and in consequence of the association that goes with it, rather than by any virtue of his own individual act of adhesion. It is as the branch of the Vine Who is Christ, as the limb of that body whose head is Christ, that the citizen of the Kingdom is a subject for the new privileges. And that mysterious association with Christ, and hence with all those other limbs his fellow-subjects, receives visible corporate expression in the ecclesia -- an actual society. For the Kingdom which is a seed and leaven, is also a field where the weeds grow as surely as the wheat. It is a net of fish, again, both bad and good; a palace (and Jesus names one of His followers as the keeper of its keys); a building (and the same follower Jesus names as its rock-like foundation). It is a flock which wolves can attack; a flock whose shepherd is Jesus, and which again He can commit to the care of that disciple who is key-bearer and foundation rock. Into this actual, visible, corporation the disciple enters by a visible corporal initiation -- Baptism. In the Kingdom there is authority, and those to whom its Founder gives that authority are to be obeyed as He Himself is obeyed. Their authority is to teach, to teach indeed all nations, to bind and loose in His name, to forgive sins even and to retain, to admit by Baptism those who believe: and what by His commission they authoritatively decide, that, He promises them, will He finally confirm. The Kingdom will be buffeted. Hell itself will strive against it -- but vainly; for He will Himself be with it to the end. The nucleus of that society in which the Kingdom is thus visibly expressed are the twelve disciples whom the record is careful to name -- the Apostles; and it is one of these, Simon, who is the shepherd appointed to feed the flock, the key-bearer of the palace, the rock-like foundation and therefore renamed by the Founder Himself, and so to be known ever after, not Simon but Peter.

The Church (ecclesia) is however much more than the association in which the disciples are grouped under an ordered authority. It is in the Church, and through the Church, by means

of that authority, that the teaching is to be preserved safe from error, the life to find true guidance. The Church is, too, the means by which the disciple is related to God. Jesus Christ and the Church together constitute the mystical Christ of which, while Jesus Christ is the head the rest of the disciples are limbs, members. This is not mere metaphor but spiritual reality. All the members live by the life of the whole, and that life is the Divine Life of the Head. Into that living body the disciple is incorporated by the ritual act of Baptism. Thereby and thereafter he shares in the Divine life, entering into a privileged relation with God, into a new relation with the other members of the body. It is through the unity of this mystical body that God has chosen to work out the salvation of mankind. This is the central point, the innermost mystery of the new religion. This is the essence of "the good news about the Kingdom of God," the fulfilment of God's promises to the Jews, the means by which man may share here on earth in the life that is divine. This unity of the mystical body is shown forth, realised and intensified through a second ritual act, the disciple's sharing in the banquet-mystery called the Eucharist, where he is given a Food which, in appearance bread and wine, is in reality Christ Himself. It is to disciples who are members of this mystical body, linked thus with the Divine in a union whence comes to them a real newness of life, a share in the divine life; to disciples illuminated in mind thereby and strengthened in will, that the high demands of conduct are made, that there is proposed the ideal of a life of love of God and of man for God's sake. The disciple, through Baptism member of the Church, member of the mystical body of Christ, is supernaturalised; and through the mystical body Christ lives on for ever in this world.

Even this is not the end of the summary of what that ecclesia is in which Jesus Christ set His revelation, and which He preached in His "good tidings." Jesus was the long-promised Messiah. All humanity, Jew and Gentile alike, had through the sin of Adam been ever since estranged from Yahweh, "under the rule of sin." The Reconciler was Jesus Christ, and the redemption of humanity from its enslavement was wrought by His sacrificial death. Through that death came for man the possibility of forgiveness, of restoration. It is, in the Gospel religion, the source of the whole scheme's life. Man's role is not, however, passive. He must take the proffered thing, the new status possible through that death. He takes it by believing - - it is not a

reward for merit-and by being baptised. The death is for all. The offer is made to all, to Jew and non-Jew alike. Man must believe once he knows it is God Who speaks. And he must become of the Church by Baptism. Baptism, associating the disciple with Christ dying sacrificially on his behalf, associates him with Christ's consequent triumph over sin. It is, once more, as a member of the mystical body that he shares in the triumph as in the death, and thence lives on in Christ, like a branch grafted on to a tree, by the one same vital principle of the Divine life. Baptism then, the rite of initiation, is most strictly bound to the sacrificial death. Equally strictly bound to it is the other great ritual of the Eucharist, which is not only a showing forth of the mystical body's unity, but a renewal of the sacrificial death itself.

The ecclesia then is not a mere aggregation of individual believers, but a spiritual moral person, which continues in concrete, visible fashion the life and work of its Founder-teaching, guiding, sacrificing; which is the means through which men take hold of the gifts of the new fellowship with Yahweh. A new vital principle, a new ideal of living, divinely revealed truth eternally secured, in a living organism ruled by safeguarded teachers with authority and power to dispense supernatural aids -- the Catholic Church. Its history we can study as the history of the development of Christ's teaching -- the History of Dogma; or as the history of the way in which the new life has shown itself through two thousand years -- the History of Christian Spirituality; or as the history of the organism as an organism. But while no study of Church History is complete which leaves out any one of these, it is truer still to say that no Church History can ever really be complete, for the essential Church History is the history of the reign of God in the millions of faithful human hearts throughout two thousand years -- and this is known only to God.

The sublime religious idealism of the revelation of Jesus Christ is the teaching for which the world has all these centuries been waiting. His own life is itself the best exemplification of the way in which His teaching must, of its nature operate For His life was hidden, remote; unobserved, for all its marvels, beyond its tiny local setting; and the propaganda, which lacked all appeal save what appeal the ideals and truth made of themselves to hearts well disposed, had so little immediate success that by the time of His death scarcely more than a hundred believing souls had

given themselves to the cause.

His daily life, for all but the last three years, was apparently the ordinary well-filled day of a workman -- a carpenter like Joseph His foster-father -- in a small country town, with so little to distinguish it publicly from the life of those around that, on His first appearances as Teacher, those who knew Him best could scornfully point to His ordinary antecedents in final and devastating criticism of His new role. He was to these simply "the carpenter's son," and to His immediate relatives the subject, obviously, of an unfortunate fit of madness ! Signs and marvels had accompanied His birth. If, on the one hand, it had come about in circumstances of destitution which foreshadowed the ideal of self-renouncement for God's sake which He was ever to preach, it had yet been heralded by visions of angels; and, led by a mysterious divine star, wise men had come from the East to adore the Newly-born. At the ritual ceremony of His mother's purification the Child had been recognised in prophecy as Israel's saviour; and Divine intervention, again, had saved Him from Herod's jealousy-inspired massacre of all the children of His age. Upon that vision Joseph had fled with Him and with His mother into Egypt and there for ten years, until Herod's death (A. D. 6), they lived. The story of the next twenty years is that of the quiet ordinary life in the house of Joseph and Mary in the town of Nazareth, half way between the Carmel range and the Lake of Genesareth, a quiet of which one incident alone is known to us -- the visit to Jerusalem when the Boy was twelve, His disappearance, and His being found instructing the Doctors of the Law in the temple portico.

Twenty miles or so to the north-east of Nazareth is the little heart-shaped stretch of water called sometimes the Sea of Galilee, sometimes the Lake of Genesareth, twelve miles long in its greatest length, seven miles broad. The half-a-dozen little towns that cluster round it were the scene of the greater part of the new Teacher's activities, and it was from their population of fisher-folk that most of His first followers came.

From the beginning that simple teaching provoked opposition and misunderstanding. For the politically-minded zealots who looked for the Messiah -- as so much contemporary discussion presented him -- as Yahweh's warrior-captain, this new teaching was a disappointment. The Pharisees too were alienated by the

denunciation of the development which had made the letter of Yahweh's Law the all-important thing in orthodox Palestinian Judaism. Nowhere was He understood immediately and fully. Even the chosen band who, coming to Him in the first days, were the objects of His special instruction, and who remained to the end, whom He chose to be the nucleus of the new institution, were to the last a little impatient of the idealism, a little disappointed at the lack of earthly glamour, at the failure to conform to the hopes of orthodox religious patriotism.

None the less, wherever He went crowds awaited His coming, listened to the teaching, followed the Teacher from one town to another and even into the wilderness when He made thither for retirement. The teaching, the new voice that spoke "as one having authority," the personality, the miracles of healing wrought everywhere in all men's sight, miracles so evident, so numerous, so characteristic that He could Himself quote them as a testimony -- "Relate to John the things you have seen, the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the dead rise again" -- as evident as that "the poor have the gospel preached to them," all these things bred immense enthusiasm but little, very little, of that solid conviction and change of heart based on belief which alone would serve His purpose.

The passing enthusiasm for novelty, for a thaumaturgus, He refused -- the leaven must work according to its nature -- refused it even when it would have saved Him from His hostile critics, from His enemies. For by now enemies He assuredly had; and in the later stages of His career as missionary they assist, "lie in wait," set traps to trick Him, now into the expression of some unorthodox opinion in the day's religious casuistry, now into treason against the all-powerful Emperor. The end is only a matter of time. Humanly speaking, sooner or later, should He not prevent it by His divine power, these jealous and wily adversaries will have Him enmeshed. From now on He redoubles the time, and the patience, He expends on the chosen faithful few. He explains to them gradually Who He is, His mission and destiny of suffering and death, their own future role in the ecclesia, the nature of their high vocation and the reception which will be theirs too, once they meet the world He is come to save, the world which knows Him not, wills not to know, and pursues Him to death itself. To the end, though they remain faithful, believing, obedient, the disciples hear all this

with reluctance. Human nature in them is not able to reconcile this destiny of vicarious suffering with that other tradition of Yahweh, Lord of Hosts, strikingly triumphant over the wicked whether in Israel's past or in the wild apocalyptic reveries that have, for them, so often drowned the sadness of the insistent present. So with the earthbound material heart of His nation against Him, and the work of formation not yet accomplished in even His faithful few, Jesus comes to the appointed chosen death. Once more, as in the birth, the circumstances make it the supreme act of self-renouncement, once more supernatural signs accompany every phase of His life.

"The Gospel is announced; the Church is founded; the sacrifice of the cross is to confirm the one and the other." Slowly Jesus makes His way south, journeying for the last time to Jerusalem, the religious capital, where for generations now the struggle between the rationalist, Sadducee, aristocracy from whom are chosen the High Priests, and the legalist piety of the patriotic and popular Pharisee is the one absorbing evidence of religious interest. Both Sadducee and Pharisee are, for their own characteristic reasons, opposed to His mission, willing to plot His fall. This He knows, yet "steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem." And He foretold that in the Holy City they would lay hands on Him, mock Him, scourge Him and put Him to death: and that He would rise again the third day. On the first day of the week before the feast of the Pasch, through the streets of the Holy City filled with thousands of pious pilgrims drawn thither by the feast, in a kind of triumph -- surrounded by His disciples and acclaimed by the crowd as the Holy One of God -- He entered on the time of His passion. One last time the imperfect enthusiasm, which would use Him and His teaching rather than yield and be itself converted to His uses, blazed in an appearance of adhesion.

Four days later, on the eve of the Pasch, He prepared to celebrate the feast for the last time with the twelve disciples of His especial choice. At the ceremonial meal He instituted the new rite of the Eucharist, already foreshadowed and promised in His preaching, and in a long discourse made to the Apostles the revelation of His own most intimate self. From the meal they passed to the olive grove of Gethsemane -- the traitor among the Apostles, seduced by the Master's enemies, had already arranged with his enemies for His betrayal and arrest. In the

garden they found Him and took Him.

He was led before the High Priests and, proclaiming His Divinity, condemned for blasphemy. But although, in his mockery of a trial, they reviled and insulted Him, more they dared not do-the Roman Authority not consulted. Whence an appeal to the Procurator of Judaea, Pontius Pilate, and a further trial. Pilate was embarrassed. His Prisoner was innocent, but the influential Jewish leaders insisted. The procurator shifted uneasily -- Jesus was of Galilee, so he tried to load with the decision the shoulders of Herod, its nominal ruler. That failing, he tried a last resource -- the custom of releasing annually on the feast some criminal condemned to death. But the mob and the priesthood asked in preference a highway robber lying under sentence. Finally, with taunts that affected the procurator's loyalty -- "If thou release this man thou art not Caesar's friend" -- they prevailed, and Pilate, disclaiming responsibility, made over the Prophet to the priests.

"And they took Jesus and led Him forth. And bearing His own cross He went forth to that place which is called Calvary, where they crucified Him, and with Him two others one on each side, and Jesus in the midst. . . . And Jesus having cried out with a loud voice, gave up the ghost. . . . And the centurion who stood over against Him said 'Indeed this man was the Son of God.'

"Now there was in the place where He was crucified a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein no man yet had been laid. There they laid Jesus because the sepulchre was nigh at hand. And on the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came to the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared. And they found the stone rolled back from the sepulchre. And going in, they found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, as they were astonished in their mind at this, behold, two men stood by them in shining apparel. And as they were afraid, and bowed down their countenance towards the ground, they said to them: 'Why seek you the living with the dead? He is not here but risen. Remember how He spoke unto you, when He was yet in Galilee, saying: The Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.' And they remembered His words. And going back to the sepulchre, they told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest. . . . And these words

seemed to them idle tales; and they did not believe them. . . . At length He appeared to the eleven as they were at table; and He upbraided them with their incredulity and hardness of heart, because they did not believe them who had seen Him after He was risen again. . . . To whom also He shewed Himself alive after His passion, by many proofs, for forty days appearing to them, and speaking of the kingdom of God. And eating together with them, He commanded them, that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but should wait for the promise of the Father, which you have heard (saith He) by My mouth. For John indeed baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence. They therefore who were come together, asked Him, saying: Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? But he said to them: It is not for you to know the times or moments, which the Father hath put in His own power: But you shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost upon you, and you shall be witnesses unto Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth. And when He had said these things, while they looked on, He was raised up: and a cloud received Him out of their sight. And while they were beholding Him going up to Heaven, behold two men stood by them in white garments. Who also said: Ye men of Galilee, why stand you looking up to heaven? This Jesus Who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come, as you have seen Him going into heaven."

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



2. THE FIRST GENERATION

After the Ascension the twelve apostles returned to Jerusalem and, in fear of the Master's powerful enemies, locked themselves away, while in obedience to His last commands they awaited the imminent coming of the Holy Spirit. "Within a few days" He had said; and ten days only after His Ascension the mysterious event took place. The Holy Spirit came in the noise of a mighty wind, appearing over each as a tongue of visible fire. And they began to speak in different tongues according as the Spirit gave them to speak. The seclusion was at an end; and strengthened by the undeniable miracle they went forth to announce themselves to the world.

It was the Jewish feast of Pentecost and the Holy City was filled with pilgrims from every province of the East, from Persia and from Rome itself. The rumour of the heavenly sign spread, the crowds began to collect, and as these pilgrims of a score of tongues understood, each in his own language, what the disciples of Jesus said, bewilderment seized on them, and anti-Christian calumny offered its first curiously futile explanation. . . . "These men are full of new wine." The calumny was the Church's first opportunity, and Peter, using it, preached its first explanatory missionary sermon, gathering in thereby the first converts -- "about 2,000 souls." Repentance for past sin, belief in Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, baptism -- these are the conditions of membership. For the rest the new group led the life of traditional Jewish piety: prayer, fasting, almsdeeds, attendance at the Temple, adding to this their own private reunion for the new ritual of "the breaking of the bread," and a practice of voluntary poverty. Day by day their number grew, and the miraculous signs which had supported the Master's teaching followed the work of the Apostles. Of Peter especially it is recorded that the sick were brought in their beds to the streets through which he would pass, that his shadow, at any rate, falling on them, they might be healed.

The opposition grew too. It was only a matter of weeks since the religious chiefs of Jewry had successfully pursued the Founder to His death, and here already His teaching was showing itself more successful than in His life. One of Peter's more striking

miracles with its accompaniment of missionary sermon and conversions (this time 5,000) gave them their chance. Peter and John were arrested, cross-examined and forbidden further to preach or teach "in the name of Jesus." More at the moment the chief priests dared not do for fear of the people. A second attempt at repression promised to be more successful. All the Apostles were arrested and imprisoned. But an angel of the Lord came by night and released them, bidding them go immediately to the Temple to continue their work. They were re-arrested, re-examined. Once more Peter reasoned with the Council affirming again the divine character of the Master's mission, until the priests "cut to the heart began to cast about how best to slay them." It was one of their own number, Gamaliel, who dissuaded them. The movement, if it were no more than man-inspired, would perish of itself. The Council fell in with his views, had the Apostles flogged, and, with renewed prohibitions, set them free once more.

The peace which followed was short. Around the activities of a new preacher and wonder worker, Stephen, the old hatred flamed yet once again. Stephen drew on himself the hostility of the Greek-speaking Jews of Jerusalem. They challenged him to debate the new belief, and, falling victims where they had promised themselves victory, they roused the mob with the word that Stephen was a blasphemer. He was dragged before the Council and charged. No plea could avail to save one who believed that Jesus was the Messiah and God, and who made the proof of this from Jewish history the burden of his defence. Stephen was condemned and, outside the walls of the city, stoned to death. This first martyrdom was the signal for a general persecution which scattered the believers through all Judea and Samaria. The Apostles alone remained at Jerusalem.

Flight however, brought little relief. The persecution was a well-organised affair and its chief agent in Jerusalem -- a young zealot of the Pharisees, Saul by name -- raided the houses of believers and filled the prisons with his victims. Then, turning his attention to the fugitives, he asked and received from the High Priest a commission to follow and round them up. Damascus was his first objective and thither with an escort he forthwith proceeded, "breathing out threats and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord." He was nearing the city when, blinded by a sudden light from Heaven, he fell from his horse. A

voice spoke "Saul, Saul why dost thou persecute me?" Who said "Who art thou Lord?" And He "I am Jesus Whom thou persecutest." Saul's surrender was immediate and whole-hearted. "Lord what wilt thou that I do?" The chief of the persecutors had become himself a disciple, the most momentous of all conversions had been made. To the Church in that hour was given the personality which more than any other has shaped its thought, its organisation, its spirit; the greatest of converts, the greatest of disciples, greatest of missionaries, thinker, ascetic, mystic, the follower in whom more than in any other is mirrored the Master.

Saul -- soon to be known exclusively by his second name Paul -- was a subject already marvellously adapted for his new role. By birth he was of the Dispersion, from Greek-speaking Tarsus in Cilicia. But his education had been in Palestine, at Jerusalem, in the school of one of the great men of the day, the rabbi Gamaliel. At Gamaliel's feet Paul had grown up, learned in biblical lore, to be a "Pharisee of the Pharisees." He knew his co-religionists as he knew himself, and, familiar with every phase of the Jewish thought of the day, moved easily in its many idioms. To the end, wherever he is dealing with Jews, whether inside the Church or outside it, he remains in his methods very much the rabbi. But his intellectual formation was not exclusively rabbinical, and though he is by no means a Hellenic type, to Hellenism he was no stranger. To this rich variety of formative influences the further fact should be added that birth in Tarsus made him a Roman citizen, gave him wherever he went within the vast empire a public status still privileged and of importance.

For a time after his conversion he gave himself to the task of explaining his conversion in the different synagogues of Damascus, and then buried himself for some years in the solitude of the Arabian desert. From this period of prayer and study he returned to Damascus with the object, once more, of converting the Jews to his new belief that "Jesus is truly the Messias." The Jews could not refute him, and to silence him they plotted his death, the governor of the city assisting them. Before the combination Paul was helpless. His time, however, was not yet; and he made a dramatic escape, lowered in a basket from the walls while soldiers watched the gates. From Damascus he went now to Jerusalem, to make himself known to Peter and the rest. He was received coldly enough until

Barnabas, like himself a convert from the Diaspora, stood bond for his conversion. At Jerusalem he began again his task of explaining his new belief to the Greek-speaking Jews and once again there were plots to make away with him. A vision consoled and directed him. Jesus appeared as he prayed in the Temple, and bade him leave Jerusalem and his present fruitless task "For to the nations that are afar off will I send thee."

That vision is the first hint of what Paul is to be, the Apostle of the non-Jewish world. But not for a few years yet was the promise to be fulfilled. Paul left Jerusalem for a second period of retirement, this time in his native Cilicia. It was at the invitation of Barnabas that he returned thence to his mission of instruction and debate. This sponsor of St. Paul had, for some time now, been in charge of the believers who lived at Antioch, the third greatest city of the empire. It was a mixed congregation, fugitives from Jerusalem, converts from Judaism and, in any number, converts also from Paganism, who had come to the Church directly, without ever passing through any stage of association with the Jews. Here there was no Temple, and the Church was emancipated from any traditional connection with the synagogues. A new type of believer was developing and the town found for them a soubriquet -- "at Antioch the disciples were first called Christians." Barnabas, sent from Jerusalem to govern this new community, saw it developing beyond his powers. He needed help, and going to Tarsus, besought Paul to come to him at Antioch. For a year they worked together "making known the Lord Jesus even to the Greeks," until (about A.D. 44) a divine monition bade the governors of the Church at Antioch set them aside for a new special work. St. Paul's ten years' novitiate was over. The promise of the vision in the Temple was to be realised. He was to go to the nations afar off. Henceforward his life is the famous series of missionary journeys: Cyprus, Cilicia, the provinces of Asia, Galatia, Macedonia, Achaia; passing and repassing through all these, establishing and organising churches, forming disciples to rule them, St. Paul, in the remaining twenty years of his life, lays the foundation on which is built the greatest part of the Church's later extension.

The procedure of St. Paul and his associates was simple. Arrived in a town, they made themselves known to its Jewish community, assisted at the synagogue service, and, when the

opportunity came, explained their teaching that Jesus Christ was the looked-for Messiah, the Church He had founded the fulfilment of the ancient prophecies, the Gospel the term of the Law. The final proof of this was the Resurrection, and of that historic fact they, the newcomers, were the accredited witnesses. Almost everywhere this exposition provoked violent dissensions, and if a few were converted to it, in the vast majority it bred a bitter hostility to the Christians and their institution. The mission, with its nucleus of converts, then turned to the pagans. Sometimes by disputation in the public places of the city, and again by private discussions, very slowly but persistently, the new religion was brought "to the Greeks also." So in the course of the twenty years 44-62, in all the chief cities along the coasts of the Aegean Sea and in many towns of the interior too, tiny communities of believers were organised. Ephesus, Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, each had its "church," and in these churches the great majority of the brethren were converts from the pagan cults. Whence very soon an important difference of opinion between the two classes of Christians, the Jewish and the Gentile, and a crisis.

The point at issue was the importance and the necessity, in the new Church of Christ, of the old Jewish Law. That the Church was open to the Gentiles no less than to the Jews had very early been made clear in a vision to St. Peter, and it was to preside over a Church made up mainly of Gentiles that the Apostles had dispatched Barnabas to Antioch. But were such Gentiles, converted now to the Church, to live as Jews? The Jewish element in the Church continued to practise all the observances of the Mosaic piety. Must the Gentile convert do as much? Did he come to Christ through Judaism or directly? The question was a practical one. It involved such things as circumcision, an elaborate code of dietary regulations, a whole way of life. But it did not end there. The controversy was, at bottom, a controversy as to the relation of the Church to the old religion of the Jews. In that religion, observance of the Law had been the very means of salvation. The discussion between the two types of Christian was a discussion as to whether the Law had lost its saving power, whether a Christian could be saved through the Church alone -- the Law being now abrogated, whether the Church was self-sufficient or, though a better kind of Judaism, still no more than a Jewish sect and, as such, tied to the Law.

The controversy was fierce "some coming down from Judea taught the brethren that except you be circumcised after the manner of Moses, you cannot be saved." St. Paul, as the man chiefly responsible for the new Gentile accession, and responsible, too, for the policy which emancipated these converts from the burden of the Law, was attacked bitterly. To still the controversy he and Barnabas came to Jerusalem (A.D. 51) and in a consultation of the Apostles -- the so-called Council of Jerusalem -- it was hid down that except for the prohibition of certain foods, the Gentile converts were free of the Law. It was a victory for St. Paul, and the circular letter announcing the decision went out of its way to give him praise for the work he had done.

But the opposition was by no means at an end. It survived to harass his work for years yet to come. At Corinth and in Galatia especially, did it trouble the peace of his converts. These Judaisers -- the "false brethren" of St. Paul's Epistles, converts from the Pharisees and at heart Pharisees still -- could not indeed go behind the decision of 51, but by insisting that the observance of the old Law added to sanctity, and was therefore the mark of the more perfect Christian, they fomented new divisions. The new controversy produced from St. Paul the most vigorous of all his letters -- the Epistle to the Galatians -- and a general manifesto on the whole question which, that it might have a greater prestige, he addressed "to all those who are at Rome the beloved of God, the chosen ones."

The Mosaic Law, he explained, as a thing useful for salvation is ended: the Sabbath, Circumcision, the whole elaborate code. There is now a new way of reconciliation with God, belief in Christ, union with Christ. The just man now lives not by the Law but by the new thing Faith. From Faith, and not from the Law, does salvation come. The whole theme is elaborately worked out, the relations between the Law and Faith, the role of Faith in the divine plan of salvation. To be in the Church is to be free from the burden of the Law.

Despite St. Paul's logic, and notwithstanding the Council of Jerusalem, the influence of the Judaising faction persisted, and so long as the church of Jerusalem flourished it did not lack a certain prestige. That influence was sufficiently powerful, for example, to intimidate St. Peter when, at Antioch, among the

Gentile Christians, he was living with Christian freedom. He went back on his conduct, and the incident was the occasion of a passage-at-arms with St. Paul who, faced with the desertion, "withstood him to the face." Not until the end of his life, in fact, was St. Paul free from these zealots. They followed him wherever he went, sowing dissension, and, to the best of their power, undermining his authority.

Another division which troubled this first generation of Christians must be noted. It arose from the desire of private individuals to supplement and explain the official doctrine, particularly in all that related to Jesus Christ. These various private systems were alike in this that, in order to throw new light on the teaching of the apostles, they made use of Jewish beliefs, of ideas borrowed from current philosophy, and of practices and rites of the different pagan cults. Also, along with their ingenious new presentation of the teaching, they prescribed a new way of life. The Jewish Law was exalted, circumcision practised, and it was from among the Jewish Christians that the movement arose. Among the non-Jewish elements of the system was a denial of the resurrection of the body and -- an aberration that will dog the Church's teaching for another twelve hundred years -- the prohibition of marriage as a thing that is evil. St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, his Pastoral Epistles, the Second Epistle of St. Peter, the Epistles of St. John and St. Jude, the Apocalypse are filled with references to the new errors and to the moral disorders they produced wherever they made an entrance.

The writings which make up the New Testament were none of them written to be a primary and sufficient source of information as to what the new religion was. They were all of them evidently addressed to readers already instructed, to recall what they have learnt, to supplement it, to clear up disputes which have arisen since the first instruction. Yet, though none of them profess to describe fully either the teaching or the organisation, we can extract from them valuable information on these two points. Though the facts may be few they are certain, and among these certain facts is the character of the early propaganda and of the primitive organisation.

The new doctrine is not offered to the world as a reasoned philosophy. Its teachers do not seek to convince by any

argumentation from principles, by any system of proof and deduction. It is presented as an indivisible body of truth to be received whole from the teacher, as he himself received it: and to be so received, not on any personal judgment of the reasonableness of its detail, but on the authority of the teacher. Nothing is more characteristic of St. Paul's methods, no note is so frequently sounded as this. It is to be, all through the centuries, the one answer of the Church to innovators, its one practical test of truth. This primitive apostolic Christianity is a lesson to be learnt, articles of faith to be believed, moral precepts to be obeyed, a mystery accepted on the divine authority which functions through the Apostle who is teaching. []

The character of the primitive organisation is no less clear; and from the Epistles of St. Paul especially, and from the Acts, we can make out the main lines of that organisation as a thing already considered traditional within twenty years of the death of Our Lord. They give us the picture of a number of Christian communities with the received- and traditional catechesis just described, an internal liturgical life, a complete ascetic formation and a regular system of government, communities in which the ruler, the teacher, and the liturgical officer are one and the same.

The foundation of the whole organisation is the authority of the Apostles. The Apostle is the official witness to Christ's resurrection; and he is an Apostle by the fact of Christ's commission given to him personally. Not gifts of preaching, of organisation, not any unusual spiritual experience, not personal merit, but the fact of his having been sent by Christ in this special manner is the basis of the Apostle's authority. It is this group, "the Twelve" is Our Lord's own term for them, which, in the days which follow the Ascension, is found exercising a general authority. They are the centre of all the subsequent development, the missionary activities for example, the institution of the order of deacons, the replacing of Judas; and it is to the Apostles that St. Paul submits his claim to be acknowledged as a thirteenth Apostle, "one born out of due time" indeed but none the less of the true lineage.

In the Apostolate, then, the Church is from the very beginning endowed with authority as its principle of unity, and that endowment is recognised as the personal work of Jesus Christ.

Before that authority, because it is an Apostle who speaks, everything else must yield. Those who exercise that authority decide but do not discuss (cf. e.g. I Cor. xi, 16). Here we have much in germ -- the notion of the Faith as a deposit, a traditional whole handed on as it has been received, the notion of authority as the teacher, and the notion of these as things willed and instituted by Christ Himself. Side by side with this fact of the Apostle's authority we note the believers' realisation that together they form a whole, that they are very truly a new people. In the Old Testament that unity had been the very evident one of race. In the Church the chosen ones are racially, "nationally," of a score of varieties, yet they are, nevertheless, immediately conscious of a unity which transcends these differences, a new spiritual unity no less real however than the old. Race no longer counts. The basis of the new unity is Faith in Christ and incorporation with Him (Gal. ii, 20-21).

The later Epistles of St. Paul add more details to our knowledge, in the regulations they contain for the appointment to other offices not hitherto mentioned, but whose institution these later Epistles certainly presuppose. Thus the Epistle to the Philippians is addressed (Phil. i, 1) to the *episcopoi* and the *deacons* of that church. This new term is also used (Acts xx, 28) of men just described (ib. 17) as *presbyteroi*. Throughout these later Epistles there is continual use of these two new terms, sometimes to describe the same persons (as in Acts xx, 28), sometimes the one term qualifying the other (cf. I Tim. v, 17). But always the term is used in the plural. In the Vulgate translation of the Greek of St. Paul, *episcopoi* becomes *episcopi* always, and thence in our English New Testament bishops. The Greek *presbyteroi* however the Vulgate sometimes renders *presbyteri* (which in our English becomes priest) sometimes *maiores natu* (Acts XX, 17) or *seniores* (Acts v, 6) and this in English becomes elders. Bishop and priest are, of course, and have been for centuries now, technical terms each with a definite unmistakable meaning. What then were the *episcopoi* and the *presbyteroi* of the New Testament? In what relation did they stand to the itinerant hierarchy of Apostles and missionaries? And since there were several in each church, how did the system give place to the system of a single bishop which has admittedly been universal since the beginning of the second century? The matter is anything but clear, and it has given rise to much controversy among Catholic and non-Catholic scholars alike.

Besides the data of the New Testament writings we have, on this point, a certain amount of evidence from another contemporary document The Teaching of the XII Apostles. []

The presbyteros was one of the senior members of the community and perhaps, sometimes, nothing more. But sometimes the term undoubtedly describes an official, e.g. St. Paul's instruction to Titus to create presbyteroi for every city. The presbyteroi again sometimes bore the burden of presiding over the community (I Tim. v, 17), or again they labour in the word and doctrine. To such presbyteroi is due a double honour (ib.). Again the body of presbyteroi, considered as a corporate thing (presbyterion) is a channel of grace (I Tim. iv, 14).

These new officers, during the lifetime of the Apostles, are all spoken of as named by the Apostles, either directly (Acts xiv, 22) or through the Apostles' immediate subordinates. In St. Paul's instructions to Timothy and Titus there is no hint that to designate episcopoi or presbyteroi is the business of anyone but the Apostle's delegate. The whole initiative is with Authority. The possession of some special gift of the Holy Ghost -- the charismata which were so common a feature of the new religion's first days -- tongues, miracles, prophecy or the like, does not of itself give the possessor any authority in the community. Authority only comes by designation of authority already recognised. It is never a charisma. Whatever the relations of these episcopoi and presbyteroi to each other, whatever the extent of their powers during the lifetime of St. Paul (and it is in connection with St. Paul that the question arises) the Apostle, there is no doubt about it, ruled personally his immense conquest, by visits, by letters, through delegates such as Timothy and Titus.

The next stage in the development begins when death removes the Apostles. Their office, status, power was unique. No one ever put in a claim to be an Apostle of the second generation. Because of the fact which constituted them Apostles they were necessarily irreplaceable. To their authority succeeded the new hierarchy of episcopoi and presbyteroi, and as it took their place this new hierarchy itself underwent a change. The college of episcopoi or presbyteroi who, under the Apostles, had ruled the local Church gave place to an arrangement where in each local Church there was but one episcopos whom a number of

subordinates, now termed presbyteroi, assisted. By the time of St. Ignatius of Antioch (i.e. the end of the first century, within from thirty to forty years of the death of St. Paul) the new system -- the so-called "monarchical episcopate" -- is so universal that he takes it for granted as the basis of his exhortations.

The change took place with so little disturbance that it has left no trace at all in history. It passed with so general an agreement that one can only infer that it had behind it what alone could sanction so great a change, what alone could secure it so smooth a passage, the consciousness of all concerned that this was part of the Founder's plan wrought out in detail by the Apostles He had commissioned.

To return finally to the question of the functions of the episcopoi and presbyteroi, and the relations of the two classes to each other, one view (very ably argued by Mgr. Batiffol and the Bollandist Fr. De Smedt), is that the presbyteros was a man to whom was given a title of honour for special service, a distinction which of itself carried with it no power or authority. From among the presbyteroi the episcopoi -- whose duty it was, under the Apostle, to rule, to teach -- were naturally elected. Whence the fact that not all presbyteroi are also episcopoi. Later the presbyteroi who are not also episcopoi disappear. The name, however, survives and is henceforward used for the subordinate officials of the new system, successors in part of the old episcopoi, but successors with very restricted powers and with no authority independent of the bishop -- as we may now call him.

One last important detail the New Testament writings give us. It concerns the inauguration of these different officers. Nomination to the office, even by the Apostle, does not of itself suffice. Before the candidate can act, something more is required. There is mention always of fasting, of prayer, and of the imposition of hands, and always this imposition is the act of those already possessed of authority. As a later, more technical language will describe it, the power of order, like the power of jurisdiction, like the faith itself, is transmitted from one generation to the next through the action of those who already possess it. Nowhere is it spoken of as coming from below as the result of popular determination, nor as deriving from the prestige of superior holiness, ability, or the possession of

charismata. Though the word is not yet mentioned, the all-important fact is clear that, for the first generation of Christians, no powers were valid, no teaching guaranteed, no authority was lawful save such as came through the Apostles.

The evidence of two more sources remains to be examined before the study of the Church in its first years is complete -- the letter of St. Clement of Rome to the Church of Corinth, and the letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch. This is a convenient place to say something of the origins of the Roman Church.

Who were the first members of that Church, how the new religion first came to the Empire's capital, we have absolutely no information. The first fixed date is nineteen or twenty years after the passion of Our Lord -- A.D. 49 when, among the Jews expelled from Rome by the Emperor Claudius (41-54), were the two Jewish Christians Aquila and his wife Priscilla.

This sudden reversal of the imperial favour was due to riots among the Jews themselves; and the riots, says Suetonius, were provoked by a certain Chrestus -- which may be literally true or may be the inaccurate fashion in which a none too well informed writer, a generation or more after the event, reports a conflict between Jews who were Christians and Jews who were not. Nine or ten years later the Roman Church is "Known for its faith to all the world", and so St. Paul addresses to it the greatest of his epistles, a public manifesto of his position on the question of the Jewish Law's status in the new religion. When in 61, St. Paul himself at last reaches Rome, as Caesar's prisoner, he finds many brethren there to aid him; and from the lodging where, under guard, he spends the two years until his appeal is heard, he directs through the Church, an active propaganda which results in many conversions. On the eve of Nero's persecution St. Paul is released (63) and undertakes his last pioneer voyage, to Spain it would seem certain, and then once again he returns to the scenes of his earliest labours. Finally he returns to Rome and, still under Nero, he is put to death.

Nowhere, it is true, does St. Paul mention St. Peter as being in Rome during his own sojourn there; nor does the account of St. Paul's arrival in the Acts. But a tradition, universal in the Church a century and a half later, and in whose support documentary evidence can be cited that is contemporary with St. Peter, (his

own Epistle for example, Clement of Rome, and St. Ignatius of Antioch) the utter absence of any rival to the Roman claim to possess that Apostle's tomb, and the important fact that to St. Peter's one-time headship of the Roman Church its bishops, henceforward, invariably -- and successfully -- appeal to justify their own assumption of superior authority; this varied and undoubted evidence, indirect though it may be, leaves the modern scholar in no doubt that St. Peter came to Rome, governed the Roman Church as its first bishop once the Christians there were organised, and, crowning his episcopate by martyrdom, left to that Church as its most treasured possession his body and tomb. As to the details -- when St. Peter first came to Rome, for how long he ruled the Roman Church, and, supposing the twenty-five years' episcopate (a tradition which goes back at any rate to Eusebius of Caesarea, born c. 270), at what dates to fix its beginning and end -- we know nothing with certainty. [] St. Peter was succeeded by Linus, and Linus by Anacletus. Of these two -- the second and third bishops of Rome -- we know absolutely nothing. With the fourth bishop, Clement, the case is far other, and under his direction the Roman Church is revealed in the special role which has characterised it ever since.

Clement was the head of the Church at Rome, the third successor, by the general reckoning, of St. Peter. His famous letter, written probably about the year 96, was directed to the restoration of peace at Corinth where a section of the faithful were in revolt against the rulers of that church. Its importance for the historian lies in the information he can gather from it as to the constitution of this early Christianity, as to the nature of its ruling authority and as to the character of its teaching. The letter makes no mention of the charismata, so familiar a feature in the time of St. Paul, nor of any itinerant missionary authorities. The temporary structures have already disappeared, and the Church is in the first days of the new permanent regime. Unity is essential and the source and means of unity is Authority. Whence obedience to authority is the first duty of all believers. This is the leading idea of the letter. The believers are "a people" (ethnos) divinely set apart. They are an army in which "not all are officers. . . each has his rank, carrying out the orders of the leader." They are a "body", "the body of Christ," a flock. Authority is the source of unity, and unity is achieved by submission to the "tutelage" (paideia) of authority. "Let us

submit to the tutelage. . . obey the elders and allow them to tutor you. . . learn to be submissive. It is better to be nothing in the flock of Christ, to be even hungry, than to appear to be great and lack all hope in Christ."

The subject matter of this education or tutelage is the traditional faith and the commandments of the Lord, "the words of the divine tutelage," things already fixed in writing. This fixed and traditional doctrine is the norm by which the believer must be guided, "Let us cease to make vain searches, let us come to the glorious and venerable fixed rule (canona) that has been handed down to us." This notion of determination by a fixed rule, a canon, is found in association with other things than doctrine. In the liturgical reunions, St. Clement reminds the Corinthians, offerings are to be made "not as anyone chooses and without order but as the Master ordained, at fixed and definite times. Where and by whom He Himself has arranged by His sovereign will." Wherefore "each of us, brethren, should keep to his own rank, and not transgress the fixed rule (canona) of his rank."

St. Clement's explanation of the historical origin of the authority he is supporting is simple. It came to its present holders from the Apostles, who received it from Christ, Who received it from God. The Apostles preached the Gospel, and the first-fruits of their preaching they made bishops and deacons. As these died, others took their place inheriting the Apostolic commission and authority. These successors of the bishops nominated by the Apostles are elected by the Church over which they are to preside, but, an important point, it is from other bishops -- not from their election -- that the elect receive their powers. The powers are received by transmission from one who already possesses them himself. The essence of the Hierarchy is its descent from the Apostles. These things are not the express teaching of the letter. St. Clement does not argue for them, nor make any attempt to prove them. They are facts apparently as well known to his readers as to himself, recalled as the basis for his plea for peace and concord at Corinth. The letter ends on a practical note. A delegation goes with it to explain more fully the mind of the Roman Church.

Such is the first appearance in history of the Roman Church in action -- intervening in the domestic affairs of another and distant Church. Was Clement of Rome asked to intervene? Then

his letter is the sequel to the first appeal to Rome. Was his letter the fruit of his own spontaneous act? Nothing remains to tell us. But the Roman Church is already acting as though conscious of its superior power; and this, during the lifetime of an Apostle, for St. John was still alive at Ephesus and Ephesus was much nearer to Corinth than was Rome !

This First Letter of St. Clement of Rome witnesses, then, to a general belief in the divine right of the hierarchy, in the divine origin of its power, and to the Roman Church's consciousness of its peculiar superiority. It takes these things as the facts of the situation, and it acts on the supposition that they are facts universally recognised, which do not call for proof.

Can it be said that Clement of Rome is unique, an eccentric? That the views of his letter are the product of any local Roman "legalist" spirit? Side by side with his letter, the letters of his contemporary Ignatius of Antioch should be read.

St. Ignatius, born about the year 60, in all probability a disciple of St. John, was the third Bishop of Antioch. He was one of the victims of the anti-Christian laws under Trajan (98-117), and it was during his journey from the East to Rome, for his martyrdom, that he wrote these seven letters. They are letters of gratitude to the different Christian communities who had come to his assistance, letters of encouragement, advice, and edification. Once more, it is to be noted, their usefulness here is their obiter dicta -- incidental references to institutions, offices, beliefs which, the writer evidently assumed, were as familiar to his correspondents as they were to himself. The letters are addressed to the churches at Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia, Smyrna, Rome and to the martyr's disciple, St. Polycarp. The general organisation of the Church as this oriental contemporary of Clement of Rome knows it, the form of its teaching, are much as we find them in the letter of Clement and in the New Testament. St. Ignatius does but confirm, once more, evidence already examined. Like Clement he knows no "itinerant" teaching hierarchy. Like Clement he attaches the utmost importance to internal peace and unity, and his insistence on this as the first necessity is the more striking because it is not provoked, as was St. Clement's plea, by any immediate breach. In each of the churches there is a ruling body, its officers now clearly distinguished, one bishop with

several priests and deacons. This one visible bishop is in each church the representative of the invisible bishop, God. Hence obedience to the visible bishop as to God, and obedience to the college of priests as to the Apostles. Again we find the Church likened to a disciplined army; and in another very striking phrase the priests are exhorted to attune themselves to the bishop as the different strings of a harp, so that the whole church will sing as a choir with one voice. Erroneous doctrine cuts off from the Church whoever believes it. The true doctrine is the doctrine handed down. To reject this traditional doctrine, or to receive it otherwise than it has been received, to prefer any other to it, is criminal. Whoever, for example, speaks of Christ otherwise than the Church speaks, should be looked on as dead. The test of a doctrine's truth is its acceptance by the visible Church, and the sole guarantee of faith is to be one in belief with the bishop. Already dissidents are to be found who appeal to Scripture for their justification. St. Ignatius has met them: "If I can't find it in the Gospel" they protest "I won't believe." He does not produce any counter argument in reply. He brushes aside their reasoning, and against their dissidence simply sets the accepted faith. Agreement with that is the measure of the truth of their opinions.

Unity is of the highest importance, is willed by God. Unity in each local church, unity by unity of belief between all the churches of the world. The test of this unity is the belief of the local bishop, obedience to the bishop is its guarantee. There where the bishop is should all believers be gathered too, as where Jesus Christ is there is the universal Church -- (katholike ecclesia). St. Ignatius, looking beyond the local churches to the one great Church which in their unity they compose, has found for that unity the name which henceforth it will for ever retain -- the Catholic Church.

It is not without significance that, in both these primitive fragments, there is reference to the Roman Church. Clement was himself the third of its bishops, and to it St. Ignatius addressed one of his letters. In his address he adds epithet to epithet, in eastern fashion, to show his sense of its distinction. Not as Clement wrote to Corinth does Ignatius write his exhortation; "I do not give you orders as Peter and Paul were wont to do; they were apostles." He congratulates the Roman Church because "it has taught the others," and because "in the country of the

Romans it presides," a curious phrase which is meaningless unless it refers to a presidency of the church over other churches.

St. Ignatius was thrown to the beasts in a Roman circus somewhere about the year 107. In the three quarters of a century which are all that separate his martyrdom from Our Lord's Ascension, the ecclesia is visibly and evidently the Catholic Church. It is spreading throughout the Roman world. It is increasingly a gentile thing; it is a federation of communities united in belief, united in their mode of government, united in their acceptance of the belief as a thing regulated by authority, united, too, in their worship. It has received its historic name--the Catholic Church -- and the rule of the Church at Rome is already foreshadowed in writing and in action, the continuation in time of the chieftainship conferred by Christ on Peter. Uniformity of belief has already been challenged, and in these challengers the Church has met the first heretics, has recognised them as such by their refusal to accept her received tradition, by their defiance of the authority of the bishop who, because he is ruler, is also teacher.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



NOTE A: THE END OF JEWISH CHRISTIANITY

Although the first Christians were all of them Jews, with every year that passed the influence of the Jewish Christians diminished, once the Greeks, too, came into the Church. The failure of the efforts of one section to enforce within the new religion the observance of the Mosaic Law as such, was a very notable setback. The Gentile converts easily outnumbered the Jewish and by the time of the death of St. Paul the Jewish Christians were already a minority. In 62 they lost the Apostle who seems to have been their especial leader -- James, the Bishop of Jerusalem; and eight years later the armies of Vespasian and Titus, destroying the Holy City and the last vestiges of independent Jewish political organisation, ended inevitably the prestige of the church in which Christianity had first been organised. There would now be no repetition of the danger, which the Church had so recently escaped, that it would present itself to the world as simply another Jewish sect. The Roman soldiery had, in very grim fashion, crowned the work of St. Paul.

But for all that Jerusalem was no more, razed to the very ground as Our Lord had prophesied, with only the camp of the Tenth Legion to mark where it had stood, its Christian population continued to lead a collective life. Some vision had warned the bishop -- Simeon -- of the coming troubles, and the faithful had left the city in time, and settled at Pella, in the pagan country across the Jordan. Here for yet another century and more they survived, isolated from the rest of the Church and increasingly a prey to heretical developments. The belief in the essential divinity of Our Lord changed into what was afterwards called Adoptianism. He was the child of Joseph and Mary and later, because of his scrupulous fidelity to the Law, permitted to become the Christ. That destiny is open to all his followers. Whence, among these heretical Judeo-Christians -- the Ebionites -- a devotion to the Law unsurpassed by the Pharisees themselves. Of the sacred books which later formed the New Testament they possessed the Gospel of St. Matthew. St. Paul they held in abhorrence as an apostate and a perverter of the truth. The second generation of the Ebionites, through contact with the Jewish sect of the Essenes, added yet other beliefs and

practices. They had their own theory of a double creation of good and bad, perpetuated through the centuries in parallel lines of good and of lying prophets, descendants of Adam and of Eve respectively. More accurately, these are re-incarnations of the one prophet, and this one prophet it is who has appeared in Jesus Christ. He is not God. Circumcision is retained along with Baptism, a vegetarian diet is prescribed, a daily bath, and, as a means of avoiding sexual sin, marriage at the very beginning of puberty. In their Eucharist water takes the place of wine. A still later development is that of the Elkasaites of whose distinctive tenets, however, nothing is known with certainty.

Ebionites and Elkasaites were of course heretics. Side by side with them, however, but in ever dwindling numbers the Christian Church survived for yet two centuries at least. St. Jerome writes of these survivors to St. Augustine, and finds them sufficiently orthodox in faith. Though they do not reject St. Paul, they cling steadfastly to all the customs of the Jews. In an earlier generation they had produced at least one writer Hegesippus, who, (c. 150), set himself to travel throughout the world comparing his own faith with that professed by all the bishops he encountered, and endeavouring to construct a pedigree of orthodox teachers, linking the bishops of his day with the Apostles. All the bishops he met agreed in doctrine and the doctrine was that which he himself had been taught. Also he noted the names of the bishops of the Roman Church down to Anicetus. It is evident from the few references to these Jewish Christian Churches of the East, and from the occasional confusion in what references we do possess, that they had ceased to be more than a matter of archaeology to the learned men who wrote about them. By the fifth century they are nothing more than this, and thence on they are entirely lost to view.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



NOTE B: ST. PETER AT ROME

(The following long note is translated, with the author's permission, from the *Histoire de l'Eglise, Tome I L'Antiquite Chretienne* (pp. 61-67) of Fr. A. M. Jacquin, O.P., Paris, Editions de la Revue des Jeunes, 1928. To the learned author of this best of manuals I gladly express my sincerest thanks.)

"The fact of St. Peter's martyrdom at Rome has been called in doubt, through the prejudices of Protestants first of all and then of the critics. In both cases the mistake has led to an appreciable gain in historical knowledge and to that extent has been of real service. That these doubts were mistaken is to-day unquestionable for all scholars save those who turn from the light. The critical apparatus with which Baur strove against the ancient tradition is to-day, and rightly, regarded as negligible." (A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Chronologie*, t. ii, i, p. 244.)

For all Harnack's judgment, there are not lacking Protestant and rationalist historians who spend their energy defending these theses which have long ceased to be tenable. Erbes, for example, and above all, Ch. Guignebert (*La primauté de Pierre et la venue de Pierre a Rome*, Paris, 1909). This last scholar's work earned him from the pen of M. P. Monceaux a lesson in critical scholarship which hardly increased his reputation as a scholar. (*L'apostolat de Saint Pierre a Rome a propos d'un livre recent in the Revue d'histoire et de litterature religieuses, New Series I* (1910), pp. 216-40: cf. also A. Flamion, *Saint Pierre a Rome: Examen de la these et de la methode de M. Guignebert in the Revue d'histoire ecclesiastique, XIV* (1913), pp. 249-71, 473-88.) On the other hand a Protestant, H. Lietzmann, has just published in defence of the tradition a work of the very highest interest (*Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, 2 ed., Berlin, 1927). His choice goes to the evidence from the Liturgy and from Archaeology, and he reaches the conclusion that, towards the year 200, the conviction at Rome was universal that the city possessed the tombs of SS. Peter and Paul. Other proofs, drawn from the letters of Clement and Ignatius, from the First Epistle of St. Peter, make it impossible for us to allow the theory of a legend formed in the interval between the death of the Apostles

and the year 200 and this all the more since no other church, whether in the East or in the West, has ever laid claim to the honour of possessing these illustrious remains.

There would then be little occasion to re-open the discussion of a question now so clearly decided, except for the fact's importance in the history of the Primitive Church and for its apologetic value as an argument for the privileges of the episcopal see of Rome. This double importance is a good reason for presenting here the arguments on which the traditional belief is based.

Moreover, the proof is by this time a commonplace, and among many others Mgr. Duchesne (*Les Origines chretiennes*, 2 ed., pp. 82-117, Paris, s.d.: *Hist. Ancienne de l'Eglise*, I, pp. 61-63, Paris, 1911) has set it out with a scientific detachment which is beyond all criticism. He makes a distinction between the principal fact, about which no one can any longer have any serious doubt, and the accessory circumstances about which we have not the same historical guarantee. "It is possible," he says, "to prove that St. Peter came to Rome, and that he suffered martyrdom there: we have no evidence sufficient to fix the date of his coming nor the length of his stay." (*Les Origines chretiennes*, p. 82.)

I. As to the first point, we can note, by the end of the second century a tradition that is precise and universal: the majority of the churches provide evidence, and that evidence is to the same effect.

1. Alexandria. Clement, writing about the Gospel of St. Mark, says "Peter preached the word of God publicly at Rome, and under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit made the Gospel known. Those who assisted at his sermons, and they were numerous, exhorted Mark, who for a long time had been Peter's companion, and whose memory held many of his sayings, to put these things in writing." (Eusebius, H.E., vi, 14)

Origen, in his commentary on Genesis (1 iii) speaks of the activity of the Apostles. Of Peter he says "Peter appears to have preached in Pontus, in Galatia, in Bithynia, in Cappadocia, and in Asia to the Jews of the Diaspora. Finally he, too, came to Rome, and there he was crucified, head downwards, having

asked to suffer in this fashion." (EUSEBIUS; H.E. iii, 1.)

2. Africa. Tertullian more than once asserts that St. Peter came to Rome and there suffered martyrdom. Speaking of the church of that city he says "O Happy Church ! The Apostles lavished upon it their teaching and their blood. Peter there suffered a death like to that of the Lord." (De Praescriptione, 36.) In the De Baptismo, 4, he recalls that Peter "baptized in the Tiber" that is at Rome. In another place (Adv. Marcion, iv, 5) it is to the authority of the Romans that he appeals against Marcion since "to them Peter and Paul left the gospel, confirmed by their blood." A little later still, Scorpiace 15, he asserts that "Nero was the first to persecute the nascent faith at Rome with punishments. Then it was," he adds, "that Peter was girt by another, when he was fixed to the cross."

3. Gaul and Asia. St. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, was of Smyrnian origin, and acquainted therefore with the traditions of these two countries, to say nothing of the tradition of Rome where he had lived for some time. Now St. Irenaeus has no doubts whatever that St. Peter came to Rome. According to him the Gospel of St. Matthew was written "while Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel at Rome and founding the church there." (Adv. Haereses, iii, 1.) And, a little later, wishing to base his argument on the witness of the Churches, he contents himself with giving the proof of the apostolic succession of the Church of Rome "founded and organised by the two glorious apostles Peter and Paul." (ibid. iii, 3.)

4. Greece. Eusebius (H.E., ii, 25) writes as follows "Denis Bishop of the Corinthians, in a letter addressed to the Romans, thus fixes the point that Peter and Paul both suffered martyrdom at the same time. You have also, by such an admonishment, united Rome and Corinth the two trees which we owe to Peter and to Paul. For just as both the one and the other planted at Corinth and taught us, so after teaching together in Italy, at the same time they suffered martyrdom."

5. Rome. Leaving aside the archaeological and liturgical evidence regarding St. Peter's chair at Rome, his tomb and the place where he is supposed to have lived in the empire's capital, [] and, too, the lists of the bishops of the Roman Church, we can cite the testimony of the Roman priest Caius, who wrote

during the pontificate of Zephyrinus (199-217). "In a treatise written against Proclus, the chief of the Cataphrygians," says Eusebius (H.E., ii, 25) "and speaking of the places where the sacred remains of the Apostles were laid he says, 'I can show you the trophies of the Apostles. Go to the Vatican, or along the Ostian Way, there you will find the trophies of the founders of this church.'"⁴ The meaning of the expression *tropaia* has been much controverted, and it is suggested that it designates not the tombs of the Apostles but simple commemorative monuments. Even so it remains true that Rome, at the end of the second century, was still mindful of the memory "of the founders of this church." But there is nothing to disprove that the term in question means 'tomb'; we find it used with this meaning, and Eusebius, who had before him the complete text of Caius, so uses it. It is, in point of fact, the only possible meaning in this context. Caius is answering the boast of Proclus that Asia retains the bodies of the four prophetess-daughters of Philip and of their father, too, and must in turn be claiming that Rome, more gloriously still, possesses, not merely a memorial, but the very tombs of the Apostles. []

This examination shows then that the principal churches of the Christian world between 170 and 210 were unanimous in affirming that St. Peter went to Rome and there suffered martyrdom. Now an agreement so unanimous, among witnesses whom we may believe to be independent of one another, can only be explained by the objective reality of the fact to which they testify. That agreement is all the more impressive from the circumstance that it has not to meet any rival contrary tradition. When the Bishops of Rome claim to be the successors of St. Peter, and pride themselves on this distinction, no one throws doubt on their claim. The Eastern churches themselves bear testimony in the same sense. (cf. F. Martin, *Saint Pierre, sa venue et son martyre a Rome*, in the *Revue des questions historiques*, t. xiii (1873), pp. 5-107.)

The end of the second century was too near in time to the events themselves for any legend to have formed and to have spread itself so widely. Besides, pushing the investigation back through the intervening years we find hints that fit in with the data of the tradition as early as the first century, as early as St. Peter himself.

If, for example, St. Justin and Hermas are silent about the coming of St. Peter to Rome and his martyrdom there, and there was no reason why they should speak of it, St. Ignatius of Antioch, on the other hand, in his Letter to the Romans, written about 110, certainly alludes to it. In touching language he beseeches those to whom he writes "to spare him any untimely benevolence" that might rob him of martyrdom, and he adds "I do not give you orders as Peter and Paul. They were Apostles and I am but a prisoner condemned to death" (Rom. 4).

Commenting on this text, Mgr Duchesne (*Les Origines chretiennes*, p. 89) says very truly, "These words are not the literal equivalent of the proposition 'St. Peter came to Rome,' but, supposing that he did go there St. Ignatius would not have spoken otherwise: supposing he did not go to Rome the phrase lacks meaning."

The tradition then existed, even in Syria, from the time of Trajan. It shows itself at Rome, in, the time of Domitian, in the letter of Pope Clement. Speaking of the evil effects of jealousy he shows how it caused the death of the apostles and of many other martyrs. "Cast your eyes," he says, "upon the most worthy apostle -- Peter, who, victim of unjust jealousy, underwent not one or two but a whole host of sufferings, and who, having thus accomplished his martyrdom, departed for the place of glory that is his due. It was through jealousy, too, that Paul showed how [to win] the prize of patience. . . . After teaching justice to the whole world, journeying to the very limits of the West, he accomplished his martyrdom before those in authority, and left this world, illustrious model of patience, to go to the holy place. With these men of holy life were joined a great crowd of chosen souls, who, the effect of jealousy, endured many outrages and tortures, and who left among us a magnificent example. It was as the victims of jealousy that these women, the Danaids and the Dirces, after suffering terrible and monstrous outrage, reached the goal in this race of the faith, and weak in body as they were, received their noble reward" (Cor. 5-6). All these victims form with the Apostles, Peter and Paul, one group. These women, came to join themselves (*synethroisen*) with the Apostles, and it is at Rome (*ev hemin*) that all suffered and left a magnificent example.

Finally St. Peter himself, in the letter he wrote to the churches of Asia, seems certainly to suggest that he is living in Rome at the

time he is writing. To these Christians he sends the greetings of "the Church of Babylon" (I Pet. v. 13) that is to say of Rome, according to most exegetes. "Peter," says Renan (*L'Antechrist*, p. 122, Paris, 1893), "to designate Rome chose the name of the capital of Asiatic wickedness, a name whose symbolical meaning all would recognise."

Thanks to this continuity in the tradition, which goes back as far as the fact itself, it is possible to demonstrate that St. Peter went to Rome and there suffered martyrdom. "Every other hypothesis," says M. Lietzmann, "heaps difficulty upon difficulty, and can produce in its support not a single testimony from sources" (*Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, p. 238).

II. If we desire to establish with precision the date at which St. Peter came to Rome and the length of his stay we are not any longer in a position to prove anything demonstratively. There are sources which all of them speak of a period of twenty-five years in connection with St. Peter's Roman apostolate, but they disagree as to the date when this period begins and also as to the events with which it is connected.

Eusebius, in his *Ecclesiastical History* (ii, 14), makes St. Peter come to Rome at the beginning of the reign of Claudius (41-54), and places his death during the persecution of Nero. His presence in the imperial city is alleged to have ruined the prestige of Simon Magus. In the second edition of his *Chronicle*, of which St. Jerome's translation is testimony (A. Schene, *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus*, Berlin, 1900), he gives as the date of arrival the second year of Claudius (42), and as the date of martyrdom the fourteenth of Nero (67).

The *Liberian Catalogue*, so called because in its present form it dates from the pontificate of Liberius (353-366), mentions St. Peter at the head of the list of Bishops of Rome. "Peter, twenty-five years, one month, eight days; during the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Caius, Tiberius Claudius, and Nero; from the consulate of Minucius (Vinicius) and Longinus to that of Nerine (Nero) and Nero (Vetus)." St. Peter then is said to have come to Rome during the reign of Tiberius, Vinicius and Longinus being consuls (30): he is said to have lived there during the reign of Caligula, Claudius and Nero until death came to him during the

consulate of Nero and Vetus (55).

Finally Lactantius (De Morte Persecutorum, 2) says of the Apostles, "They spread themselves throughout the world to preach the gospel, and for twenty-five years, to the end of the reign of Nero, were busied about the foundation of the Church through all the provinces and cities. Nero had already come into power when St. Peter came to Rome. . . . Nero was the first to persecute the servants of God. Peter he crucified and Paul he put to death."

These three texts agree in speaking of a period of 25 years. But while Eusebius and the Liberian Catalogue speak of the period as the duration of St. Peter's Roman episcopate, Lactantius' reference is to the preaching of all the Apostles, during the time between the Ascension and Nero's succession, and preceding St. Peter's coming to Rome. Again, the first two sources differ in the dates from which they make the period begin -- Eusebius places the period between 42-67, the Liberian Catalogue between 30 and 55.

All the documents date from the fourth century but two of them, Eusebius and the Catalogue, derive from earlier documents, lists of bishops already existent in the third century and perhaps even in the second. (cf. A. Flamion, *Les anciennes listes episcopales des quatre grands sieges*, in *Revue d'histoire ecclesiastique*, i (1900), pp. 645-678; ii (1901), pp. 209-238.) It follows from this that it was probably from this time that the idea of twenty-five years was linked with St. Peter's Roman apostolate.

It is not, for all that, easy to understand the twenty-five years as a period of uninterrupted residence at Rome. According to the Acts of the Apostles St. Peter was at Jerusalem in 49 on the occasion of the conference which dealt with the question of Gentile converts to the faith. Shortly afterwards he was at Antioch where the incident related by St. Paul occurred. St. Paul's own silence in his Epistle to the Romans, written in 58, that of the author of the Acts in his account of St. Paul's captivity (61-62), the silence of the Apostle of the Gentiles in all the letters he wrote from Rome, seem to point to the fact that in these years St. Peter was not living at Rome. "All this is, no doubt, not absolutely irreconcilable with an effective residence

of twenty-five years that would have to allow for necessary absences. But it is very extraordinary that these absences fall precisely at all the times concerning which we have information about Roman Christianity" (L. Duchesne, *Les Origines chretiennes*, p. 84, note).

According to Eusebius (H.E., ii, 14), St. Peter, who routed Simon Magus for a first time in Palestine, met the imposter a second time at Rome "at the beginning of the reign of Claudius." Simon's success which had been such that he had come to be considered "as a god, honoured with a statue," disappeared and was extinguished with himself. As early as the third century the author of the *Philosophoumena* (xi, 20) had recalled this fact without, however, making any mention of the statue. The value of this testimony, and of other testimonies still more recent, is hard to assess. Eusebius, for all that relates to Simon, bases his account on St. Justin, citing his first Apology (26), where the magician is spoken of as follows: "He was taken for a god; as a god he had his statue; it is erected on an island in the Tiber, between the two bridges, with his inscription in Latin: *Simoni Deo Sancto*." Now it is very probable that Justin, whose historical accuracy often leaves much to be desired, has here confused Simon and the Etruscan divinity *Semo Sancus*. In the sixteenth century, as a matter of fact, on this very island of the Tiber, there was discovered the base of a statue with the words upon it *Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio Sacrum*. Later still, on the Quirinal, where there was a temple to this divinity, two similar inscriptions were discovered. On the other hand the literary tradition of the meeting, of which one finds traces as early as the third century, may derive from the Acts of Peter, which dates from this time. But this work, romantic in character, Gnostic in origin, Docetist in tendency, is too slight an authority to have any credit at all. It is to this work, too, that we owe the story of *Quo Vadis* -- St. Peter leaving Rome to escape martyrdom meets Our Lord Who invites him, tactfully, to return to the city.

All things considered, if it is not possible to deny absolutely the meeting of St. Peter and Simon it is impossible at present to prove it scientifically. As far as regards St. Peter's death, on the other hand, we possess some data of the very best authenticity coming from Tertullian and Origen. The first says clearly (*Scorpiace*, 15) that he died in the time of Nero, the second (EUSEBIUS, H.E., iii, I) placing the martyrdom of St. Paul at this

time seems to associate with it that of St. Peter. The two writers add that he was crucified (TERTULLIAN, De Praescriptione, 36, Scorpiace, 15; ORIGEN loc. cit.) and Origen says, too, that he was crucified head downwards, not an unusual circumstance as the custom of the day went and one which is to be found in other cases too (cf. P. Allard, Histoire des persecutions pendant les deux premiers siecles, p. 79).

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 3: THE FIRST CONTACTS WITH THE PAGAN RELIGIOUS WORLD

1. *THE RELIGIOUS WORLD OF THE SECOND CENTURY*

THE history of the first contacts of the new religion with the religious thought of the Romano-hellenic world is only imperfectly known to us. The Acts of the Apostles relates, of course, the story of the conversion of the Roman officer Cornelius in the first years after Our Lord's Ascension, and describes St. Paul's varied success with the pagans of the Roman East. The Acts is, in a large part, the story of the origins of Gentile Christianity. Nevertheless it is not until the next century that we begin to have evidence in detail about the way the new religion affected the religious gentiles who occupied themselves with its teaching and promises; or the like evidence about the way the Church reacted to its contact with the world outside it.

That world outside was not, in the second century, by any means unconcerned with religious theories and practice. Religion was all important to it, and though the religious restoration of the first of the Roman emperors had not developed, as he had hoped, into a rebirth of the old classical Paganism, religion a hundred years after his death was flourishing and promised to flourish yet more. Development since Augustus had not, indeed, taken the direction he would have willed. It had left the Paganism of the classic pantheon to its inevitable end. It showed itself rather in the appearance of new cults, particularly in the cult of personified abstractions. Such were the new religions which worshipped Honour, Piety, Peace and -- the most popular cult of all -- Fortune. These new fast-spreading cults were free of the mythological foulness which had disfigured the older religion they displaced; but the gods they honoured remained, for the popular imagination, little more than abstractions before which the only attitude possible was the resignation of fatalism. Fortune might be worshipped as the supreme goddess, but Fortune was inexorable unchangeable destiny, Fate -- and before Fate what use to pray or beseech?

A like fatalistic attitude to life was bred by another series of new cults now in full emigration from the East, the cult of the Sun, of the Moon and of the Stars. According to the positions of the stars at the moment of birth, so must every man's life be; and the adepts of these cults set themselves to work out astrological codes by which each man's future and fate might be told. The emperors enacted the severest laws against these mischievous superstitions, but without any great success. The promise of this religious astrology was too much for human anxiety to resist, and the very emperors in whose name the laws were published were themselves the first to break them.

But the most important feature of the century's religious history was undoubtedly the progress of the ancient cults of the old pre-hellenic culture of the East. Below the veneer of Hellenism which had covered it now for generations, the East still remained the East. Egypt, Asia and Syria still retained their ancient identities, their ancient sensual and bloodthirsty gods. Slowly, now, that older East was coming to life again; and, in a kind of revenge for the Hellenistic centuries, its old religions seeped through the surface, steadily, increasingly, until by the middle of the third century they had done much everywhere to transform the religion of the city populations. These cults were popular now for the same reasons that the mystery religions had been popular in ancient Greece. They offered to their clients guarantees of special protection -- very notably they offered protection against the powers of evil, against Fate itself. They gained a hold on the imagination by the splendour of their rites, their secret initiations, the spectacle of their sanctifying sacred dramas. In the assemblies which were the scene of these rites a mad enthusiasm spread through the crowd. Men stabbed themselves and each other, feeling nothing; in sheer religious exultation mutilated themselves publicly and shamelessly, passed through fire, leapt unbridgeable gulfs, gave themselves to actions of unbelievable impudicity. But more potent than the attraction of these often misunderstood aberrations was the novelty of the god's familiarity with his client. The gods of the classic Olympus had been aloof. Familiarity with them was perilous. Their company no man could hope to survive. But Isis, Mithra, the Syrian Goddess, offered familiarity, friendship: offered this, even, as the very means of their protection, as the medium through which they wished to be worshipped.

As these cults slowly established themselves in the West, they underwent more than one important modification. The Syrian goddess, patron of reproduction, was seen by the Greeks as another Aphrodite, by the Romans as a Venus. With the identification a more open sensuality often crept into the old Paganism of the West, a new brutal bloodthirstiness. From Rome the new cults crossed the Alps, and revived by their presence the superstitions and the horrors of the old pre-Roman religion of the Celts. Always there is the fantasy of the legend, never exactly the same in any two places; always the rough and ready identification of the new and the old; the attraction of sensual novelty in the ritual, the promise of the god's intimacy, of his special protection and of a happy eternity. The man who has given himself to the god or goddess and is accepted has no more to fear. Though Fate dog his life Isis will effectually protect him.

These religions introduced, too, a new kind of priesthood. Their priests were a caste apart, men whose lives were wholly given to the service of the god, and who were set apart for that service in a definite ritual, often indeed of a brutal and obscene character. They had their prophets, they had their magicians, sorcerers, soothsayers; and their establishment presented the nascent religion of Christ with yet another obstacle to overcome in its mission of winning the populace to the good tidings of the Kingdom of God. Under the working of these new influences the popular inert dislike of the Christian turns to passionate, active hatred -- a hatred which skilful calumny intensifies. And as with the third century, the Eastern cults gain a hold among the aristocracy, and can claim the emperor himself as a devotee, the possibilities of the anti-Christian influence know no limit. It is, for instance, the magician, Macrian, who converts the emperor, Valerian (253-259), from his sympathy for the Christians and makes of him one of the bloodiest of persecutors.

The mystery religions, as they developed in the century between Nero and Marcus Aurelius, were to influence the pace of the Church's development in another way. Two features they all shared -- the initiation reserved to the select few and the special revelation of the god to the initiated. It was only after a laborious novitiate, and a series of tests and partial initiations, that the candidate was in the end admitted to the heart of the mystery. In

every mystery religion, then, the disciples, at any given moment, were arranged in a hierarchy of knowledge, and of perfection, according to the degree of their initiation. And as knowledge of the divine secret and intimacy with the god developed together, the perfectly initiated into knowledge was alone perfectly holy, stainless and saved. This idea of a hierarchy of virtue based on degrees of knowledge was to play its part in the Church, too, once the Church came into contact with Gnosticism.

The perfection to which the initiate few thus attained was of course wholly unconcerned with moral goodness. In the dramas of the mysteries, even of the more restrained Hellenic mysteries, the subjects of the splendid spectacle were all too often the sexual relations of the god and goddess with one another and with mankind. Moral teaching they held none; nor anything of instruction about the gods except the interminable, meaningless genealogies. And if the early Christian writers used all their eloquence to denounce the mysteries for the traps they were, the Pagans were equally outspoken. Plutarch, for example, ends his description of the myth of Isis and Osiris with the comment that to those who really believe that the gods give themselves to such a way of life there is no more to be said but what Aeschylus advises, "Spit it out and rinse your mouth." Nothing in this latest development of Paganism brought it nearer to the chance of giving the world what the Gospel promised to give. It was no rival gospel that the Church had to fear in the mystery religions, or in these new cults from the East. The danger was more simple -- that the mixture of charlatantry and sensuality would find so ready a response in the weakest parts of human nature that there would not even remain a beginning of natural virtue to which the super-natural could make an appeal. "The mysteries never raised man to a belief more worthy of the divinity. Rather it was man who by his interpretation of the mysteries gave them a meaning more worthy of the gods."

Such as they were, however, these religions flourished. The army, the imperial functionaries, the officials of the civil service spread them from one end of the empire to the other. The century that begins with Marcus Aurelius and ends with Aurelian (161-275) is their golden age. The old Paganism of classical times, as a force influencing men's lives, is dead. As a ritual, as a part of the day's public life, a religious consecration of the State and its institutions, it still continues. But it has long since

ceased to shape men's activities. In its place are the oriental religions just described and, for the elite who think, the religious philosophies. In the Paganism of the second century these two things alone are alive.

The religious philosophy of the day made, of itself, no appeal whatever to the senses, nor to the imagination. It attempted a reasonable explanation of religion and of the mythologies, and, more than that, it presented itself as a reasoned teaching in religious matters, offering a reasoned system of morality. The philosophers were the guides and spiritual directors of that minority who wished to live an ordered, reasonable, and, as we should say, religious life. In their teaching such souls found illumination and encouragement, and it was from the philosophers of this generation that the Church recruited those converts who were to be pioneers in the work of expounding her doctrine rationally to the intellect of the non-Christian world. The philosophy fashionable in the second century is, then, not only an important element in the non-Christian life of that time, but it has its effect within the Church itself thanks to the conversion to Christianity of so many of its devotees. Two schools of this second-century philosophic thought call principally for notice -- the Stoics and the

For the Stoic all things had their origin in one single living principle, and this principle is material. From this first material principle -- the purest and most subtle matter conceivable, a kind of fiery air -- all other existing things have come, and will continue to come, by a process of continual degrading, a process inevitable and necessitated. In all these derived existing things, no matter how low the degree of their existence, there remains always some spark of that principle whence they first derive -- whether the things be, as we should say, animate or inanimate. "This fire" the definition classic among the Stoics explained "is skilled and travels a fixed road since the world's beginning. Locked up within it are all the seminal logoi in accordance with which all things necessarily come into being." From this fire all things come, to it all things return; and the evolutionary process is fixed, inevitable from the nature of the fire. Returning to the original fire, they issue forth yet again -- always in the same way, bound to the same evolution in the future which has shaped their history in the past; things, animals, men, the gods themselves, except Zeus whom the

Stoics identify with the imperishable fire. All is governed by this unescapable law of necessity. Even the least of human actions necessarily follows from causes outside man's control, is fixed by the nature of things, is shaped by the one soul of the universe. "Man," said the Stoics, "is a dog tied to a car. He has no choice but to run in its wake."

This necessity, constraining human action, is and is not a slavery, for the soul of all things whence the necessity comes is man's soul too, and the necessity which constrains him is not the violence of another to which perforce he must submit, but the necessity of his own nature's deepest need. "Secure in his autonomy, why should the Stoic sigh for liberty?" The theory worked out in practice in very different ways. First of all it set man on an equality with the gods, for it is the one same divine soul that gives life to all. Whence a valuation of human personality among the Stoics higher than any other of the ancient philosophies ever accorded it. Whence, too, those beginnings of a care for personality in legislation, and the humanitarianism of which Cicero is a leading example. Whence also, on the other hand, a pride and self-exaltation that could end in mania.

Again, although the theory of the divine origin of all things could, and did, in Seneca for example, develop into a belief in something like Providence, the other half of the theory -- the necessary evolution, the unescapable force, the inevitable, individual destruction and re-absorption, -- is the very negation of Providence. This god who is in us all, who is ourselves, as he is everything, is yet unknown and unknowable, and research as to his nature can only end in ever greater obscurity. Prayer, supplication can find no place in the system -- for all things that happen must happen as they happen. No effort can change them, no flight escape them. If one type of character was helped and encouraged by the system's Pantheism, braced or consoled by the belief in fellowship with the rest of creation, assuredly there were others crushed in despair by its fatalism.

The two great names among the Stoics of the second century are Epictetus and the emperor Marcus Aurelius. Epictetus is no fashionable philosopher with the entertainment of a leisured audience as his highest aim. He is a man with a mission, and his hearers were earnest and devoted seekers after a higher life. He

set before them an ideal of austere detachment from the chances of life. Sickness, old age, misfortune, death itself should have no power over the Stoic; no power to disturb the calm, happy freedom of this man whom reason controlled. Such ills, when they threatened his peace, should be looked in the face, understood for what they were, and, their whole power for ill thus reasonably examined, they would cease to trouble. Was not man his own only master? containing within himself the only real good? and did he not live as part of a great universe of existence? What matter if his role in that great plan was meaner than another's.

To the whole it was equally necessary, and in this consideration of his contribution to the need and welfare of the whole the reasonable man would find compensation and consolation for the chances of life. Should this Pantheism fail to console, a further solution still remained. "There is one who provides me with food and with raiment. . . when he no longer gives he signifies to me that it is time to depart, he opens the door and calls. Whither does he call me? Towards a term which cannot affright thee, for it is thence thou didst originally proceed, towards friends and kinsfolk and the elements of things. What in thee is fire, to fire will return; what in thee is earth, to earth; what air, to air; what is water, to water yet again. There is no Hades, no Acheron, no Cocytus, no Periphlegethon, but everywhere is filled with gods and with daemons." But suicide is only for the weakling, blessed even as Epictetus blesses it. The ideal is acceptance of life in an indifference to its chance, an acceptance buttressed by the belief that man, too, is divine. God is in us, we are part of God and we should be loyal to what in us is divine for so we are most truly loyal to ourselves. "As the soldier swears he will prefer Caesar before all others, the Stoic swears so to prefer himself." Prayer and theories of divine assistance can have no place in the system, and the basis of the exalted sentiments that still move whoever studies these ancient writings is self-exaltation. Epictetus presents us with a meditation on death in which the dying man reviews his life and thanks his god for all it has been. It is no act of thanksgiving for mercies and favours, still less is it a confession; and if its underlying self-satisfaction recalls anything in the Gospel it is the famous prayer of the Pharisee.

Stoicism was never popular. Its theories, no doubt, broke too

soon at the contact with reality. And it had too much scorn for the unenlightened herd to make their conversion a possibility. It remained the privilege of an elite, and even there its success was not such as to encourage its prophets. "Show me a Stoic if you know one," said Epictetus. "You will show me thousands who speak like Stoics. Show me at least some one who shows promise of realising this ideal. Let my old age gaze on what so far it has never been my lot to know. Show me one at least. You cannot."

Such an one we see perhaps in Marcus Aurelius. Under Domitian Epictetus had been banished from Rome as a philosopher. Now philosophy itself was on the throne. In his *Meditations* Marcus Aurelius admits us to the innermost workings of his mind. We see the Stoic theory shaping his response to the demands of life. We see the progress of self-knowledge, self-discipline, the continual examination and analysis of action and motive pursued faithfully day by day in search of truth ever more profound. All the traditional Stoic theory is here, not set out in theory for a class, but in its practical application to life. Man's share in the universal life, the common logos, is to Marcus Aurelius a familiar, a personal daemon. He reveres it, serves it, obeys it and for its sake will keep his life spotless. He shares, of course, the fatalist resignation to life which is the aim of the school, though the thought of the extinction which is death moves him to angry resentment. On the other hand he believes in prayer, prayer not to the gods of the classic pantheon, but to Fortune, the Sun, the Stars, Asclepius. Inevitably he is the victim of superstition, dreams and omens playing their part in his life. And the whole life is built on a foundation that is ever in movement, on hypotheses and alternatives and the uncertainty of doubt, of sentiment and guesswork. It is the end of happiness, the end of life, and from it derives that "infinite boredom" which Renan noted as characteristic of the famous work. "Infinite boredom", in life as in the *Meditations*, and "an analysis of life which leaves life little better than death."

The second great school of religious philosophy was that of the Platonists, and this, unlike the school of Epictetus was not only popular, but as the century went on, grew to be one of the greatest forces in its religious life. For the Platonists there is a dual principle at the origin of things -- spirit and matter. God is

not only not identical with the world, as the Stoics proclaimed, but so transcends the world as to be beyond all power of our knowing him. In ecstasy alone can man reach to the divine. This dualism, and the doctrine of the divine transcendence, go back to Plato himself. It was his immediate successor Xenocrates who developed the system's dualism, and Plutarch derived from it the other notion of the divine inaccessibility to human reason. In the succeeding centuries these two ideas came to dominate the whole teaching of the school, and thereby inevitably lowered the system's intellectual appeal and bequeathed to it the continual menace of scepticism.

Since God was inaccessible, and since all things owed to God their origin and their continuance in being, the Platonist postulated as the medium of the divine action one or more beings intermediate between God and man, beings who shared indeed in the divine nature but who were yet subordinate to God their first origin. These are the daemons, powers, spirits, the logos. For the Stoics the logos was the immanent necessary law of things. For the new Platonists, it was the divine agent, and the pattern by which all things were; it was the divine element by which the other necessary element of the universal duality was corrected -- all things being subject to the double law, i.e. of influences deriving from a thing's nature, and of influences deriving from the divine. This duality obtained in things inanimate, in man's soul too. Logos and nature, one for the Stoic, are for the Platonist rival contending forces.

Platonism had borrowed a term from the Stoics to express itself. It had borrowed elsewhere, and notably from the East. From its conception of spirit and matter as forces inevitably in conflict, a whole train of consequences were to follow. That conception was to enter the Church, to cause endless trouble in the heresies it provoked, and to be the cause, too, of more than one set-back in the development of thinkers otherwise orthodox.

These ideas of the dual principle in all reality, of a hierarchy of perfection, and of the radical opposition of matter and spirit, the Platonists popularised as Stoicism never was popularised. Around this philosophical core other doctrines gathered taken from the teachings ascribed to Pythagoras, and with them there passed to the Platonists something of that spirit which turned philosophy into a cult, with devotees, holy men, religious

practices, rites and -- by no means its least important feature -- itinerant missionaries who gave their lives to the work of propaganda. There gathered, too, around the core of philosophy and idealism, something of the superstition and the magical practices which always attached to the self-styled disciples of Pythagoras. If such features detracted from the dignity of the philosophy they were, on the other hand, its very life as a force in public affairs. It was not long before Platonism, as a cult, absorbed the neo-Pythagoreans and quite ousted the Stoics. Later it was to inspire the bitterest and most skilful of all the attempts to destroy Christianity. Meanwhile, in that second century which at the moment occupies us, its leading figure, after Plutarch (50-125) was the lecturer, Maximus of Tyre.

The subjects of the lectures which gained him fame are the questions which the public of his day debated. Is revenge noble? Is activity a higher life than contemplation? Should we pray to the gods? What is Plato's notion of God? How can we reconcile human liberty and sorcery? His theological teaching is a mixture of superstitious credulity and scepticism. Between God and man there is an intermediate hierarchy of daemons, demi-gods, who though they are passable are yet immortal. They are the companions of mankind, guiding and inspiring its life. "Some of them," he said, "cure sickness, or they tender advice in difficulties. They make known things otherwise hidden, they inspire the masterpieces of art. Some dwell in towns, others in the country, others in the sea. . . . They are sometimes the guests of human bodies, as in the case of Socrates, of Plato, of Pythagoras. . . . Some of them are scourges, others humane. . . . There is as great a diversity in the dispositions of the daemons as in those of men themselves." All the gods of the ancient mythology are seen now to be daemons, and Zeus identified with the supreme divine monarch. Prayer -- the habit of petitioning the gods-Maximus condemns as useless. If God is Providence these things will come unsought. If God is Chance prayer cannot move it. As for the desire to possess greater virtue, no god can do more here than man can do for himself, for the source of virtue is within man himself. This last point recalls Epictetus and the Stoics, and is one of the many evidences of the eclectic character of the new Platonism of the time. Its adepts borrowed as willingly from contemporaries as from the past, borrowed ideas and terminology no less readily than ritual.

The one supreme God transcends sense. The soul is raised to communication with him by contemplation and love, and the condition of this ascent is an increasing detachment from all else. The perfection of this intellectual vision of God is indeed impossible in this life. Yet, by meditation and a life of detachment, great heights may be attained even here on earth. Not all men it is true can so raise themselves. For those who are unable there remains in consolation the contemplation of the hierarchy of semi-divine intermediaries.

"How then will you escape, how come to see God? In a word, you will see him when he calls you to come. Nor will he long delay to call. Only await his invitation. Old age is at hand which will lead you; Death, whose approach affrights the coward to tears but whom the lover of God looks for with joy, receives with courage. But, if you wish, even in this present, to know his nature how shall I explain it? God is no doubt beautiful, of all beautiful things the fairest. But it is not the beauty of a body. He is what gives the body its beauty. It is not the beauty of a field, but again that whence comes the field's beauty. Beauty of streams, beauty of sea and sky, it is from the gods who dwell in the sky that all this beauty flows, running over from a spring pure and eternal. And in the measure of their sharing this eternal stream, all things are beautiful, ordered, saved. In the measure they turn from it there remains for them only shame, death, corruption. If this satisfies, you have seen God. If not, how can you be made to understand? Do not picture to yourself size, nor colour, nor form, nor indeed any material quality, but, like a lover stripping of its varied clothing the beautiful body thus hidden from his gaze, strip away with your thought all these material imaginings. There will remain, and you shall gaze upon it, what you desire to see. But if you are too weak thus to arrive at the vision of the Father -- the Demiurge, it will suffice that you actually see their works and adore their offspring in all their rich diversity. . . . Imagine a great empire, a powerful kingdom where every creature depends, and willingly, on the good will of one soul, the soul of the King, venerable, excelling in virtue. . . imagine then this King himself, immovable as law itself, communicating to those who serve, the salvation which is his. See all those who share in his power, the innumerable gods, visible some and others yet unseen. Some there are who, like guards of honour, at his side share his table and his food. Others serve them, and others there are of yet lower degree. See

you not this chain, this hierarchy descending from God down to the very earth?" []

The charm of the vision so described, its poetry, the communication of religious emotion between master and student explain much of the system's appeal. It brought about, in the end, and made generally acceptable, an idea of the infinite that grew ever vaguer, ever more indistinct; an instinctive suspicion, indeed, of distinctness and definition and reason in religious speculation; the idea of an opposition between "mysticism" and "dogma " necessary and fundamental; an exaltation of " mysticism " at the expense of " dogma," and a surrender of reason for emotion. Closely allied to this school of Platonists were those other practical philosophers who pass under the name of neo-Pythagoreans. Little as we know of them, we know that for them also matter was a principle of death, that the perfect reality was transcendent and unknowable. Between God and man, once again, there is this world of intermediaries, and one chief mediator, daemons and the Logos. The Logos again is at once God's idea or pattern according to which all things are, and the divine instrument. But it was the neo-Pythagorean school which did most, apparently, to build upon these philosophical theories a working religion. And it did so by borrowing from the East magical rites and incantations, rites of expiation and purification, mutilations and sacrifices.

All through the second century, and increasingly as the second century passed into the third, the missionaries of these new religions moved through the empire, lecturing, explaining and translating their theories into act. They consoled souls broken with sorrow and pain, they prepared for death the unfortunate whom the tyranny of the emperors condemned to suicide. "By word and example they showed to all the way of salvation."

Religions from the East offering salvation, astral religions, new cults of Fortune and the Fates, the pantheism and magic of the philosophers, mysteries dazzling by their splendour, initiations attracting by their exclusiveness, with all this rich and active diversity we have not, even yet, come to the end of the catalogue of the second century's religious activities. More important than any one of them individually is a movement which runs through them all, drawing something from each, offering something in return -- a deeper insight, a truer vision, Knowledge in fact

where, so far, no more has been possible than to see as in a glass darkly. This movement that claims to reveal to the religious themselves Knowledge, is the much discussed Gnosticism, and the history of the Church in the second century is very largely the history of its relation to Gnosticism.

Gnosticism is pre-Christian in its origins. It set itself to reinterpret Paganism and to re-interpret Judaism, and in the course of the interpretation it altered them radically. It offered Knowledge, the vision of God, actual communication with the divine here on earth. Like the philosophies, it made ecstasy the means of the most perfect knowledge and the ultimate aim of religious life. Like the mystery religions, it promised salvation. To all the thousands who sought security, in one or other of the myriad cults, it suggested a better understanding of those cults, the revelation of a deeper meaning in what they already believed or practised. It varied enormously, inevitably, from one exponent to another, varied according to whether it set itself to work on Paganism or Judaism or the religion of the Church; and it added new hybrid gnostic-inspired cults to those hundreds it found in possession. There were Gnostic-Pagan cults, and Gnostic-Jewish cults and ultimately Gnostic-Christian cults. But in all these amalgams we can trace some common features, can discover at work forces allied in character. There is for example, the claim that the Gnostic teaching is of divine origin, handed down through a secret chain of initiated disciples. There is a marked insistence on the dual origin of existence, and a hatred and scorn for the material world as a thing necessarily evil. God is of course transcendent, and so removed from the material world that creation is necessarily the work of intermediary powers. There is a preoccupation with theories about the creation, the end of creation, and the divine genealogies that borders on mania. There are rites, symbols, a mystical arithmetic, and exotic cults. Finally Knowledge is always presented as the privilege of the few. It is to an elite only that the real meaning of religion is offered.

It was simply a matter of time before the religion of the Church attracted the attention of Gnostics, and before Christians themselves began to turn to Gnosticism to explain the mysteries in their beliefs. With that, and the beginnings, inside the Church, of attempts to explain its belief "gnostically," the Church enters upon the first great crisis of its history

A rich and confused amalgam of rites and beliefs and magical practices, theories to explain the origin of evil, human destiny, the relations between matter and spirit, between God and his creation, between God and Jesus Christ -- the Gnostic movement within the Church was to win from the tradition some of the Church's first theologians and scholars, Tatian for example and Bardesanes. It also provoked a strong traditional reaction, and one of the great masterpieces of Catholic writing, the Adversus Haereses of St. Irenaeus. In studying the history of this second century we are watching the first attempts of Christians to explain rationally their beliefs and mysteries and, in the story of the Gnostic crisis, can observe the natural, spontaneous reaction of the Church to its first great danger. The manner of that reaction throws an interesting light on the nature of the Church's organisation, and on second century theories about the Church's constitution and its powers.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. THE FIRST APOLOGISTS

What was there in the religion of the Catholic Church to interest the Pagans of this century so desperately interested in religion? Had it any "message" for the enquirer who sought security of mind and peace of soul, and sought in vain from mystery cults and magic? from first one, and then another, of the day's moral philosophies? Celsus, the most informed perhaps of all its early opponents, was to sneer at Christianity as a religion that began with fishermen and publicans. Had it then nothing to offer to the educated, to the intellectuals? Was it no more than an association of mutual benevolence, a friendly society with its ritual and passwords, a kindly sentimental morality? The answer to these questions was the writings of Christianity's first publicists, the so-called Apologists.

The name Apologist is conventionally restricted to a small group of some fifteen writers. Half of them -- Quadratus, Miltiades Melito for example -- are little more than names to us, for their works, all but a few fragments, have perished. In other cases whole treatises remain from which we can discover the common aim which inspired this great literary effort, study its methods, and form some estimate of its importance in the development of Catholic theological thought and of the technical language in which it has come to be expressed. This second more important group includes the Greeks Aristides, Athenagoras, Hermias and St. Theophilus of Antioch, the Syrian Tatian, the Latins Minucius Felix and Tertullian, and St. Justin Martyr. In date their work ranges from the Apology to [the Emperor] Antoninus Pius of Aristides (between 138- 161) and Hermias' A Laugh at the Heathen Philosophers of perhaps seventy years later. Tertullian, the greatest writer of them all, was something more than an apologist and will be discussed elsewhere. A more representative figure is St. Justin Martyr, and the school, with its merits and its weaknesses, is perhaps best described in him.

A double object inspires the writings of the Apologists. They hope to clear their religion of the calumnious charges which the Pagan world takes as proved against it, and so to persuade the emperors to a policy of toleration. They hope, also, to make clear to the associates and friends of their own pre-Christian life

the beauty and truth of their new belief. They are converts from Paganism, converts from the Philosophical sects, who have not ceased to philosophise with their baptism but, realising now that their new faith is the goal of all thought, they burn with the desire to communicate this good news to those by whose side they sat in the lecture rooms of Rome and Athens, or those to whom they themselves once taught the consolations of Stoicism and the divine Plato. With St. Paul (Philipp. iv, 8) they made their own whatever is true, whatever is just, the virtuous and praiseworthy, wherever they found it. They carefully sought out whatever of truth or goodness there was in Pagan thought and inspiration and, made the most of it, that it might serve as a bridge for the heathens to pass from the philosophies to Christ. Christianity was the unknown good, and to it unconsciously all men of goodwill tended. The Apologists hoped then to dispose the pagan mind for Christianity. They did not set out to instruct the Pagan in the full detail of Christian belief -- and the Apologists' limited objective must be continually borne in mind when their writings are used as evidence of early Christian belief. From the nature of the Apologists' case, they prefer to elaborate those points where Christian teaching confirms Philosophy, to discuss natural virtues and those truths about God which are discoverable by the natural reason. All the stock topics of the day find treatment in their writings -- the unity of God, the unicity of God, the soul's immortality, the future life as a sanction of morality. These are the substance of their apologetic appeal.

St. Justin was born in Palestine round about the year 100. He was not only a philosopher by education and taste, but by profession too! earning his living by teaching philosophy. In his search for truth he passed from one school to another and was Stoic, Aristotelian, Neo-Pythagorean, Neo-Platonist by turn. Finally, when thirty-eight years of age, he was converted to Christianity at Ephesus, and passing to Rome opened there a school where he taught Christianity as a philosophy. At Rome he flourished for nearly thirty years, until the malice of a rival, worsted in debate, set the persecuting laws in motion against him and, under the philosopher-emperor Marcus Aurelius, thrown to the beasts, he died a martyr in 165 His surviving works are his two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho the Jew. St. Justin's reasoned presentation of Christianity has for its starting point the principle that Christianity is itself a

philosophy. More striking than its differences from other philosophies are the many points it has in common with them. Those differences, too, are not so much real oppositions as shades of meaning. The Faith does no more than teach with greater security what Plato and the Stoics teach. Faith teaches with divine authority, and Faith can prove with reason what it teaches. The origin of this likeness between Philosophy and Christianity is, for St. Justin, twofold. First of all, the philosophers originally learned these truths from the Old Testament -- an idea popular, before St. Justin, with the philosophising Jews of Alexandria. Then -- by a theory of St. Justin's own invention, destined to make a name for itself -- the philosophers had profited from the activity of the Divine Logos. The Logos, whose incarnation in Jesus Christ was the beginning of Christianity, had, from the beginning, made Himself known to the Pagans as well as to the Jews. To the Jews He had spoken by the prophets and the writers of the sacred books, to the Pagans through the philosophers. This revelation through the philosophers was indeed less complete than that made to the Jews. None the less it was sufficient to make possible the philosophers' discovery of the truths of natural religion. This seed of the Logos (Logos Spermatikos) planted in every man's mind from the beginning, was the true source of philosophical truth. Between Philosophy then and Christianity there could not be any real and final opposition. All who have lived according to that light are Christians, Socrates and Heraclitus as truly as Abraham. Christianity is the fulfilment of Philosophy, Jesus Christ of Socrates ! The revelation through the Logos Spermatikos was incomplete, and from its incompleteness errors were bound to follow. Hence the mistakes of even the best of philosophers. But now, the Logos has appeared incarnate, the fullness of revelation is come by which the errors of the past may be corrected. The philosopher who is logical embraces Christianity.

The argument against the sufficiency of the philosophies of the day, thus roughly summarised, is but one side of the Apologist's work. He criticises the pagan religions, their insufficiency, their puerility, their immorality. He defends the Christians from the vile calumnies which, to the man in the street, justified the persecutions. He addresses himself also to the Jews, responsible, in the eyes of St. Justin, for many of the calumnies whose refutation occupies his time. The accord of their own

prophetic writings with subsequent history and the present event, proves the Church to be the divine fulfilment of the religion of Abraham and Moses. The true Israel of to-day is the Church of Christ.

It is not easy to say how much this first learned appeal for a hearing achieved. The calumnies continued, as did the persecution. Nor have we any data by which to judge of the fruit of the Apologies among the Pagan elite. They remain, however, a valuable evidence of the first contact of Christianity with the thought of the contemporary Pagan world; and, in addition, they are of absorbing interest as the first attempts of members of the Church to clothe its traditional beliefs in philosophical language. With the Apologists Catholic Theology is born -- the development of the content of Revelation by human reasoning under the guidance of that authoritative teaching which, from the beginning, has been one of the new religion's most striking features. With these first beginnings of speculation on the data of Revelation there begins no less surely the trouble bred in the Church by the thinker who claims for his thought, for his own carefully worked-out explanation of the revealed tradition, a superiority over the tradition itself. Here, too, is the real origin of those discussions which fill the fourth and fifth centuries, and which can never be really understood if these primitive theologians are neglected. Inevitably the Apologist's trained mind was drawn to the exploration of the meaning of the great mysteries of the Christian tradition. The urge of his own piety, the passion to explain all, to know all that is knowable, made it impossible for him not to attempt the task of describing these mysteries philosophically.

So it was with the mystery we know as that of the Trinity. God was one. Jesus Christ was God because the Logos incarnate. And yet Jesus Christ was not God the Father. Again there was the absorbing question of the relation of the Father and the Logos before the incarnation, and the question of the eternal generation of the Logos. These difficulties did not challenge in vain. The Apologists boldly showed the way to eighteen centuries of Christian thinkers. Like pioneers of every type they had to devise instruments and machinery as they went along. The road was unplotted, the obstacles unknown and, when known, for long not fully understood; the rough tools were sometimes a hindrance as well as a help. They use, for example,

the concepts and language of the philosophical schools to which they at one time adhered, and thence ensues a host of new difficulties for the student of their teaching. The modern scholar picks his way easily through the difficulties of such high speculation, equipped with a tested technical language which they lacked. Of that language they were the founders. In their stumblings and gropings it was born. Inevitably there is, at times, in their speculation an uneasiness, a confusion and an obscurity which leave room for contrary interpretations of their meaning. Little wonder, then, that the efforts of these first private theologians bred a certain uneasiness on the part of the Authority whose mission it was to preserve at all costs the traditional faith, and for whom, by comparison with that high duty, the need to explain philosophically that faith's coherence was of secondary importance.

St. Justin, faithful to the tradition, explains that there is only one God and that in God there are to be distinguished the Father, the Logos or Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Father is God as the source of divinity and is therefore the Creator who formed all things from nothing. Nevertheless, following St. John (i. 3), creation was, by the Father's will, through the Logos, and so too, through the Logos, has God chosen to reveal himself to man (St. John i. 18) and to redeem him. Creation, revelation and redemption are the work of the one only God. The Logos is truly God; not a creature, not an angel. "God of God Begotten" says Theophilus of Antioch. The Logos exists before all creation, is not himself made nor created, but begotten and therefore truly Son of God. The Logos then is really distinct from the Father. For all the distinction's reality, it does not imply any division of the indivisible divinity, any separation of Logos from the Father. The next two questions to suggest themselves were that of the moment of the generation of the Logos, and, deriving from this, the question of the difference in the relation of Father to Logos before and after the creation. The current philosophical theories of the day once more came to the thinker's aid. These notions the Apologists adapted to explain the Christian mystery of the Trinity.

Logos in Greek means the word as spoken, and it also means the conceived idea of which the spoken word is the manifestation. The Stoics had thence developed a theory of the Logos as immanent and as manifested. St. Justin put it to a

Christian use.

The Logos existing from all eternity, did not exist from all eternity in a real distinction from the Father. As a term really distinct He exists only from the moment of the generation, and that moment was the moment of God's willingness to create. Until that moment the Divine Logos is Logos Endiathetos -- the Logos Immanent in God. At that moment, in a manner of speaking, the Logos issues forth. Thenceforward He is Logos Prophorikos -- the Logos Manifested -- and really distinct. This is the theory which has been called (none too correctly) the theory of the temporal generation of the Logos. The Logos, moreover, since He is in function the minister of the Divine Will is "subordinate" to the Father -- a subordination however not of nature, for the Logos is equally God with the Father and God is one. This is subordinationism, but only in so far as it is an attempt to describe the role of the Logos in the Divine ordering of things. It neither necessitates, nor implies, any theory of the inferiority of the Logos to the Father in nature.

Through the Logos manifested had come the Creation, and the partial revelation to the philosophers and to the Jews. Through the Logos incarnate in Jesus Christ had come the fullness of revelation and the Church. It is from the Church that the disciple learns of His work and its fruits, how He died on our behalf to ransom us from the death which sin had merited. His death is the principal cause of our redemption, and, as Jesus Christ the Incarnate Logos restored what Adam the first of mankind had ruined, so Mary, consenting to be the mother of Him Who is mankind's salvation, repaired the ills that followed from Eve's disobedience.

St. Justin is primarily a polemist. He has set himself to the restricted task of the defence and explanation of special points, and this to a restricted audience of Pagans. None the less he describes the Christian life, makes clear the ritual, as well as the doctrine, of Baptism; and he has left the most precious description of the liturgy of the Holy Eucharist, in primitive times, which we possess.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



3. THE Gnostics AND THE CHURCH

St. Justin is an example of the philosopher turned Christian who uses his philosophy to gain a hearing for the Church's teaching. The aim of the Gnostics was far different. Where St. Justin only strove to translate that teaching into a language understood of the non-Christian thinking world, the Gnostics urged that the Church's teaching should itself be remodelled. There was a higher knowledge than that of the traditional catechesis, and only in accordance with this higher knowledge could the revelation of God to man really be understood.

Gnosticism in its relation to Christianity is a subject of bewildering complexity. The simplest way to explain the very real danger it became is, perhaps, to describe the systems of two of the leading Christian Gnostics of the time -- Basilides and Valentine. Better so than in any other way -- in a work where space is limited -- can we see how a school of thought within the Church, inspired by an all powerful religious tendency of the time, and using its methods, hoped to find a deeper meaning in Christianity than that offered by the gospels and tradition, and to transform the religion of the Church into a mystery cult of dreams and initiations. Apart from the matter of these Gnostic-Christian speculations, the long crisis is important in another way. For Gnosticism is also, historically, an attempt on the part of the Christian "intellectuals" -- some of them thinkers of unusual power -- to usurp a right of speculating, of systematising and dogmatising in the strictest sense of the word after the manner of the pagan schools of philosophy.

To the ordinary man the detailing of the beliefs and theories of these heretics is a wearying business. Speculations seemingly as divorced from right reason as the schemes of the professors in Laputa, nightmarish mechanically-contrived fantasies, a wilderness of sounding phrases and necromantic names, a chaos where sounds abound and sense is all to seek -- in studying these systematic aberrations we have to remind ourselves at every turn that their bizarre extravagance covers a discussion, and an offered solution, of the most fundamental of all problems. The nature and origin of evil, of man, of God, the purpose of life and its attainment through living -- these are the

problems, theoretical and practical, which the Gnostic interpretation of Christianity claimed to answer. Nor was Gnosticism a mere academic discussion. It offered itself as a religious system. It had its ritual and its observances, its regulations and its officials. It was a formidable competitor to traditional Christianity, and to Gnosticism the Church lost some of its best minds and most energetic spirits. Nor did the influence of the movement end with the second century. That century witnessed a life and death struggle between the Church and the Gnostics which ended in the Gnostics' expulsion from the Church, but the defeated theories survived outside the Church to provide, for centuries yet to come, an undercurrent of influences which never ceased to irritate and disturb the development of Catholic thought.

Of Basilides himself we know little except that he flourished at Alexandria in the reign of Hadrian (117-138). The beginning and first principle of all things, according to his theology, is the unbegotten Father. Thence, by a series of successive emanations, derive the eight intermediary and complementary divinities-Nous, Logos, Phronesis, Sophia and Dynamis, and from this last couple the Powers, Archons and Angels. This personification of abstractions was all in the contemporary fashion, as was also the arrangement of intermediary divine agencies between the first principle and the created universe. The ogdoad of intermediary divinities is also a familiar notion in the religions of ancient Egypt.

The Powers, Archons and Angels made the first heaven. Other Angels, issue of these first Angels, made the second, the third and the rest of the heavens to the number of 365. The origin of the world is conceived as from two opposing principles Light and Darkness, between which there is an irreducible opposition. This dualism finds its counterpart in the opposition between the Supreme God and the first of all the Archons. This Archon, the leader of the wicked Angels, is the God whom the Jews adore. The apparition of the Holy Spirit at the baptism of Our Lord bred in him a terrible fear which was for him the beginning of Wisdom. The system offers a theory about Our Lord, about the redemption, the creation of the world and the nature of the divine life. It is a miscellany in which reminiscences of biblical theology and of Egyptian and Persian religion find their place. In addition Basilides lays claim to a special knowledge deriving

from the secret teaching of the Apostle St. Mathias.

In the next generation Valentine built up a system still more complete upon much the same foundation. Where and when Valentine was born, what influences shaped his early formation is not known. He came to Rome in the second quarter of the century and was sufficiently prominent in the Roman Church at the death of the pope St. Hyginus (c. 140) to hope himself to secure election as its bishop. He was disappointed and, according to Tertullian, this disappointment was the occasion of his breach with Catholicism. Tertullian's account of this crisis in the life of Valentine has been called in question. Be it true or false, there is no doubt whatever as to the success of the grandiose system of which Valentine was the founder. All contemporary writers agree that his sect was the most numerous and the most powerful of all. In time it divided and while one school of Valentinians spread through Egypt and Syria, the other filled Italy and southern Gaul. It is this western Valentinianism which is best known to us, for in Gaul it met the man who was to be its greatest adversary and in whose writings the memory of it is best preserved, the Bishop of Lyons St. Irenaeus.

In the Valentinians the Christian aspect of the movement is clearer than with the followers of Basilides. It is more apparently their object to find a solution for the paradoxes of the Christian mysteries in the fashions of contemporary ideas. Valentine supposes a dual principle at the origin of things. He has the old hatred of matter as a thing necessarily evil, and thence, in his theology, the theory of the Supreme God in necessary opposition to the divinity through whom He creates, and a theory of the Incarnation that makes the humanity of Christ Our Lord a matter of appearance only.

At the summit of all being is God, the Father, and His companion Sige (Silence). God is One, unique, known only to Himself, remote, inaccessible; and between God and the world is a whole universe of "demi-gods." From the Father and Sige proceed Intellect and Truth, and from these Word and Life, and from these again Man and the Church; these are the eight superior eons. This process of generation among the eons continues until the Pleroma is complete -- the perfect society of divine beings, thirty in all. So far all is abstraction, idea. Physical reality

originates through a breach of the harmony of the ideal pleroma, "a kind of original sin". . . . The lowest of the thirty eons, Wisdom, conceives a desire to know the Father -- an inordinate desire, necessarily, since the Father is knowable only to His own first born, Intellect. This inordinate desire of Wisdom is a new being, imperfect necessarily and therefore cast out from the Pleroma. Its name is Hachamoth. To prevent any recurrence of such disorder Intellect and Truth produce a sixteenth pair of eons, Christ and the Holy Ghost to teach the rest the limits of their nature. Then in an act of Thanksgiving all the thirty-two eons unite their powers and produce the thirty-third eon, Jesus the Saviour. The thirty-third eon and the eon Christ are now dispatched by the Pleroma to Hachamoth -- the imperfect desire of Wisdom. From the eon Christ it receives a beginning of form and the elements of conscience -- whence a sense of its own inferiority. The thirty-third eon separates the passions from it. The separated passions are inanimate matter (hylike); Hachamoth, freed from them, is animate matter (psychike). Hachamoth's vision of the Saviour results in a third substance, the spiritual (pneumatike). So originate the elements of the world that is to be. Hachamoth, from the psychike, produces the Creator, Demiurge, and he gives form to the rest of creation.

Demiurge is ignorant of his own origin, believes himself supreme. He is the maker of man, material and animated, the god of the Jews and the Old Testament, a bad god and to be resisted. (Whence the common Gnostic teaching of a fundamental opposition between the Old Testament and the New.) Men are of three types, according to the element predominating in them. There are material men (hylikoi), who cannot be saved; spiritual men (pneumatikoi) who have no need of salvation (the Gnostics); and animate men (psychikoi) who need salvation and can attain to it. For these last there is the plan of Redemption. The redeemer is spiritual, he is animate, he has the appearance of the material and, a fourth element in him, he is the eon Jesus. This eon descended into him at his baptism and remained until the trial before Pilate when it returned to the Pleroma, taking with it the spiritual element. The actor in the Passion was no more than the animate element with its appearance of matter. The Passion is not the source of redemption. Salvation, the redemption of the spiritual in man from the influence of the psychic, is due to the knowledge brought by the thirty-third eon -- knowledge of the secret

traditions and mysteries, knowledge of the Gospel, which can only be truly known through this esoteric knowledge. The possession of this knowledge is the key to life, and knowledge is the highest of virtues. Matter is the source of evil in man, and since the Gnostic is spiritual, his actions cannot but be good. Spirit and flesh are independent, and the spirit is not responsible for the flesh.

The system of eons proceeding the one from the other by pairs is not Valentine's own invention, and the idea of a pleroma of thirty eons is to be found in Plutarch. Peculiar to Valentine is the introduction of the two new eons Logos and Life and this, together with the presence in the lower series of the Only-begotten and the Paraclete, is no doubt explainable as a borrowing from the Gospel of St. John. But these Christian expressions are no more than trappings to decorate a pagan masquerade, mere names which have lost all their Christian meaning when they have not been distorted to a new meaning altogether. []

It was not through such elaborations of learned fantasy as these that the new religion was to live. This was again to show itself as primarily the tradition of an unaltered block of truth revealed once and for all. The test, for the Church, of the Gnostic theology's truth was its accord with the tradition; and the judge of that accord was to be, not the encyclopaedic erudition of the Valentines and Basilides, nor even the trained minds of convert philosophers. Victory was to lie with the tradition and its sole authorised exponent the hierarchy of bishops. The adversary par excellence of Gnosticism in the Church, is, fittingly enough, no Apologist but a bishop, St. Irenaeus of Lyons.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



4. ST. IRENAEUS OF LYONS

St. Irenaeus is one of those sympathetic figures in whom all the tendencies of a time seem to meet. He was born, apparently, between the years 135-140 in Asia Minor, and in his youth was a disciple of the famous Bishop of Smyrna St. Polycarp who was, in turn, the disciple of St. John. From Smyrna Irenaeus passed to Rome and, possibly at this time, came under the influence of St. Justin, reminiscences of whose work are found in all his writings. But it is not until the year 177 that Irenaeus appears in history and he is then in Rome, the envoy of the Church at Lyons, recounting for the Roman Church the detail of the famous persecution. In that persecution he has himself suffered and he is by this time a priest of the Church at Lyons. By the time he returned from Rome, the persecution had given yet more martyrs to the Lyonnese Church, among them its aged bishop, Pothinus. Irenaeus was elected to succeed him, and ruled for the next twenty or thirty years. How his life ended we do not know, but, traditionally, it is as a martyr that he figures in the calendar.

St. Irenaeus -- and the fact is immediately evident from his writings -- is not an apologist. To win a sympathetic hearing from the Pagan elite whom philosophies attract is by no means his object. He is a man of affairs, the busy missionary bishop of a frontier diocese, and if he writes it is to defend his people from the ever menacing heresies. He is concerned to rout the Gnostics to shatter their claims to be followers of Christ, to state yet once again the simple truths delivered to the Apostles in which alone salvation lies. And for all his admiration for St. Justin and his use of that scholar's work, he has little patience with the attempts of philosophers to explain rationally the how and the why of the mysteries. Quasi ipsi obstetricaverint -- "as though they themselves had been the midwives" -- he says scornfully of the theorists busy with discussion on the generation of the Logos. His work marks an epoch in the development of Catholic Theology and there are not wanting scholars to see in him, in this respect, the peer of St. Augustine, the greatest force indeed between St. Augustine and St. Paul.

Yet St. Irenaeus is no innovator. He has no revolutionary theories to present, no new explanations -- explanations indeed

he does not profess to give. But he so re-states the old traditional truths in relation to the particular danger of his day, that his restatement has a new, universal value and, beyond what he designed, it has stood ever since as a refutation by anticipation not of Gnosticism alone but of all and every heresy. Simply summarising the legacy of all who had preceded him, setting forth once again the traditional belief and practice of the Church as he knew it, he ends by sketching a theological theory of the Church and its teaching office which all subsequent discussions have merely developed. He is a most valuable witness to the second century Church's own theory of her own nature. He professes merely to state facts, to describe the reality before him, and the event is proof of his sincerity and his truth. The Church did not become Gnostic, although many Catholics were Gnostics. It threw off the doctrine, as a thing it could not assimilate. Gnosticism, and the religion of the Church as Christ would have it, are incompatible because the religion of Christ is essentially a religion of authority. The issue is the simple one of tradition against speculation. Two theories claiming to determine truth within the Church are in conflict -- the Gnostics base all on the depth of their learning, Irenaeus on the teaching authority in the Church. The Gnostics, witnessing to the institution they seek to subvert, gibe at "the teaching fitted for simpletons." Irenaeus accepts the gibe. Upon it he builds his work. Not by the machinery of councils, nor the aid of the State, but by the simple functioning of the authority which was its essence, the Church of the second century shook itself free of its modernising children. Upon no other hypothesis than a general belief in the traditional nature of Christian teaching, and a general acceptance of the claim of the rulers to decide what was the tradition, can the passage of the Church, scathless, through this crisis be explained. If, on the other hand, the Church was as St. Irenaeus describes it, the matter is self-evident.

Two books of his writing survive. The first which we have in a Latin translation, possibly contemporary with the author, and in a vast number of Greek fragments, is the work usually known as the *Adversus Haereses -- Against Heresies*. Its Greek title better describes it as *A refutation and criticism of Knowledge falsely so-called*. The second and much shorter work -- *The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* -- is a kind of handbook for one who is already a believer, explaining the faith,

with arguments and citations from Holy Scripture. It was lost for centuries and rediscovered, in an Armenian translation, as recently as 1904.

It is to the Adversus Haereses that St. Irenaeus owes his place in history. The doctrine of the book is the traditional doctrine. God is only fully knowable by revelation. God is one and there is only one God, God of the Old Testament and of the New alike. This one true God is the Creator of all. In God there are the three, Father, Son (St. Irenaeus characteristically prefers the term Son to Logos with its associations of alien philosophies and Gnostic misuse) and Holy Ghost. The Son existed before His incarnation, for the Son is God equally with the Father. As to the mode or, moment of His generation St. Irenaeus, as against the Gnostics and in marked contrast with the Apologists, has no theory to propose. These are mysteries known to God alone, and the Gnostic's elaborate explanations are mere fantasies. Nor does he offer any explanation of the origin of evil, beyond the free will of man and the fact of the first man's fall and its consequences. That falling away from God at the beginning of things has affected all subsequent humanity. From its disastrous consequences we are redeemed by the saving death of Jesus Christ-the Logos Himself, now incarnate. He is Saviour and Redeemer, as well as Revealer of God to man. He is truly God and truly man; and St. Irenaeus is again content to record the traditional belief without any attempt to show how the two realities meet in Him. From the redeeming action of the incarnate Logos there comes to man the possibility of reconciliation with God, to be achieved by faith in Christ, obedience to His precepts, and rebirth in Him by Baptism. The mystery of the Holy Eucharist in which are really received the Body and Blood of Christ, and which is also a sacrifice, consummates on earth the work of reconciliation.

In all this St. Irenaeus is not merely repeating the tradition. He is repeating it to refute thinkers whose special error it is that they claim to arrive at the fullness of Christianity by "Knowledge." Whence the special attention he gives to the fundamental question of the sources and means by which we can come to know God and His will in our regard. Here is the very heart of what is characteristic in his work. Man, because of his finite nature, can never attain to full knowledge of God. It is no matter for surprise, then, that such mysteries as the generation of the

Logos, the origin of the material escape us. Perfect knowledge is more than we can expect. Yet there is open to us a sure knowledge of heavenly things and mysteries, even a sure knowledge of the Logos -- the knowledge God Himself has chosen to reveal. This knowledge is, in part, contained in the divine Scriptures. It is objected that these are often obscure, and the difficulty arises of correct interpretation, of a choice between rival interpretations. What then is the ultimate guide? Not Scripture but "the fixed, unchangeable rule of truth" which each receives in Baptism. This canon of belief is the same throughout the Church; so that the Church whether in the Germanies or in Gaul, in Spain, among the Celts, in the East, in Egypt, in Libya has but one heart and one soul, speaks with one mouth and one voice. The most eloquent of bishops cannot teach otherwise, the weakest can do nothing to lessen the tradition. So it is with the Church universal, wherever it is established. The source of this canon's value is its apostolic origin, the historically demonstrable fact that it was committed to the Church by the Apostles and has, by the Church, been ever since preserved. All those who care to know the truth can examine the apostolic tradition, shown forth clearly in every church throughout the world, guaranteed by the line of bishops which began with those whom the Apostles appointed and which continues to their successors in our own time. To trace the succession of bishops in all the churches of the world would take more space than his book can afford, he proceeds. A simpler way is to examine the succession in that see of Rome, the greatest and most venerable of all, founded by the glorious apostles Peter and Paul. By setting out the tradition it holds from the Apostles, and the faith it has taught through a succession of bishops reaching thence to our times, we bring to confusion those who, for whatever reason, gather elsewhere than they ought. And this for the simple reason that every church throughout the world is bound to bring itself into line with the Roman Church because of that Church's surer guarantees, [] for in that Church what the Apostles handed down has ever been preserved by those who govern. In final analysis it is not human learning, not even the study of the admittedly Sacred Writings, which is the source of man's knowledge of the truths revealed., It is the teaching of the Roman Church.

Such is the famous testimony of St. Irenaeus written, not as an argument to prove the papal claims against objectors, but, as a

reminder of known and accepted truths, to make it easier for his contemporaries to distinguish between truth and heresy. For a Church so constituted, and so clearly conscious of its constitution, there was little to fear in Gnosticism. The seduction of the heresy, its apparent success in giving rational explanations where the Church proposed mysteries to be believed, its ritual, its exclusivism, its suggestion that the Gnostic was one of an elite -- all these might lead many astray. But, upon the institution they deserted for the "knowledge falsely so-called", the theories could make no impression. The tradition was too rooted that the religion of the Church is itself a thing handed down, to be believed on Authority, to be taught by Authority; a religion in which the last word in controversy rests not with learning, but once again, with Authority.

It is the glory of St. Irenaeus that his genius stated the anti-Gnostic case in this universal way. His ideas are never new. They are to be found where he too found them -- in St. Polycarp of Smyrna (155) and Papias and Hegesippus and the whole line back to the Apostles themselves. But his use of these riches stamped on theology once and for all that traditional character which it still bears. He is not the inventor of the principles which he states, and thanks to the Church's acceptance of which the Gnostic influences fail -- the authority of the Rule of Faith and of the Apostolic Succession, the infallibility of the Church and the united episcopate, [] the special doctrinal authority of the Roman See. But he is the first to set them out for what they are, the several parts of an amazing whole, and thereby he is the first founder of that treatise De Ecclesia fundamental in Catholic Theology.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



5. MARCION -- MONTANISM

The tableau of the life of the Church in this century of its first contacts with Pagan life and thought is not yet complete. Two more deviations from the Tradition call for record. They are the heresies called, after their founders, Marcionism and Montanism, heresies of quite another spirit than Gnosticism -- organised for specific purposes all their own.

Gnosticism tended to make the traditional faith a mere introduction to the final truth of which the Gnostic alone held the key. Marcion was a revolutionary who proposed to reform the Church and to reconstitute it on entirely different foundations-an aim in which he is perhaps Luther's first precursor. That he made his own some of the ideas common to the Gnostic sects is not surprising -- they were the common coin of the day's religious life. But it is Marcion's aim which fixes his place in history, and his aim is not the Gnostic ambition to discover the hidden meaning of Christianity, but the practical business of bringing back the Church to its first mission, of restoring to men what alone could save them, the original uncorrupted gospel. This, and not any enthusiasm for a hidden and higher knowledge, motivated his dissension. Marcion was born a Catholic, the son of the Bishop of Sinope. He came to Rome round about the year 135, and taught there for some twenty-five years. Valentine the Gnostic and Marcion were thus contemporary celebrities in the Roman Church. In 144 Marcion was excommunicated, but in what precise circumstances we do not know. At the basis of his system is a theory of the radical opposition between the Old and New Testaments, the Law and the Gospels. The Law, harsh and inflexible, was the work of the Creator, an imperfect God to be abandoned now for the Supreme God, God of Love and forgiveness, revealed in Jesus Christ. The Gospel, then, was meant to displace the Law; the New Testament to reverse the Old. Unfortunately the Apostles, through ignorance or prejudice or lack of courage, failed in their task of purging revealed religion from the Old Testament blemishes. Whence the Old Testament ideas which remain in the Church to harass the faithful. To this failure of the Apostles there is however one very notable exception-St. Paul. For St. Paul Marcion has the most extraordinary veneration; and

Marcionism is little more, on its dogmatic side, than St. Paul's doctrine of emancipation from the Law exaggerated to caricature. In the light of what he conceived St. Paul to have taught, Marcion revised the New Testament itself. From St. Paul he cast out the "interpolations" made by the Apostle's successful opponents which had masqueraded ever since as St. Paul's own words. All the remaining books he rejected as worthless except his own, amended, version of St. Luke. A book of his own composition -- the Antitheses -- in which he set forth the opposition between the Law and the Gospel completed the Marcionite Bible. A new morality, in which the fashionable notions of the day appear, accompanied the new canon of Holy Scripture. For all believers the most rigorous asceticism was prescribed as of obligation. Fasts are multiplied, abstinence from meat is perpetual, and upon all there lies the obligation of perpetual celibacy. At the end of the world God will leave the wicked to the power of Demiurge the Creator who will, thereupon, devour them.

Marcion showed himself a capable organiser, and, with the Church as his model, he set up a rival Church with a hierarchy and sacramental ritual. The movement met with success, and by the end of the century Marcionite churches were to be found in every province of the empire. Many of the Marcionites suffered death in the persecutions rather than sacrifice to the Pagan deities, and the sect continued to flourish for long after the Catholic Church had become the official religion of the Empire. In the middle of the fifth century the problem of whole villages of Marcionites in his diocese of Cyrrhus occupied the attention of the great Theodoret, and there is mention of them even so late as the tenth century.

With Montanism we move yet further from the spirit which inspired the Gnostics. Here there is nothing of philosophising, nothing of the spirit of hellenic or oriental Paganism. It is a movement where the actors are Catholics, and the action is a revolt against one established institution bred of exaggerating the importance of another -- an effort to make private revelation supreme over the official teaching hierarchy. The movement first showed itself about the year 172, in the highlands of central Asia Minor, the neighbourhood of the modern Ancyra. Montanus, a recent convert, a one-time priest, self-mutilated, of the goddess Cybele began to experience "ecstasies", in the midst of which,

to the accompaniment of bizarre gesticulations and long drawn out howlings, prophecy poured forth from him and new revelations. The Holy Ghost was speaking. The end of the world was at hand. The new Jerusalem was about to come down upon the earth, where Christ would reign with his elect for a thousand years. It was to come down at Pepusa, to be precise, some two hundred miles away to the east. So to Pepusa went the believers in their thousands; and in the plain soon to be favoured by the miracle a new city of the expectant sprang up. Montanus was there, and his assistants, the chief of whom, a notable novelty of the sect, were two women, Priscilla and Maximilla. Their pious exercises, the frequent ecstasies, with their accompaniment of "mystical" phenomena, served to console the faithful while in patience they waited.

Except for their insistence that through them the Holy Ghost was speaking, the new prophets do not seem at first to have made any innovations in doctrine. In morality they followed the current of contemporary rigorism, with its food taboos and its suspicion of marriage. The main feature of the movement was its belief that the end of the world was at hand. The founders died; the end of the world delayed to come; but the sect still grew, and rapidly; while from all over the Church came protestations -- not against prophets as such, nor against the asceticism, but against the novelty that men should claim the authority of the Holy Ghost for things said in ecstasies whose extravagance suggested mania rather, or possession. The most important achievement of Montanism was that in the first years of the third century it made a convert of one of the very greatest of all Christian writers -- Tertullian. Finally, in different parts of the Church, bishop after bishop turned to expose and denounce the sect, which thereupon showed itself a sect -- for the Montanists preferred their prophets to the bishops. It was in this, precisely, that the novelty of Montanism lay -- "its desire to impose private revelations as a supplement to the deposit of faith, and to accredit them by ecstasies and convulsions that were suspect." The action of the bishops seems to have checked the movement's further progress, but in places where it was once established it lasted into the fourth century. Montanists suffered martyrdom with the Catholics, and they survived the attempts of the Catholic Emperors to suppress them. By the sixth century, however, all trace of them has vanished.

The Montanist belief in the Millennium, in the theory that, as a first reward of their fidelity, the saints would reign with Christ for a thousand years upon this earth, was not, however, peculiar to the sect. Its affinity with some of the pre-Christian Jewish theories about the character of the triumph of Messias is evident. Not less evident is its connection with a literal interpretation of the Apocalypse. [] Within the Church it makes its first appearance in the first years of the second century, with the heretic Cerinthus and with Papias the -- orthodox -- disciple of St. John. For Cerinthus, and for the later heretical adherents to the belief, the coming reign would be a *vie de Theleme*, where previous asceticism would be rewarded by, amongst other things, a lively carnival of the flesh. The Christians who were Millenarists naturally steered clear of such horrors. What they anticipated was the triumph on earth, in an earthly life, of Christian holiness. Among those who held to this belief were such illustrious writers as St. Justin and St. Irenaeus, the latter developing it as an argument against the Gnostic denial of the resurrection of the body. These very writers, however, bear witness that Milleniarism was never the general belief of the Church in their time, and it met with vigorous opposition, at Rome from the priest Caius and in the East from Origen and, especially, from St. Denis of Alexandria. By the time of St. Augustine it had disappeared from the churches of the East, and the great authority of his exposition of the texts in the Apocalypse ended, for ever, whatever hold Milleniarism still possessed in the West. Henceforward, where it does survive it is no more than an eccentricity of heretical sects. []

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 4: THE CRISES OF THE THIRD CENTURY

INTRODUCTION

The history of the Church in the second century is very largely the history of its first contacts with the Pagan religions of the time. The effect of that meeting is to bring out, ever more clearly, the new religious thing's well defined form. The reaction by which it emerges unchanged -- and alone unchanged -- from that syncretist century of a hundred religious enthusiasms, is spontaneous. The Church does not find it necessary to add either to its traditional faith, or to the already recognised jurisdiction of its rulers, in order to stem the development within its walls of theories alien to its nature. *Sedet aeternumque sedebit* -- for such crises was it built. They have been no more than the occasion for its essential nature to show itself in function. They leave the Church no different, save, perhaps, for a clearer consciousness of its own nature and powers. The stress of the century which culminates in the *Adversus Haereses* of St. Irenaeus was due, primarily, to the influence on the Church of forces bred elsewhere. It was an attempt from outside to pull the Church into line with the day's religious fashions. In the century which follows St. Irenaeus the crisis is wholly different. Catholics are its authors; and the struggle is one for mastery between the episcopate and individuals who, by reason of their theological skill or of the sacrifices they have made for the faith, claim for themselves and their opinions a deciding voice -- as of right -- in matters of discipline that involve points of belief.

It is one of the fortunate accidents of the story of the next eighty years (190-270) that these disputes involve the Roman Church, whose history over a continuous period of years is now, for the first time, revealed. As the troubles of the second century are a means to inform us what contemporary Catholics believed about the nature of Catholicism, so those of the third century throw a flood of light for us on the position, already traditional, of the Roman Church within the great whole. They supply a commentary of fact to St. Irenaeus' theory, and we are thereby enabled to see at work that superior authority which he noted as

the Roman See's peculiar privilege. There is a dispute concerning the calendar, disputes on the explanations of the mysteries of faith, disputes about changes in discipline, and disputes which raise the fundamental question of the relations of the Roman Church to the rest. We meet the first of the anti-popes, and the first schisms in the Roman Church itself. At the same time, thanks to the genius of Plotinus, a last attempt is made to infuse life into Paganism- an attempt which is, also, bitterly anti-Christian. A last new religious revival from the East threatens yet another delay to the Pagan's realisation that Christianity or nothing is his choice. At Alexandria one of the greatest geniuses of all time essays a vast synthesis of philosophy and Christian learning, and founds a tradition of theology which is to endure for centuries.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



1. THE EASTER CONTROVERSY

The actual date of the death and resurrection of Our Lord formed no part of the Church's traditional faith. From very early on, the different Churches followed each their own judgment in the matter. By the end of the second century the majority of the churches, Rome amongst them, had come to celebrate the Resurrection on the Sunday which followed the 14th day of the Jewish month of Nisan. The churches of the Roman province of Asia (Asia Proconsularis) celebrated the commemoration of Our Lord's death rather than His resurrection, and they kept it on the 14th of Nisan whether that day fell on a Sunday or not. This difference of observance was felt as a serious inconvenience; and, in 154, the pope of the time -- Anicetus -- made an effort to win over to the Roman, and more general, practice the bishop whose prestige might have brought in the rest of the Asiatics, Polycarp of Smyrna. St. Polycarp, invoking the great name of the apostle St. John as the source of the Asiatic tradition, would not be persuaded, and endeavoured in his turn to win over Anicetus. But Anicetus, too, had his tradition -- the tradition of his predecessors in the Roman See. There the matter rested -- the harmony of charity between the two bishops in no way disturbed.

In 167 this difference of practice again came to the fore. The detail of the event is not known, but the Asiatic bishops are found in that year defending their own tradition, apparently against an attempt to introduce the more general custom. Twenty-four or twenty-five years later, however, the question came up once more, and it speedily developed into a crisis of the first magnitude. It is unfortunate that we know nothing of the immediate reasons for the action of the pope of the time, St. Victor I (189-198) and very little of the order of the events. What is certain is St. Victor's letter to the Bishop of Ephesus, Polycrates, in which he bids him call together the bishops of the province of Asia and secure their consent to the adoption of the Roman practice in the matter of the celebration of Easter. The pope reminds Polycrates of the apostolic origin of his see, and, presumably, of the authority thence deriving. Polycrates called the bishops together -- from his letter to St. Victor we gather such a reunion was without precedent, and only the fact that it

was ordered from Rome could have justified him in the innovation. But the bishops of Asia preferred to keep their own tradition, and in the reply of Polycrates we have a curious testimony to the fact that the theories of church government to which St. Irenaeus gives expression are not any personal invention of his own. For Polycrates bases the refusal on the grounds of apostolic tradition. His practice is that of apostles too, St. Philip buried at Hierapolis and St. John whose tomb is in his own city. He makes the list of distinguished bishops and martyrs since then, and he pleads " the fixed rule of faith" which forbids innovation in the apostolic tradition. No threats, he declares, will terrify him. Greater men than he have settled the principle on which he must act "It is better to obey God than men." (Acts v, 29.)

The issue is simple. Two traditions equally apostolic are in conflict. On what principle shall either prevail? Rome acted. St. Victor, apparently about the same time that he wrote to Polycrates, had written to other bishops also in the same sense. The letters of several councils of bishops in reply to his survive. They all express their agreement with Rome. "No threats will terrify me," the Bishop of Ephesus had written to the pope, referring no doubt, to some mention in the Roman letter of penalties in case of refusal. Now, by letters to all the churches, St. Victor declared Polycrates and his associates cut off and separated from the Church. It is the first recorded occasion of such disciplinary intervention on the part of the Roman Church, and its action has already all those characteristics which mark it ever afterwards. As against the Roman tradition not even apostolic traditions prevail, not even Philip nor John, since Rome is Peter and Paul.

But the matter did not end with the excommunication of the Asiatics. In more than one church it was felt that Rome had used them harshly, and appeals for a more lenient treatment began to flow in to St. Victor. Among those who pleaded was St. Irenaeus himself. He urged that the difference of practice was not of those for which brotherly charity should suffer, and he recalled the previous discussion between St. Polycarp and the pope Anicetus and its happy ending. And he wrote to others beside the Bishop of Rome, rallying opinion to his view of the case. But nowhere is it suggested that the Roman bishop had outstepped his jurisdiction, that the right he was exercising, perhaps

somewhat mercilessly, was not really his right. St. Irenaeus was as successful in his mediation as in his theology. The pope withdrew the excommunication, and the churches of Asia continued to celebrate Easter in the tradition of St. Philip and St. John.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. MONARCHIANS -- SABELLIUS -- ST. HIPPOLYTUS

Of more serious intrinsic importance than this quarrel of liturgical observance was another controversy which began in the reign of this same pope, St. Victor I, and which raged around the divinity of the Second Person of the Divine Trinity, the Logos incarnate in Jesus Christ. The discussions which now began continued at intervals for the first half of the third century. Then, after a peace of fifty years, they revived, and for a good hundred and fifty years more they were the chief feature of the Church's history.

The traditional belief was simple. God is one and there is but one God. Jesus Christ is God, being the incarnate second term of the Divine Trinity, God the Son or Logos. The Logos is nevertheless not the Father. The intelligence of believers, and their piety, continued to meditate and probe these traditional data, always with a hope of better understanding, and with the practical aim of making the tradition seem reasonable to critics from outside. Two questions in the main divided the attention of these theorists, the relation between the human and the divine in Our Lord, and the way in which the divine in Our Lord was divine. This second question had been already discussed by St. Justin. Now it was the turn of the first, and when the theorists, in their efforts to conciliate seemingly contradictory beliefs, stumbled into a denial of the tradition, a school of thinkers arose to set them right who in turn stumbled into errors on the Trinitarian question.

There came to Rome towards the end of the pontificate of Eleutherius (175-189) a wealthy citizen of Byzantium, one Theodotus, by trade a dealer in leather. He had apostatised in a recent persecution, and now sought to hide his shame in the great city. He was less successful, however, than he had hoped; and taxed with his record he retorted that after all, in denying Jesus Christ he had not denied God, for Jesus was but a man, the holiest of men admittedly, upon whom the Christ had descended in the form of a dove when he was baptized in the Jordan by John but, for all that, no more than a man. To support the theory Theodotus produced a catena of texts from Holy Scripture. The pope, St. Victor I, in 190 excommunicated him,

but Theodotus remained obdurate. He gathered round him a number of adherents, and soon was the leader of a sect taken from the most erudite circle of the Roman Church. Logicians, mathematicians, scientists, they used the comparative method and along with their Bibles studied Euclid and Galen and Aristotle: The Church tradition occupied a very small place in their critical labours, where indeed grammar and logic extracted from the Scriptures all they craved to know, How long the sect continued as a sect we do not know. But through one of its members of the second generation, Artemus (fl. 235), its teaching passed to the notorious bishop of Antioch, Paul of Samosata, the friend of that Lucian who was the teacher of Arius and the real father of Arianism. The theories of Theodotus do not seem to have seriously troubled the peace of the Church, at any rate during his own lifetime. With the contemporary theory which bears the cumbrous name of Patripassian Monarchianism it was far otherwise. The thinkers responsible for this theory were moved by the desire to safeguard the two traditional truths of the unity of God and the real divinity of Jesus Christ, and to refute the suggested contradiction between the two. But their theory only achieved its end by identifying Father and Son, thus sacrificing a third truth of the tradition, namely that the Father and Son are really distinct. []

The first to bring this theory to Rome was, according to Tertullian, Praxeas in the closing years of the second century. Thence Praxeas had passed into Africa where Tertullian routed him, and, better still, converted him. Another account makes Smyrna the seat of the heresy's first beginnings and Noetus its founder. From Smyrna, after the excommunication there of Noetus, it came to Rome with one of his disciples, Epigonus, somewhere between 198 and 210. The Monarchists speedily became known, and the theory became the exclusive topic of discussion in the Roman Church. Nor was the cause of truth and peace at all assisted by the presence in Rome of a double opposition to Monarchianism. The Roman Church opposed it for the innovation it was; but, at the same time, it met with opposition of a very different character, the reasoned opposition of a philosopher, from the greatest scholar in the Roman Church, the priest Hippolytus. It was the misfortune of the Roman Church that between its officials and Hippolytus there was soon a war as bitter as that between either of them and the Monarchists. Nor did Hippolytus scruple to charge the official

opposition with complicity with the heretics. On the other hand Hippolytus and his followers, in their ingenious defence of one truth, came very near to denying others. The task of the historian is not made easier by the fact that our knowledge of these transactions is due, in the very largest measure, to the writings of St. Hippolytus himself, -- written before the saint's reconciliation and martyrdom, when, the first of all the anti-popes, he was himself leading a schism against the lawful Bishop of Rome.

When Epigonus arrived in Rome to set up his school of Theology, mindful of the condemnation at Smyrna and perhaps knowing of the fate that had befallen Praxeas at the hands of Tertullian, he tempered his zeal with caution. It was his good fortune that the pope St. Zephyrinus (199-217) was an administrator rather than a scholar, and as Epigonus and his chief lieutenant, the more famous Sabellius, showed their belief in the reality of Our Lord's divinity in an instructed attack on the recently condemned Theodotus, they speedily gained a name for orthodoxy and the favour of the pope. But if Zephyrinus, lacking both taste for this theorising and skill in its practice, saw no more in the new party than welcome allies against the Adoptionists, this was by no means the case with Hippolytus. The writings of this great man have most of them perished, but enough remains to show that in him the Roman Church possessed a scholar of an erudition like to that of Origen. With the erudition, there went, alas, an uncomfortable impatience of ignorance in high places, and a genius for rough and bitter language that recall his other contemporary, Tertullian. In the events of the next few years both the learning and the caustic wit of St. Hippolytus were to have every opportunity. He now attacked Sabellius as he had attacked Theodotus; and when the pope refused to endorse the letter of his attacks, refused to make his own the learned theories by which Hippolytus was routing the new heresy, Hippolytus turned to attack the pope. Zephyrinus, however, stood firm. He refused to enter the dangerous ground of the rival philosophical explanations of the tradition, and contented himself with a steady re-affirmation of what had always been believed "I only know one God Who suffered and died, Jesus Christ and beyond Him no other. It is not the Father Who died but the Son."

In 217, while the three-cornered controversy was still raging,

Zephyrinus died. He had ruled for nearly twenty years, but during all that time there had been a "power behind the throne", a greater man than himself, on whom, wisely enough, he relied. This was his deacon Calixtus. Calixtus had had an unusually exciting life. Years before, as a slave, he had managed his master's bank. He was unlucky enough to lose his master large sums of money, some of it in bad debts where the debtors were Jews. His efforts to recover from them led to a riot and, the Jews denouncing him as a Christian, he was sent to penal servitude in the mines of Sardinia. About the year 190 he was set free and returned to Italy. The accession of Zephyrinus found him at Antium, a pensioner of the Roman Church. The new pope brought him back to Rome and ordained him deacon, one of that council of seven who saw to the management of the Roman Church's temporal business. Calixtus was a man of affairs, a practical administrator, and in the influence of Calixtus over his master, Hippolytus saw the reason for the pope's reluctance to condemn Sabellius and the rest in terms of his theory. Hippolytus was, then, already personally hostile to Calixtus when Zephyrinus died. When Calixtus was elected to succeed him, the learned and choleric Hippolytus seceded, accusing Calixtus of Monarchianism, and of holding that the distinction of terms in the Trinity is incompatible with the divine unity.

Hippolytus had a numerous following. They gathered round him and he set up his sect as the true Church in opposition to the " Monarchist " Calixtus. Meanwhile Calixtus had acted. He condemned Sabellius and excommunicated him as an innovator in the traditional belief, but he did not, in so doing, make his own the subtle reasoning by which Hippolytus exposed the heresy and explained the compatibility of the related truths.

That reasoning is indeed subtle, and to distinguish it from the heresy which makes the Logos a second inferior God calls for a philosophical mind and much good will. Nevertheless, although he did not adopt the ideas of Hippolytus, neither did St. Calixtus condemn them.

The schism of Hippolytus -- he was never thrust out of the Church but left it himself -- continued long after the death of St. Calixtus (222) and of his successor Urban I. In the persecution of Maximin, which was directed mainly against the rulers of the Church, Hippolytus, a confessor now in the mines of Sardinia,

found himself the fellow-sufferer of the lawful pope Pontianus (235). There, under what circumstances no record remains, he was reconciled to the power he had so long denied, and the Church honours him among her martyred saints.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



3. THE PENITENTIAL CONTROVERSY -- ST. CALIXTUS I

The question of Patripassian Monarchianism, or to give it its shorter name Modalism, [] was not the only controversy in which the pope, St. Calixtus I, was involved. In that controversy he had had for his adversary the subtle, scholarly, and irascible Hippolytus. In the next, which raged round changes in the Church's penitential discipline, his action roused all the bitterness of Tertullian as well. Few men have been called upon to face two such adversaries in a short four years.

Tertullian, at the moment when he composed his bitter attack on St. Calixtus I, was nearing the end of his long and eventful career. He was born at Carthage apparently about the year 160. His father was a centurion, and Tertullian was born and bred a Pagan. It was, however, the Law and not the Army which attracted Tertullian, and it is the Roman lawyer who speaks through all his varied writing. He was converted to Christianity, became a priest of the Church of Carthage, and from 197 he is, for a good quarter of a century, the central figure of literary activity in the Latin Church. Tertullian is always the Roman, sober, practical, contemptuous of philosophy and abstraction. He is, too, always the lawyer, with the lawyer's failing of over-refinement, of quibbling even, in his destructive criticism and in his advocacy. But never was any lawyer less hindered by the dry formalities of his knowledge. For Tertullian's learned advocacy is fired by one of the most passionate of temperaments. Thence results an apologetic of unexampled vigour and violence. Tertullian is master of all the controversial talents, "the most prolific, the most personal of all these Latins", with a gift of apt and biting phrase that sets him side by side with Tacitus himself. Of no man has it ever been truer that the style is the man; and in the works of this convert genius lie the foundations of the theological language of the Latin Church.

Christianity, for Tertullian, is not the crown of all philosophical history, it is not a light to make clear riddles hitherto obscure, but a fact to be proved and a law to be explained and obeyed. Into that explanation he put all the native rigour of his own harsh temperament, all the inflexibility of the civil law in which he was a master. From the chance that it was Tertullian who was the

pioneer of the Latin theological language, it gained that tradition of clear cut definition, and the beginnings of that store of terms incapable of any but the one interpretation, which, from the beginning, saved the Western Church centuries of domestic controversy and disputation.

Tertullian's temperament proved, in practice, too much for his logic; and in Montanism his strongly individualistic nature found a home more congenial than the religion of the Church. The Montanist Tertullian spent the last half of his life in reviling the Church as bitterly as he had previously reviled, on its behalf, Pagans and heretics alike. He had been a Catholic perhaps fifteen or sixteen years when Montanism began to seduce his splendid intelligence. Ten years later, when the decree of St. Calixtus roused him to write the *De Pudicitia*, he was a fully-fledged member of the sect, and so great was his influence upon it that, in subsequent years, it was as Tertullianists that the Montanists were known in Africa.

But it was as a Catholic that he wrote the greatest of all his works the *De Praescriptione Hereticorum* -- a statement of the old argument which rules heresy out of court unheard, self-condemned, because self-confessed as an innovation. It is St. Irenaeus' argument from tradition, but cast this time in legal form, and gaining enormously in power from Tertullian's superb exposition. Other works poured from his versatile mind, his supple mastery of the old Latin tongue bending it to new uses. Instructions for catechumens, apologies addressed to Pagans, ascetical exhortations for the faithful, and everywhere controversy, panegyrics of virginity and of that patience in which, rather touchingly, he notes himself so sadly lacking "*Miserrimus ego semper aeger caloribus impatientiae.*" Perhaps Tertullian's greatest service to the progress of theological science is his exposition of the mysteries in the Divine Trinity. The attempts of all his predecessors in this field, from St. Justin downwards, are easily surpassed; as Tertullian surpasses, too, all later writers until Nicea. More convincingly, and more clearly, than any of them does he argue the eternal divinity of the Logos, His origin from the substance of the Father, His unity of nature with the Father, and His real distinctness from the Father. More clearly than any writer, Greek or Latin, before St. Athanasius, he explains the necessity of belief in the divinity of the Holy Ghost. But it is his exposition of the mutual relations between the

Divine Three, and its unembarrassed understanding that there is no conflict between the truths of Their unity and of the Trinity, that is Tertullian's chief glory as a theologian. All his ease of careful analysis finds scope in the distinction he draws between a division of the Divine Substance and its organisation. The resulting terms of that organisation he recognises as spiritual substances, divine in nature; and, first of all writers, he gives them the name persons. "Unity of Substance, Trinity of Persons" the classic formula in which the traditional faith finds reasoned expression is of Tertullian's very minting. A hundred years before the event he thus anticipates Nicea, and by his immense influence wherever the Latin tongue prevails, he saves the West from years of subtle controversy and disunion. []

That a power to forgive sins, and to reconcile the sinner to God, was left to the Church by its Founder was undoubtedly part of the Tradition from the very beginning. " Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them," He had said, "Whose sins you shall retain they are retained," and "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in Heaven, whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed also in Heaven." In St. Paul's letters to the Corinthians we have at least one record of the Apostle's use of his powers. A generation later we can, however, note a tendency to require that the Church be an assembly of saints, from which all who sin after their baptism should be rigorously expelled; a tendency to demand absolute sinlessness as a normal condition of membership. Baptism could not be repeated. Therefore let the baptized be warned. Should they again fall into sin, the Church had no second baptism to raise them a second time. To this ideal the evidence of everyday offered a contradiction of fact. There were Christians who sinned and sinned gravely, and who yet did not fall from their faith in Christ. Did their sins really matter? Gnostic theories that matter and spirit were independent the one of the other, so that sin, deriving from matter, could not affect spirit, would deny to post-baptismal sin any importance at all. The more prevalent opinion in the Church judged it with the utmost severity. Such literature, of the generations immediately following that of the Apostles, as has survived is filled with evidence of this fact. The tendency is to abolish the distinction between precept and counsel, and to impose both alike, as of obligation, on all Christians. In nothing was the new rigorism more rigorous than in what related to sex. Not only, for such extremists, is virginity

preferable to marriage, but marriage itself is considered a bar to sanctity. "There is no resurrection except for such as keep their virginity" one pseudo-Pauline maxim declares. True Christianity implies perpetual virginity. Baptism is equivalent to a vow of chastity. Those who uphold these opinions are the Encratites -- never a sect as such, though more than one of the greatest of them ultimately fell away from the Church, but a group whose ideas were for long a feature of public opinion to be constantly reckoned with. Their views on the Church's policy in the matter of forgiving post-baptismal sin were, naturally, extremely rigid.

The Encratite view of things was not, however, the only view to find expression in the second century. There was another school of thought which kept nearer to the spirit of the Gospel. Its chief exponent, in the literature of the time which has come down to us, is the brother of the pope, St. Pius I (140-154), a priest of the Roman Church, Hermas by name. His book-the Shepherd -- is a popular work, practical not speculative, and its aim is to bring home to the ordinary man the truth that there is always pardon for the sinner who repents -- pardon at any rate once. Nor is there any mention of sins so great that they are beyond pardon. The sinner repents and God receives him back. Between the terms of the process a series of actions intervenes. The sinner, turning once more to God, re-enters the Church by acts of penance. But, for Hermas, once and once only is there for the sinner this way of forgiveness. The Encratite current runs too strongly for even Hermas to disregard it. None the less he is a witness, in a question where sources are so scarce as hardly to exist at all, that, in the Roman Church, Encratite theories were viewed with disfavour.

The rigorist reactions from the everyday immorality of Pagan life might carry away the enthusiastic Christian to assail even the lawful use of what he saw so generally abused. Hermas is a witness that not all were carried away, though all perhaps felt the strength of the tide at its full; and that the Roman Church continued to teach that to repentance sin is forgiven

Between the Shepherd of Hermas and the decree of Calixtus I which roused all Tertullian's cantankerousness, there is a period of some seventy years. How the discipline had developed in that time, in some places, can be learnt from a book of Tertullian's written to instruct candidates for Baptism, the De Penitentia.

With regard to sins committed after Baptism he teaches the same doctrine as Hermas, but without the hesitation which appears in the Shepherd. There still remains one more opportunity of pardon, and it is given through an external ritual which Tertullian names -- the Exomologesis. This is a laborious, public, penitential act, which the repentant sinner voluntarily performs in atonement for his sin. The sin is declared to the bishop, he fixes the nature and the duration of the penance to be performed, and on its completion receives back the sinner into full communion. Tertullian himself describes these penitents, clad in a special dress, living under a rigorous regime of abstinence and fast, ashes on their heads, their bodies uncared for, who kneel at the door of the church beseeching the prayers of the faithful as they pass in to the services.

The Exomologesis lasted a longer or shorter time according to the sin. Of itself it was merely an offering to God in satisfaction for the wrong done. But since the Church associated herself with the penitent who undertook the penance at the bidding of the bishop, the discipline acquired a new value. The intervention of the Church made it "efficacious" for, Tertullian explains, the Church is Christ and His mediation is infallible in its effect. Two last points of Tertullian's description are to be noticed. Pardon is granted through the Exomologesis once only. The sinner who relapses must, thereafter, negotiate his own pardon with the mercy of God. Nor is the Exomologesis available for every kind of sin. Three sins, notably, are excluded -- idolatry, murder, and fornication. The Church does not teach that these sins are unforgivable. Merely she will not take it on herself to forgive those who commit them. They may be admitted to the ranks of the penitent, there to remain for the rest of their life. Their penance will avail them much in the sight of God, but the Church does not formally receive them back into her communion.

It was this reservation in the discipline of the Exomologesis that Calixtus I now decided to alter. This particular reservation has no warrant in Scripture, nor does Hermas make any mention of it. In all probability it was an ecclesiastical regulation of the late second century, a special provision provoked, it may be, by some special circumstances of contemporary Pagan morality. Whatever its origin, the restriction added to the severity of the existing discipline which, Tertullian is our witness, was already beginning to defeat its own ends. For very few indeed were they

who were prepared to submit to it. Whence a practice of deferring Baptism, and a crop of secret sinners. Those who knelt in sackcloth among the penitents were not, apparently, the only ones guilty of sin. More than one of those at whose knees the penitents besought prayers might fittingly, in his turn, have prostrated himself in the dust.

The system was ceasing to fulfil its purpose, and Calixtus I prepared to modify it. He announced that, henceforward, sin in sexual matters would also be forgiven through the discipline of the Exomologesis. No longer would such sinners be permanently cut off from the Sacraments, but, their penance duly performed, they too would regain their place among the faithful. Whereupon Tertullian, and Hippolytus, attacked the pope bitterly and maliciously.

It is important to notice the grounds Calixtus cites as authority for his action. They are quite simply Our Lord's words to his predecessor Peter " Upon this rock I will build My Church, to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven, Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven." Calixtus explicitly claims to be the present heir of Peter's prerogative, and on this basis he acts.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



4. THE SCHISM OF NOVATIAN

The edict of Calixtus I marks an important stage in the development of the Church's discipline of penance as we know it. Thirty years later one of his successors, St. Cornelius, developing the reform, brought within the system the sin of apostasy. The action of Calixtus had led to controversy; that of Cornelius provoked a schism

The persecution of the Emperor Decius, which had just ceased, had been altogether novel in its systematic organisation, thanks to which hardly any Christians escaped the test, save the tiny minority who had means to fly the country. The result was an unprecedented crop of more or less nominal apostasies, and the anomalous situation arose that in many places the majority of the faithful, guilty of a sin the Church refused to pardon, were out of the Church. It had long been the custom -- St. Calixtus allows for its action in his decree -- that although the Church did not reconcile such apostates through the Exomologesis, she accepted them as reconciled at the intercession of their more steadfast brethren, who in bonds awaited the martyr's death. This custom, owing to the crowds of repentant apostates who now besieged the prisons where the confessors were detained, suddenly threatened to break down the reservation once and for all. If these thousands were to be re-admitted at the prayer of the confessors, how could re-admission be refused any longer to those who sought it by the harder road of the Exomologesis? A further complication arose from the fact that not all these confessors were as docile to authority as they were constant in faith. What authority had allowed as a privilege, some of the confessors now began to claim as a right, and their petitions to the bishops for the reinstatement of the apostates took on more and more the appearance of commands. *Communicet ille cum suis* is a text which St. Cyprian's indignation has preserved. Not only the penitential discipline of the time was shaken, but there were the beginnings of a threat to episcopal authority also. As the bishops in the second century had had to defend the tradition of authority against the usurpation of learning and of private revelation, so now they faced a new menace which would subordinate their authority to the prestige of individual confessors and martyrs.

It was in Africa that the new troubles began, in the Church of Carthage whose bishop at the moment (250) was St. Cyprian. He protested against the threatened subversion of traditional practice. Such sinners were not admitted to receive the Eucharist until, having performed the appointed penance through the Exomologesis, the bishop and his clergy solemnly laid hands on them. Wherefore he forbids his priests to admit apostates to Communion on the simple presentation of the recommendation of a confessor or a martyr, that is to say, without penance done, without the Exomologesis and without the imposition of hands. The act of the martyr is an act of intercession with the bishop -- an influential intercession no doubt, but no more than that. This intercessory procedure St. Cyprian proceeds to regulate. There must be no more of the collective notes. The martyr must specify by name the person for whom the indulgence is sought, and the person must be someone really known to him. These petitions the bishop will examine publicly, once peace is restored, and thereupon give his decision in each individual case. An exception is made for the apostate in danger of death whom a martyr has recommended and who cannot await the bishop's decision. Him any priest or deacon may reconcile, receiving the acknowledgement of his sin and imposing hands upon him.

These regulations brought to the surface the latent arrogance of the innovators. One martyr sent to St. Cyprian a notification for the reconciliation of all apostates wherever found. Priests were not wanting to support this new revolt, and soon, in one town after another, riots broke out as the crowds of apostates, armed with their letters from the confessors, besieged the churches demanding re-admission from the local clergy. St. Cyprian reminded the rebels that it is the bishop who rules in the Church, and that episcopal rule is the Church's foundation. Also he wrote to Rome an account of his troubles, explaining his point of view and asking for the Roman Church's support.

The Roman reply was encouraging. It explained that the mode of procedure at Rome was substantially that adopted by St. Cyprian, and it endorsed his contention that the bishop alone had jurisdiction in these matters of discipline.

So far, at Rome, no trouble had arisen from any undue

interference of the confessors. In its place another question was beginning to arouse discussion. This was the fundamental question, not of how the apostates should be reconciled, but of whether they should be reconciled at all. Calixtus I thirty years before had inaugurated the practice of receiving repentant adulterers through the Exomologesis. Was it now time to extend the same favour to repentant apostates too?

The Roman Church, at the moment of St. Cyprian's letter, was without a head, for the pope, St. Fabian, had been arrested and put to death in the January of 250, and the vigilance of the authorities had, so far, prevented the election of a successor. The reply to St. Cyprian had, then, been the letter of the clergy who governed the see during the vacancy. It was actually written by the priest Novatian -- at that moment the outstanding personality of Christian Rome. In many ways he recalls St. Hippolytus, though he was cast in a smaller mould than that great man. His surviving writings recall Tertullian in their doctrine and in their manner of exposition. In the history of the development of the philosophical explanation of Revelation Novatian has an important place, and his influence on later thinkers was considerable. He is said to have been harsh in disposition, and is accused of vanity. His elevation to the priesthood had not been universally popular, and the criticism continued now while he held the important position of instructor to the catechumens. In the reply to St. Cyprian Novatian had shown signs of a spirit more rigorous than that implied by the system he described, of a fear that, in absolving the apostate, the Roman Church was losing something of its prestige and strength.

This rigorist spirit was soon to have its opportunity. The persecution ended. The bishops came back to their sees. In Africa a council of bishops adopted St. Cyprian's provisional arrangement as henceforward the permanent law of the Church in the matter. At Rome, after a vacancy of fourteen months, St. Fabian was given a successor, the pope Cornelius (March 5, 251), Novatian had been a candidate, and among his helpers in what we might perhaps call his campaign, were two of St. Cyprian's clergy, excommunicated by him for their share in the revolt of the apostates, and come to Rome to intrigue against him. Novatian was apparently to be the next pope. They joined themselves to him and they shared his disappointment. For

Novatian was bitterly disappointed, and with a following among the clergy, the laity and the imprisoned confessors, he now organised a Church of his own and found three bishops to consecrate him. The new sect needed a principle by which to justify its existence. It found it in the question of the treatment of the apostates. Paradoxically, the man whom the envoys of the unreconciled and rebellious apostates of Africa had supported, now declared himself the patron of rigorism. The one point on which Novatian now condemned the Church of Cornelius and of Cyprian was that it offered pardon to the repentant apostates. Novatian not only would refuse them pardon, but, developing his first severity, he denied there was any possibility of their being pardoned at all, no matter what their sorrow, no matter how severe the reparation they made.

The new pope, Cornelius, in the autumn of 251, summoned a council of bishops at Rome -- sixty of them. The teaching of Novatian was condemned and, with his supporters, he was expelled from the Church. The policy of St. Cyprian, which the bishops of Africa had already endorsed, was now adopted by the Roman Council too, and thereafter by all the churches of the world.

The Novatian schism, a conflict of personal ambition to some extent, had been much more the product of a conflict between the rigorism of the Christian pharisees and the more merciful tendency of constitutional authority. Something of that rigorist spirit was to be found in every Church, and hence Novatian, beaten at Rome, and disavowed in a series of echoing condemnations throughout the Church, was yet able to organise a strong minority. The Novatian Church had its hierarchy, its sacraments, its churches, its cemeteries. Its existence was legally recognised by Constantine (326) and not until a century later did it lose its last church in Rome. In the East and in Africa it survived even longer, still divided from the Catholic Church by the one belief that to absolve from crimes such as apostasy was beyond the power of the Church, and as late as the beginning of the seventh century it was still a useful occupation for an Alexandrian theologian to write a lengthy treatise Against the Novatians.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



5. ST. CYPRIAN AND ROME

St. Cyprian, whose co-operation with Rome in the affair of the repentant apostates has been recounted, was at that time, only recently consecrated (248), and his consecration as bishop had followed closely on his conversion. He came apparently of a family socially distinguished, and his own education was of the best. A scholarly distinction and the courtesy of the great gentleman are apparent in all his writings, and in all that we know of his eventful career as Bishop of Carthage. St. Cyprian was of that class of men who are born to rule. The habit of decision, the instinct for responsibility, the courage to lead, all this was St. Cyprian's by nature.

He had hardly been consecrated when the persecution of Decius came to wreck the peace of the Church, and with the persecution the crisis of the confessors and the repentant apostates. He had thought it his duty not to expose himself to arrest, and it was from a secret hiding place that he ruled his flock, encouraging those whom the persecution tried and, to the best of his powers, restraining the excesses of the innovators. With the peace there came the end of the long vacancy in the Roman See, the election of Cornelius, and the schism of Novatian. Towards that schism some of St. Cyprian's own disloyal clergy had worked, and it was but fitting that he should himself be prominent in the work for peace. He checked the schemes of Novatian's envoys at Carthage, and he wrote a memorable appeal to the confessors at Rome who sided with the anti-pope. But his great contribution to the restoration of unity was his treatise On the Unity of the Church published at this moment. The subject of this important work is better indicated by an older title it sometimes bore, De Simplicitate Praelatorum, i.e. on there being but one bishop in each church-for the Church with whose unity St. Cyprian is concerned, in this work, is not the Catholic Church as a whole, but the local church, and more precisely the local church of Rome.

It has been well said of St. Cyprian that "He was a practical man without any philosophy or theology." He repeats the tradition; he borrows very largely from Tertullian; he writes a highly cultivated Latin; but there is nowhere evidence that he

possessed any power of seeing general principles in the learning he had, nor of deducing thence, in his day to day application of it, further general truths. The one subject which he ventures to explore is this question of the Church and its nature. He explores it simply because exploration of it is forced on him by controversies he cannot escape. And it is in the spirit of a practical controversialist, eager to find arguments and confirmation of his policy, that he explores it. The pitfalls to which such a character is exposed, in such a work, are very easy to imagine. St. Cyprian was to experience them in very full measure.

In the *De Unitate Ecclesiae* he pleads for unity in each local church, and, well in the tradition, he finds the only hope of such unity in the obedience of all to the local bishop. Our Lord founded the first Church on one individual, Peter, as a pattern for all time. In each church there should be but one bishop as there was but one Peter. Schism is the sin of sins. To leave the bishop is to leave the Church, and to leave the Church is to leave Christ. Outside the Church there are no sacraments nor any bishops. St. Cyprian's theory, and the arguments by which he supports it, serve his restricted purpose admirably. But beyond the local church there is the whole body, of which the local church is but a part. It is possible, in arguing for the authority of the local bishop, to leave less room than will be needed if the theory is ever to be completed and take in the unity of the Church Universal. It was St. Cyprian's misfortune that he based his pleas for unity on arguments only true in part. The next five years were to make this painfully, almost tragically, clear. St. Cyprian was next to find himself in disagreement with Rome.

The first trouble was with that pope, Cornelius, to assist whom the *De Unitate Ecclesiae* had been written. The priest Felicissimus whom St. Cyprian had excommunicated for his share in the disturbances of the repentant apostates, and who, gone to Rome to appeal, had then become the ally of Novatian, now put in his appeal to Cornelius. St. Cyprian's complaint is that the pope should even listen to so discredited an intriguer. An incidental phrase of his letter witnesses to the important fact that he shared the belief, so far uncontroverted, that in the Church Universal the local Church of Rome had a special place. For St. Cyprian it is *ecclesia principalis* (a phrase which recalls

immediately the potentior principalitas of St. Irenaeus) and the " source from which the unity arises."

Pope Cornelius died in 253. His successor was Stephen I, and with the new pope St. Cyprian had a series of disagreements.

In 254 the bishops of Merida and Leon in Spain were deposed, why we do not know. The affair had apparently caused a certain commotion, for their successors thought it well to seek support in a general confirmation of their rights. So it was that they appealed for recognition to Africa and, at their Autumn meeting, the African bishops confirmed the Spanish sentences and the new elections. But the deposed bishops appealed to Rome, and Rome re-established them ! Of the rights and wrongs of the affair it is not possible to judge, for the documents have long ago perished. We can, however, note the affair as a cause of discord between St. Cyprian and Rome at the very beginning of St. Stephen's pontificate, and we can also note, in connection with it, the appearance of some disturbing new theories in St. Cyprian's theology of Church government. One such theory is that it is for the people to depose bishops who are sinners. They are the judges. Another equally mischievous novelty is the idea that only men of innocent life should be made bishops, because bishops who sin lose the Holy Spirit and all power of order; their prayers are not heard; God no longer ratifies what they do; their sacrifices contaminate those for whom they are offered.

The next stage in St. Cyprian's development is the affair of the bishop of Arles, Marcian. He was a rigorist of the Novatian type and he refused to give his people the benefit of the new milder discipline in the matter of apostasy. Thereupon he was denounced to Rome, and at Carthage too, as a bishop who had cut himself off from the unity of the Church. It was a suitable occasion for the application of St. Cyprian's theory of deposition. He did not, however, make use of it. Nor did he leave the matter to the bishops of the accused prelate's own province. Instead he wrote to Rome, a most urgent letter. The pope, he urged, should write authoritatively to the bishops of Gaul. It is his duty to maintain the established discipline, the decision of Cornelius. He must depose Marcian and appoint another in his place. And would the pope be good enough to say whom he had appointed as Marcian's successor so that the bishops would know with whom, in future, they must communicate as Bishop of

Arles.

St. Cyprian, in his indignation, has forgotten his own theory of the year before. He contradicts it. He is appealing, once more, in the traditional manner to the potentior principalitas of the ecclesia principalis. A year later and, in conflict with Rome on a question of policy, he once more involves himself in novelties and contradiction.

The subject of the new dispute was the question whether, when persons already baptized by heretics or schismatics were received into the Church, they should be re-baptized. A layman of note raised the question -- a very practical one no doubt in the time of religious revival which followed the Decian persecution-- and St. Cyprian replied in an elaborate letter. The baptism administered by heretics cannot be of value, he teaches, because the Holy Spirit does not operate outside the one only Church. Later in the year (255) the question was raised at the African bishops' meeting, and the same decision was given in a joint letter to the bishops of Numidia. Despite the authority that inspired the letter the discussion continued. An opposition party revealed itself, quoting against St. Cyprian and his council an older practice. To settle the matter finally a joint meeting of all the bishops of Africa and Numidia was held in the Lent of 256, and the declaration of 255 re-affirmed. St. Cyprian wrote to Rome the news of the council's decision.

Now at Rome, as at Alexandria, the teaching had always been that the baptism of heretics was valid, as it had been the teaching in Africa until about thirty years before St. Cyprian's time. There is reason to believe that the Africans knew the Roman tradition, and it is possible that during the interval between the two African Councils (Autumn 255 and Spring of 256) Rome had declared its mind. St. Cyprian, in that case, would be repeating the procedure of acting independently of Rome, as in the matter of the Spanish bishops, and his letter after the Council of 256 be, not merely an announcement of African policy, but a reply to Pope Stephen's definite declaration that if the rite be duly administered the person of the minister does not affect its validity.

Be that as it may, two facts are certain. First of all, when the African envoys arrived in Rome they found themselves treated

as heretics. They were refused communion, refused even hospitality, and the pope refused them a hearing. Cyprian was regarded as the false prophet of a false Christ. The second fact is St. Cyprian's letter. For all his recognition of the ecclesia principalis, he writes as though, in this matter, he considered all bishops were equals; as though the administration of baptism was a detail of the local church's domestic life -- and if the detail differed from church to church, that was the business of the local church and of the local church alone. To God alone is the local bishop responsible. This is hardly in keeping with the theory of 254 that bishops are to be judged by the people who elected them and, if bad, deposed. St. Cyprian is once again weaving a theory to justify his policy, and weaving it from one day to the next. Another contradiction of his own theory is the declaration, in the letter to Rome, that this question of the validity of baptism is one on which Catholic bishops can differ. In 255 he had explained to Marcian that it is an article of faith !

The letter to Rome is, in its tone, an appeal to an ally. For answer the pope notifies the Bishop of Carthage of the Law and the Tradition and, without any diplomacy, simply bids him observe it. " If therefore anyone shall come to you from any heresy whatsoever, let there be no innovation contrary to what has been handed down, namely that hands be imposed upon them in [sign of] penance." The reply is in the curt legal tone of a power too conscious of its own authority and of the obedience due to it, and too accustomed to receive obedience, to feel any need of argument. To the decision the pope simply added the reference--the already traditional reference -- to the first of his predecessors in the Roman See, and to the authority thence deriving to himself. In all this there is nothing new. The one element of novelty, so far, is in St. Cyprian's theories. His action on receipt of the Roman decree adds yet another. He took fire at what he called the pope's "haughtiness, self-contradictions, wandering from the point at issue, his clumsiness and lack of foresight," and at the next meeting of the African bishops (September 1, 256) a joint reply was sent to the pope. " None of us," said St. Cyprian in his opening speech and alluding to the pope, "poses as bishop of bishops. . . each bishop has the right to think for himself and as he is not accountable to any other, so is no bishop accountable to him." The Council unanimously supported St. Cyprian.

Rome proceeded to make known its decision to all the churches. It was no longer a question merely of the correction of the Bishop of Carthage. Rome was hinting at the possible excommunication of dissidents. St. Cyprian began to look round for allies. He found a most devoted one in the Bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia, Firmilian. Firmilian replied in a letter filled with so violent an invective against the pope that the pious pens of the copyists not infrequently refuse to transcribe it. The unity and the peace of the Church, "unity of faith, unity of truth" are assured facts. They stand in no need of any protection from a supreme judge of controversies. Almost, in the midst of this philippic, Firmilian denies the possibility of differences. The pope is worse than all the heretics, for he deliberately darkens the minds of the repentant heretics who seek light from him. As for the pope's reminder that he is the successor of Peter and therefore the final judge of the tradition, that, for Firmilian, is the crowning mark of St. Stephen's folly and pride.

Rome waited, her relations with the churches of Asia Minor as strained as her relations with Africa. Then, before any action had been taken, on August 2, 257, the pope St. Stephen died. Whether the new pope, Sixtus II, was of a gentler disposition, or whether he thought it wiser not to press the matter to a decision at a moment when the persecution was reviving, the question was left alone. Sixtus and St. Cyprian were friends and the Roman Church in the next year came to the help of Firmilian, whose diocese had suffered much in the Persian invasion. The controversy of the three sees had speedily travelled beyond its first issue of the worth of heretical baptism. It had raised the question of the relation between the pope and the episcopate, a thorny question which was to cause trouble again and again in the ensuing centuries, and which was not to be finally solved until the Council of 1870. Little wonder that its appearance in the days of St. Cyprian provoked such a turmoil. Of more importance to Church History than the evidence which that turmoil affords as to the real humanity of the great saints, is its witness to the Roman See's habit of ruling; and to the fact that, upon all the questions which the ever-widening discussion involved, it is that decisive Roman interpretation of the tradition, which had occasioned the turmoil, that secures universal acceptance and is taken as the Church's belief. "For with this Church every other Church throughout the world must bring itself to agree."

St. Cyprian, it is not hard to understand why, has been the chosen patron of those in our own times whose ideal is a Catholicism without the Roman Primacy. But so to esteem him is to do him serious injustice. 'The theological impasse into which, at the end of his career, his untheological mentality led him must be judged in the light of his whole life, the mood which found expression when storms provoked his gallant soul be set side by side with those calmer hours when, free from the necessity to justify a policy, "he recognised in the Roman See an altogether special importance because it is the See of that Apostle upon whom Christ conferred the primacy of apostolic authority."

Eleven months after the pope whom he had opposed, St. Cyprian, too, laid down his life in testimony of his faith, September 14, 258. The Acta which relate his trial and martyrdom are well known as among the most moving of all that marvellous literature: his arrest and trial, and exile, his recall and re-arrest, the second trial, its sentence of death and the serene confident beauty of his death. Galerius Maximus proconsul Cypriano episcopo dixit: Tu es Thascius Cyprianus? Cyprianus episcopus respondit: Ego sum. . . . Iusserunt te sacratissimi imperatores caerimoniari. Cyprianus episcopus dixit: Non facio. Galerius Maximus ait: Consule tibi. Cyprianus episcopus respondit: Fac quod tibi praeceptum est: in re tam iusta nulla est consultatio. Then the proconsul most reluctantly, vix et aegre, lectured him as is the custom for judges with the man they must condemn. Et his dictis decretum ex tabella recitavit: Thascium Cyprianum gladio animadverti placet. Cyprianus episcopus dixit: Deo Gratias. He was led to the place of execution. He set off his outer garment, bade his servants give the executioner his alms, five and twenty pieces of gold. He bound himself his eyes, and his deacons bound his hands. "Ita beatus Cyprianus passus est. . . the eighteenth day before the Kalends of October, under the Emperors Valerian and Gallienus but in the reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ, to Whom honour and glory for ever and ever Amen."

The Roman Church, embodying the memory of her greatest names in the very heart of her active life, has written them into the consecration prayer of the Mass, and along with the names of these ancient popes, that of the great Bishop of Carthage

who, on earth, sometimes opposed them.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



6. THE SCHOOL OF ALEXANDRIA -- ORIGEN

Alexandria, in the third century, was still the intellectual capital of the Roman world. Thanks to its great library and the marvellous scientific organisation of the Museum, the city never failed to draw to itself leading thinkers of every kind of learning. It had been the centre of the learned Judaeo-Hellenic speculation associated ever after with the name of Philo; from Alexandria, too, had come many of the leading Gnostics -- Valentine certainly, and Cerdon who was responsible for the Gnostic element in the theology of Marcion. It was in Alexandria, too, that the effort of philosophy to replace the Hellenistic religions as interpreter of the riddle of life now reached its full perfection. The thinkers who now built from it a kind of Hellenistic theology and mysticism were three, Ammonius Saccas (d. 242), Plotinus (d. 270) and Porphyry (d. 304).

Their system is Neo-Platonism properly so called. Ammonius Saccas, an Alexandrian labourer, is known chiefly by the work of Plotinus, his pupil, for, if he himself wrote at all, his works have all perished. Plotinus, also an Egyptian by birth, left Alexandria for Rome after the death of his master. There he lectured and taught for the next twenty years -- the elite of the world capital filling his rooms, the Emperor Gallienus among his audience-but not until the last few years of his life did he commit his ideas to writing. As Plotinus developed Ammonius Saccas, so Porphyry, his own confidential pupil, arranged and systematised the teaching of Plotinus. But Plotinus is the real founder of the new faith and its principal saint. That faith was not, of course, anything so simple as the mere revival of a cult of Plato's philosophy. The spirit of syncretism, powerful for three centuries and more everywhere, except in the domain of the Church's tradition, showed itself very apparently in Neo-Platonism. Plato's ideas found a place in it, but so, too, did those of the Stoic Zeno, of Pythagoras, of Aristotle, and of Philo. Finally there was the influence of the Gnostic movement, with all its strange amalgam of oriental ideas and Gnostically interpreted Christian traditions. Out of these elements the genius of the Neo-Platonists, during the third century, devised their system.

These Neo-Platonists were, however, very far from desiring any

reconciliation of philosophy with the religion of the Church. On the contrary the movement was markedly hostile to the Church; Porphyry, amongst his other works, writing classical antiquity's masterpiece of anti-Christian polemic -- a great work in fifteen books of which, however, only a few pages have survived. Anti-Catholic might be a truer description than anti-Christian, for Porphyry shows great reverence for the memory and character of Our Lord; and his attack, on the lines of the familiar modern historical criticism of the gospels, is directed rather against what he considered the influence of St. Paul. Porphyry lived to see the last of the persecutions in full swing; and it was the Neo-Platonist movement which, in more than one important instance, lent the illiterate and uncouth Galerius, who was that persecution's real author, a logical excuse for his hate and something of a system in his pursuit of it.

Neo-Platonism, in itself a vaguely rational justification of religious sentiment, with a worked out scheme relating the fundamental problems of the nature of God, the creation of man and man's destiny, and offering to man the chance of recovery, of a gradual ascent by increase of knowledge to the actual vision of God Himself, could scarcely ever have progressed beyond the elite of a small philosophical school. But, by an ingenious exegesis of the mythologies, this religious idealism was combined with the old classical Paganism, all of whose rites and practices found in the new system an allegorical interpretation to sanction them. This sagacious combination met with much success. It helped once more to its feet the religion so often condemned to die since the days of Euripides; and whatever hold these ancient beliefs maintained for the next three centuries on the allegiance of the intelligent, can be set to the credit of the system which had at last given them a philosophical setting, something even of a body of doctrine, and which was offering to their devotees a way to heaven even in this life of earth. Of the movement's influence on the Church much must be said, but in dealing with a later period of the Church's history. The harm it did the Church of the third and fourth centuries was that, as an attractive willo'-the-wisp, it distracted from their real goal those who anxiously sought for truth, and that it armed the fiercest of the Church's persecutors. But in a later age, through the genius of St. Augustine, and through the writer who passed, for centuries, as Denis the Areopagite, more than one idea that derived through Plotinus

entered into the service of Catholic theology and Catholic mysticism.

Of the first introduction of the Church into Egypt we know nothing. The legend of the foundation of the see of Alexandria by St. Mark was, apparently, unknown even to Alexandrians before the fourth century; and except for the names of the handful -of Alexandrian Gnostics, all that we know of the Egyptian Churches before the end of the second century is a list of bishops of Alexandria that goes back to A.D. 61. It is only in the last twenty years of the second century that the darkness lifts, and it lifts to reveal to us the existence at Alexandria of a flourishing school of Christian culture under the guidance of Pantenus.

The writings of this doctor of the Alexandrian Church have perished. That he was a convert from Stoicism, and that before setting up at Alexandria he had shared in the evangelisation of "the Indians," and that among his pupils were Alexander, later bishop in Cappadocia, and Titus Flavius Clemens who succeeded him in the direction of the school, is the sum of our information regarding him. For these scanty data it is to that successor that we are indebted. Titus Flavius Clemens -- Clement of Alexandria -- unlike the master to whom he owed so much and whom he so greatly venerated, is very well known to us, is in fact one of the best known, as he is one of the most lovable personages of the Church's early history. His work at Alexandria, and the work of the genius who was first his pupil there and then his successor-Origen, was to exercise an influence far beyond the local church that bore them to the faith. It was to be a leading influence in Western theology until the time of St. Augustine, and to give to the theology of the Eastern Church an orientation and a spirit which it has perhaps never lost. Also this Alexandrian theology, like its two great teachers, was to be a sign of contradiction among Catholics for all time -- contradiction always sufficiently lively to be a barrier to any official recognition of the sanctity of the two pioneers of the Church's systematic theology. Neither Clement of Alexandria nor Origen, for all their heroic life, are invoked as saints or enrolled among the Doctors of the Church.

Clement was born in Athens, probably about 150, a Pagan. We are ignorant of what brought him to the faith, but he has himself

listed the different influences which, after his conversion, perfected the formation of his Christian culture. He names a Greek of Ionia, another of Greater Greece, a Syrian, an Egyptian, an Assyrian and a Palestinian convert from Judaism. Then he met Pantenus, and with him found his vocation in the explanation to educated Catholics of the religion they professed. To the lecture rooms of the school in Alexandria came a varied and distinguished audience, of men and women alike, drawn from the leisured and educated classes of the Church. Clement, now a priest of the Alexandrian Church, set their Faith before them scientifically. Like himself, they were, the most of them, converts from Paganism. He showed them, with all his own rich knowledge of Paganism, the world they had gained in comparison with what they had given up. At every turn he cites the treasures of that ancient culture, in which they had been bred. Its poets, its philosophers, its orators - - he knows them all, and in his instructions the appropriate citation from them is always to hand. Like St. Justin he is optimistic in his view of the Pagan culture and the pre-Christian philosophies. Both have in them a vast amount of good; both rightly used can greatly assist the instructed Christian; the religion revealed to the Church is, yet once again, the crown of truth naturally known.

This cultured critique of Paganism, none the less effective for its sympathy with the Pagan's craving for certitude and security, is only one part of Clement's mission. He shows himself -- this man driven by his nature to teach -- equally enthusiastic, equally cultured, equally painstaking in his elaborate instructions on the life the Christian should lead. Not a single occupation of the day, not one of the phases of that sophisticated civilisation escapes him. His audience is made up of that immense majority of human beings who are tied to the life of the city by a hundred obligations. They cannot, if they would, leave the world for the desert. Clement proposes to teach them how to remain in the world and yet be perfect Christians. It is a little the mission of St. Francis d Sales fourteen hundred years later, in a civilisation so very different, and where yet human nature is so very much the same, and tried in the same way. And it is in the same spirit of cultured optimism that Clement too, priest here as well as philosopher, directs his hearers.

Finally Clement is a theologian, using his trained mind to develop the data of the traditional belief. As a theologian he

knows, and respects, and makes much of "the fixed rule of the tradition." He proclaims himself as heir of the ancients from whom he learnt the Faith in the days before he met Pantenus, and is careful to note that what they taught was valuable because they had received it from the Apostles, from Peter and Paul, John and James. Peter is "the chosen one, the elect, the first of the disciples for whom alone the Saviour paid the tribute money," and so attached is Clement to Peter's prestige that he will not have it that it was Peter the Apostle whom St. Paul "resisted to his face" at Antioch. That unfortunate was another Peter. one of the seventy-two disciples ! It is from the Apostles, again, that bishops derive the authority by which they rule. Of all doctrines the Church's doctrine is to be preferred, because it is traditional. It is the role of Philosophy to prepare the mind to receive this doctrine, and it is on the basis of this doctrine that Clement proposes to build what is, for him, the crown of the Christian's achievement, the perfect knowledge (Gnosis) to which only the perfect Christian attains.

This superstructure, or rather Clement's view of its nature, goes beyond what the Church had ever taught. It is Clement's personal (and erroneous) contribution to the theology of man's knowledge of God. But, even for Clement, it depends for whatever truth it can claim to possess on the previous acceptance of the Church's traditional teaching. The point is important, for Clement, so often claimed as a "liberal protestant," born seventeen hundred years before his time, is a Catholic as his very mistakes clearly prove. He shares the common Alexandrian fault of an over-fondness for allegorising the meaning of Sacred Scripture, and, more seriously still, in his eagerness to discover the traditional teaching in his beloved philosophers (the Trinity, for example, in Plato) he runs the risk of deforming it. Again, though his division of practising Christians into two classes, those who live by faith and those raised to knowledge, might accord with the traditional distinction between life according to precept and life according to counsel, Clement's introduction of the Platonic idea that the possession of knowledge adds, of itself, to moral perfection opens the way to all manner of error. In the same spirit of optimism he introduces into his moral teaching a canonisation of what it is hard to distinguish from the Stoic virtue of indifference (apatheia).

Clement guided the school at Alexandria for more than twenty years. In the persecution of 202 he made his way to Cappadocia where his friend Alexander was now bishop, and when Alexander was imprisoned administered the see for him. The last record of him is a letter from Alexander, written in 215, which speaks of him as dead. That letter is addressed to Clement's one time pupil, Origen, now himself in turn director of the theological school. To have formed Origen is perhaps Clement's chief title to fame.

Origen, born 185, was Christian from his birth, the child of parents who lived only for their faith. Unlike Clement in this, he was unlike him, too, in race; for Origen, to all appearance, was of the native Egyptian stock. He was still a student when his father was martyred (202). The sentence entailed the confiscation of the family property, and the youth began his career as a teacher to help t- keep his mother and her numerous family. When Clement fled to Caesarea, Origen took his place as director of the theological school. The heroism to which Origen was so movingly to exhort his contemporaries, was, from his childhood, the daily affair of his life. It was about this time, too, that in an heroic misunderstanding of the Gospel text, Origen submitted to the famous mutilation which was later to form the technical justification for his dismissal from the school. Like Clement, and like St. Justin before him, Origen was not content with what chances of achieving wisdom he found at home. He travelled much. Greece, Palestine, Arabia, Antioch, Nicomedia, Rome -- he had seen them all and was familiar with what each had to offer the scholar. To defend the faith against its critics he must know what the critics themselves believed, and so he spent years in the schools of the leading philosophers, and notably of Ammonius Saccas. His zeal for the study of the Bible drove him to the original texts and to learn Hebrew. He became known as the most learned of all the Christians, and it was to him that the learning-loving mother of the Emperor Alexander Severus applied for instruction as to the Church's teaching.

He was ordained priest in Palestine by a bishop other than his own, and upon his return home was solemnly deposed by the Bishop of Alexandria, and deprived of his position in the school. He betook himself to the friendly bishop who had ordained him, and thenceforward Caesarea, in Palestine, was his headquarters until in 235, driven by the persecution of Maximin, he made his

way to Cappadocia. In the persecution of Decius he was arrested, imprisoned and tortured. Four years later -- 254 -- he died at Tyre. He had been for forty years the wonder of the Christian world, the oracle universally consulted on points of doctrine and of practice. His knowledge, his logic, his eloquence knew no equal, and his amazing genius was set in a life of ascetic detachment and humility.

His erudition, and his industry, were indeed immense, and its output reckoned at six thousand volumes -- an enormous total even when the slender possibilities of the "book" as the ancients knew it are borne in mind. More important even than the erudition and the industry was the systematic fashion of its exposition. The learning of Clement -- so far as it found expression in writing -- lacks all order. It resembles only too faithfully the meadow to which he himself compared it -- where all things grow and, if sought, are ultimately found. St. Justin, Tertullian, St. Hippolytus had each of them, for the purpose of his own particular controversy, used secular learning to explain and defend the tradition. But beyond the defence of special points there was as yet no Catholic Theology. The only syntheses which claimed to set out a rational orderly exposition of religious truth, from the first movements of the Divine Life ad extra down to the last destiny of created things, were the Gnostic systems. It is Origen's chief title to fame that, first of all Christian scholars, he set himself to construct a vast synthesis in which the many sided truths of the traditional faith should be displayed in all their related harmony. Much of that work has perished. Enough remains to make very clear the reason of the admiring veneration with which his contemporaries regarded him.

In Scripture, besides a great mass of commentaries which covered every book of the Bible, he published that stupendous instrument of textual scholarship, the Hexapla. Here were set out, in six parallel columns, four Greek versions and two Hebrew versions of the Old Testament in an endeavour to ascertain the value of the Septuagint text. Then, as an apologist, he wrote the eight books Against Celsus, the most perfect apologetic work of the primitive Church, in answer to the mightiest attack on Christianity that Paganism ever produced. His theological reputation depends chiefly, however, on his Summa, the Book of Principles (Peri Archon). Here, for the first time, a Christian

writer, with no preoccupation with controversy to influence the order of his work or his style, endeavours to explain systematically the whole body of the tradition. That the technical language of theological science was as yet too undeveloped -- to say nothing of the notion of Theology as a science -- to make success possible, does not detract from the glory of the pioneer. Faults, and serious faults, were in the circumstances inevitable; and the product of Origen's mighty erudition was, in the centuries that followed his death, to be more than once the occasion of controversies that aroused the whole Church. Nor are Catholic scholars at one, even to-day, in their opinion of Origen's orthodoxy on many points. But of the genius which places him near to St. Augustine himself, of the encyclopaedic learning, of Origen's real holiness of life and of his constancy in the presence of persecution, there has never been any question. In his own lifetime, for all the misunderstanding between himself and the Bishop of Alexandria, there was never any condemnation of his theories. He died venerated by all the Catholicism of his time. But almost from the moment of his death discussion began and presently from one quarter and another condemnations began to shower upon his work -- though never were any made of the man himself.

The gibe of Celsus -- and of contemporary Paganism generally -- that the Church has no message for any but the illiterate, Origen turns against its authors. The truth of the faith is capable of scientific proof in the Greek manner, and the Christian gladly makes use of other knowledge to explain and prove his Christianity. "The disciples of the philosophers say that Geometry Music, Grammar, Rhetoric, Astronomy are the born companions of Philosophy. We say the same thing of Philosophy itself with regard to Christianity." Nowhere in all this early Christian literature is there a keener realisation of the beauty and the value of the Pagan culture, nowhere a greater confidence in its role of pedagogue to bring the Pagan mind to Christ. Not that, for Origen, the religion of the Church is merely a matter of philosophy, of principle and conclusion. It is for him as for his predecessors a thing revealed, "the model made over to the Churches," and the true prophets of Christ are they who teach the word "as the Church." The test by which he would have his hearers distinguish the true exposition of Christ's teaching from the false is the ancient one -- " Make use of the Church's preaching handed down by the Apostles through the

order of succession, which still to this day remains in the churches. That alone is to be believed as true, which, in every way, accords with the tradition of the Church and the Apostles."

To this tradition all else, even that pursuit of a deeper knowledge which Origen, following Clement, acclaims as a Christian's noblest virtue, is subject. To the primacy of the Church's traditional teaching, even the Hellenic culture must yield. There is no place in the Church for contrary philosophies, and to attempt to introduce them is criminal. Hoc fecit infelix Valentinus, et Basilides, hoc fecit et Marcion haereticus. The schools where these men expound their personal interpretations are no better than brothels. Haeretici aedificant lupanar in omni via, ut puta magister de officina Valentini, magister de coetu Basilidis, magister de tabernaculo Marcionis. The Church has its rulers the bishops. Not all of them, he notes, are models. "At times we surpass in pride the wicked princes of the heathens. A little more of it and we, too, shall have our bodyguard like the King. Terror walks in our wake. We live apart, inaccessible to all -- and especially to the poor. To those who petition us we are haughtier than any tyrant, than even the most cruel of kings. Such is the state of things in many a famous church, especially in the churches of our greatest cities." Origen knows then what a bad bishop can be. He is not thereby confused as to the place of the bishop in the Church. The bishop is sovereign over clergy and laity alike. As he has the power to offer sacrifice, so he has the power to rule and to expel unworthy members for the safety of the whole body. Finally the bishop is the teacher. Origen makes much of the possession of knowledge as itself a virtue, and the perfect Christian is the instructed Christian, the Christian who "knows", Origen's "gnostic." Logically he makes much, also, of the Church's learned men, doctores ecclesiae, of whom he is proud to be one. But the final word, yet once again, is not with individual learning but with authority. In doctrine, as in morals, the bishops are the judge of what is in conformity with the tradition.

The Church's teaching is, then, the starting point of Origen's exposition. He notes that while some truths are taught as certain others are to some extent matters for discussion. The traditional teaching of the Church is completed by the study of Sacred Scripture and of Philosophy. Origen is perhaps the most scriptural of all theologians. It is to Scripture he goes for the

solution of all his problems; and Scripture for him had three meanings the literal; the moral -- that is, the meaning useful for the spiritual welfare of the soul; and finally the " spiritual " -- that is, the allegory which contains a doctrine about the relation of God to His universe. Origen by no means ignores or discounts the literal sense, but it is the allegory of the moral and spiritual interpretations which most attract this great Alexandrian, as it had attracted Alexandrian Judaism centuries before him.

He is not so enthusiastic as Clement, his master, in the employment of Philosophy as an auxiliary, despite his enthusiasm for Philosophy. He does not so much use philosophical data to explain Christian doctrine, to accredit it with the Pagan world, but rather, in his theological exposition, he thinks like a philosopher. The philosopher, the enthusiast for Greek learning, is revealed in the spirit of his work rather than in the presence there of any definite philosophical teaching. For all the time Origen spent in the schools of Ammonius Saccas, he cannot be claimed as a neo-Platonist. God is one, incomprehensible, impassible; and in this unity there are the three hypostases Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The second term of this Trinity, the Son or Logos, is God, yet distinct from the Father, begotten from all eternity. "There never was a time when the Son was not," he said, refuting Arius a century before that heretical Alexandrian appeared; and the Son is of the [same] substance as the Father -- the Nicene teaching and even, perhaps, the Nicene formula homoousion.

So far, on these fundamental points, Origen is undoubtedly orthodox; but the faulty terminology of some of his obiter dicta led later to the suspicion that, in the matter of the relation of the Son to the Father, he taught a subordinationist theory. Like the Apologists who preceded him, he relates the generation of the Logos to the creation, and, a very serious error, he teaches a theory of eternal creation -- there never was a time, according to Origen, when there were no creatures, God's omnipotence being eternal. Here Origen's speculation leads him to the theories for which, in the centuries ahead, he was to be most savagely attacked. For the subject of this eternal creation is the world of spirits, created equal in gifts and powers and endowed with free will. From the varying degrees in which, at the moment of trial, they were faithful to the Creator there have resulted all the subsequent inequalities of the Universe, moral and physical. Of

the original spirits some became angels, the hierarchy of heavenly powers; others, the sun, moon and stars; others, the souls of men; and yet others, the demons. No term has been set to this evolution, and according to their conduct it is in the power of all spirits to regain the height from which they have fallen, and, in another world which will come into being upon the consummation of this present world, to work out their new destinies. The spirits who, in greater or less degree, fell in the hour of trial are provided with bodies of one kind or another -- even the angels have a body of a " subtle " kind -- and in that union of body and soul they expiate their sin and work out their salvation. But not through their own efforts alone are they saved. They are assisted by the intervention of the Logos, Who to that end, finally Himself became incarnate, uniting Himself first to a human soul and thereby to a human body.

Jesus Christ, the Logos became man; He is then really man and really God. The redeeming death of Jesus Christ was universal in its effect, profiting not only men, but all reasonable beings wheresoever found. That this treasury may be his, however, man must co-operate with God Who offers it to him. God's help is essential, a sine qua non, but even this is powerless unless by act and will man co-operates. One form of God's help is the gift of Faith. Another is the higher gift of knowledge (gnosis). "It is much better to be convinced of our teaching by reason and knowledge than by simple faith," and Origen -- though not so enthusiastically as Clement divides the faithful into two classes according to this principle. The Christian who is " gnostic " has greater obligations. He should live austerely, practising continency, preserving virginity and living apart from the world.

After death there is the life to come, and, for most men, a certain purification in quodam eruditionis loco, through a baptism of fire. The less a man has to expiate the less will he suffer. Heaven is the full revelation of the mysteries of God and union with Christ. The old apocalyptic notion of an actual material kingdom of Christ on earth where with His saints he will reign for a thousand years Origen rejects, as he rejects the theories of the transmigration of souls. The wicked will be punished by fire -- a special kind of fire for each individual, bred of his own individual wickedness. Will this punishment last eternally. Here Origen hesitates, and except for some of the fallen angels, teaches that in the end all God's intelligent creation will be reconciled to Him.

Not all will enjoy the same degree of happiness, but all will be happy in some degree.

The premises on which the vast system is based are excellent. But along with all the vast learning, and the deep thought, that produces the system, there is an amazing amount of rash conjecture and of unproved assertion. Origen is indeed "like some great river in flood, which in its very abundance, brings down together the rich fertilising mud and the sand whence comes sterility." And in this great synthesis there is one thing lacking. Nowhere does Origen, ex professo, discuss the nature of the Church itself. For good or for ill, however, he was to dominate all theological development until St. Augustine, and in the East until long after. Even his opponents were obliged, in their fight agains this influence, to use his learning and to copy his methods. St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, the champions of Catholicism in the doctrinal controversies of the next century, are all his pupils; for if there descended from him to the theology of the Greek-speaking Church a looseness and a vagueness from which the West was preserved, that same Church more than once found in Origen the best of defences against the speculations of heresy.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



7. MITHRAISM

Before we come to the final discussions which bring this century of controversy and crisis to an end, something must be said of yet another ancient religion from the East which, by now, was racing for the primacy of popularity. This was the cult of Mithra.

Mithra, originally, in the religion of ancient Persia is the god of Light. In the religion of the Avesta he is a god of the second rank, the judge of the dead, the god who keeps men to their promises, the god of Honour then, and especially of military honour. He sees all things and the Sun is his eye. With the fourth century B.C. the cult spread to Chaldea, and Chaldean astrological theologies influenced it, working out an identity between Mithra and the Sun God. About the same time Alexander's conquest of Persia brought Mithraism into relation with the Greek mythology, and thence derived a more aesthetic interpretation of the rites and the myth. Finally the later Roman conquest of the East opened to the cult the whole of the West, and from the end of the first century (A.D.) Mithraism was a settled religion in the West and rapidly developing. Merchants and oriental slaves took it to all the ports of the western world, but the chief agent of its spread was undoubtedly the army, and with the legionaries it soon travelled to the very frontiers. As a religion it has its foundation in the great eastern theory of the dual origin of all reality. To fight the evil principle, beings are created intermediary between God and man. Mithra is one of these heroes and gradually, as the theories develop, he comes to eclipse all the other heroes, and even the transcendent divinity, as the God of Light and the protector of mankind.

The culminating point of the Mithra legend is his victorious conflict with the bull, and from the slain bull flows all life and all usefulness. Finally Mithra ascends to Heaven in a fiery chariot driven by the Sun. He will, however, return once more. There will be a second slaying of the bull, whence will come immortality for the faithful, and then a general conflagration will destroy the wicked, the demons, and the principle of evil, Ahriman himself.

The cult was organised in circles of restricted membership

which divided and sub-divided as their members increased. It had an elaborate liturgy in which ablutions, an anointing with honey, fasts, and a ritual banquet of bread and water played their part. The initiation was through seven degrees, animals were sacrificed, and the candidate was received through a baptism of blood which poured from the bull slain above him. The meetings took place in caves, and crypts built to resemble caves, decorated with pictures of Mithra slaying the bull. The weekly holy day, naturally, was Sunday and, equally naturally, the Equinoxes were regarded as a sacred season, and the date of Mithra's birth, placed at the winter solstice -- December 25.

That the cult was immensely popular with the army there is no doubt, nor of its influence in the third century. But that it ever threatened the future victory of Christianity is a matter infinitely less certain. It has, however, been the subject of much loose thinking, as has been also the question of the analogies between Mithraism and the religion of the Church. Fr. Martindale [] summarises the position very fairly, setting side by side M. Salomon Reinach's neatly phrased thesis and the no less skilfully worded examination of Pere Lagrange. "M. Salomon Reinach thus sums it up: ' Mithra is the mediator between God and man; he secures salvation to mankind by a sacrifice; the cult includes baptism, communion, fasts; his disciples call themselves brothers; in the Mithraist clergy there are men and women vowed to celibacy; there is a moral code which is of obligation and which is identical with that of Christianity.' We have here a series of scornful affirmations to which Pere Lagrange can oppose another series of flat denials. 'The fasts and the brotherhood we can admit -- and they are found in every religion that ever was. Everything else is incorrect. Mithra is called "mediator" once-in Plutarch, and he is mediator between the God of Goodness and the God of Evil. We have no knowledge of any direct relation between the sacrifice of the bull and salvation. Nor is Mithra ever sacrificed, as was Jesus. The Mithraist baptism is a simple ablution in no way different from any other; the communion is nothing more than an offering of bread and water, nor can anyone say it was even intended to represent Mithra; women, usually, had no part in the mysteries of Mithra and could not, therefore, have been there dedicated to celibacy. . . as to men, in that respect, we know nothing except for a single text of Tertullian. . . a text which has been misinterpreted. Every moral code sets out to be obligatory, more

or less, and if that of Mithra was identical with the Christian code why did Julian the Apostate-himself a devotee of Mithra -- recommend the Christian code as a model to Pagans?' "

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



8. THE MANICHEES

It was in this third century, critical in so many ways for Christianity, that a new religion began to be preached which, although proscribed everywhere from its very first appearance, did not cease to trouble the peace of the world for another thousand years. This was that famous Manicheism which Christians and Mohammedans, Pagan emperors of Rome and Chinese mandarins, all in their turn repressed with all possible severity. It was a cult that very soon disappeared from sight indeed, but it persisted as the strongest religious undergrowth of all time; and it would be a bold assertion to say that we have yet heard the last of it. There are few features of the general history of the Church better known than its persistent struggle against the Manichees -- the Bogres, Cathari, Albigenses of the Middle Ages -- and yet it is only within the last twelve years that we have had any truly reliable information about the origins of the sect and about its founder. []

Mani, a Persian by birth, set himself to found a new religion which should contain all the religious wisdom hitherto known. In this conscious and ambitious syncretist, that long drawn out business comes to its final perfection. Mani is the contemporary of those imperial patrons of syncretism, Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus, and in the years during which they enthroned the Syrian influences at Rome, Mani, from the other side of Syria, made the long pilgrimage still further to the East, in his search for yet more religious wisdom, to India and to the Buddhists.

For Mani, there had been, in the career he had chosen, three great practitioners already, Our Lord, Zoroaster, and Buddha, three interpreters of a single wisdom. They had only preached: Mani would also write, and so secure for "my religion" a world empire such as no religion had so far known. The time was indeed to come when it would, for a time, win over the great intelligence of St. Augustine in Africa, and gain a real hold as far to the east as China. And the main arm of its propaganda would be the book, and its illustrations.

There is something of Montanism in the new religion, for Mani

declares himself to be one body and spirit with the Paraclete, the spirit sent by Jesus Christ. At the same time it embodies a mythological doctrine about the origin of the universe which is akin to that of such Gnostics of the previous century as Basilidie's and Valentine. And Mani owes much to Marcion also.

In this new amalgam, the existence of two first principles of all things -- the good and the bad -- is all important, for around the unending struggle of the good god and the bad god everything else turns. This the key to the whole system, as it is the key to Mani's explanation of the universe.

The ascetic ideal was pitched high -- so high, indeed, that the sect was divided into the Perfect, bound to practice what it was the unforgiveable sin to fail in even once, and the Hearers, who accepted the ideal indeed but, fearful of their ability to live up to it, put off their reception until the last hour of life. The seeming simplicity with which the theory of a dual first principle solved the torturing riddle of the existence of evil, the stiff ascetic ideals, and the spectacle of the life of the Perfect, fascinated thousands, in Mani's time and for centuries afterwards. For these devotees the moral horrors, and such repugnant practices as the ritual slow suicide, were altogether obscured. Nothing availed, in the end, but to destroy the Manichees, as so much noxious human vermin -- so, everywhere, said those to whom it fell to undertake the work of destruction. Mani was not only a cool headed prophet, but an organiser of genius. The new religion was strongly built, and the prophet's first coadjutors were well chosen. Mani's violent end -- he was crucified by the Persian king Bahram in 272 -- did not appreciably halt the progress of his sect. It gradually drew to itself the remains of the Marcionite church, and established itself in the lands between Persia and China. It was the last phase of organised Gnosticism, and the most successful of all.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



9. DENIS OF ALEXANDRIA -- PAUL OF SAMOSATA

The century which follows the *Adversus Haereses* of St. Irenaeus ends, as it begins, with a Trinitarian controversy and an intervention of the Roman Church. Curiously enough it is a controversy that concerns the very points which had then engaged the attention of the pope St. Victor I. It reveals to us yet another sympathetic figure of the Alexandrian school of theology-St. Denis, Bishop of Alexandria -- and a Bishop of Antioch whose life bears out to the letter Origen's anticipatory warnings on the temptations which beset prelates in the empire's greatest cities-Paul of Samosata.

Denis of Alexandria was Origen's own pupil. After a period as head of the Catechetical School he was elected bishop in 247, and he ruled the Church of the great metropolis for as long as seventeen years. It was an eventful episcopate. To begin with, there was the persecution of Decius in which the bishop was arrested. From the trial which awaited him he was, to his embarrassment, rescued by some of his flock and forcibly hurried into safety. The persecution over, he had to face the problem of the reconciliation of the repentant apostates. His solution of the question was that adopted at Rome, and he took the Roman side again when, three or four years later, St. Cyprian raised the question of the validity of heretical baptism. In the persecution which crowned St. Cyprian's life with martyrdom, Denis was again arrested, tried and exiled. How he escaped death it is hard to understand. He returned to Alexandria when the persecution ended, to find the city given over to a civil war in which it was almost destroyed. To add to the troubles the plague came to devastate the surviving population.

The years of St. Denis' episcopate were then hardly the most suitable for the exercise of the talents which had given him his place in the succession to Origen. But interest in religion was inseparable from the intellectual life of the time; the elaboration of new theories and their passionate discussion, endemic. The occasion which would call forth all the bishop's talents was bound to come.

It presented itself in a revival of the Monarchist theories of

Sabellius, of which the five cities of Cyrenaica were the scene. Once more, in their zealous attempts to defend the truth that there is only one God, Christian thinkers were sacrificing the other truth that Father, Son and Holy Spirit are realities really distinct. For these neo-Sabellians the Trinity was a mere matter of names; God is one and according as He is successively Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier, He is Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The controversy reached Alexandria in an appeal to the bishop from the contending parties. There could be little doubt where so faithful a disciple of Origen would range himself, and St. Denis wrote strongly to Cyrenaica defending the reality of the Trinity. He also wrote to the pope, Sixtus II. It was, however, the misfortune of the Bishop of Alexandria that he did not content himself with a repetition of the tradition in face of the new theory, but criticised that theory in the light of his own, Origenist theology. This, for whatever anti-Origenists there were at Alexandria, was an opportunity not to be neglected. They denounced the bishop to Rome. The pope -- it was no longer Sixtus II but a successor, also named Denis -- had the matter formally examined. He objected to several details of the Bishop of Alexandria's refutation of the Sabellians - - his use of the word "creature" to describe God the Son, for example, and his reluctance to use the word homoousios (consubstantial) to describe the relation of the Son to the Father; and he objected also that his defence of the reality of the distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost by a theory of three distinct hypostases was so expressed that it might be taken as a theory that there were three Gods.

This was communicated to St. Denis in a private letter which invited him to explain the difficulties. With that letter there went a new public condemnation of the Sabellian theories, and also, no names being mentioned, of whoever taught that the Son was a creature, or that the three of the Divine Trinity were separate hypostases. St. Denis gave his explanations -- four books of a "Refutation and Explanations" -- and satisfied Rome of the perfect orthodoxy of his thought. Once more, in a vital controversy involving the traditional faith, Rome has declined to philosophise. There are in presence the innovators and the Catholic who uses against them the weapon of theological theory. Rome stands by the tradition, condemns the innovation by reference to the tradition, and as dispassionately criticises -- again by reference to the tradition -- the theory which the

Catholic has constructed to defend the tradition. The procedure is already traditional, and it throws a great deal of light on the practical working of the potentior principalitas of the Roman Church.

The date of this correspondence between Denis of Alexandria and Denis of Rome is somewhere about 262. About the same time the Bishop of Alexandria was drawn into a second controversy which brought him into relation with the greatest centre of Christianity in the East -- Antioch. The Bishop of Antioch at the moment was Paul, a native of Samosata. The moment was one of political debacle throughout the East. The disasters of the Persian War were a recent memory, with the defeat and the shameful captivity of the Emperor himself. The flood of the Persian invasion had barely subsided, and Antioch was under the rule of one of the border States to which Rome's weakness promised a new opportunity of expansion, the Kingdom of Palmyra and its queen Zenobia. With the new ruler, Paul of Samosata was on the very best of terms, and he contrived to combine a high position in the State Treasury with his leadership of the Church of Antioch. Cultured, worldly, profligate even, this aspect of his career fills more space in the contemporary record than the more important, but less alluring, theme of his heresies. Nevertheless, it was his heresies which finally provoked the intervention of neighbouring bishops and his deposition.

The heresies offered in sum, nothing very new. They were little more than a re-edition of the theories of Theodotus and of Artemas.

Jesus Christ was not divine in the same way that the Father was divine, for the Logos dwelt in Jesus Christ simply as in a temple. Moreover, the Divine Logos was simply an attribute or faculty of God and not a divine Person. Jesus Christ could only be said to be divine in so far as the Divinity had adopted Him. The opposition to Paul's novelties showed itself immediately, and between 263 and 268 at least three councils were held at Antioch to judge its bishop's orthodoxy. To these St. Denis was invited, but old age stood in the way of his personal intervention. The long thousand miles journey was more than he dared attempt. It was another pupil of Origen upon whom fell the role of defender of the tradition -- Firmilian, Bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia,

the ally, ten years before, of St. Cyprian.

But Paul of Samosata was too subtle an adversary for the orthodox. Time and again he eluded the prosecution, and not until 268 was the case so handled that he was forced into an open declaration of his dissent. The hero of this was one of his priests, Malchion, the head of the school at Antioch, and its scene a council in which seventy or eighty bishops took part. Paul was deposed, Domnus elected in his place and letters sent to Alexandria and to Rome, communicating the decisions. But Paul was not at the end of his resources and, strong in the support of Zenobia, he held out for four years more, refusing to surrender either church or palace. The deadlock only ended with the new Emperor Aurelian's victory over Zenobia (272). Antioch was once more a Roman city and the suit for Paul's dispossession came before the emperor. He decided that the Bishop of Antioch was the man whom the bishops of Italy and Rome acknowledged to be such. Paul was therefore ejected.

One interesting point about this last controversy of the third century is that while the champions of orthodoxy were all onetime pupils of Origen, the heresiarch, too, made use of the master's terminology to defend himself and to baffle the prosecution. His use of one term in particular drew down upon it the censure of the bishops. This was the term *homoousios*. Rome, seeing in it the Greek equivalent of Tertullian's *consubstantialis*, by now the consecrated term in the West to describe how both Father and Son were divine, had, a few years before, overridden Denis of Alexandria's objections to its use. Denis, a Greek, with a philosopher's experience of the subtle possibilities of his native language, had then feared that *homoousios* might be taken to mean "identical in person" and therefore seem Sabellian. Now, in 268, Paul of Samosata had been able to exploit in the interests of his theory yet a third interpretation of the term. The Council of Antioch had thereupon condemned it. Sixty years afterwards and more that condemnation was to bear unlooked for fruit. For when the Council of Nicea used the word *homoousios* to defend the traditional faith against Arianism, the heretics retorted with the charge that the Catholics were the real heretics, alleging in proof the objections of Denis of Alexandria, while the old condemnation of the term, now become the touchstone of orthodoxy, was an embarrassment for many of the Catholics.

There is, however, a more intimate connection still between this crisis of 263-268, of which unfortunately we know so little, and the Council of Nicea. With Paul of Samosata there disappeared from the clergy of Antioch one of his leading allies, the priest Lucian. The name should be noted for Lucian was the teacher of Arius and the real father of Arianism.

With Aurelian's decision regarding the property of the Church of Antioch there begins a period of thirty years, of whose history we know nothing. Save for the general description -- a few sentences -- of Catholic life at this time in the great history of Eusebius, nothing has survived beyond names and dates in the lists of the bishops of the principal sees. When in 303 the veil lifts, it is to reveal all the horrors of the persecution of Diocletian, the Empire's last assault on the religion of the Church. That assault is the prelude to the Empire's conversion. With that conversion the setting of the Church's life is so different that we can speak of the period which follows as a new age. The formative period is now at an end. It is the history of an undeniable world force which lies before us.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 5: THE WAY OF CHRISTIAN LIFE

INTRODUCTION

Le milieu païen, cet immense océan de superstitions et de rêves que le courant chrétien dut traverser sans s'y mêler. []

THE current was threefold. It was a revealed doctrine, it was a thing organised, and it was a special way of life. So far we have been concerned with the fortunes of the doctrine and of the means divinely devised for its propaganda and protection as the current moves slowly through the ocean. The study is incomplete if it neglects some description of how the ideal of Christian life fared during these first momentous centuries.

The foundation of that life was the spirit of renunciation, of good things for the better, of all things for the sake of God, as the gospels describe it. For some of the Christians this knows no limits. Property, marriage, life itself they will gladly renounce to give themselves more fully to the following of Christ, Who is from the beginning the one centre of their new religious life. Others give up less, but something each must give up, for in each disciple there must be that permanent willingness to renounce whatever is asked, whenever it is asked. Renunciation is not cultivated for its own sake, nor with the purpose of perfecting the disciple's own personality. It is an imitation of Christ, made in union with Christ, its purpose ever closer union with Christ. It is an activity of that new life which has come to the disciple through fellowship in the Church and the mystic incorporation with Christ -- a life which never ceases to be dependent on Christ. This life begins with the rite of Baptism; and the chief means through which it is increased and the union between Christ and the disciple consummated, is the rite of the Eucharist. This new mystical, super-natural union with God is the source of the believer's new relation to his fellows. He is to love them as himself, not with the natural love that springs from his appreciation of their natural attractiveness, but with a super-natural love deriving from his new relation to God. God loves them, and therefore the disciple, loving God, loves them for God's sake. This love of the disciple for his fellows is the very

mark by which his discipleship is recognisable.

This doctrine, which characterises especially the Gospel of St. John, is also the teaching of the epistles of St. Paul. The two principles of spiritual self-denial and of the constant union between the believer and God are, here again, the foundation on which all is built, although St. Paul's approach to the subject is not that of St. John. Though the new life is given in Baptism, something of the old survives. Whence a lifelong contest between new and old or, as St. Paul says, between Flesh and Spirit. These terms recur often in St. Paul, and following him they become, for all time, the common coin of spiritual teaching with orthodox and heretic alike. It is important to note the meaning St. Paul gives them. By "Flesh" is not meant merely the temptation to sensuality in matters of sex. The term stands rather for human nature as the fall of the first man affected it, crippled, disordered, no longer answering naturally to reasonable control, and therefore ever afterwards a source of rebellion, a thing which the unaided human will is unable to dominate. Left to itself this fallen human nature is a source of sin. Baptism, making the baptized one with Christ, breaks that ancient dominion of the first sin over human nature, but yet not so completely that it cannot make new bids to recover. Whence the life of the disciple is a continual struggle; and St. Paul has a rich store of comparisons to emphasise this truth. A second obstacle to the disciple's progress is the World -- the mass of men who, for one reason or another, live in habitual disregard of the Spirit, in habitual affection for the Flesh. No disciple can possibly love the World. In St. Paul, too, we see the two classes of disciples with greater or less perfection for their aims, and, as a means to perfection, we find recommended that peculiarly Christian notion of consecrated virginity. The notion involves no disparagement of marriage or of sex. On the contrary, whoever practises continency is considered as denying himself an important good.

In the two centuries or more which separate the Apostles from the convert emperors of the fourth century, the believer never lacked eloquent guides to remind him of the fundamental principles which should control his life. Here is a theme to which every Christian writer of these centuries returns sooner or later. " There are two roads: the road to life, the road to death," begins the Didache, and the parable speedily becomes a commonplace

of the primitive moral exhortations. "The road to life" -- the love of God, obedience to His commands, flight from sin, from sexual wrongdoing, perjury, lying, theft, avarice, blasphemy, avoidance of whatever disturbs the unity of the Church, the practice of almsgiving, the care of children, obedience to authority, humility. The apostolic theme of the continual warfare is not neglected, and the never-ceasing persecution gives rise to a whole literature exhorting to patience and constancy in the hour of trial, to confidence in Christ for Whom the martyr is privileged to suffer. To comfort and strengthen the confessor and the martyr all the great writers in turn set their genius, Tertullian, Origen and St. Cyprian very notably. In all this literature the one common, dominating feature is the reference to Christ as the centre and goal of the whole idealism as this is preached and as it is lived. It is no detached theorising about an indubitable but distant God which these theologians present, St. Ignatius, St. Irenaeus and the rest. A vivid faith in His presence in the very hearts of those for whom they write is the very life of their work. And, of course, nowhere is this so manifest as with the martyrs. The martyrs were the crown of every church's achievement.

After the martyrs came another class of spiritual heroes -- the continentes and the virgins, those who bound themselves, for the love of Christ, to a life of perpetual continency. There is no ascetical practice so praised, so exalted by these early writers as this; and the number of those who gave themselves to it is the boast of the Apologists, as it was the marvel of the contemporary Pagans who knew it. The continentes are cited too, and continually, as a powerful force for good among the believers themselves, a living exhortation to the whole Church. Those who so devoted themselves continued, as yet, to live with their families, but very soon they came to form a kind of spiritual aristocracy in every church, along with the widows, who, in a like spirit, made a perpetual consecration of their widowhood. From a very early time so important a matter ceased to be left to the discretion of the individual. The consent of the bishop was essential before the irrevocable life-long dedication was allowed. A ritual of consecration developed, and an age limit was introduced earlier than which no one could be accepted. The care of these specially consecrated believers took up much of a bishop's time, and warnings against the pitfalls that lay before the virgin, the especially insidious temptation to pride, self-esteem, and a contemning of the ordinary folk, fill many pages

of the contemporary exhortations *Ad Virgines*. It was natural, too, at first to recommend, and later to enact, that for their own greater security, and for the seemliness of the thing, such as were thus dedicated should lead a life of retirement. They should not appear at public banquets, nor at weddings, should avoid the public amusements and the baths, should dress soberly, without jewels or cosmetics, and in public always go veiled. To the ordinary fasts which bound the whole Church they added still more, and in their retirement multiplied the hours of prayer, meeting together privately for the purpose. Naturally, occupied with little but the service of God, they soon became the Church's recognised agents for the vast charitable services which were this primitive Christianity's leading activity -- care of the widows, of orphans, of the sick, and the systematic relief of the poor and distressed.

The movement did not progress without serious aberrations showing themselves from time to time. There was the tendency to value these abstinences for their own sake, to declare the use of wine for example, of flesh meat, of marriage, things evil in themselves -- a tendency related, very often, to the theory that matter is necessarily evil. St. Paul had to warn Timothy against such "saints," but for all authority's faithful adherence to his example the tendency never ceased to show itself. Apocryphal Acts of particular apostles, forged to give a sanction to these theories, did much to make them popular, and no doubt the every day experience of the excesses of contemporary Paganism helped very considerably in the same direction. It is also interesting to notice that rigorism of this kind is associated with all the early heresies, the mark of Montanists, Marcionites and Gnostics alike.

From the tendency to control and regulate the daily life and occupation of the continentes was to come, ultimately, the institution of Christian Monasticism. [] "Happy the virgin who places herself under a rule," runs a fourth century saying "she shall be as a fruitful vine in a garden. Unhappy is the virgin who will not follow a rule, she is as a ship that lacks a rudder." From St. Jerome (347-420) and St. Ambrose (340-397) we can learn many details of what such a rule was. These ladies live at home a life of seclusion, going out rarely. They wear their hair cut short, their long-sleeved dress is black and they are veiled. They have a round of private prayer at home and certain daily prayers

in common in the church. They fast, taking each day one meal only, and that without meat. This meal, too, they often take in common. They serve the poor and they attend the sick. From such a state of things to the life of a convent is but a step. As early as 270 we find St. Antony of Egypt placing his sister in a house where a number of like-minded holy women lived a common life, and by 300 such institutions were fairly numerous.

This was not the only source whence monasticism developed. There were others of the continent who, although they no longer lived with their families, preferred to live alone, solitaries, on the outskirts of the towns first, and then further away still in the "desert." Of these anchorites or hermits the pioneer is St. Paul of Thebes. More famous, however, is his disciple Antony (c. 250-355). Such was this hermit's fame that, despite his opposition, disciples gathered round him and pursued him into the very depths of the Egyptian deserts, until, in the Nitrian desert, there were, about 325, more than 5,000 solitaries, of both sexes. They lived in separate huts without any common rule, each a law unto himself, meeting at the church on the Sundays for Mass, to receive the Holy Eucharist and a spiritual instruction. They chose their own austerities, each according to his own fancy, and were their own judges as to the extent to which these should be continued. There were hermits who hardly ever ate, or slept, others who stood without movement whole weeks together, or who had themselves sealed up in tombs and remained there for years, receiving only the least of poor nourishment through crevices in the masonry. The fervour of the oriental found in this primitive monasticism all it could crave of opportunity for sacrificial self-despoilment. In the fourth century more especially, when to the persecution there followed an era of comfort, and when, in the saying of a contemporary, there were many more Christians but less Christianity, did the zeal of the more perfect lead them into the desert.

The hermit movement presently had a competitor in the monastic movement properly so-called -- the foundation in the desert of institutes where the members led a common life, working, praying, practising austerities, studying the Sacred Scriptures, under the rule of a superior. In these institutions the will of the superior was the guide and the norm. The austerities, no less than the prayers, were regulated by his discretion. The pioneer of this movement was St. Pachomius, and his first

foundation-a monastery for men and one for women -- at Tabennisi dates from about 320.

From Egypt the movement spread to Palestine and here a disciple of St. Antony, Hilary, devised yet a third form of the life, the Laura. The Laura was a village of cells or huts, so that each monk lived alone as did the hermits, but the community was subject to a superior as in the monastery. This system became rapidly popular, and many of these monastic villages counted each its thousand of monks. Jerusalem, in the fourth century, became a great centre for monks of every kind of monastic life, the capital, in fact, of monasticism, and St. Jerome the movement's presiding genius.

Syria had its monks, Asia Minor, too, and here, towards the middle of the fourth century, this eastern monasticism produced the great saint whose rule was to fix its characteristics for the rest of time -- St. Basil (329-79). St. Basil was a reformer of the practical type. He had travelled much, had seen every aspect of contemporary monasticism in one country and another, and when he came to draw up a rule it was much more a code of life than any of the so-called rules which preceded it. He it was who invented the novitiate -- a systematic probation of aspirants, who were to be trained primarily to the renouncement of their own way, obedience being the monk's great virtue and the means of his spiritual progress. And the monasteries were not to be over large -- thirty or forty monks only to each superior. This was in very striking contrast to the monasteries of the Pachomian type where, as with the system of the Laura, the monks were to be numbered by the thousand.

For St. Basil the community type of life is a higher form than the hermit life; and from this moment the hermit life declines in prestige. All the monks are to come together for all the prayers, and the psalms and singing are to be varied to avoid monotony and the boredom that derives from it. The superior gives his monks instruction, confession of faults to him or to another monk is encouraged, and great emphasis is laid on the necessity of systematic manual work for each monk. The will of the superior is the monk's law in all that concerns his monastic life. Hence no room is now left for personal eccentricity, whether in the matter of devotions or austerities. All exaggerations, and the trouble they breed, disappear. To guard against pride and

vanity no one may go beyond the rule except by the superior's special permission. The abstinence from meat and wine is perpetual. Silence is the law for meals, at the office and during work. The monk never leaves his monastery, except for a just cause, and even then he never goes alone. The sick are to be cared for with every comfort, and hospitality is enjoined as a primary duty. For those who refuse to keep the rule, penalties are provided. But, where St. Pachomius provides floggings and a bread and water diet for serious faults, in St. Basil's rule there is nothing harsher than a kind of temporary internal excommunication.

In the East, by the end of the fourth century, within a hundred years of its first introduction, Monasticism was established as perhaps the most flourishing of all the Church's activities. In the West, it had developed more slowly. Here, too, in every church, there had been, from the first generations, the spiritual aristocracy of continentes and virgins, and, for example at Rome, such women had begun already to live a common life when, towards the middle of the fourth century, the knowledge began to spread of the marvellous happenings in the Egyptian deserts. One important source of this knowledge was the accidental presence, for several years, in Italy and Gaul of the bishop of Alexandria, St. Athanasius, banished from his see by the Arianising policy of the emperor. None knew better than he the detail of the new movement -- of which he was indeed one of the earliest historians -- and to the presence in the West during so many years of the bishop who was, by his position, the very patriarch of nascent monasticism, and by his temperament a master propagandist, much of the sudden growth of the movement in the West may be ascribed. Another source of the West's knowledge of the ascetic marvels of the eastern Churches was the experience of the thousands of pilgrims who, in the first generations of the Christian Empire, made the long journey to Palestine to venerate the sacred places whence the Faith had come.

Some of these pilgrims, attracted by the life, even stayed on, spiritual exiles for the sake of the more perfect life. Of such westerners who so made themselves easterners the most famous is St. Jerome (347-420), and around his life may be written the whole history of early Roman monasticism. His first experience of monasticism was the five years he spent as a

solitary in the desert to the east of Antioch -- a desert so peopled with like-minded souls, that solitude, he found, was the last thing possible. From the desert St. Jerome returned to Rome, and for the next few years he was the centre round which the monastically-minded of the old capital -- women of noble families for the most part -- gathered. In this circle all the stark austerity of the life of the desert found willing adepts, under the learned direction of St. Jerome. There was the inevitable conflict with the less ascetically inclined relatives, and with the still less ascetic Roman clergy, and in the end St. Jerome and his followers left the city, to establish themselves once and for all at Bethlehem (386).

Along with St. Jerome there must also be mentioned his contemporaries the Bishop of Milan, St. Ambrose (340-397) and the future Bishop of Hippo, St. Augustine (354-430). St. Ambrose did much, by his sermons *De Virginibus*, to foster the ideal among his people and to encourage the movement. St. Cyprian is here his master, but St. Ambrose breaks entirely new ground when he suggests Our Lady as the type and model of the consecrated virgin. Milan, under St. Ambrose's direction, became in its turn a centre of the monastic life, and with the progress of the movement came the inevitable opposition. The saint's *De Virginitate* is his reply to it.

In St. Paulinus of Nola, a retired imperial official of high rank who gave himself to the life, monasticism reached another stage of development and with Eusebius, Bishop of Vercelli, it began to affect the clergy too. The priests who served the church of Vercelli lived a life in common, whose spirit was the spirit of monasticism. It is with this clerical type of monasticism that the still greater name of St. Augustine is associated. Some of the best known pages of his *Confessions* record how greatly he was influenced, at the crisis of his life, by the story of the imperial officers whom the example of the hermits in Egypt had won over to monasticism. After his return to Africa the converted scholar, giving up his career and his projected marriage, turned his house at Tagaste into a monastery. There with his friends, their property sold and the proceeds given to the poor, he led a regular life of seclusion, of prayer and study. His ordination in 391 fixed him at Hippo, and at Hippo he once more established a monastery of the same type in which he himself lived. Finally when, in 396, he became Bishop of Hippo he not only continued

his own monastic way of life but brought all his clergy into it also. The episcopal palace itself became a monastery -- a monastery whence, as from Marmoutier and Lerins, monks went forth as bishops to rule more than one of the neighbouring sees. St. Augustine has left descriptions of the life of the community in his sermons, a treatise *De Sancta Virginitate*, another *De Opere Monachorum*, while, from the letter he wrote to restore peace to a community of holy women, later centuries developed the so-called Rule of St. Augustine.

The opposition to monasticism continued. Its strength lay very largely in what remained of Paganism in the old Roman aristocracy, and more than once the city mob rioted in its anti-monastic zeal. There were also the heretics -- Helvidius, for example, who preached against continency, derided the idea of mortification, and even denied the virginity of Mary. Another such was Jovinian, an ex-monk who, man of the world now and practised debauchee, turned -- first of an unhappy line -- to revile and attack all he once had revered. There was, he declared, only one heaven, only one reward for all; and since those validly baptized cannot but be saved, mortifications are but a useless show. He drew replies from St. Ambrose and -- a characteristically waspish one -- from St. Jerome. He was excommunicated by the pope, Siricius (384-398), but his teaching grew, and many apostasies are recorded.

It was, however, in Gaul, and not in Italy, that the first western monks really flourished, where the pioneer was the Bishop of Tours, St. Martin (317-397). St. Martin, born in Pannonia, was the child of a legionary and, despite his early attraction to the hermit life, forced to follow his father into the army. His vocation survived the experiences of the camp, and, once baptized and free of the army (339), he was received into the clergy by St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers. For some years afterwards he lived as a solitary, first near Milan and later on an island in the Mediterranean. St. Hilary, banished to the East for opposition to the Arian Constantius II, returned with a new knowledge of monasticism (361); and it was now that, under his direction, Martin founded at Liguge, close by St. Hilary's cathedral city, the first monastery of the West -- a few huts, one for each monk, grouped round the church in which the monks met for what spiritual exercises they had in common. There was no rule but the mutual good example and the duty of obedience to the

superior. St. Martin was still at Liguge when he was elected Bishop of Tours. The new office made no difference to the man. He continued to live his austere life, to sleep on the bare ground, to wear his old clothes, to fast, to pray as before and, within sight of the walls of Tours, he founded Marmoutier -- another and larger Liguge. Here he lived with his community of eighty monks a life very like that of the Egyptian monasteries of St. Pachomius. Very many of the monks whom this austere life attracted were of noble birth, and from Marmoutier came forth a whole series of bishops -- the first monk-bishops in the Church. By an extraordinary paradox this first great monastery of contemplative solitaries became, and almost immediately, the first great centre of that movement to convert the countrysides of Gaul, whose greatest figure is St. Martin.

St. Martin was, however, not an organiser of monasticism, and it was in monasteries founded a little later, in the south of Gaul, that the first monastic legislators of the West arose. Two monasteries in particular must be noticed -- Lerins, an island off the coast of Provence, and the abbey of St. Victor at Marseilles. At Lerins, founded by a wealthy patrician St. Honoratus (429), the rule of St. Pachomius was held in great veneration, and although not followed to the letter, it undoubtedly influenced the life there. Lerins too was a nursery of bishops, supplying indeed so many bishops to the sees of southern Gaul that it became a matter of complaint between the clergy and the Roman See. Marseilles had for its founder an Eastern who had travelled much. This was John Cassian. He was born about 350, was a monk at Bethlehem in the early days of St. Jerome's career there, and after several years in Egypt came to Constantinople, where in 403 he was ordained deacon by St. John Chrysostom. Four years later he was in Rome, carrying to Innocent I St. John's appeal against his illegal deposition. Finally, in 414, he was ordained priest at Marseilles and founded there the abbey of St. Victor. The rule's inspiration was Eastern, but modified to suit the very different Western conditions. Cassian, however, did much more than found a monastery. He set down his ideas in two books which were to influence monastic thought and theories of spiritual direction for centuries -- his *De Coenobiorum Institutis* and his *Collationes*.

The way of the Counsels -- monasticism in the later centuries, the life of the virgines and continentes in the primitive times --

was, however, the privilege of a minority. This elite was vastly outnumbered by the thousands of believers whom necessity and choice bound to the life of the world, and of whom the churches were chiefly composed. To them also, through the Church, the Spirit spoke. In them, too, ran the same supernatural life, fed from the same sources which nourished those especially consecrated, and producing in the activities of ordinary human life the same superhuman fruits. For these Christians, too, the gospel, -- an institution and a belief -- was also a way of living, a code of conduct based on a teaching, and nourished through a cult.

Conformably to the will of Christ its Founder, the Church received its new adepts through the visible ceremonial rite of Baptism. Closely connected with Baptism was the complementary ceremony of the laying on of hands. St. Justin gives us the earliest detailed description of the rite which has survived, and fifty years later Tertullian is evidence that an explanatory and preparatory ceremonial had already gathered round the primitive nucleus. The ceremony takes place at Easter. The water with which it is administered is especially blessed for the purpose. The candidate makes a previous explicit renunciation of the devil. The baptism is followed by an anointing with blessed oil and an imposition of hands. It is the bishop who officiates, and the candidates prepare for their reception by special prayers and fasts. St. Hippolytus, Tertullian's contemporary, speaks also of an anointing of the catechumen before baptism. The heretics, too, had these ceremonies -- the Marcionites, for example, and many of the Gnostics -- which points to their being established in the Church before the heretics broke away, to an origin that is at least as early as the generation which followed the death of the last apostle.

But the preparatory period was not merely a time of special prayer. From a very early date indeed those who wished to be members of the Church were trained in its doctrines and practices, their sincerity and fervour tested by a long systematic course of instruction. This was the Catechumenate, and in every church there came to be a priest appointed for the purpose of instructing and watching over the Catechumens. The Catechumens had their special place in the assemblies, and during the time of their probation they were prepared for

baptism by a series of preparatory ceremonies, exorcisms for example, blessings and anointings. After the baptism and the anointing and imposition of hands which followed, the newly-initiated received for the first time the Holy Eucharist.

The minister of these public initiatory rites was, originally, always the bishop. Later the custom gradually made its way that the priests, too, assisted at the actual baptism, the bishop blessing the water and the oils but baptizing only a few of the catechumens though still administering to all the rite of anointing and the imposition of hands. Then most of the baptisms fell to the priests. Still later when, in the fourth century, parishes began to be founded outside the cities, the priests in charge of them were allowed to bless the water for Baptism, to baptize all who came to them and to anoint them also, the bishop reserving to himself the blessing of the oils and the final imposition of hands. Such is the Roman practice, at any rate, from the time of Innocent I (402-417).

The centres of the Church's religious life were the weekly assemblies where the bishop presided and at which all the brotherhood assisted. These took place three times each week, on Sunday the weekly feast day, and on the two days of fasting Wednesday and Friday. To Sunday was transferred the ritual importance of the Jewish Sabbath -- in the days of the Apostles themselves--and the observance of the two weekly fast days goes back, at all events, to the closing years of the first century.

The services which occupied the assembly were of two kinds. There were first of all the Vigilia, celebrated in the hours before dawn. These consisted of readings from the Sacred Books, and homilies delivered by the bishop interspersed with prayers and hymns. In the plan of this service there was nothing specifically new, and the same is true of the first part of the second service--the assembly for the Holy Eucharist.

Here, too, there is a preparatory element which the Christians took over bodily from the synagogue -- a service of prayers, hymns, readings from the Sacred Books, and a homily. To this the Christians added readings from their own Sacred Books and made it the preface to their own new liturgy the Holy Eucharist. The origin of this is once more the example and the precept of the Church's Founder, and it is in St. Paul's Epistles and the

Synoptic Gospels that we have the earliest description of the rite- in its essentials a special kind of prayer over the bread and wine, a breaking of the bread and a distribution of the "eucharisted" food to those who assisted.

The Didache, recalling the obligation of this Sunday reunion for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, urges the necessity of a good conscience in those who assist, for that at which they assist is the pure sacrifice foretold of old by the prophet Malachi. St. Ignatius is equally explicit, in his witness that the Eucharist is "the flesh of Our Saviour Jesus Christ, the flesh which suffered for our sins, the flesh which the Father in his goodness has raised again." Equally clear is his fidelity to another element of New Testament doctrine on the Eucharist, namely that it is the symbol and the source of the Church's unity and peace.

These three fundamental ideas -- that the Holy Eucharist is sacrifice, food, and principle of unity, being the very body and blood of Jesus Christ -- the later writers do but develop and explain. St. Justin, in his First Apology, and in the Dialogue with Trypho too, gives us the earliest detailed account of the rite which has survived. In it we can see already achieved the combination of synagogue service and Eucharist around which the rich diversity of liturgies is later to grow. In St. Irenaeus we have the definite statement that it is by the words of the consecrating prayer that the change is wrought, while Clement of Alexandria uses a phraseology medieval in its concrete realism "To drink the blood of Jesus is to share in His incorruptibility," and Origen speaks of the Christian altars as "consecrated with the precious blood of Christ." Meanwhile, in the West, St. Hippolytus composed a treatise Should the Eucharist be received daily? and in Africa Tertullian, and above all St. Cyprian, write, with a fullness to which nothing is wanting, of the mystery, of its use, and of its role in the general life of the communicants. The lips with which Christ has been received, shall they turn next to applaud the brutalities of a gladiator? the hands which have held Him proceed to their daily task of making idols?

Universally, at the Sunday assembly the Eucharist was celebrated. The observance on the fast days varied. The fast remained unbroken until the mid-afternoon. In Africa, and at

Jerusalem too, the Eucharist was celebrated at the assembly. At Alexandria and in Rome there was no Eucharist -- simply the service of prayers, readings, hymns and a homily. The next day to receive a regular service was Saturday, the one-time holy day. By the fourth century throughout the East, save at Alexandria, there was on Saturday an assembly with celebration of the Eucharist. At Rome, however, the development was in the contrary direction. Saturday became not a new weekly feast but a fast, an extension, in fact, of the fast of Friday. Another Roman peculiarity was the fast celebrated in the first week of each of the four seasons--the fast of the Four Seasons (Quarter-Tense, Ember Week). In these weeks the unusual fasts of Wednesday, Friday and Saturday were kept with the additional solemnity of a Eucharistic service on the first two days and a Vigil and Eucharist on the Saturday. A fifth specially honoured week centred round the annual commemoration of the death and resurrection of Our Lord. Originally this was little more than a fifth Ember Week with a feast on the Thursday to commemorate the institution of the Holy Eucharist. The commemoration which is the later Easter, goes back to the Apostles, as the evidence of all parties in the famous controversies of the second century goes to show. Pentecost, celebrating the visible outpouring of the promised Holy Spirit upon the first disciples is just as old a feast and was just as universally celebrated as Easter, but with perhaps less solemnity. The third feast of this cycle -- commemorating the Ascension -- is of much later origin. The earliest trace of it dates to about 350.

The great annual penitential season which, in English, is called Lent developed from two elements, the fast in preparation for the feast of Easter and the catechumen's preparation for Baptism. The pre-Easter fast was originally very short indeed -- one or two days in St. Irenaeus -- but, to compensate, it was very severe, for no food at all was taken while it lasted. In Africa, in Tertullian's time, it lasted from the Thursday to the morning of Easter Sunday. At Alexandria, a generation later, every day in that week was a fast day. The earliest mention of the fast of forty days in the spring is in the Canons of Nicea (325). Then, and for long afterwards, this fast was primarily directed to the coming baptism of the catechumens; it was a time of retreat, of recollection and special prayers, during which the candidates passed through the final stages of their probation. The discipline of Lent varied. At Rome the Sundays were considered to be

outside the season, at Constantinople the Saturdays too. Lent again brought with it liturgical developments. In the East the Eucharist service on the Wednesdays and Fridays disappeared in Lent, but the number of reunions of the "mass-less" type increased. In the West the opposite happened. The number of mass days was increased, until, in the end, on every day of Lent there was an assembly with the celebration of the Eucharist.

Of the many other feasts which, later, were to enrich the calendar of the Church, we have hardly any record earlier than Constantine's conversion. Christmas, for example, was a Western feast originally and the earliest record of its celebration is at Rome in 336. The East had a similar kind of feast -- the Apparitions (Epiphany) -- commemorating the birth of Our Lord, the coming of the Wise Men, and His baptism, which was kept on January 6. One element in this may go back to a very early date, for about the years 200 the Gnostics kept a feast to celebrate the baptism of Our Lord. Nor are the feasts of Mary the Mother of Our Lord any older. There is no mention of them at Rome before the seventh century, although the feast of the Circumcision, the octave of Christmas, which is an indirect commemoration of her, goes back a century earlier. In this matter the West borrowed from the East where a feast of the Presentation of Our Lord in the Temple was kept at Jerusalem from about 370.

The oldest of all the feasts were the annual commemorations of the martyrs -- reunions of the local church, at the tombs of its most distinguished members, those who had testified to the faith with life itself. Of this development the earliest instance on record is the case of the martyred bishop of Smyrna, St. Polycarp, put to death in 155. A practice so natural grew speedily, and though the martyr cults were in their essence local things, some of the more noted of these Christian heroes -- St. Lawrence of Rome for example, St. Cyprian of Carthage -- soon won a wider renown, and honours in churches other than their own. With the Peace of Constantine the persecution, as a more or less normal incident of Christian life, ended. The heroism which had found its crown in martyrdom now developed in the solitude of the deserts. The new heroes were those who battled in the austerity of the new monasticism; and the next saints to be honoured liturgically after death, their prayers officially besought, were the ascetics, the first of them all in time the great

St. Martin of Tours who died in 397.

The religion founded by Our Lord in the Church was then a corporate, social thing, just as truly as it was the sum of the innumerable conquests of the myriad individual souls who made up the mystical body. And from its understanding of its corporate nature there gradually developed its public liturgies, and a Christian art; latest of all there developed an architecture--latest of all, for the first buildings erected for the purpose of containing the Church at prayer, the first churches in the architectural sense of the word, were not built until well on into the third century. Before that time the Christians met for worship in the houses of one or another of the brotherhood. At certain places, in times of persecution, they met in the catacombs -- a Christian adaptation and development, on an immense scale, of the underground cemetery system, which, in all probability, they had borrowed from the Jews. This system of catacombs was especially well developed at Rome, where it grew to be a second underground city, Roma sotterranea cristiana. []

The Roman practice by which great families opened their private cemeteries to their dependants; the sacredness in the eye of the Roman law of the tomb and the cult of the dead; the ancient Roman custom of family reunions at the tomb of its deceased members: all these favoured the development. The Christians, once gathered in their cemeteries were secure, not only from mob hostility, but even from the attention of the police during persecutions. These Roman catacombs go back to the days of the Apostles themselves. Still, today, the pilgrim can wander through the miles of their underground galleries and the chambers hewn out of the tufa where, nearly two thousand years ago now, the mass was said and the homilies delivered and the neophytes baptized. He can look upon the sites of the tombs of the earliest martyr-popes, and upon the hundreds of funeral inscriptions that tell the names and qualities of these long dead Christians and that attest so many of the doctrines they professed; and he can look upon the earliest Christian paintings, and study, there again, not merely the quality and development of the artistic inspiration, but the beliefs to which the paintings witness and the religious practices of which they are the mute unchanging record.

In the course of the third century, as will be seen, the

persecution of the Church changed its character entirely. It was no longer left to the initiative of private malice to unleash the fury of the persecuting laws. All now depended on the emperor; there were emperors who were favourable to the Church as well as those resolved on its destruction; and between the new, most savage persecutions that now took place, there were long intervals of peace when the Church enjoyed recognition as a lawful religion. It was during this p ace that, in the third century the first churches began to be built. Traces of these first churches still remain, at Rome for example, below the basilica of St. Clement and the church of S. Martino ai Monti, at S. Anastasia, at SS. Giovannie Paolo, and at S. Sabina. These discoveries of archaeology in our own time confirm the witness of the contemporaries who describe this first public appearance of the Church in the public life of the day, whether Christians themselves, like Eusebius of Cesarea, or bitter enemies such as Porphyry.

In all this swarming spiritual activity of Christian life, it is the Church, the whole assembly, which is all important. The newcomer to it is instructed by the Church, and prepared by the common and public prayer of the Church for his reception and baptism, and in the rite itself the collectivity of the life is manifest. It is in the assembly that he makes his progress, and should he fall from grace, his fall is the concern of all his brethren, who assist his penances by their own charitable prayers and good works.

When a Christian marries he is warned to take a Christian for his partner, [] for there is a Christian law of marriage. [] The marriage should be with the bishop's consent, [] or at any rate blessed by the Church. [] Marriage between Christians is indissoluble, even the adultery of one of the partners cannot break the bond. [] Though Encratites, like Tatian, condemn marriage as mere fornication, and Marcionites forbid it altogether, the Catholic tradition is constant that perpetual continency is not of obligation, that marriage is lawful, [] -- more, that it is a holy thing, since it is the figure of the union of Christ and His Church. [] Second marriages, which the Montanists condemn altogether, although reprov'd [] are tolerated, except in the case of the clergy. A second marriage is also a bar to a man's ordination. Marriage is a holy thing, and the mutual rights and duties of the contracting parties are discussed

by these first Christian moralists always with reference to the life of the Spirit which, since Baptism, is the most important factor in every Christian's life.

The primitive tradition that the ruling members of the Church are also the authorised teachers, and the ministers of the Eucharist is faithfully maintained. With these first and essential officers others are now associated; Lectors whose office it is to read the chosen passages of Holy Scripture in the assemblies; Exorcists to whom is entrusted one of the chief functions in the preparation of the catechumen for Baptism; Acolytes who share more closely in the ritual of the Eucharist; and Doorkeepers (Ostiaarii) whose mission is the very important one of securing that none but members of the Church are admitted to the different reunions. The rite by which all members of the clergy are commissioned and receive their new spiritual powers is still the primitive imposition of hands, its minister the bishop, and in St. Cyprian we note the first appearance of the regulation that for the consecration of a bishop three bishops are required. Marriage is no bar to ordination, although (Councils of Ancyra, 314, Neo-Cesarea, c. 314-25) it comes to be the law that the deacon, priest or bishop once ordained may not marry. The prestige of continency is bringing about an association in the mind of the Church between its practice and the ministry. The clerical state, in its higher ranks at least, should not lack the virtue which now adorns so many of the flock. And even in the case of those married before ordination it begins to be suggested that, after ordination, husband and wife should be to each other but as brother and sister. This clerical body, for all its undoubted position apart in the Church, is not, in the first three centuries, a way of life that excludes the following of a profession. Its members support themselves, as do the faithful to whom they minister, by a variety of occupations. Nor, for the best part of two centuries after Constantine, is there any suggestion of a special clerical dress, any more than there is evidence of what to-day we call, technically, vestments. When the first attempt to introduce a clerical costume was made it met with little favour, and was in fact severely rebuked by the pope of the time (St. Celestine I, 422-432).

How far had Christianity spread by the time of the conversion of Constantine? The question is much easier to answer definitely than the other question it provokes, how far was the Empire then

Christian? At Rome there had been Christians from within a few years of Our Lord's Ascension, and a Pagan historian speaks of them as "a great multitude" at the time of Nero's persecution. From the second century Rome becomes a great centre of expansion, whence southern and central Italy are evangelised. Northern Italy was a much later conquest. Of Christianity in Gaul, our earliest certain attested fact is the persecution of 177 which reveals at Lyons a well-ordered and flourishing church. A hundred and forty years later, at the Council of Arles, sixteen bishops of Gallic sees were present, among them bishops from Bordeaux, Rheims and Rouen. Spain knew the Church as early as the days of St. Paul who was, seemingly, one of its first apostles. But we know nothing of its Christianity until the persecution of Decius (250-251). Fifty years later the Church there had so profited by the long peace which followed Valerian (259) that, at the Council of Elvira (300), forty Spanish bishops assembled. In Britain, too, there were Christians and organised churches, Christians who gave their lives in the persecution of 304-5; and the bishops of York, London and Lincoln sat in the Council of Arles of 314. Of the origin of this British Christianity we know nothing. At the Council of Arles there assisted also bishops from Mainz, Cologne and Treves, the earliest representatives of Christianity among the Germans known to us. Of the conquests of the Church in the lands beyond the Rhine where the Empire never established itself we know scarcely anything.

The first evidence of Christianity in Africa is as late as 189-the martyrdoms at Scillium. The churches in Africa are, by then, already numerous and well-organised. A few years later and Tertullian has been received at Carthage (c. 194) and can urge as one of his pleas for toleration that the Christians are almost the majority in every town of the province. Certainly in the two provinces of Numidia and Proconsular Africa there were, by the beginning of the third century, seventy bishops.

But the real strength of Christianity lay to the east of the Adriatic. Greece, Epirus, Thessaly and Thrace were by the end of the second century very well evangelised. Into the Danube provinces to the north Christianity came later, but not too late to produce martyrs under Diocletian. Dalmatia's conversion began with Titus, and it is in the lands evangelised by St. Paul and his lieutenants that we find Christianity strongest three centuries

later. While in Palestine, its first home, Christianity had almost disappeared with the destruction that followed the wars of Titus and Hadrian, Syrian Christianity developed amazingly around that most ancient centre of missionary zeal the city of Antioch. Again, in Asia Minor, while Cappadocia remained unconverted until the time of St. Gregory the Wonderworker (c. 230-50), Phrygia and Bithynia were Christian from the end of the previous century. It was, however, the province of Asia, whose chief city was Ephesus, that led all the rest, the one really Christian province of the whole Empire. Egypt, too, was largely Christian. By the end of the third century it had fifty-five bishops, and from what we know of Egyptian Christianity in the first century in which it is known to us (Clement of Alexandria to St. Athanasius) it would seem to have been established at a very early date. A list of its bishops is extant that leads back to 61.

Christianity was not, however, confined to the Roman Empire. The buffer State of Edessa was so thoroughly converted in the second century that Christianity became the official religion of the kingdom. Armenia, too, dates its first conversion from about the same time, but the chief agent here was St. Gregory the Illuminator (late third century). He was himself Armenian and under his influence once again Christianity found itself the religion of the State. For all that, the conversion proved superficial. To the south of Egypt lay Ethiopia, and the conversion of Ethiopia counts among St. Athanasius' many titles to remembrance. From Egypt, too, but a century earlier, came the conversion of Arabia. The most flourishing of all these oriental Christianities was however that of Persia. Persia's first missionaries were from Edessa and they built up, in the century which preceded the conversion of Constantine, a really imposing church. This was the century of the great wars between the Roman Empire and the resuscitated Persia of the Sassanid kings, and the religion persecuted in Rome found, if only for political reasons, a protector in the Great King. Constantine's conversion brought to an end this happy state of things. Christianity, the religion of the Roman Emperor, was henceforth banned in Persia and a century of almost uninterrupted persecution followed in which thousands of martyrs perished.

Although the essential organisation of the spreading Christianity remained the same -- the bishop supreme in the local church

under the unique hegemony of the Bishop of Rome -- two very important new institutions developed during these first three hundred years, the council of bishops and the ecclesiastical province, i.e. the permanent grouping of sees round a central metropolitan see. The earliest council recorded is that called by the Bishop of Ephesus at the time of the Easter Controversy (189-198). To judge by his letter to the pope the procedure was altogether new, and due entirely to the initiative of Rome. In the next hundred years the institution developed rapidly. Origen records councils at Cesarea in Palestine (230) and in Pisidia. In the same year there is a council at Carthage and in 240 one at Ancyra. in Africa especially was this new organ of government -- L'evêque au pluriel -- made use of, and under a bishop like St. Cyprian, through the council of Africa, the primacy of Carthage developed rapidly. It is, again, through councils that Denis of Alexandria combats the revival of Sabellianism, and that Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, is convicted of heresy and deposed. The councils secure uniformity of faith and discipline without, as yet, in any way hindering the action of the Roman See, which continues its practice of intervention, even in the case of such great sees as Alexandria and Antioch, intervening always with a tone of authority found nowhere else, commanding as though in no doubt that obedience would be given, holding out sanctions to rebels and the negligent.

The councils, however, even that council of Africa which apparently met every year, were not in permanent session and the new grouping of sees around the metropolitan see -- see of the chief city of the province, mother-see very often whence had sprung the rest -- supplied a machinery for the co-ordination of every day activity. For all that the bishop is supreme in his own church, the local church is not an isolated spiritual kingdom. Outside bishops have a say in its affairs -- in the election of the bishop, for example, and in his consecration -- and, for St. Cyprian, this is a tradition which goes back to the Apostles. The system by which the activities of every bishop are subordinated -- on appeal -- to the collective scrutiny of the other bishops dependent on the same metropolitan see, is already well established by the time of the Council of Nicea (325), whose very important canons do but regulate an already existing institution, adapting it to the new delimitation of provinces accomplished by Diocletian and his successors. Already there is confusion, already rivalry between the great sees. Nicea -- with the whole

eastern episcopate assembled for the first time -- is an opportunity to set all in order.

There is no record of either Antioch or Alexandria as a great central see before the third century, nor is there any regularity or uniformity in the way in which the central sees begin to develop. Rome for example -- we are not concerned here with the organisation of its peculiar universal jurisdiction, potentior principalitas -- is gradually revealed as the metropolitan of all central and southern Italy, Carthage of Africa Proconsularis and Numidia, Alexandria of Egypt and Libya. Antioch, however, for all its civil importance, has nothing like so definite a power over the sees of the East. Asia Minor too is, by comparison with Egypt, Africa and Italy, poorly organised. Ephesus, for example, despite its apostolic origin, and its civil importance as the capital of the province, has an equal and a rival in every other church. Nor is the original grouping based on the civil divisions.

The rise of Antioch is particularly interesting and it is important in view of the history of the fourth century, to notice the failure of this Church to achieve a real local hegemony. From about 250 Antioch begins to show itself the centre of action for a group of sees which finally becomes the episcopate of The East (i.e. the civil diocese of that name). After the death of Constantine, (337) Antioch became the seat of the imperial residence and it continued to be the de facto capital down to Theodosius (381). These are the years of the Arian supremacy, and that supremacy and Antioch's predominance went together. It was no matter of ecclesiastical legislation, simply the natural effect of the city's new civil importance increasing the influence of its bishops. But Antioch never drew within its sphere of influence either the province of Asia or Egypt, where Alexandria, during the whole of this period, led the fight for Catholicism -- inevitably a fight against Antioch and against the spread of Antioch's influence. It will be seen later how Antioch was the centre of the campaign against St. Athanasius, and how the church of Antioch supplied and consecrated the Arians whom the emperor installed at Alexandria as bishops during St. Athanasius' exile. It is the eternal problem of the East to preserve the Church from this evil of episcopal ambition, so to balance and regulate the relations of sees and metropolitans that no one see shall ever achieve an undue predominance. In its failure to solve that problem, and in the absence of adequate machinery through which the Roman

hegemony, functioning continuously, might supply what was lacking to local arrangements, lie the beginnings of the end of Eastern Catholicism. Egypt was organised, Africa and Italy too, while the disorganised East inevitably offered itself to the ambition of first one see and then another. How, finally, Constantinople captured it is what the rest of this history must tell.

The canons of Nicea enact that all the bishops of the province (i. e. the civil province) shall take part in the election of its bishops, that the metropolitan shall have the right of veto; and that, as a check on episcopal misgovernment, the provincial council shall meet twice each year as a court of appeal. But this regime of churches grouped by civil provinces (since Diocletian's reforms these number now ninety-six in all) applies only to the civil dioceses of Asia, Pontus and The East. The council expressly recognises the special and ancient regime which obtains in the (civil) diocese of Egypt -- Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis -- where the Bishop of Alexandria himself chooses all the bishops and consecrates them and, if need be, deposes them. His authority is much more than metropolitan, and his authority extends far beyond the civil provinces. They are the same rights, the council recognises, as those which the Bishop of Rome exercises in Italy. Antioch, too, is mentioned by name, but the council again does no more than confirm existing rights " To Antioch and throughout the other provinces, the privileges proper to metropolitan sees." The bishops at Nicea did not innovate; they made no attempt to centralise the organisation of the immense Christianity which stretched from the Euxine to the Red Sea.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



CHAPTER 6: THE CHURCH AND THE PAGAN ROMAN EMPIRE

1. THE STATE -- HOSTILE AND TOLERANT

THE Roman power, at the time of Our Lord's birth, (4 B.C.), had already nearly reached to what were to be the limits of its geographical expansion. With the exception of the island of Britain, the Romans held the whole of Europe west of the Rhine and south of the Danube, northern Africa from the Atlantic, Egypt, Palestine, Syria and the most of Asia Minor. Claudius (41-54) was to add Britain, Trajan (98-117) Dacia and a great territory to the east of the Euphrates. But except for these later conquests, the Empire which at the beginning of the fourth century saw the conversion of Constantine, was, geographically, the same Empire in which the Apostles had preached.

The conquering power showed to the religions of the conquered peoples a politic tolerance. There was, of course, nothing in the old Roman religion to breed in its adherents anything approaching to a spirit of intolerance. That religion was essentially a private, local, personal relation between an individual, an individual family, an individual city, and its own protecting deity. From the nature of the case there was in such a religion no room for the idea of propaganda, no anxiety that others should share its benefits, no zeal to compel others to come in. The cult of Rome and the worship of the emperor which, later still, was associated with it, was, it is true, universally imposed. But to the syncretist age in which this new State cult developed, the universal insistence that all men should worship the State was no hardship. The new cult -- a mere ritual which, like all the rest, involved no new definite belief, prescribed nothing in the way of conduct -- was in no way incompatible with the devotee's loyalty to the score of cults which already claimed his attention; and if the State saw in this new cult a means to promote the unity of a world-wide Empire, the means was yet not an artificial thing specially devised by the State for this purpose, but a natural product of the religious spirit of the time.

Two exceptions there were to the Roman State's universal toleration or indifference. No cult would be authorised which was of itself hostile to the State; nor any which was itself exclusive of all others, The basis of these exceptions was, once more, political policy and not any dogmatic zeal To these exceptions there was again in turn one very striking exception. Judaism was essentially an exclusive religion. No Jew could have any share in any other religion. No Jew could take part in the official worship of the State. Yet the Jewish religion was not only not persecuted, but it was the subject of the State's special protection. The reason for this singular exception is to be found in the coincidence of the religion and the race. Judaism was the religion of a subject nation. The non-Jewish adherents of the sect were so rare as to be negligible, nor did their number really increase. The religion of the Jew was part of his nationality and, as such, the traditional Roman policy, which tolerated all differences in the one loyalty, tolerated the Jew's religion and protected it.

It was in the shadow of that protection that the religion of the Church made its first contacts with the Roman authority, for to the Romans the first Christians they knew were members of a Jewish sect. The differences between the Christians and other Jews were mere quarrels of Jewish divinity, with which the Roman law refused to occupy itself. Naturally enough it was only a matter of time before the Jews who did not see in Jesus Christ the promised Messias, and who were responsible for the expulsion of His followers from the body of Judaism, made it clear to the Roman officials that in Christianity they had to deal with a new, nonnational religion. From the moment when the distinction was clear, and the exclusiveness of the new religion recognised, it became for the Roman State an unlawful religion in the technical sense, and the atmosphere thickened with hostility. To this legal suspicion of the Church as a religious conspiracy, there was added very soon the more fruitful suspicion of its members as monsters of depravity, meeting secretly for the performance of rites bloody and unnaturally obscene. A tradition which goes back to the first century itself, credits the Jews with the authorship of these only too successful calumnies.

By the time of the Emperor Nero (54-68) the Christians were known as such in Rome, they were numerous, and they were the

objects of popular suspicion and hatred. It is to Nero there falls the horrible distinction of exploiting this hatred to cover up his own misdeeds, and also of setting a precedent in the manner of dealing with the new religio illicita.

The circumstances which brought about the persecution under Nero (64-67) are obscure. The terms of the legislation are lost, though it seems agreed that it was Christianity as such that was the object of the law. Christiani non sint is its spirit. More certain than the terms of the law are the facts of the terrible scenes in the garden of Nero's palace on the Vatican, where, like so many human torches to light up a festivity, thousands of Christians, clad in garments steeped in pitch, paid with their lives for loyalty to their new faith. Equally certain appears to be the motive which turned Nero's attention to the Christians -- the chance of saddling an already suspect people with the guilt of his own recent criminal burning down of Rome. Little is known in detail of this first persecution, though from the first epistle of St. Peter (iv, 12, 15, 16) warning Christians in general to lead good lives so that if condemned for their faith it will be evident to all that their faith is their only crime, it might be argued that the persecution was not confined to Rome.

Nero's criminal insanity was already nearing its term when the Christians fell victims to it. Four years after the Vatican martyrdoms he was dead, slain by his freedman too impatient to wait for the emperor's suicide; and the State, after a century of peace, was once again in all the turmoil of civil war. To Nero, in that year, three different armies gave three successors, all three of whom died violent deaths, the swiftly passing Otho, Galba, and Vitellius. Finally the army of Vespasian triumphed and with his acknowledgment as emperor the Roman world once more had peace. Peace came to the Christians, too, for the persecution had been Nero's personal act. In the reaction which followed his death Nero's laws were annulled, except, significantly, his law against the Christians. Nero had put them outside the State's protection. There they remained, the peace they now enjoyed the accident of circumstances.

Under the Flavian emperors -- Vespasian, Titus and Domitian -- the restoration necessary after twenty years of crazy rule was systematically carried out in the spirit of the empire's best tradition. How, towards the end of his fifteen years' reign,

Domitian (81-96) suddenly turned into a second Nero or Caligula is one of the commonplaces of the imperial story. From his struggle with the senatorial aristocracy a reign of terror developed which involved all the better elements of the population and the Christians with them. Details, once again, are few. There is no record of any new law, and it was, apparently, under Nero's all sufficient edict that the martyrs suffered. They included, at Rome, members of the noblest families, the emperor's own kinsfolk, Flavius Clemens, recently consul, and his wife, and Glabrio, another ex-consul. It is to this persecution, too, that tradition ascribes the martyrdom of St. Clement of Rome, and the passion of St. John the Evangelist before the Latin gate of the city.

Domitian, too, died violently, murdered by his officers before his madness had found the chance to murder them, and before the persecution had lasted long. In his place the officers of the guard installed as emperor the elderly Nerva (96-98) and with Nerva there came in a new tradition of administration and a wholly new spirit. The chronic problem of the "right to the throne" in a State where the chief magistrate was, in the last analysis, supreme because he was the commander-in-chief, where there was no such thing as a principle of legitimacy, and where the army was an army of citizens, this new tradition solved by the principle of adoption. The emperor, early in his reign, chose his successor, adopted him as his son. and secured his recognition as emperor-to-be. For the best part of a century the system worked admirably, and it gave to the empire its golden age of prosperity and peace under Trajan (98-117), Hadrian (117-138), Antoninus Pius (138-161) and Marcus Aurelius (161-180). But Marcus Aurelius chose his own son to succeed him, the worthless and incompetent Commodus (180-192) whose murder was the prelude to a century of civil anarchy in which, more than once, the Empire seemed on the point of disappearing entirely.

With these emperors whose skill in administration, practical wisdom and concern for the welfare of their subjects have made them ever since the very type of the model ruler, Christianity had to face the worst century of all the persecutions. It was to these emperors, moderates like Trajan, cultured scholars like Hadrian, philosophers like Marcus Aurelius, that St. Justin and the rest addressed their reasoned and eloquent pleas for toleration. All

in vain. Not only did the Apologists go unheard, but the emperors, by removing the process against the Christians from the unseemly irregularity of lynch-law, not only fixed the State's hostility in their regard, but indirectly provided a recommendation to the zeal of good citizens to discover the Christians and to good magistrates to persecute them: indirectly, for the motive of the first of the new imperial orders was to solve a case of conscience for an administrator anxious to administer the law faithfully and yet perplexed by the consequence that he was thereby sending to torture and death citizens of blameless life.

This administrator was none other than Pliny the Younger and the episode of his correspondence with Trajan throws a great deal of light on the spirit of the persecution under these truly Roman princes, aristocrats, conservatives, inflexible men of law. The administration of the province of Bithynia had lately passed into the emperor's personal charge, and Pliny, his friend and confidant, had been despatched to carry through the necessary re-organisation.

He found a province in which Christians were so numerous, in the countryside as well as in the towns, that the temples were deserted, the public ritual in places abandoned and the traders for whom the sacrifices were a means of livelihood generally impoverished. Denunciations from such interested parties poured in to the new governor, and persons accused of being Christians were hauled before him for judgment. The business was new to him, and in a letter to Trajan he set forth his hesitations, described the course he had taken, and asked for directions. Should he make any distinction on account of the age of the accused? Should he grant a pardon to those who repented their Christianity? And in the case of those who refused to abandon it, was it the bare fact of being Christians that should be punished or should they be punished for the crimes which went with membership of the sect? So far he had questioned the accused, and threatened them with punishment should they admit they were Christians. Those who obstinately refused to deny it he had punished, for, whatever the nature of what they confessed, such obstinacy he thought deserving of chastisement. A vast number had been denounced in an anonymous letter. Those who denied they were, or ever had been Christians, and at Pliny's demand proved it by offering

wine and incense before the emperor's statue and by cursing Christ, he had released. Others there were who, once Christians, had now for some years ceased to be. These, too, proved their Paganism in the same way. From this last class he had obtained strong denials that Christians were bound by oath to a life of crime. Their mutual agreement was rather to avoid theft and robbery, adultery, frauds. Apart from the folly that, on a fixed day, the Christians met before dawn to sing a hymn to Christ as God, he found nothing against them.

Trajan's reply furnished the principle which for the next hundred years determined the procedure. Pliny's action is approved. Christians are not to be hunted out by the magistrates. Those denounced and brought before the tribunals are, however, to be tried. If the accused denies the accusation and supports the denial by taking part in the sacrifices, even though the suspicion was justified, he is to go free. Anonymous denunciations are to be ignored. *Nam et pessimi exempli, nec nostri saeculi est.*

Christianity, then, is very definitely a crime, " an abstract crime," itself punishable. Yet for all its gravity -- death is the punishment -- it is not the dangerous thing that, say, brigandage is. It is no part of the State's duty to search out these criminals. The situation is an illogical one, as the Apologists were not slow to point out. To punish so savagely, for a "crime" such that it was not worth while tracking down the criminals ! And to free from the penalty his past crime deserves the criminal who will declare that he has lately ceased to commit it ! The procedure before the tribunals was something new. It was not by the testimony of witnesses that the crime was proved, but by the criminal's own refusal to deny it. None sought to convict him, often indeed the magistrate by promises, by threats, by violence sought to prevent his conviction. The law strained every nerve that the criminal might escape the awful penalty which the same law declared to be his just desert. The whole machinery of justice was employed to force, not an admission of guilt, but a denial. In the acts of the trials of St. Polycarp (155), of St. Justin (165), of the martyrs of Lyons (177), of Scillium (180), and of others of this century, the whole process can be read in detail.

To this legislation of Trajan the next hundred years add little if anything. And there is to be noted, as the century goes by, a tendency to disregard the prohibition to hunt out the Christians,

thanks to the increasing popular hatred of their religion which calumnies inflame, and which the learned apologetic never reaches, and thanks also to the indifference of the officials. During this century, then, the Christian is at the mercy of his Pagan neighbours and acquaintances. Until they move, the law ignores his existence. Once they act, the law must act too. The magistrate is here the servant of any chance spite or hatred. The emperor's sole care is to see that, in the administration of Justice, due order is observed.

With the last of the Antonines, the " roman-ness " of the empire disappeared for ever. Commodus was murdered in 192 and his successor Pertinax, emperor by grace of the imperial bodyguard, a few months later. Didymus Julianus followed Pertinax and, as in 68, the Empire seemed doomed to a long civil war. It was rescued from this by the success of the African soldier who established himself in 193, Lucius Septimius Severus. With Severus there entered into the high places of the State a type hitherto unknown there -- the provincial for whom the provinces were more important than the capital, and who had for Rome and Roman ways a simple vigorous contempt. Nor was this all. The wife of Severus, Julia Domna, came of a Syrian priestly family. A woman of talent and highly cultured, the court under her influence became an academy. Galen, Diogenes Laertius and the great jurists Papinian and Ulpian found in her a patron. Thanks to her influence the religion fashionable in the imperial circle, for the next half century, was that philosophical morality which has been described. It was one of this circle of Julia Domna's proteges, Philostorgius, who, at the request of the empress, now wrote the famous life of the chief of the "saints" of the new moral philosophy, Apollonius of Tyana, with its classic pleas for toleration in matters of religion. The old, hard, legalist spirit of the Antonines had indeed disappeared. In its place is this fever of syncretism which finds the old classical polytheism an obstacle to the new aim of a universal, all-embracing, moral religion. Eastern cults, with their ideas of moral purification, expiation for past misdeeds, belief in a future life which is conditioned by present conduct, are a help. One Eastern cult, especially, is patronised -- that of the Sun, in which these imperial syncretists see an impersonal symbol for the Monotheism to which they tend. Into this system Christianity could not enter, but thanks to the spirit which inspired it, Christianity was now, for the first time, to experience a certain

understanding and even an admiration of its ideals, and to be conceded a legal existence.

Septimius Severus was not himself personally hostile to the religion of the Church, and a Christian was foster-mother to his son and heir, Caracalla. Heliogabalus (217-222) was actually the chief priest of one of the principal Sun-cults at the time of his elevation, and he not only retained the dignity but, to the disgust of his Roman subjects, made no secret that he considered it of more account than his imperial rank. But the emperor who, more than all the rest, sums up this un-Roman succession of emperors is Julia Domna's great-nephew Alexander Severus. It was to his mother, the Empress Julia Mamaea, that St. Hippolytus dedicated his treatise On the Resurrection, and she is remembered, too, as the empress who at Antioch summoned Origen to speak before her on the Christian mysteries. Alexander Severus did not belie his parentage. In him Syncretism is indeed enthroned, more even than was Philosophy in Marcus Aurelius. In his own "oratory," side by side with statues of Orpheus and the more noble of his imperial predecessors, he placed those of Abraham and of Our Lord Himself, and in Our Lord's honour he even planned to build a temple.

Under such princes, and with such a spirit informing the court, some modification of the persecution was inevitable. To that modification the first of the line contributed not at all. Tertullian indeed speaks of his benevolence, but Christians certainly suffered during his reign, notably the famous women SS. Felicitas and Perpetua. There exists, too, the record of an edict which most scholars take as a prohibition against conversions, conversions primarily to Judaism, but also to Christianity -- "Under severe penalties it was forbidden to become a Jew (Iudaeos fieri), the thing was also enacted regarding Christians." There seems room, however, for the interpretation that the edict of Severus merely forbids circumcision whether practised by Jews or, as was still the case in parts of Palestine, by Christians.

Whatever be the share of Septimius Severus in the new policy of benevolence, that of Alexander Severus (222-235) is beyond all doubt, and this emperor is, in this respect, a more important personage than has been generally recognised. With his reverence for Christian ideals there went some knowledge that

their religion was an association ruled by an elected hierarchy, for in his scheme of reforms he holds up the system as an example in reference to the nomination of governors and other high officials. The changes which Alexander Severus introduced into the anti-Christian code were fundamental, for he abrogated the law of Nero which was its basis, granting Christians the right to exist, allowing them corporately to own property, and the right to assemble for worship. Christianity then ceased to be *religio illicita*. The date of this legislation we do not know.

Alexander Severus was but a boy of thirteen when he succeeded his cousin, the fantastic Heliogabalus, and he was still four years short of thirty when Maximin the Thracian murdered him and took his place. With Maximin yet another type of emperor appears -- the soldier, born on the frontier, and bred in an army that is less and less a Roman thing, rough and illiterate, the successful recruit who has risen from the ranks, the ex-sergeant-major never at his ease outside the camp. From this class are to come most of the emperors of the next hundred years.

Maximin's policy, in many matters, was the simple one of reversing the policies of his predecessor. His short reign (235-238) saw then a renewal of the persecution, a renewal in which the State set the new precedent of itself taking action against the Christians. The *conquirendi non sunt* of Trajan had fallen along with the *institutum Neronianum* which it had organised. The new fury derived from an edict intended for the whole Empire, and aimed specifically at the Church's rulers. The persecution -- in which, among others, both the pope, Pontian, and the anti-pope Hippolytus were deported to the mines in Sardinia -- was of short duration, for Maximin's successor Gordian III (238-244) returned to the regime of Alexander Severus, and the next emperor, Philip (244-249) was himself a Christian.

But this short persecution of Maximin had far-reaching results. It set the precedent of State initiative, and the equally menacing precedent of general edicts. No longer was the Christian safe so long as his Pagan neighbours were friendly, or he could find means to hide the fact of his faith. The State was no longer indifferent until provoked to action by private zeal. Maximin had been inspired by hatred of his predecessor, in whose entourage many Christians were to be found, rather than by any interest in Christianity itself. But fifteen years later there came an emperor

whom enthusiasm for the old national religions inspired. He copied Maximin's methods and extended them into a plan of simple extermination. This was Decius (249-251).

In Decius it was the spirit of the ancient republic that returned for a few years to the Empire. With Severus, fifty years earlier, a culture hostile to the Roman genius had come to rule the Roman world; with Maximin, Barbarism undisguised; and with these changes, a new and terrifying insecurity for whoever held the throne. Between Marcus Aurelius and Decius (180- 250) history counts the names of sixteen emperors, and of them all, one only escaped a violent death. In the thirty years between Decius and Diocletian (251-284) there are eleven emperors more, and of these not one died in his bed. The battlefield claimed of the whole perhaps half a dozen. The rest were murdered, either by the troops who had elected them or by the troops of their rivals; and if Gallienus continued to rule for eight whole years, there is record during that time, in one province or another, of nineteen rival emperors set up by the different armies.

Decius interrupted this tradition of barrack-square emperors. He came of a Roman family, and he inherited all the cold conservatism and austere reverence for tradition proverbially associated with the Roman. He was a member of the Senate when his predecessor, Philip the Arab, named him as his commissioner to suppress a mutiny of the army. Decius was too successful for his own peace. The troops insisted that he should be emperor. Yet another short sharp civil war, and either the field of battle or the daggers of Decius' supporters removed Philip. The new emperor set himself to undo all the work of the past seventy years. The discontent of the Roman with the domination of the provinces, of the East, of the Barbarian, found in him a leader. The State was to be re-Romanised. Amongst other things the old religion, overshadowed for half a century by the imperial patronage of oriental cults, was to be restored. Christianity was to disappear. A day was appointed by the imperial edict upon which all those whose religious allegiance was doubtful were to appear before a local commission. Each of the suspects was in turn to be bidden to offer sacrifice, to make a declaration denying his faith and insulting its Founder, and finally all were to share in a formal banquet where the wines and food used in the sacrifices were to be consumed. Certificates were then to be issued testifying that the accused had proved

himself a good Pagan. Not a town, not a village of the Empire escaped the trial. For those who refused to sacrifice, the penalty was, ultimately, death. But the emperor's intention was not so much the massacre of Christians as their conversion to the old religion. Whence, in the case of the loyal Christians, long drawn out trials which lasted for months and filled the prisons with confessors, repeated interrogations and the extensive use of torture in the hope of gradually breaking down the resistance.

Among the better known victims of this persecution was the Bishop of Jerusalem, Alexander, who had been the fellow-pupil of Origen at the School of Alexandria and was later his protector. Origen himself was imprisoned and subjected to continual tortures. At Rome the pope St. Fabian was executed out of hand, an exception to the general procedure, to be explained perhaps by Decius' own statement after the event that he would rather hear of a rival to his throne than of the election of a new bishop in Rome. The terror inspired by the government was sufficient to keep the see vacant for more than a year.

If martyrs were by comparison few, the number of confessors was huge; and, by the testimony of contemporaries (for example St. Denis of Alexandria), the number of apostates greater still. The penalty of confiscation of all property appears to have influenced many of the better class of Christians, and the connivance of the magistrates countless others. Not so much that there were magistrates who could be bribed, but that very many of them were willing to issue certificates of sacrifice to any Christian who would accept one, whether he had in fact sacrificed or not. Such nominal apostasy often enough satisfied the officials and saved the Christian's property and life. It was one of the chief causes of that crisis which, on the morrow of the persecution, was to occupy the bishops in every province of the Empire. In more than one place the majority of the faithful had, technically at least, renounced their faith.

Decius was slain, bravely fighting the barbarians on the Danube, in 251. He had reigned less than two years. But the persecution had ended even before his death. The emperor apparently realised that he had gained for the State religion merely the feeblest and most worthless of the Christians. He had failed utterly to rally that better element whose falling away from the old ideals he so deplored. For the Church itself the emperor's

policy was a rude shock, revealing, as it did beyond all doubt, proof upon proof of the disastrous effects of the long peace upon the quality of its members' spirituality. Origen's general strictures were given an unpleasant particularity.

To Decius succeeded Gallus (251-253) and to Gallus, Valerian, in whom all the best ideals of Decius might seem assured of success, for it was Valerian whom Decius had named as a kind of general superintendent of morality when he appointed him to the restored office of Censor. To the Christians, however, Valerian was at first well disposed, and there were so many of them in his service that St. Denis of Alexandria could say that his palace was almost a church. "He was kind and well-disposed to the people of God, and none of his predecessors, not even the emperors who were openly known to be Christians, showed them more sympathy and made them more welcome than did Valerian at the beginning of his reign." [] For four years all went well until the influence of his chief adviser, Macrinus, brought the emperor to a renewal of the methods of Decius. The cause of the change, apparently, was the increasingly desperate situation of the Empire, attacked now on all its frontiers at once, the Rhine, the Danube, the Sahara, Mesopotamia and Armenia, while pirates ravaged the coasts of Britain and of Asia Minor. Macrinus, a devotee of the old cults, superstitious, and a responsible official, is thought to have interpreted the disasters as the signs of the wrath of the gods provoked by the toleration of the arch-enemy, the religion of Christ.

There are two phases of the persecution. The first edict -- August, 257 -- was directed against the persons of the clergy and against the reunions of the faithful. The bishop in each town, and his priests, were to be summoned to sacrifice to the gods of the State. Those who refused were to be exiled, and the cemeteries and other places of worship were seized by the State. Christians who persisted in meeting for religious purposes were to be punished with death. A year later, by a second edict, the penalties were increased and the proscription was given a wider field. Not exile, now, but death is the penalty for the clergy who refuse to sacrifice; and it is to be carried out immediately on their refusal. The laity also are brought within the terror. Nobles who admit they are Christians are to lose their rank, their properties and their lives, while those specially attached to the Emperor's personal service -- the Caesariani --

are to suffer confiscation of goods and to be reduced to serfdom. The new legislation was rigorously applied. At Rome the newly-elected pope, Sixtus II, was arrested, tried and beheaded within a few days, and his more famous deacon Laurence. At Carthage St. Cyprian, exiled under the first edict, was now recalled and put to death under the second. But, as in 251, a political catastrophe brought the new reign of terror to an unexpected end. An invasion from Persia summoned Valerian to the distant eastern frontier. His armies were overwhelmed and he himself fell into the hands of the enemy, to end his life in chains, to be a public show in every town through which his conqueror passed, and this even after death, for his skin was stuffed and preserved to be an everlasting memorial of the greatest disgrace that ever befell a Roman Emperor.

The new emperor was Valerian's son, Gallienus, associated with him in the Empire since 253. One of his first acts was to end the persecution, and the act by which he did so is extremely important. It was no mere cessation of hostilities but the definite restoration of a status once held and recently lost, a recognition once more of the Church's legal right to exist. The "Peace of Gallienus" is a re-affirmation of the policy of Alexander Severus, with the new precedent that the emperor now treats directly with the bishops and restores to them the Church property under sequestration since three years before. Once more the Christian is to be unmolested in the practice of his religion, is to enjoy all his rights as a citizen. It was indeed peace and it endured for forty years.

Gallienus died in 268. Claudius II, Aurelian, Tacitus, Probus, Carus and Diocletian (284-305) succeeded him one after another, and under Diocletian, in 302, the persecution was renewed. About these thirty-four years that lie between the death of Gallienus and the first edicts of Diocletian we have almost no knowledge at all. There is the appeal to Aurelian in 272 on the part of the church of Antioch, embarrassed by the presence of the deposed Paul of Samosata in the episcopal palace. There are allusions to other episcopal dissensions, and that is almost all we know. Aurelian meditated a renewal of the war against Christianity -- he even issued the edicts -- as a part of his campaign to establish, as the new State religion, the solar monotheism which was his own especial cult. But he was killed before his ordinance could be put into execution and no

martyrdom is recorded in his reign. The period is one of unhindered propaganda and of uninterrupted unconcealed activity on the part of the Church. Churches are built everywhere -- in Rome alone, by the end of the century, there were more than forty -- and to be a bishop is to occupy an envied position, so great is the deference shown by the imperial government, so high and so secure is the bishop's social standing. Christians rise to the chief posts in the administration, even to be governors of provinces, and, in the words of Eusebius of Caesarea, who grew up to manhood under this happy regime, "The emperors allowed the Christians in their service to make the freedom of the faith almost a matter of glory," even dispensing them from the sacrifices which were part of the routine of official life.

Nevertheless, below the surface, the old Pagan animosity survived. The old calumnies, so scornfully retorted on those who spread them by, say, Tertullian, had perhaps disappeared. Origen and St. Cyprian had found friends and admirers in circles where, fifty years earlier, their very existence would have been ignored. But fifty years later than Origen and St. Cyprian the educated Pagan world is still materialist at heart, sceptical about the life after death, and unhesitating when it feels the attraction of vice. The crowd, despite the philosophers and the centuries of progress in the reformation of religion, is still, in its measureless ignorance, where its ancestors were three, four, and ten centuries earlier -- materialist, sensual, superstitious, its present tolerance easily stirred to cruelty against the demonstrated enemies of the human race. The philosophers have on their side the prestige of the traditional culture. Christianity is still on the defensive, still easily derided as fit only for old women and the abnormally stupid, a butt for wits who continue to make mock of a sect that worships a shamefully executed criminal. In all these manifestations, and they are the ever-recurring theme of the theatre's topical skits, there lurks an active disgusted hostility towards such fools. But most dangerous of all was the reasoned hatred that found its armoury in Porphyry's great work *Against the Christians*. Porphyry himself was, it is true, no advocate of persecution; but his learning, his extensive knowledge of Christianity and of Christians, his specious and effective criticism, were at the service of philosophers less indifferent than himself to the fate of what they attacked. Such a philosopher was the one whom

Lactantius describes as a really influential personage of the imperial court, at the moment when the persecution was renewed. This was, apparently, Hierocles. He, too, wrote his book, an address To the Christians. It is a reasoned criticism of the Gospels and the Life of Our Lord. The miracles are not denied, but they are set beside the alleged miracles of Apollonius of Tyana to destroy whatever force Christians give to them as proofs of Our Lord's divinity. The book was written in a popular style. Bitter and mordant in its language, it attacks the religion of the Christians as an insult to reason.

As the third century drew to its close the old State religion and the new philosophical deism drew together, in opposition to the object of their common hatred. Popular feeling there was in plenty to exploit against the Christians, a tradition made up of a variety of elements appealing to every rank and class. It needed but the opportunity and the vast coalition would move. That opportunity none could create but the emperor. The moment came when he was won over, and the long peace ended, suddenly, in the greatest of all the persecutions. The emperor was Diocletian.

Diocletian has deservedly a very great name in history. He succeeded in halting the general dissolution of the Empire which had gone on now for half a century, and faulty as many of his measures were, they made possible another century and a half of greater peace and prosperity than the West was to know again until the later Middle Ages. He restored the Roman power by remodelling it: the central administration, the provinces, taxation, the army, the imperial court. The last vestiges of the old republican State disappeared, the de facto absolutism that had grown with every generation since Augustus received explicit recognition, and the emperor, even to the trappings and ceremonial, was henceforward that semi-divine autocrat the East had always known, and against which the West had always fought. The truth that the most important region of the Empire was the frontier was emphasised in the most striking way possible. From now on Rome ceased to be the Capital. In all his twenty years of reign Diocletian visited it but twice, and Constantine, the greatest of his successors, hardly more often in a still longer reign. The capital follows the emperors, and the emperors live on the frontiers defending what is now perpetually in danger. The emperors -- for, another revolutionary change

due to Diocletian, there is no longer but one emperor. The task is beyond any one man's energies, and as well to provide for the State as to lessen the danger from the inevitably powerful subordinate, the imperial task is shared by equals. Diocletian was acclaimed emperor in November 284. On April 1, 285, he made over the administration of the Western half of the Empire to his comrade-at-arms of half a lifetime, Maximian. Eight years later he carried the principle a step further. To each emperor was adjoined a lieutenant, who would ultimately succeed his chief and to whom, meanwhile, there was entrusted with the title of Caesar the administration of a group of provinces. Thus when the persecution broke out, in 303, four princes ruled the one Empire, Diocletian and Galerius in the East, Maximian and Constantius Chlorus in the West. []

Diocletian was as little a lover of Roman ways as Severus had been a hundred years before. He was a provincial, and a none too cultured provincial, with a certain cold surliness of manner that repelled. In religion he had no personal preferences. He was not, for example, like Aurelian, concerned to depress one religion in order to exalt another. But he was notably superstitious. Towards Christianity he continued, and apparently as the obvious policy, the policy official since the Peace of Gallienus. His household was filled with Christians and his wife and daughter were converts to the faith. The persecution when it came was not so much the fruit of long deliberation on his part, as an enormous blunder into which he was tricked to consenting. The real author of the persecution was Diocletian's lieutenant, the Caesar Galerius, and this time it was undisguisedly the war of one religion on another, a persecution which had for its complement the most elaborate attempt to revive Paganism yet undertaken by the Roman State.

The history of the series of persecutions which began with Diocletian's edict of February 24, 303, and which did not end until the so-called Edict of Milan, ten years later, is far too complicated to be set forth adequately in any chronological summary. It was a persecution differing as widely in its methods as the four princes who ruled the Empire differed one from another, and its history is complicated by the rapid changes in the government which mark these ten years. The Empire is divided, united, divided anew; Diocletian and Maximian resign; Galerius and Constantius Chlorus succeed them, with Maximin

Daia and the son of Constantius -- Constantine -- as their respective Caesars; Constantius dies in 306 and, although Constantine maintains his hold on the provinces he has ruled as Caesar, there is a new Western Emperor, Severus. The son of Diocletian's old colleague, Maximian, next makes himself master of Italy and Africa. This is Maxentius. A few years later, and Maximian himself returns claiming the honour he had resigned. Six emperors are simultaneously in the field, and civil war again claims the Empire for its own.

Galerius was, once more, the barbarian soldier in the purple, the typical sergeant-major emperor, a good soldier but by Roman standards hardly civilised, violent, crafty, and greatly influenced by his mother, a superstitious peasant from the Carpathians with whom hatred of Christianity was a passion. The first step was to remove the Christian officers from the army. On the plea that the military discipline was suffering from the neglect of the old religious ritual, orders were issued that the routine sacrifices were to be resumed. Those who refused to take part must abandon their careers. The Christians thereupon resigned by hundreds from the army commanded by Galerius. A little later it was represented to Diocletian, more and more superstitious as he aged, that the presence of unbelievers interfered with the auspices. The augurs were unable to divine the will of the gods while unbelievers were present. The emperor thereupon ordered that all his household, on pain of being scourged, should show their faith by offering sacrifice, and that the soldiers should do the same or leave the army. By the end of 302 the regime of tolerance had so far changed that the army and the imperial service were closed to professing Christians.

In the next few months Diocletian was won round to a plan of general extermination. Again it was with Galerius that the scheme originated. A council of State was summoned to discuss the matter, and the last hesitations of Diocletian were overcome when the oracle of Apollo at Miletus spoke in favour of Galerius. But, still reluctant, Diocletian would allow no death penalties.

The signal was given when on the day the edict was published, February 24, 303, the cathedral of the capital city, Nicomedia, was, by the emperor's order, burned down. The edict forbade the Christians to assemble for worship, the churches were to be destroyed, the sacred books handed over to the police, and all

Christians were to renounce their faith. Those who refused were, if nobles, to lose their rank; if citizens to become slaves; and, if slaves already, to remain slaves forever. When, soon afterwards, the imperial palace took fire Diocletian's last hesitations vanished and at Nicomedia blood began to flow in abundance.

New edicts followed. First the clergy throughout the Empire were to be arrested, and be summoned, under pain of death, to abjure. Then (304) the same was decreed for the general body of the Christians. There was now no choice but apostasy or death for millions. The legislation was the most severe so far and the most systematic. A host of new and horrible punishments were devised to terrify the weak into submission. Christians were rounded up by the hundred, summoned to sacrifice, and massacred. In one case at least, in Phrygia, where the whole population was Christian, a whole town was wiped out. A phrase in the authentic acts of one of the victims of this time -- St. Philip, Bishop of Heraclea -- summarises the spirit of the new savagery. " You have heard the law of the emperor," says the judge, speaking to the accused. "It commands that throughout the world members of your society must either sacrifice or perish." With the resignation of Diocletian and Maximian (305), Galerius and his new Caesar, his nephew Maximin Daia, developed the inquisition yet further. By the edict of 306 all citizens -- not merely suspected Christians -- were to be summoned to sacrifice. Heralds in the streets were to call out the heads of families, the army to be paraded for the purpose. It is now, too, that the first evidences show of a decline in the character of the judges who carry out the edicts. A new type of magistrate appears, men as gross as the new emperors themselves, to whom the persecution was an opportunity for loot and for lust, and whose malignity devised new horrors and provoked a new danger for the accused, some of whom -- a thing hitherto unknown -- threw themselves to death to escape inevitable shame. The persecution went its way unhindered in the East for the best part of eight years. In the West it had never been so violent. Where Constantius Chlorus ruled as Caesar, in Gaul and in Britain, there had been practically no persecution at all: where the Emperor Maximian ruled, in Italy, Spain and Africa, the Christians had suffered as in the countries directly subject to Diocletian. But in 305 Constantius became emperor; Spain passed under his rule and there the persecution ceased. Africa and Italy passed, first to Severus and then (autumn of 306) to

Maxentius; under neither of these princes were the persecuting edicts enforced. When Constantius Chlorus died (July 306) his son Constantine succeeded him and maintained his policy of toleration.

For the policy of Galerius, the successful coup d'état by which Constantine came to the purple was a defeat. The dispossession of Severus, whom he had named to succeed Constantius in the West, was a second; for here again the victor, Maxentius, abandoned the policy of persecution. Far different was the fate of the Christians in the East where the advent of Maximin Daia balanced the gain through Constantine and Maxentius. The new eastern Caesar was, like his uncle, Galerius, the simple product of the wilds beyond the frontier, tamed a little by the army, but hardly improved from his crude native barbarism. Yet, curiously enough, it was he who planned, and to some extent carried through, a great scheme of reformation by which Paganism should itself at last become a "Church." Temples were restored, new ones built, the priests for the first time organised in a hierarchy with a presiding high priest for each province. The ritual was standardised, and the " magicians," the clergy of Maximin Daia's predilection, promoted to the highest offices of the State. It was in the interest of this new State religion that Maximin Daia continued the persecution, henceforward admittedly the war of one religion on another and not a simple measure of precaution in the interest of the State's security.

This new phase, however, was not of long duration. On April 30, 311, an imperial edict brought the whole persecution to an end, restoring the status of 303. It bears the names of Galerius, of Constantine and of Licinius. Galerius, after eighteen years of Empire, was dying in the horrible agony Lactantius has described. Fifteen days after the publication of the edict he was no more. His share in that edict can have been no more than nominal. It was really the act of Constantine and Licinius, the first stage of the new policy of which the Edict of Milan, two years later, was to be the consummation. The edict of 311 is by no means a pro-Christian manifesto. The emperors are at no pains to hide their scorn for the religion they are relieving. They refer approvingly to the edicts which inaugurated the persecution, and to the end in view, the restoration of the old Roman life. Those edicts are now annulled because it has been proved that what Christians had returned to the ways of their

ancestors had done so simply through fear. The chief result of the persecution had been the creation of a large class who worshipped neither the Roman gods nor the God of the Christians. Before the menace such a feature in the national life presents, the emperors prefer to grant once more a licence to Christianity to exist. *Denuo sint christiani*. They may reorganise their Churches; the prisoners are to be freed. Let them for the future avoid anything which is contrary to the established order, and let them not forget the duty laid upon them to pray to their God for the safety of the State and its princes.

From the new policy Maximin Daia, now in the East the supreme ruler, held himself coldly aloof. As Constantius had never given an effective assent to the edict of 303, so Maximin ignored that of 311. Nevertheless even Maximin yielded somewhat to the new forces, and in a letter to the provincial governors of his Empire halted the persecution. For a moment the Christians breathed easily through all the Roman world.

Licinius was an old friend of Galerius, for years one of his most confidential advisers. Had Galerius been wholly free in the matter, Licinius would have succeeded Constantius in 306, and again Severus in 307. It was not until 308 that he was in fact associated with Galerius in the Empire, and Galerius proclaimed his confidence by naming him Emperor and not Caesar. He was then heir to the provinces Galerius had ruled, with Nicodemia as their capital, and to whatever he could hold of Galerius' position as the senior emperor. Maximin Daia was overshadowed by a newer power. He did not intend to remain so and with his invasion of the states of Licinius the duel between Paganism and Christianity reopened. It was marked on the part of Paganism by a last supreme revival.

From all over the East petitions from the municipal and provincial councils came in -- organised to some extent by the imperial officials -- calling for the suppression of Christianity. The petitions and Maximin Daia's replies, into which there has crept a tone of piety that makes them nothing less than Pagan sermons, were inscribed on tablets of bronze and set up in the chief places of the cities -- a new and subtle means of anti-Christian propaganda. The calamities which of late years have afflicted the State, war, famine, plague, tempest, all these are the natural effects of the wrath of the gods provoked by the

practices of Christian folly. In the loyalty of all good citizens to the ancient religion lies the Empire's one hope. Let the temples once more take up their place in the people's life, the sacrificial fires be renewed. The emperor will himself lead in the pious work, the head and centre of every religious inspiration. For the encouragement of the Pagan, the State organised a campaign of education in the wickedness of Christianity. Placards, pamphlets, lectures subsidised by the State, set before the Pagan the vile thing his Christian neighbours were. Elaborate forgeries alleged to be the sacred books of the Christians appeared, and these blasphemous parodies and caricatures were used as lesson books in the schools. The latest Pagan offensive was at its height and beginning to show results in a revival of Pagan practice when, as Maximin Daia planned to ally himself with Maxentius in Italy -- hitherto a usurper in the eyes of the three " legitimate " emperors -- against the combination of Licinius and Constantine, the news of news came to him that Constantine had declared himself a Christian.

It was unexpected news, and the occasion of the declaration fitted it -- the eve of a battle against Maxentius upon which, following a first reverse, Constantine staked his whole fate.

Constantine had marched from his own States -- as yet overwhelmingly Pagan -- through Italy, still Pagan too, and was preparing to attack the single army which lay between him and Rome, of all the empire's great cities perhaps the most Pagan. The expedition he had undertaken had no religious significance -- its purpose was simply the destruction of the power of a usurper. Constantine himself was not merely a Pagan but, from all his associations and upbringing he belonged to that new school of Paganism from whose scorn Christianity had naturally least hope of recruits. His parents were Pagans, and his father's religion a form of that new moral monotheism, popular with the army, whose symbol was the Sun -- Sol Invictus. One form of that cult had seemed destined to high fortunes under Aurelian (269-75). After Aurelian's death Constantius Chlorus was its most eminent supporter. The cult then probably came to Constantine as part of his paternal inheritance, and as he shook himself free of the influence of Diocletian and Maximian (whose son-in-law he was) the young emperor showed himself openly the protector of his father's cult. By the time of his expedition against Maxentius his evolution in religion had gone beyond

this. He had abandoned the last traces of a cult of the Sun, and reached the point of a simple belief that there is but one God. The final, decisive step was not the fruit of any further meditation but was due to something which happened to Constantine the very night before the battle at the Milvian Bridge, a mile or two outside the Flaminian Gate of Rome. In a dream the emperor was bidden to mark his soldiers' shields with the sign of God, coeleste signum Dei, and go into battle with this as his badge. He did so. In the fight which followed he was victorious, and Maxentius was drowned in the Tiber as he fled from the field. Constantine entered Rome convinced now that the one, supreme God was the God whom the Christians worshipped -- Jesus Christ.

From Rome, after receiving the congratulations of the Senate, he proceeded to Milan for the solemnities of the marriage arranged between his sister and his colleague Licinius. At their meeting the two emperors, advancing the policy of the act of two years before, published what has come to be called the Edict of Milan (313, probably February), the final and definitive admission of the State that the new religion of the Church must survive. Maximin Daia -- to anticipate the story by a few months -- took advantage of the absence of Licinius in the West and, despite the difficulties of the winter, invaded his States, crossed into Europe, and with his powerful army laid waste the rich provinces which are now the Balkans. There, at Nicopolis, he met, and was defeated by Licinius, returned from Milan in haste; and with the defeat and death of Maximin Daia the authors of the Edict of Milan were masters of the Roman world (May 1, 313).

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. THE STATE DE-PAGANISED

The famous edict of Constantine and Licinius is by no means a charter of rights and privileges. It is a political act, and as such is conditioned by the circumstances of the moment. Both of these emperors had long been agreed that the persecution menaced the future of the State. If one of them was recently converted to a belief in Christianity -- and the belief was as yet incomplete -- his colleague, however, still remained a Pagan. Constantine himself could have no policy which went beyond the maintenance of a balance between the two religions, and the language of the edict, as far as we can tell, is not that of a Christian at all. In this respect it is very evidently the supplement to the act of 311 and the spirit it breathes is that of the " deistic " monotheism which was the reigning fashion at the court. It is an arrangement prepared by Constantine which his colleague accepts, and which is expressed in tactfully neutral language. The motive for the new policy is no longer the restoration of the old Roman ways but simply " the public good." This is unattainable if due honours are not rendered to "the divinity." That these honours may be rendered, all who honour "the divinity" have leave to do so -- Christians with the rest. Thus the edict does not by any means proclaim universal toleration. "To the Christians and to all men we decree there be given free power to follow whatever religion each man chooses, that, whatever gods there be, they may be moved mercifully in regard to ourselves and those over whom we exercise authority" -- an insurance devised possibly to comfort the devout Pagan critic against vengeance from the old gods for any apostasy implied in the act. The edict, then, grants once more what Alexander Severus had first granted, and then Gallienus thirty years later. But this time the grant is explicitly built into the law as a fundamental principle of public welfare; and the emperors from whom it emanates are no religious dilettantes, nor weaklings anxious at a crisis to rally a disunited people. They are conquerors, one of them the empire's greatest soldier for generations and a whole-hearted convert to the faith, and the edict is the sign of their conquest. But it does more than restore liberties. A further clause gives the surest of all guarantees that the toleration is no mere matter of form, no political trick of the moment. It decrees the restoration to Christians of whatever property has been confiscated "without any price asked or any

transference money. . . without delay and without discussion." []

That Constantine's conversion to a belief that Jesus Christ is the one only God was sincere is certain, and equally certain his subsequent loyalty to what he considered to be the best interests of the Church through which the one God chose to be worshipped. But whatever the growth of his knowledge of his new faith and of his attachment to it, he remained, as emperor, faithful to the principles of the edict of 313. Even had he desired to christianise the State, the difficulties before him would have prevented it. The Christians were by no means in the majority. The West especially, his own sphere of operations, was strongly Pagan; [] and its anti-Christian habits and traditional prejudice survived for the best part of the next hundred years. If there were Christians who, impatiently, demanded a reversal of roles and repression of the Pagans they found no welcome at the court. Whatever the emperor's personal preferences, he maintained the Pagans in the posts they occupied; and he continued to be the Pontifex Maximus of the Pagan Cults. So bound up with the old religion was the imperial office, that to have abolished the pontificate at that moment would have been to strip himself of vast prestige and authority; to have transferred the office to another would have been almost an abdication. Tertullian had plainly said that no man could become emperor and remain a Christian, and for the next sixty years the Christian Emperor proved him right to this extent, at least, that he retained and exercised the supreme headship of the Pagan Cults. Finally, for the first eleven years which followed the edict, Constantine's colleague was a Pagan, and a Pagan who gradually grew hostile to Christianity.

In 323 there was a breach between the two emperors in which religious differences played their part. Licinius abandoned the policy of 313 and, in the States of the eastern Empire, the persecution raged once more. Constantine's victory at Chrysopolis (September, 323) brought this to an end, and it ended, too, the reign of Licinius. Six months later his death -- in which not improbably Constantine had a share -- left Constantine without a rival, sole master of the whole Roman world. His new, unquestioned supremacy found expression in a notable change of the form of his language about matters religious. So far he had kept studiously to the neutrality of 313.

He had, as Pontifex Maximus, carried through certain reforms -- divination in secret was henceforward forbidden, and certain abuses in magical rites. As emperor he had granted the Catholic clergy those exemptions from the burdens of citizenship which the Pagan priests had always enjoyed, he had given the churches the right to receive legacies and he had made the Sunday a legal holiday. In his language he had been as impartial as in his actions, and not a sign escaped to show publicly his increasing contempt for the stupidities of the old polytheism and for its superstitions. But now, victorious over a Paganism lately militant, and master for the first time in the more Christian part of the Empire, he was free to express his personal sentiments. In the proclamation which announced the victory to the bishops of the East, he tells the story of his conversion, describes the atrocities of Diocletian's persecution, speaks of himself as brought to the Faith by God to be the means of the Faith's triumph, and declares that he takes up the government of his new State " full of faith in the grace which has confided to me this holy duty." There is a like change in his language to his Pagan subjects. The policy of 313 is scrupulously maintained, but he does not hesitate to speak of Pagan " obstinacy," of their " misguided rites and ceremonial," of their "temples of lying" which contrast so strikingly with "the splendours of the home of truth."

The convert emperor no longer hides his contempt for Paganism, but he is careful still to distribute offices to Christian and Pagan alike. All are equal, and both religions equal, before the law.

The first breach in this policy of neutrality was the work of his sons. Constantine died in 337 leaving as heirs his three sons, Constantine II, Constantius II, and Constans. The eldest died three years later, and the new law bears the signature of the two younger brothers. It declares the abolition of all sacrifices and threatens dire punishment to those who contravene it (341). Among one section of the Christians its enactment was the occasion of great joy. They exhorted the emperors to go further still. Whence so great an uneasiness among the Pagans that, a year later, the emperor in the West, Constans, the vast majority of whose subjects were Pagans, published a new law to reassure them, ordering special care for the historic temples of the old capital. Ten years later Constantius II, now sole emperor,

published a new edict which threatened death to those who worshipped idols. The temples were to be closed, the sacrifices to cease. No doubt where the thing was peaceably possible the law was enforced. But despite the law the facts show the old religion as still flourishing unhindered throughout the West. All the old feasts were observed at Rome, with all the accustomed sacrifices, in the year which followed this law (354), and in the very year which saw its renewal Constantius II himself, visiting Rome, confirmed the privileges of the different cults, the subsidies of public money granted to them and, acting as Pontifex Maximus, he filled the vacant priestships by nominations of different members of the Roman aristocracy. This contrast between the terrifying threats, and the impotent toleration of those who ignored the threats was characteristic of the general policy of Constantine's vacillating successors. They repudiated their father's policy, and were yet too weak to enforce the repudiation. The chief effect of their legislation was to irritate the Pagans, and to prepare the way for the anti-Christian reaction which followed under Julian.

Julian (361-363), the successor of Constantius II, has gone down to history as Julian the Apostate, but the title is hardly fair, for though Julian set himself to reverse the policy of the previous fifty years and to restore Paganism, it is hard to see that he was ever a Christian at all, and he certainly was never a Catholic. He was a nephew of Constantine and, a child of five at the emperor's death, one of the very few near relations of the new emperors who survived the general massacre designed to remove possible rivals to their succession. For these massacres, in which his father, two uncles, and a brother perished, Julian declared Constantius II responsible, and in this personal hatred of Constantius, which deepened after that emperor's execution in 354 of Julian's only surviving brother, may be found one reason for Julian's fanatical hatred of everything Christian. His earliest education he received under the care of the arch-Arians Eusebius of Nicomedia, George of Cappadocia and Aetius; and once his childhood was past he was deprived of even this pale reflection of Christian truth. In place of Arian bishops and their sterile logomachies, he now had hellenists to tutor him, and in the distant and lonely palaces to which he was exiled, the imaginative boy grew to adolescence and early manhood, dreaming of a revival of the Paganism of the poets and the philosophers. His own religion was little more

than a devotion to the classic Greek Culture, a thing intellectual, literary, artistic. His philosophy was the neo-Platonism of the day, something of Plotinus and much more of superstition and magic, a melange that had in it something of the modern Theosophy cults and Spiritualism, with a veneer of elaborate ritual. The thing he planned to revive had never existed; it was the golden age of every adolescent's dreaming fancy, the past seen through the idealism of literature. But for all his bookishness the shy, reserved, and ascetic young man showed his gifts as a ruler once his cousin named him Caesar (358), and enough of political ambition once the troops hailed him Emperor (360) to take the offensive against Constantius II. But the sudden death of Constantius (Nov., 361) gave him the mastery of the world without a battle, and for twenty months he ruled supreme. It was too short a time for any permanent accomplishment, and his revival had the ultimate effect of all schemes that plan to ride the skies and fail. It left the prestige of the old religion very much lower than it had found it, left it indeed covered with ridicule.

For the greatest attempt of all was now made to organise Paganism, its cults and its priesthood; to give it a coherent body of doctrine, a fixed and regular liturgy. Its priests, on the model of the Christian clergy, were to be teachers, and schools of Pagan theology were established. The practice of good works was to be a function of the new religion; orphanages, hospitals, asylums to be founded in which the new Pagan virtue of charity would find expression. Nothing was less in keeping with the facts of the old Paganism, nothing less in accord with the Roman tradition, than the new priesthood as Julian planned it, influenced obviously by the desire to defeat Christianity by copying the Christian spirit. The Roman priest had been an important personage in the political and social life of the day. High rank in the priestly college, and high office in the State had always gone together. But Julian's priests were to live like monks, ascetics, carefully avoiding contact with the evil world, given to a life of virtue, and service, prayerful, studious, continent.

The sacrifices were restored and carried out on an enormous scale, Julian himself as Pontifex -- against all tradition -- actually immolating the victims. The Christian magistrates and officers were replaced. The Christian clergy lost all their privileges. They

lost, too, what pensions the State had begun to pay them, and were obliged to restore what they had already received. Even the Christian poor were made to give back the alms which the imperial charity had assigned them. The temples, too, where these had fallen into decay, were to be restored at the expense of the Christians. But the edict most complained of was that which expelled the Christians from the schools. No Christian was henceforth to be allowed to teach or to study the ancient classical authors. "Let them keep to Matthew and Luke," said Julian. Rhetoric, Philosophy, Political Science -- to the Christian henceforward these were banned, and with them all hope of a professional career.

All this was but the preparation for a revival of the older persecution of blood -- none too easy a matter in 361 with Christianity strong through fifty years of State favour, and entrenched in all the high places of the State. Julian did not live long enough to launch another frontal attack. Death claimed him before he had the chance to show his quality as a philosophical Decius or Diocletian. But every encouragement was given to the Pagans to attack the Christians. Anti-Christian riots went unchecked, excesses, massacres even, went unpunished. To the Christians who appealed against the indifference of the officials, who stood by while property was destroyed and lives were lost, the emperor mockingly recalled that it was part of their faith to suffer wrong patiently. Martyrs there were as fifty years before, but condemned and put to death now, ostensibly, for rebellion or treason -- a new legal trickery intended to rob their deaths of any religious significance.

The persecution ended very suddenly. On June 26, 363, Julian was slain, fighting the perpetual enemy of the East, Persia, testifying with his last breath, according to Theodoret's account, Whom he had fought, and by Whom he was conquered "Galilean, Thou hast triumphed." The army gave him Jovian for a successor and Jovian was a Catholic. Without any elaborate measure of repression, the whole edifice of Julian's "Church" crumbled and fell. The new edict restoring religious toleration, and the statutes of Constantine's regime, was enough. The dead thing lately galvanised into a semblance of life ceased to move, the apostates who had served it returned to Christianity more easily than they had left it. The path to the inevitable Christianising of the State was once more open.

But despite the opportunity a reaction always presents to the victorious reactionaries, the movement to de-Paganise the State halted for another ten years and more. Jovian reigned only nine months and his successor, Valentinian I (364-75), though a Catholic, was as emperor more neutral than Constantine himself. The temples remained open, the oracles were consulted as of old; and if he took from the temples the properties which Constantius II had confiscated to the benefit of the Church, and which Julian had recently restored to the temples, Valentinian did not make them over to the Church once again, but ordered that they should revert to the imperial treasury. As he held himself aloof from the controversy between Catholics and Arians, declaring " I am a layman. It is no business of mine to scrutinise Christian dogma. That is the bishop's affair," so he showed a like indifferent neutrality in the edict which reversed Julian's educational policy; " Whoever is worthy by character and by talent to educate youth shall have the right to open a school or to gather together once more his dispersed scholars." Later in his reign (371) he is even more explicitly averse from any anti-Pagan legislation. "I do not consider this art to be criminal," he declared to the Pagan augurs, "nor indeed any of the religious observances established by our ancestors. The laws enacted at the beginning of my reign are proof of this. They grant to every man the right to follow whatever religion he prefers. I do not, therefore, condemn the auspices. I simply forbid them to be used for criminal purposes."

In the Eastern Empire, where Valentinian's brother Valens ruled (364-378), there was during these years an actual patronage of Paganism. Valens was determined that his Christian subjects should all be Arians. The thirteen years of his rule were for the Catholics of the East a long reign of terror, and in his measures of repression the emperor gladly made use of the Pagans.

Valentinian I died in 375 and with the accession of his son the youthful Gratian (375-383) the religious situation changed immediately, for the new emperor refused to be Pontifex Maximus with the words " A robe such as this does not become a Christian," and abolished the office. The anomaly of the Catholic functioning as the chief priest of Paganism was at an end; and Paganism, the head of the State declining to be its chief priest, may be considered henceforth as "disestablished."

It remained to disendow the institution, and this Gratian did seven years later. By an act of the year 382 the privileges and exemptions enjoyed by the Pagan priesthood were abolished, the property of the temples confiscated and henceforward all legacies to temples were null and void.

About the same time the statue of the goddess Victory that stood in the senate chamber at Rome was removed. This statue, to which the senators offered incense as they entered, and through whose presence the goddess herself in some sense presided over the debates of the empire's most venerable institution, had come to be the very symbol of Paganism's official primacy. It had already been removed in the time of Constantius II (357) but, to appease the storm of angry protests, it was speedily replaced. The aristocratic families of the old capital were, in fact -- along with the intelligentsia and the half-educated everywhere -- the last champions of the cults. Among the first there had developed a new, obstinate ardour about the rites and liturgies; with the men of letters it was an attachment to professional ideals, a dislike for Christianity as the feared foe of beauty and culture, whose triumph would be the triumph of barbarism. What a reality these last oppositions were, and how powerful was their main weapon -- scorn -- the elaborate constructive apologetic of St. Augustine remains to show, the *De Civitate Dei*. The protestations of the senatorial aristocracy were now renewed and, Gratian being murdered the following year, and the regent for his child-successor -- Valentinian II -- being an Arian, the Pagans might easily have secured the replacement of the statue once more. That they did not do so was due to the vigorous opposition of the Bishop of Milan, at this time the imperial capital. This was the great man who, until lately, had been governor of the province, one of the last of the Romans, St. Ambrose. He had been Gratian's tutor, as he was now the tutor and protector of the child-emperor. He had been the emperor's adviser in matters temporal no less than spiritual, an ambassador, more than once, where a delicate situation called for the experienced wisdom of the man in whom the Roman administrator and the Catholic bishop were so well combined. St. Ambrose is an augury of what the Middle Ages, at their best, are to be, and in nothing is he more so than in his bold defiance of the Empress Justina in this matter of the statue of Victory. Thanks to his vigour and prudence the policy of Gratian suffered no setback. Upon Paganism it produced the

expected result. There was not enough faith in the cults to keep them alive once the revenues went, and with the disappearance of the priestly aristocracy whom those revenues nourished there disappeared, too, the social prestige which was the old religion's chief asset. There was no attempt to punish Pagans for belief or for practice. There was no Christian revenge, and no attempt, as yet, to substitute Christianity for Paganism as the official religion of the State. The Roman Empire was, for the moment, a State in which religion and the republic were things entirely separate. Under Gratian's successor the policy was to reach its logical conclusion. It was Theodosius who first made the State a Catholic thing.

Theodosius (379-395); the one great man the Empire produced in the two centuries which separate Constantine and Justinian, was that phenomenon hitherto rare, an emperor baptised from the beginning of his reign and a convinced practising Catholic. The Catholicism of his regular private life was the mainspring of his public action as the Catholic Emperor. He was not only Latin -- almost the first emperor for a hundred and fifty years not born East of the Adriatic -- but he came from the most Latin province of all the West, Spain. He had pre-eminently all the Latin virtues; he had a logical mind, an inexhaustible fund of personal energy, a temperament made for prompt solutions, and impatient of half measures. When Valens died, in 378, Gratian had associated Theodosius as his partner and assigned to him the difficult task of restoring the East to something like peace and contentment after half a century of religious disunion that bordered on civil war.

From the beginning Theodosius was definite. The long domination of the little clique of Arian bishops, in whose influence at court lay the real cause of the troubles, came to an end. Catholicism was freed; and security for its future provided in the first code for the repression of heresy. Orthodox Christianity received its first description in civil law as "the faith which the Roman Church has received from the Apostle Peter," it is the faith "professed by the pontiff Damasus and Peter Bishop of Alexandria." The churches of heretics of every sort, Anomeans, Arians, Apollinarians, Macedonians, are to be confiscated and handed over to the Catholics. Heretical assemblies are forbidden and heretics lose all power of making wills or of inheriting. Six times in the next fifteen years these

laws are renewed.

Towards the Pagans, on the other hand, Theodosius is much less rigorous. There is a law against apostates from Christianity to Paganism, and all sacrifices to divine the future are now strictly forbidden. Divination of all kinds is abolished. On the eve of his succession to the Western Empire (391) upon the death of Valentinian II, an edict closes all the temples once and for all. Gradually they are given over to other uses. Finally, in the year in which Theodosius becomes master of the whole Roman world (392), the law occupies itself with the domestic religion which was the last refuge of Paganism, as, in Rome at least, it had been the place whence it sprang. All household rites are forbidden, all the domestic shrines are to be destroyed. But with all this anti-Pagan legislation it is to be noted that there is no attempt to compel the Pagan to become a Christian. Christian and Pagan are equal before the law. Honours and office continue to go impartially to the one as to the other. There is no violence offered to persons. The supports of the old religion have been ruthlessly struck away. The structure will soon fall of itself. Pagans remain, and will remain, here and there for a century yet, especially in the country districts. The old cults will, finally, come to be so associated with rusticity that the Roman's very name for a countryman (*paganus*) will for ever describe, and describe primarily, one who worships the old gods. Pagans, countryfolk, living remotely and divorced from the day's life and culture, ignorantly clinging to ancient superstitions and rites, backwoodsmen, there still will be in plenty; and for three centuries after Theodosius the business of their conversion will occupy the Church; but Paganism, with Theodosius, dies never to rise again.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



NOTE C: THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF THE PERSECUTING STATE

How did the disciples of the Church regard the Roman State which was their persecutor? From the very beginning there were two schools of thought. The Apocalypse speaks of the Roman power in language of unmeasured abhorrence. It is the beast, the great harlot, drunk with the blood of the saints, destined for its crimes to a fearful chastisement.

But in St. Paul there is discoverable a certain pride in the Empire of which he is a citizen, and a faith that its stability and the order it secures are to be, under God, a powerful means of Christian propaganda. The authority which, in some instances, it misuses, is none the less divine in its origin; and whoever resists it resists thereby God Who is its author. To the Christian the prince " is God's minister. . . for good. . . an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil." Obedience, loyalty, the payment of tribute are then obligations in conscience (Rom. xiii, 1-7). Nor does the teaching change when, a few years later, Nero's edicts have destroyed the Christian's legal security. It is still his duty to pray "for Kings and for all that are in high station " (I Tim. ii, 2), "to be subject to princes and powers, to obey at a word, to be ready to every good work" (Titus iii, 1-2). The contemporary writings of St. Peter (I Peter ii, 13-15) are inspired by the same ideals, "Be ye subject to every human creature for God's sake: whether it be the king as excelling, or to governors as sent by him for the punishment of evildoers and the praise of the good. . . . Fear God. Honour the King." Such, in the first generation of Christianity, was the Church's general commentary on Our Lord's own direction to "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's."

This theory of the lawfulness of authority, of the State's right to loyal obedience, and of the Christian's political duties as obliging him in conscience, the persecutions by no means destroyed. It is repeated faithfully in the writers of every generation from Nero to Constantine, and, a rooted tradition by the time of that emperor's conversion, it supplied one of the foundations upon which he and his successors were able to build their untraditional novelty of a State-directed Christianity.

The epistle of St. Clement of Rome gives a noteworthy testimony to the theory, in the prayer it contains for "our masters and those who govern us on earth " since " Thou, O Lord, has given them sovereign power" and " knowing the glory and honour with which Thou has endowed them, grant us to be submissive and never to rebel against Thy will. . . . Give to them O Lord health, peace, harmony and security, that they may exercise without harm the authority Thou has confided to them."

The martyrs, too -- St. Polycarp for example -- pray for the emperors in whose name they suffer and for those who are the agents of the imperial power in their death. This religious concern for the welfare of the State is so known an element of the Christian mind that the Apologists can point to it in disproof of the charge that Christianity is a danger to the State; and Tertullian lightly invites the magistrates, "Come good governors, put this soul to the torture while it prays to God for the emperor." Christians, the same bitter spirit insists, have a greater interest than Pagans in the Empire's welfare for it is, in God's providence, the one barrier against all-destroying anarchy and chaos. Nor, he notes, has a Christian ever been found among all the hundred leaders of sedition and revolt.

The Church, then, by no means saw in the Empire a thing evil in its nature, a thing therefore to be destroyed. Nor was there ever any Christian policy in the matter of the persecutions except the heroic policy of patient Endurance and prayer for the persecutor until the providence of God should send quieter times.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



CHAPTER 7: THE ARIANS, 318-359

INTRODUCTION

THE conversion of the Roman Emperor to Christianity in 312, an event of such proportions that the Christians themselves were staggered thereby for a generation and more, proved in the end to be as important a turning point in the history of the Church's own development as in that of her relations with the State. The century which saw, as an immediate effect of the conversion, the steady de-Paganising of the Roman power, saw also a much more violent sequel to it -- the struggle to determine the role of the Christian Emperor within the Christian Church. That the autocrat of the Roman world, master of all men's lives, and of the destinies and fortunes of every institution within the world-state, whom millions gladly worshipped as a god, and whom, by formal etiquette, all men treated as semi-divine, that this personification of human might would be, in the Church of Christ, no more than the equal of his subjects, acknowledging there an authority within his State which he did not control, was a consequence of the conversion that the emperor did not realise by any sudden intuition. Nor did the Church as a whole; and before the ecclesiastical mind [] had come to the clarity of the formulae in which St. Ambrose fixed the matter for all time, the Church had to pass through fifty years of a fight which, more than once, seemed to threaten the death of the traditional faith. Caesar is no sooner converted than, as the protector of the things that are God's, he threatens to overshadow the hierarchy and its traditional chief. More than any bishop, more than all the bishops, more than the Bishop of Rome himself, Caesar in his role of Faith's defender will determine the course of the Faith's development. When the first Christian rulers appear, of the State in which the Church is born, the Church meets, for the first time, the problem of Caesaro-Papism that has never since ceased to vex her, of the Catholic prince who wills, in effect, to be pope; the danger that princely benevolence threatens to transform the mystical body of Christ into a department of State.

The occasion of the struggle is the renewal of a dispute about a point of doctrine. The point, once again, is fundamental; how far

is the Church's founder divine, and therefore how far divine His work in the Church. The disputes spread widely; they are conducted with spirit, with energy and bitterness; and into the arena the whole social life of the time is drawn: not scholars merely and bishops, but the whole lay world, down to the charioteers and market-women. The mobs of the great cities are passionately interested, and play their violent part. The emperor intervenes. There is a council, a decision. The defeated party bides its time; then, through the avenues by which at courts these things are managed, it gradually turns the emperor round. The decision of the council is left intact, but the emperor is worked upon to act against the council's promoters and defenders. There follows a desperate endeavour on the part of the emperor to pacify the State by forcibly imposing the heresy. In the end the heresy disappears, but not even then is the Church's view of Caesar's role wholly victorious. For if, in the East, heresy disappears, it is because an emperor succeeds who is a Catholic. There it is by now a tradition that Caesar interferes in matters of religion, and that he is a lawful court of appeal. Whence, succeeding the struggle of the Church against Caesar patronising heresy, a new struggle against the Catholic Caesar, now fettering the Church with his insistent patronage. The second struggle is not determined for centuries. It only ends with Caesar's victory and the disappearance of the Church from his State.

Arianism, as a theological doctrine, was the outcome of yet another effort of the Greek mind to reconcile rationally the truths that there is but one God, that the Logos incarnate in Jesus Christ is God, and that the Logos is yet admittedly distinct from the Father. If the Father is God, and if God is one only, and if the Logos is not the Father, how is the Logos God? The Gnostics of the second century had proposed their solution, and a succession of other theories had continued to trouble the peace of believers through all the next hundred years. All in their turn had been condemned; for, whatever the merit of these ingenious systems, none had produced a satisfactory explanation which yet preserved the traditional faith in its integrity. Praxeas, Noetus, and Sabellius ended by identifying Father and Logos. Theodotus, on the other hand, and the more famous Paul of Samosata, denied that the Logos is truly divine. Of Paul's spectacular disgrace we already know something. With him there fell, too, his friend the priest Lucian, so notorious as

heretical in this matter that he lay excommunicated through the reigns of Paul's three successors Later, under what circumstances we do not know, Lucian made his peace and, in the persecution of Galerius, gave his life for the Faith, 312. The memory of his martyrdom was still fresh, and his tomb at Nicomedia, the eastern capital, a centre of pilgrimage when, ten years later, Constantine came to rule the East, and the new Emperor's mother, St. Helen, adopted Lucian as her patron saint. Arius was the pupil of Lucian, and Lucian the real father of Arianism. []

The theory of Arianism is that "God is One, Eternal, Unbegotten. All other beings are His creatures, the Logos the first of them. Like other creatures the Logos was created from nothing and not from the divine substance (ousia in the Greek). There was a time when the Logos did not exist. His creation was not necessary, but due to the will of the Father. The Logos, God's creature, is in turn the creator of all other creatures and his relationship to them is a kind of justification of his being called God. God adopted him as Son foreseeing his merits, for the Logos is free, subject to change and determined to good by his own will. From this adoptive sonship there does not result any real share in the divine nature, any true likeness to it. There cannot be anything like to God. The Holy Spirit is the first of the creatures created by the Logos. He is even less God than the Logos. The Logos became flesh in this sense that in Jesus Christ he took the place of the soul. "

Arius, at the time of Constantine's conversion, was a priest in Alexandria known for his ascetic life, with a great following, among the clergy and, especially, the consecrated virgins whom he directed in the higher way. He was also a preacher of talent, and he began a few years later to fill his church with a popular exposition of Lucian's theory (318). The novelty had all a novelty's success until it was officially brought to the notice of the Bishop of Alexandria. There followed the usual procedure of enquiry and consultation, and it was decided that Arius' explanation was not in accord with the traditional belief. Arius was called upon to abandon it. He refused, and thereupon, with his adherents, he was excommunicated. So far the dispute was on the smallest possible scale -- an obscure priest and his bishop. But the priest had travelled, had made friends, and some of these were powerful. The most powerful of them was an old

classfellow of the days when, at Antioch, Arius had followed the lectures of Lucian. This was Eusebius, now a bishop -- bishop indeed of the imperial city Nicomedia, and related to the new imperial family. When, after his condemnation, Arius set himself to write "to all the bishops," in writing to Eusebius of Nicomedia he was writing to an assured ally. The Bishop of Alexandria, too, wrote to the other bishops -- more than seventy letters in all, among them one to the pope -- an official notification of the heresy and the condemnation, to ensure that Arius, who by this time had fled, should find himself condemned wherever he halted.

Arius, however, found a welcome among his friends at Nicomedia, and set himself to organise a body of supporters. Letters, pamphlets, and popular songs embodying his doctrine, poured from his pen. His bishop replied, the other bishops took sides, and soon all the East was ablaze with the controversy -- Egypt condemning Arius, the bishops of Asia, led by Eusebius, supporting him. The dispute was still unsettled when, in the September of 324, Constantine defeated the Eastern Emperor Licinius and became, at last, sole master of the Roman world. To him the disputants turned.

His first action was to send to Alexandria the bishop who most possessed his confidence, Hosius of Cordova. It was possibly from this meeting of Hosius and Alexander of Alexandria that there came the idea of submitting the matter to a council that would not be local merely, as all councils up to now had been, but would gather in all the bishops of the Church. Whatever the origin of the plan, Constantine made it his own. It was in his name that the bishops were invited; he provided the travelling facilities which alone made its meeting possible; and he chose the place where it should assemble, Nicea, a city of Bithynia, close to his capital. The council opened in the June of 325. Estimates differ as to the number of bishops present. Traditionally they were 318, but the creed bears the signatures of 220 only. They were almost all from the eastern half of the Empire, fourteen only from Europe and of these fourteen eleven were from European Greece. [] The Bishop of Rome was absent; his age forbade his making the journey, but two of his priests represented him. Hosius presided.

To the bishops who assisted at the magnificent festivities with

which the council opened, the whole affair must have seemed incredible. Most of them had suffered for the Faith, some very recently indeed, in the persecution of Licinius. They had seen their colleagues die atrociously in its defence. Many of them, blind and lamed, still bore in their bodies eloquent testimony of their own fidelity under trial. Now all was changed, and the honoured guests of the power which so recently had worked to destroy them, escorted by that soldiery the sight of whose arms must still provoke memories at which they shuddered, the Catholic bishops were come together with all possible pomp to regulate their differences before the face of the world.

The minutes of the Council of Nicea have long since disappeared. Apparently the procedure followed by the Roman Senate, and already traditional in councils, was adopted. Each bishop who wished to speak stated his opinion, and then followed the general discussion. The parties soon showed themselves. For Arius there was a tiny fighting band of seventeen, led by Eusebius. Of the rest, one large party was against any innovation in the traditional Faith or in the manner of its exposition, opposed indeed to the idea that any investigation was necessary. Others were for examining every detail of the tradition before reaffirming it.

Arius was given his chance. He stated his doctrine in all its bald simplicity. The bishops agreed to condemn it. It was a more difficult matter to agree on the form the condemnation should take. A test-formula was needed which would express the traditional Faith precisely as it differed from the heresy, and thus bar out the new doctrine's adherents. Eusebius of Nicomedia had one ready. It was rejected, because it was so ambiguous that Arians could sign it as easily as Catholics. His namesake, Eusebius of Cesarea, -- " the Father of Church History," one chief source for many earlier matters, down to 324, and who, also, from a Lucianist education, favoured Arius -- proposed a better. It was however, even so, too ambiguous to suit the Council. Something more precise, a phrase which could not possibly be interpreted in an Arian sense was needed; and finally, to express the fullness of the Son's divinity in relation to that of the Father, the term homoousion (i.e. consubstantial, of the same substance) was proposed. It met the case admirably, and it was accepted. But not without much discussion, hesitation and, even in the end, reluctance. Quite apart from the

Arianisers, whom such a close definition would force into the open as innovators and drive out of the Church, there were Catholics also who disliked this fashion of defining faith in new terms not to be found in the Scriptures. Again this particular term had, for Easterns, unhappy heretical associations. Paul of Samosata, it was remembered, had used it fifty years earlier, not it is true to express the idea that Father and Son are of the same nature, but with the meaning that they are identical in person. Sabellius, too, had used it to convey a like notion. Paul's theory had been condemned and with it the term he used, as he used it. On the other hand, with the meaning now given it, the term had long been in use in the West. It was Tertullian's consubstantialis translated, and Rome had given this use an orthodox consecration in the settlement of the disputes about Denis of Alexandria's orthodoxy now nearly seventy years ago. In favour of the term homoousion, then, there was the great advantage that it exactly met the need of the moment as did no other term; and there was good warrant for its being so used. In this acceptance by Easterns of a term they disliked but which had Roman use to support its orthodoxy, we can perhaps discern a trace of Roman influence at the Council; the test clause of the formulary it adopted was Roman. That formulary is the famous Creed of Nicea. It deserves to be cited as the council proclaimed it.

"We believe in one only God, the Father, Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one only Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the sole-begotten of the Father, that is to say of the Father's substance, God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God; begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father (homoousion to Patri), by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down, became incarnate, became man, suffered, was raised again on the third day, ascended back to heaven and will come again to judge the living and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit. As for those who say 'There was a time when He did not exist; before He was begotten He did not exist; He was made from nothing or from another substance or essence; the Son of God is a created being, changeable, capable of alteration,' to such as these the Catholic Church says Anathema."

With two exceptions all the bishops signed, whatever their real beliefs, whatever their doubts as to the prudence of the defining

word. Eusebius of Nicomedia at the solicitation of his patron Constantia, Constantine's sister, the widow of Licinius, signed with the rest. The two recalcitrants were promptly exiled, and the Emperor's orders were sent to Alexandria to secure the acceptance of the council's decision and the removal of dissidents.

Here the history of Arianism should have ended. But now, for the first time in the history of the Church, a heresy was, after its condemnation, not only to survive, but to survive within the Church, to be protected there and maintained, and to be a cause of disorders whose bitter fruits are with us still; and all this was because now, for the first time, there remained to the condemned heretics the resource of appealing against the condemnation to that new element in the Church, the Christian Emperor. A new untraditional procedure is to begin to function; the new circumstance of Caesar's being a Christian is to be made to tell. It is the condemned who will attempt it, and their success will not only create a precedent for future condemned heretics, but initiate Caesar into the exercise of new unlawful power, create in him a taste for it, and habituate him to its exercise.

The first attempt to reopen the question ended badly for those who organised it. Some of the dispossessed Arians from Alexandria came to court to plead their case. Eusebius and a neighbouring bishop -- Theognis of Nicea -- supported them, but too enthusiastically. The appellants were dismissed and the two bishops exiled. In exile they remained for three years.

It is with the return of Eusebius in 330 that the next chapter in the story begins. Eusebius was no mere theorist concerned only to expound his unorthodox views, but a cool and capable leader who must, in order to retain his influence and position, either capitulate to the forces which had defeated him in 325 and exiled him in 327, or now, in his turn, drive them out. He realised that a frontal attack on the Council of Nicea would fail. Constantine was too attached to the council and to its definition as his own achievement to tolerate, where these were concerned, any other attitude than obedient submission. It was, however, another matter to attack the men responsible for the definition. To force these into exile, and then, with a new personnel in the highest ranks of the hierarchy substitute an Arian interpretation of Nicea

might be possible. Eusebius could count on sympathy within the imperial family; he could use against those who stood by the letter of the homoousion the numerous bishops who, though they believed what it expressed, disliked the term and suspected those who imposed it. The council had long ago dispersed: Eusebius remained, Bishop of the Capital, the emperor's natural adviser in religious matters, ready and able at every opportunity astutely to suggest what he was now too wise to propose, and at every turn able to show himself as the emperor's obedient servant.

Slowly, gradually, after the return of the exiles, the controversy re-opened, its central point shifted now to the expediency of using the critical " homoousion ". Was the term really orthodox? Was it not as heretical as Arius himself? Not of course Arian, but, perhaps, Sabellian? In the meshes of this subtle dispute Eusebius caught his first victim the bishop of the second chief city of the East, Eustathius of Antioch. Eustathius accused the Bishop of Nicomedia of betraying the faith of Nicea. Eusebius replied that the Bishop of Antioch was a Sabellian. At Antioch, the city where Lucian had taught, where Arius and Eusebius had learnt their heresy, there was a strong pro-Arian faction. Eustathius had done his best to drive them out. Here was their opportunity. A council was summoned, at which Eusebius played his part, and Eustathius was deposed, 331. There were riots and, lest Eustathius should become a perpetual provocation by his presence, Constantine followed up the council's sentence by a second sentence of exile. This henceforth is to be the normal procedure with deposed bishops.

In place of the deposed Eustathius there was elected one of the few bishops who, at Nicea, had gone so far as expressly to defend Arius -- Paulinus of Tyre. He died, however, in a matter of months, and in the election of his successor the emperor took a hand. He congratulated the Antiocheans on their expulsion of Eustathius -- "they had cleared the ship of its bilge" -- and he recommended as their new bishop either of two candidates for the orthodoxy of whose faith he pledged his word. Inevitably one of the imperially nominated was chosen, Euphronios. For the first time in history the civil power has interfered in the election of a bishop; the novelty is the work of a faction; they will make over to the civil power one prerogative after another, if only they can thereby destroy that orthodoxy by whose existence they

stand condemned.

The events at Antioch were a pattern for subsequent Eusebian procedure. One city after another saw them repeated, and bishop after bishop who had fought Eusebius was deposed, exiled, and provided with a Eusebian successor. The machinery of this ecclesiastical revolution was consistently the same -- orders and directions from the emperor himself.

The next stage was to install a Eusebian in the greatest of all the Eastern sees, Alexandria. The bishop who, years ago now, had condemned Arius and assisted at Nicea's ratification of that condemnation, was dead. In his place there had been elected one of his principal advisers, his companion at Nicea, the deacon Athanasius. With him there enters into the story its greatest figure. He was able, he was learned, he was orthodox. His life was irreproachable. He was to his people a model bishop, and for tenacity of purpose, the inflexibility bred of a clear grasp of principle, no hero of Church History has ever surpassed him. Eusebius attacked, in a letter inviting Athanasius to open his church to the friends of Arius. The Bishop of Alexandria explained that since they all lay under the anathema of Nicea the thing was impossible. Whereupon there came to him a further letter, this time from the emperor, "You know my will. Whosoever wishes to re-enter the Church is to be given all facilities. If I hear that you have forbidden to enter anyone who wishes to return, I shall speedily send someone with power to depose you by my order." Athanasius, undismayed, protested ever more clearly that "there can be no communion between the Catholic Church and a heresy which fights against Christ."

Athanasius had on his hands, at this time, a more domestic anxiety -- the Meletian schism. Three of the schismatics went to the capital to lay complaints of a civil nature against him. Eusebius welcomed them, advised them, and Constantine, though he was not sufficiently convinced to have the affair formally dealt with, summoned Athanasius to reply in person. He cleared himself without difficulty and, apparently, quite won over the emperor. But, twelve months later (334), the trouble began again. New accusations of the same nature, with this in addition that he had murdered a bishop, were made and this time it was before the emperor's brother, residing at Antioch, that

Athanasius had to clear himself. Again, without difficulty, he was successful, producing the supposedly dead bishop as convincing answer to the charge ! But this time Eusebius had been certain that his opponent was finished. So certain indeed that with other bishops of his party he was already en route for the East, to a council to be held at Cesarea, which would make an end of Athanasius, when the emperor ordered him home. To Athanasius Constantine wrote once more, expressing his confidence in him.

Constantine had twice turned from Eusebius to his calumniated opponent. But when Eusebius, a third time regained it, his hold on the imperial mind was to be permanent. The council forbidden at Cesarea in 334, was allowed to meet in 335. The place chosen was Tyre. With Athanasius came forty-nine bishops from Egypt. They were refused admission. The jury was already carefully packed, Arians to a man, Eusebius at their head; and behind this Eusebian conspiracy lay the prestige and power of the Court. An imperial official was the Council's president. "How can anyone dare to give the name of synod to this assembly over which a count presided? It was the count who spoke, the members of the synod were silent, or rather they took the count's orders. He gave his orders and the soldiery put us out. In reality it was Eusebius and his friends who gave the orders. The count was there to carry them out. What kind of a synod was it, which, if such were the prince's good pleasure, might end with a sentence of exile or death?" So the Egyptian bishops protested in later days. It was indeed a new kind of council, the first of its kind, but destined to be the pattern of imperially organised councils under the Casaro-papist emperors. The old accusations once more made their appearance, and along with them new ones of the same type. Athanasius, yet again, cleared himself of the first, and as to the newer charges the council named a carefully chosen deputation to investigate them on the spot. That they made the investigation so carefully as never to examine the principal witnesses, and with such discretion that they never officially knew even of their existence, surprised no one. Not truth was their aim but a report which would help on the work of the council. Athanasius understood -- none better -- and he left the council to lay his case in person before the emperor.

In his absence the Eusebians carried out the appointed

programme only the more easily. They condemned him, deposed him, forbade him to return to his episcopal city. They had not yet separated when from Constantinople came letters from the emperor. Athanasius and his sovereign had met -- casually, in a street of the capital, as the court returned from its hunting. Constantine would have ignored him but the bishop held firm, coldly stating his one simple desire -- to meet his enemies face to face in the emperor's presence. Constantine agreed and the bishops, fresh from sentencing Athanasius, were ordered to the capital to justify their proceedings. The heretics had called in Caesar to redress the balance of the orthodoxy so heavily weighed against them. Now Athanasius had made a like appeal -- none too wisely. It was his first -- and last -- reliance on the princes of this world. The provincial council was arranged. It was very brief, for Eusebius had found a new charge, that the Bishop of Alexandria had schemed to hold up the capital's corn supply. The mere accusation drove Constantine into one of those fits of fury to which he was liable. Without further ado Athanasius was exiled, banished to the very end of the world, to Treves and the distant Moselle (335).

Eusebius might rest content. The last out-and-out leader of the homoousion party, the most uncompromising of the survivors of Nicea, was driven out at last. The victor returned to the East to Jerusalem, whither the bishops from Tyre had gone to celebrate the consecration of the new basilica built by the magnificent imperial generosity over the site of Our Lord's tomb. Thence, in a synodal letter, he proclaimed his victory to the Christian world. Arius and his associates have now given pledges of their orthodoxy to the emperor. He exhorts us peaceably to receive them back into the Church whence unseemly envy has lately expelled them. He stands guarantee for their good faith. The formula the Arians were to sign as the condition of their restoration, and which Eusebius and his bishops at Jerusalem accepted as proof of their orthodoxy, follows the imperial letter as an appendix. It is the creed of Nicea with the critical phrases carefully omitted. The term homoousion does not appear at all, and instead of the affirmation that Jesus is the Son "begotten of the Father," it is merely stated that as God the Logos He existed from all time. The Nicene definition is not explicitly repudiated, it is simply ignored. In its place is an equivocal compromise, which Arians can subscribe as well as Catholics, and which Arian ingenuity has devised to obscure the distinction between

Nicea and the theories there condemned. In ten years, Arius, thanks to the astute pertinacity of his "fellow-Lucianist" Eusebius, and despite Nicea, is back in the Church. The bishops at Jerusalem have sanctioned the new practice of finding substitutes for definitions of faith in order to rally dissidents. This, too, is a precedent that henceforward every condemned heretic will most carefully strive to follow.

To complete the triumph, it only remained for Arius to be received back into the Church with all the apparatus of public ceremonial. But Alexandria would have none of him. Its bishop might be in exile, but the people stood loyally by him. The riots were so violent, so continuous, that the scheme was abandoned, and Arius was summoned to Constantinople, charged with the responsibility of the disorder. There, too, his arrival divided the city into] hostile factions. The bishop, no Arian but perplexed, hesitated. The prelates of the Council of Jerusalem were by this time, most of them, in the capital, enthusiastic to see their decisions imposed as law. Constantine lent his aid. The Catholics of the city stormed heaven with supplications that the catastrophe might be averted. In vain, apparently, for the day was fixed and the church chosen. But on the very eve Arius himself suddenly died (336). A few months later Constantine, too, was dead (May 22, 337). The Eusebians had lost, in the very moment when their triumph seemed complete.

The figure of the historical Constantine later ages overlaid with legend. Under this softening influence he becomes the model of Catholic princes, a first pattern St. Louis for all succeeding ages. The truth is very different [] In his manners he remained, to the end, very much the Pagan of his early life. His furious tempers, the cruelty which, once aroused, spared not the lives even of his wife and son, are not only disproof of the legend but an unpleasing witness to the imperfection of his conversion. That conversion was indeed sincere. The emperor certainly I believed that Christ Our Lord had appeared to him, had promised him victory. Victory had in fact followed and thenceforward Constantine's faith had been proof against all doubt. He gave himself to Christ, and broke from the official polytheism incompatible with his new allegiance. But there he halted. He was not received into the Church, even as a catechumen, until the very end. Nor, possibly, did his knowledge of his new religion ever advance beyond this simple belief that Christ is the

One and Only God. Uninstructed, a politician concerned to safeguard at the same time the welfare of the Church of Christ and the public order, expediency inevitably determined his decisions; and in the oligarchy of court prelates such as Eusebius of Nicomedia this disposition found every encouragement. Constantine was the greatest military leader the Empire had known for nearly a century, and as an administrative reformer he was only surpassed by Diocletian. That such a man should be indifferent to the internal life of the Church, to its controversies and the intense movement born of them would have been impossible. His intervention was inevitable, and it had its limits. It was, in his own conception, as the servant of Christ's religion that he intervened, to protect the faith defined -- but never himself to define it. It was his misfortune, rather than his fault, that Christ's religion was to him the religion of Eusebius and his associates. To their influence was due the most serious flaw in all his ecclesiastical policy -- his practical neglect of the Roman primacy, which he treated as non-existent. Later legend told how the Emperor, struck with leprosy, visited the pope, and how, St. Sylvester baptizing him in the Lateran, the leprosy was healed as the baptismal water cleansed his soul. The truth is far other. "The Roman Church -- Constantine's generous presents apart, and the presence of two of its priests at Nicea -- has no history between the council of 313 under Pope Miltiades and that of 340 under Julius I. The Papacy, one may say, seems with Sylvester to pass through a quarter of a century's retirement." In place of the traditional court of last appeal, Constantine was guided by the oligarchy whose head was the bishop of his capital city. This novelty was to show all its mischievous consequences in the reign of his son Constantius II (337-361). Not only would the emperor then "protect the faith, but he would himself decide what faith merited his protection. And if, with all his advantages, the son did not succeed, his failure would be owing very largely to the fact that the Bishop of Rome, carefully excluded from effective power in the East, continued in his traditional authority in the West, and binding the West in a firm resistance, rallied what remained of orthodox Catholicism even in the carefully disciplined eastern hierarchy.

These things, in 337, no man could foresee, neither the aggression of Constantius II nor the amazing sudden re-appearance of the Papacy, fully armed, with St. Julius I (338-

352). The great emperor was dead, and he had died as a Christian should, sorrowing for his sins and begging God's mercy, pledging himself most solemnly as he received the white robe of the newly-baptized to live what rest of life God granted him in more seemly accord with the Faith he professed. It was, however, no Catholic who thus initiated him with the sacraments but an Arian, no less an Arian in fact than Eusebius himself.

Constantine did not lack for relatives to inherit his Empire. He had three surviving sons, he had brothers, he had nephews. His death was the signal for a family massacre in which, to the profit of his sons, his brothers and some of the nephews perished. There were left as almost the only survivors of the descendants of Constantius Chlorus, the three sons of Constantine, Constantine II, Constantius II and Constans. The vast heritage was once more divided. To Constantine II went the dioceses of Spain, Gaul and Britain; to Constantius II those of Thrace, Asia, Pontus, Egypt and the East; to Constans Africa, Italy, Rome, Dacia and Macedonia. Three years later, in a civil war with Constans, Constantine II met his death and, his heritage passing to the victor, of the two surviving brothers Constans was master easily of the greater part of the Roman world, and the predominant partner. The fact played an important part in ecclesiastical affairs, for, while Constantius II in the East was a decided Eusebian, though not even a catechumen, Constans was a Catholic, and was even baptized. His health unfortunately was poor, and with this continual debility went a disinclination for action. Nevertheless, he was strong enough, so long as he lived -- he died in 350 -- to make any Arian aggression in the West impossible, and to exercise some restraint upon anti-Catholic violence in the East.

Two events marked the beginning of the new regime after the death of Constantine the Great (337). St. Athanasius was allowed to return to Alexandria, and Eusebius succeeded, in defiance of Church law, in capturing for himself the see of Constantinople. A renewal of the conflict in the East was already in sight.

It began with an attempt to install at Alexandria an Arian rival to Athanasius. The Eusebians revived the memory of the sentence passed on him long since at Tyre (335) but never confirmed. Each of the three emperors was approached, and an embassy sent with a like mission to Rome. The Western Emperors

dismissed the envoys; Constantius II welcomed them, and promised support. Rome acted with the traditional formality, observance of the canons which governed appeals. The pope -- Julius I -- knew the men with whom he was dealing. They had already planned to trap him into an implicit disavowal of Nicea when they sought confirmation for the Arian competitor of St. Athanasius, suppressing the fact that, excommunicated himself, he was ordained by an excommunicated bishop. Now, presented with the minutes of the Council of Tyre, the Pope wrote to St. Athanasius, enclosing the accusing documents, bidding him summon a synod before which he should clear himself and to report its decision. The synod was held. The Bishop of Alexandria, once more going through all the ancient charges once more cleared himself, and the council sent its decision to Rome.

Meanwhile, the Eusebians had written again to Rome. This time they asked the pope to judge between them and St. Athanasius. The emperors held aloof. After all these years of imperial protection the normal procedure was once more to have its chance-the Bishop of Rome deciding an appeal of one bishop against another. But before the appeal was heard, the situation at Alexandria suddenly changed. Constantius sent orders that St. Athanasius was to be expelled, and in his place another enthroned as bishop -- Gregory of Cappadocia, a notorious Arian, a lieutenant admittedly of Eusebius. This was indeed imperial confirmation of the sentence manufactured at Tyre. It revealed Constantius as an Arian, and that Eusebius was able to play in the new reign the part he had played in the old.

St. Athanasius, expelled but not a whit thereby dismayed, blazed out in an encyclical of protest, to which the pope replied by summoning him to the council shortly to be held at Rome, the council for which the Eusebians had asked, where all should be reviewed. To this council there came in, from all parts of the East, bishops who had been the victims of the Eusebian treachery, expelled by his manoeuvres, hailing the un hoped for boon of an ecclesiastical council free from imperial influence. But the Eusebians now would have no share in it. To the pope's notification -- since they had chosen him as judge, he now informed them when the council would meet and that should they not appear they would be judged accordingly -- they replied in a manifesto full of threats and sarcasms, refusing to accept

his jurisdiction in the matter. Unless the pope will recognise the sentences of Tyre and the other depositions they have decreed, they will not, for the future, hold communion with him. The manifesto was the product of a council held at Antioch, and it bears the signatures of a variety of bishops. It strikes a new note in the history of the relation between Rome and the other sees. It is the first open denial of her primacy, the first occasion when the Bishop of Rome has been threatened with rebellion to coerce his jurisdiction (341).

For the moment the pope ignored the letter. The council held its sessions. The deposed and exiled bishops stated their cases. The case of the Bishop of Alexandria was given especial consideration. The council thereupon decided that all had been unjustly condemned, and the pope summed up the decision in a letter to the Easterns. As one reads this letter one understands the reluctance of the Eusebians to appeal to Rome, the long years during which they kept Rome out of the quarrel, and the instinct which prompted them to refuse her jurisdiction once they realised it had begun to operate. It is not merely that the letter has all the easy Roman serenity, that the charity which inspires it is itself such a condemnation of their own misdeeds. But there is present, throughout, that Roman consciousness of universal authority, which, informing the precedents that St. Julius quotes against the incipient schismatics, makes the letter the most notable of papal contributions to the century's long debate. The pope is astonished that his own charitable letter has provoked such a bitter and scornful reply. He would have preferred not to publish it, had in fact held it back until the last, hoping against hope that the arrival of the Easterns, returned to a better frame of mind, would cancel what they had written. "That he whom you chose to write it thought it an occasion to make a show of eloquence moves us not at all, for in ecclesiastical matters the important thing is not to parade one's eloquence but to observe the apostolic canons, and carefully to avoid whatever may give scandal." The Easterns now deny that the decision of a council (i.e. Tyre in 335) can be revised by a second council. They are reminded that they themselves petitioned for the second council, and " even had your envoys not themselves demanded that council, had it been myself who sought it as a means whereby the appeal of those complaining of injustice might be heard, my intervention would have been just and praiseworthy because in accord with ecclesiastical

practice and agreeable to God." Nicea itself had passed judgment in matters where previous councils had already judged, and in so doing Nicea itself had merely followed ancient precedent. "Your claim is then unjustifiable, for a custom once established in the Church, and confirmed by councils, is not to be abolished by a chance group of individuals." As for the intruder Gregory of Cappadocia, whom this faction asserts to be the lawful Bishop of Alexandria, " what ecclesiastical canon, what apostolic tradition empowered them, at a time when there was peace in the Church and when Athanasius was so generally recognised, to send this Gregory, ordained by them at Antioch and escorted thence to Alexandria, not by priests and deacons of his church, but by soldiery?" The church of Alexandria and the bishops of the province alone had the right to decide the matter. Supposing there had been some real ground of complaint against all these bishops -- Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra and the many others who had come to Rome to make appeal-the ecclesiastical rule should have been observed. "Your duty was to write to all of us so that in rendering justice we might all of us have shared. For it was a question of bishops and churches more than usually important since they had, in times past, had the Apostles themselves for rulers. Are you ignorant that the usual thing is to write first to us, and that thus justice may be rendered from here? Those then who, far from this, have acted without reference to us, in this arbitrary fashion, would then like us now to signify approval in a case where we have no knowledge? This is not according as Paul commanded, nor as the tradition of the Fathers. This is a procedure wholly foreign and new. I beseech you, allow me to say it thus. I write what I write in the common interest, and what I write to you is what we have received from the blessed apostle Peter."

The protest fell on deaf ears. The emperor who mattered-the emperor of the East, Constantius II -- ignored it, and St. Athanasius with the rest could only resign himself to the exile. Constantius was one with the arianising Easterns, and the bishops of the court faction, later that same year (341), assembled at Antioch with others to the number of a hundred for the dedication of the basilica, picked up the challenge of the letter of Pope Julius and replied with an implicit denial of his claims. They confirmed Gregory of Cappadocia as bishop of St. Athanasius' see; they denied that they were Arians although they acknowledged that they had received Arius once more into

the Church. As an exposition of Catholic teaching in the matter of the divinity of the Logos they preferred to the Nicean creed a creed attributed to Lucian; it expressed the same truth but, they explained, in more suitable language. More truly the new creed sacrificed that truth because it sacrificed the one term which unmistakably expressed the precise deviation of the heresy Nicea had condemned. The new equivocal phraseology was a deliberate confusing of issues clarified these fifteen years, and the new confusion was introduced in the interests of the heresy. This council, In Encaeniis, of 341 inaugurates the new strategy of finding synonyms for the technical terms used in conciliar definitions, synonyms designed to betray the truth already decreed and to ensure the condemned heretics their place within the Church. The precedent now set will be followed faithfully in every crisis of heresy for the next two hundred years. It will, almost always, gain the emperor -- for it is the high water mark of ecclesiastical expediency in matters doctrinal. It will often rally to a lowering of the standards of orthodoxy that orthodoxy's recent defenders, for it promises to gain the heretic while maintaining truth. It will always find in the last resource a resolute opponent in the Bishop of Rome, if nowhere else. His opposition will reject such compromise, at the cost of no matter what measure of peace, ecclesiastical or civil.

It was in the emperor's presence that this council met, Eastern bishops, heretics all, banded with their emperor against Rome. So will it be, again and yet again, until with their emperor they work themselves free of the Bishop of Rome and the Church of Christ.

The council of 341 has another interest, for it marks a change of tactics on the part of the bishops who led the movement. They are anxious to dissociate themselves from Arius, dead now this five years, and from his radically exposed ideas which only a few extremists defend. To be a self-acknowledged Arian was no recommendation anywhere outside that narrow circle. Hence, with a last salute to the memory of the dead heresiarch, they put out a series of formulae of calculated vagueness to indicate the difference between their own orthodoxy and the universally reprobated heresy. It was not Arius, nor was it Nicea: it was Lucian. Its present defenders claimed it as the traditional Catholic faith; the Catholics signed it because there were defenders of the homoousion who were Sabellian; and the

Council went on to condemn, yet once again, the heretics who failed to make the proper distinction between the Father and the Son: Sabellius, that is to say, Paul of Samosata, and Marcellus of Ancyra. The first two were dead long since. The third, however, was not only alive but, driven from his see like Athanasius for opposition to the Eusebians, at this very moment in Rome. More, the famous letter of St. Julius had expressly mentioned his case, had publicly proclaimed him as a protege of the Roman See so that, as has been said, that letter marks an alliance between Julius, Athanasius, and Marcellus of Ancyra. Now, unhappily, Marcellus was looked upon with suspicion throughout the East. He was a true opponent of Arianism, and perhaps his intentions were orthodox. But his language was certainly tricky, and there was only too much justification, in the terms he used, for the charge of Sabellianism made against him. When the council of 341 made the charge, and condemned him, it promised to do more harm to the Roman defence of Nicea than any frontal attack could have done, for it not only condemned this apparent heretic, but also "all those in communion with him." The council proclaimed the chief defenders of Nicea as themselves suspect of heresy in the eyes of the Catholics in the East who still held out against Eusebius.

Eusebius himself died this same year, 341, the fruitful result of his sixteen years of episcopacy a divided Church, East and West drawn up the one against the other. It was a lamentable state of things indeed, and before it should harden into permanency the pope turned to a last effort of reconciliation. Through his own emperor, the Catholic Constantine, he approached the sovereign of the East. After one or two failures the negotiations succeeded thus far that the two emperors agreed to call a council of bishops of the two empires. It was to meet at Sardica, the modern Sofia, a city of the Western Empire but close to the frontier of the East.

At Sardica then the council met in the autumn of 342 or 343 (authorities dispute the date). There were, in all, a hundred and seventy bishops, seventy-six of them from the States of Constantine II. Hosius of Cordova once more presided and the pope was represented by two priests of the Roman Church. The Easterns arrived with their minds made up. The council's task would be the simple one of registering what they had already decided. Before they would consent to take their places in the

council, the council must ratify the condemnation of St. Athanasius and Marcellus -- accept, that is, without discussion, the Eastern view on two of the points to discuss which the council had been called. Hosius, of course, rejected their ultimatum, and the Easterns thereupon, that same night, left Sardica, leaving behind a lengthy protestation. In this they renewed their condemnation of St. Athanasius and Marcellus, denied the right of the West to revise the decision of an Eastern council, and, laying upon the West the blame for this new breakdown, they excommunicated Hosius and the pope with him. They ended with a statement of belief characteristically ambiguous. Meanwhile at Sardica, the council proceeded with its work -- the stale re-examination of the ancient often-exploded charges against St. Athanasius and those against Marcellus too. St. Athanasius once more they cleared. As to Marcellus he, too, was cleared, the council accepting an explanation that what had provoked criticism in his exposition of faith had been, in his intention, theory merely and hypothesis. The bishops unlawfully intruded by the emperor into the different sees of the East were excommunicated and, with them, the leaders of the recent schism from the council. It was suggested, too, that the council might issue a new statement of belief, but, thanks to St. Athanasius, the wiser course was followed of reissuing the adequate, unmistakable creed of Nicea.

The Council of Sardica, failing to unite the divided episcopate, served only to stabilise the division. But although it failed completely in the purpose for which it had been summoned, it left behind it a memorable series of disciplinary canons in which, seeing how the root of the trouble lay in the civil power's usurpation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, it proposed, by strengthening previous legislation regarding the relative rights of bishops, to set a barrier against the new aggression. These canons recall and re-enact the old law that a bishop consecrated for one see is not, on any pretext, to pass therefrom to any other see. Bishops are not to receive clergy excommunicated by their own bishop, nor are they to invade the sees of a neighbouring (civil) province unless duly invited. Bishops whom a necessity of private affairs calls outside their sees are reminded of the rule that no bishop is to be absent from his see for more than three Sundays, and that outside their own sees they are to respect the rights and liturgical prerogatives of the bishop in whose see they find themselves. Useful legislation, this, to check the

episcopal vagabondage which had so assisted the Eusebian faction's growth. The clergy's right of appeal from their own bishop to the bishops of the province is recognised, and where the bishop himself is accused, the old law is still maintained that he is not to be judged by his own subjects. Such cases the council of the bishop's province must decide. From the provincial council such a bishop, should he be condemned, can appeal and the appeal is to the Bishop of Rome. The Bishop of Rome may himself decide the case or order a new trial, and at this the judges are to be the bishops of a neighbouring province. The Eusebian Council of Antioch (In Encaeniis) of 341 had decided that sentences passed on a bishop by the unanimity of a provincial council were irrevocable; and that where the provincial council was divided, the metropolitan should associate with his own bishops those of a neighbouring province and, whatever the new decision, it should be final. This attempted destruction of a bishop's right of appeal to Rome had been the Eusebian reply to Pope Julius I's council in Rome and its rehabilitation of St. Athanasius. The canons of Sardica were a riposte to the Eusebian innovations. They re-affirm and implement what St. Julius had affirmed in his letter to the Easterns, namely that a case could be rejudged, and that the usage is that Rome is consulted first so that "judgment may be done from here." But Sardica did more than merely re-affirm existing rights. In its turn it innovated, when it prescribed the course of action which the Bishop of Rome judging an appeal should follow. This innovation the papacy ignored. The appeal-procedure does not appear ever to have functioned in the detail prescribed by Sardica, nor does Rome's over-riding of the council in this respect appear to have provoked any protest.

Finally the council reported to the pope in a formal synodal letter "since it seems right and truly most suitable that in what concerns each and everyone of the Lord's provinces bishops should act with reference to the head, that is to the see of Peter the Apostle."

Constantius II's reply to the letter of the Council of Sardica was of the practical order. He forbade the bishops it had rehabilitated, under pain of death, to return to their sees, and the two bishops of his Empire who had gone with the Council were sent into exile. None the less, new efforts were again made to heal the breach, and as a result delegates met at Milan in 345.

But since the Catholics continued to demand a repudiation of Arius and his teaching, while the Arians refused to accept the definition of Nicea, the negotiations were without result. The Arians clung, also, to their demand that Marcellus should be condemned, and although the Catholics were willing to condemn the undeniably heretical opinions of his disciple Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, they still refused to accept the Arian view of Marcellus. St. Athanasius, however, increasingly suspicious of Marcellus the better he came to know him, now definitely broke with him. Also, in 346, thanks to a sudden change in court favour, St. Athanasius was allowed to return to Alexandria. His second exile had lasted seven years.

So, in a kind of deadlock, the next few years went by; St. Athanasius at Alexandria but isolated from the Easterns (Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor and Thrace); the Easterns cut off from Rome and the West; while Photinus, whom all condemned, still reigned at Sirmium since no emperor had concerned himself to execute the sentence passed upon him. The assassination of Constans on January 18, 350 brought the deadlock to an end, for his heir was his one surviving brother, Constantius II, who now became sole emperor of the whole Roman world. His Arian sympathies no one could doubt, nor his willingness to act on them, and though the circumstances of his brother's death involved him in three years of civil war, the heirs of Eusebius immediately began their preparations for another attempt to capture Alexandria for Arianism by driving out St. Athanasius, and, also, to end the scandal of Photinus' hold on Sirmium.

For the moment they were powerless against St. Athanasius, for Constantius held firmly to his promises of protection. But the next year, 351, found Constantius in residence at Sirmium and at a council called there by him, and held in his palace, Photinus was deposed. This council followed a curiously novel procedure which made very evident the extent to which the new emperor was prepared to stretch his assumed ecclesiastical prerogative. By his orders a theological debate was arranged in which Photinus was allowed to expose and defend his theories. As opponent there was assigned to him the successor of his old master Marcellus, the new Bishop of Ancyra, Basil. The debate was conducted in approved scholastic fashion, official stenographers took notes for the emperor's benefit, and as judges Constantius nominated eight high officials of the Court.

To complete its work the assembly at Sirmium added yet another to the series of indeterminate creeds which, by suggestion, repudiated Nicea, while Photinus -- condemned as Sabellian -- was given a successor of proved Arian orthodoxy.

The civil war came to a close with the victory of Constantius, on August 10, 353, over the usurper who had murdered his brother. Its vicissitudes had suggested to the Arians a new pretext by which to revive in Constantius his old opinions of St. Athanasius. The Bishop of Alexandria, they urged, had had his share in the attempt of the Western usurper on the peace of the empire. Day by day more bishops were rallying to him. He considered the Arians heretics, enemies to be rid of as soon as possible. Could he be really loyal to the emperor who was their patron? Moreover, there was a new pope. Julius I had died in the previous April (352). He had been the staunch champion of Athanasius. With his successor, Liberius, Arian intrigue might be more successful.

The new pope suggested to Constantius the convocation of yet another council, at Aquileia, to take up the work unfinished at Sardica ten years before. Constantius was at the moment at Arles. Instead of the council asked for, he summoned one to Arles, to which the bishops of Gaul were convoked. Assembled (353) they first of all desired to express their belief in the definition of Nicea. But the emperor would not allow this, nor indeed any discussion on the faith. Instead, he presented the assembly with an edict condemning to exile whoever would not condemn Athanasius. It was the West's first experience of the policy which had made the Eastern Church Caesar's, and it succumbed. Paulinus of Treves stood firm and was exiled. The rest, to a man, signed -- and with them the legates of Liberius.

The effect upon the pope of this betrayal by his legates should be carefully noted, for of all the popes Liberius is the one in whose case contemporary calumny has had most lasting effect. Discouraged truly, but by no means despairing, Liberius replied to this new tactic of breaking St. Athanasius by isolating him from the West as well as from the East, with a new request for a council. Constantius, whose violent language in his regard had certainly reached Liberius, made a show of entering into the plan. The pope chose new legates and in 355 the suggested council met, this time at Milan. At Arles, the bishops, incredibly

ignorant of the history of the previous twenty years in the East -- it was the first time some of them had even heard of Nicea [] -- had acted in fitting deference to requests from "the most Christian emperor." Their acquiescence had been a victory for the emperor's prestige as the son of the great Constantine. At Milan there was, from the beginning, no attempt to cloak the violence under such formalities. Arian bishops dragged the pen from the hand of the Bishop of Milan as he prepared to sign the creed of Nicea in token of orthodoxy. The council became a riot. The mob invaded the church to defend its bishop, and the council's next meeting took place in the palace. In this more favourable locale the imperial will had its way more easily. Once more, as at Arles, the bishops signed -- all save a handful among whom, alas, were not the papal legates. The little band who resisted, Paulinus of Treves, Lucifer of Cagliari, Eusebius of Vercelli and Denis of Milan, were summoned to a special audience. "The emperor," it is St. Athanasius who describes the scene, "having summoned the bishops, ordered them to sign the condemnation of Athanasius and to receive the heretics into communion. They protested against this innovation in Church discipline, crying out that such is not the ecclesiastical rule. Whereupon the emperor broke in 'My will is canon law ! Bishops in Syria make no such objections when I address them. Obey me or. . . exile.' The bishops, astounded at such language, lifting their hands to heaven, with great boldness opposed to the emperor that his kingly power was not his own, that it was in fact God's gift to him, and that he should fear God Who could, and suddenly, strip him of it. They reminded him of the last day and its judgment. They advised him not to throw church affairs into utter confusion, not to confuse the civil power with the Church's constitution and not to open the Church of God to the Arian heresy." Constantius, undersized and bandy in the legs, a poseur who flattered himself that his very gaze struck terror where it fell, who cultivated a deep voice and an oracular manner, listened patiently enough. Then, brandishing his sword, he ordered the bishops to instant execution, only to countermand his sentence immediately and substitute one of exile.

There were, of course, many bishops in the West who had been unable to make the journey to Milan. To reach these absentees, couriers were now sent to one town after another, and by the means used at Milan yet more signatures were obtained to the

condemnation of Athanasius. Once again Liberius had been duped. This time something more was required of him. He too must sign. One of the emperor's confidential eunuchs was despatched to ask his assent. He made show of the valuable presents Constantius sent. Liberius replied fittingly. The eunuch next deposited them at the shrine of the Apostle. Liberius, learning of it, had them thrown into the street. "If the emperor is really anxious for the peace of the Church let us have a truly ecclesiastical council, away from the palace, where the emperor will not appear, nor any of his counts, nor judges to threaten; for the fear of God is sufficient, and the teaching of the Apostles, to enable the Council to secure the Church's faith such as it was defined by the Fathers of Nicea." There, for the moment, the matter of Liberius' signature was allowed to rest.

The Arians turned their attention to Alexandria. Plots were laid to entice the bishop, quietly, away from the city; but he knew his enemies too well to be so easily taken in. Finally they resorted to force. On February 8, 356 the imperial troops broke into the church where St. Athanasius was presiding at the night office. Their arrows flew right and left -- more than one of the congregation was slain -- and with drawn swords they made for the bishop. Despite his efforts to meet death, as centuries later St. Thomas of Canterbury, his attendants managed to get him away. From that moment the city knew its bishop no more. He simply disappeared from view, while the imperial troops hunted for him from one end of Egypt to the other. In Alexandria itself the churches were seized and handed over to the Arians -- the Catholics always resisting to the end -- and Constantius, fresh from legislating terrible penalties against the Pagans, now called in the Pagans themselves to assist in the forcible enthronement of yet another successor to Athanasius. It was once more a Cappadocian, and, like his predecessor, ordained at Antioch for his new post, a certain George whose chief claim to notoriety hitherto had been his skilful mismanagement of the imperial finances. Under George of Cappadocia the Catholics of Egypt were to suffer for the next few years as half a century before Catholics had suffered under Diocletian and Galerius. Once more the mines were filled with Catholic convicts, bishops, priests and laity alike, condemned for their loyalty to St. Athanasius.

The most outspoken defender of Nicea was now, and finally it

seemed, driven out; and with him disappeared orthodoxy's last spokesman. For by this time Hosius was a prisoner and Liberius, also, far away from his see in exile.

Liberius, indeed, the emperor had not dared to silence in his own city; and, fearing riots, should he attempt openly to arrest the pope, he at last had him kidnapped by night. He was carried to the imperial court (357), and between him and his captors there took place an interview whose detailed record, preserved by Theodoret, is one of the golden pages of the history of the Roman See. With hardy courage Liberius recalled to the emperor himself the facts of the case, that the so-called trials of St. Athanasius by the different imperial councils had been so many mockeries, and that before pursuing further the Bishop of Alexandria, Constantius should proclaim his own belief in the creed of Nicea and recall the exiled bishops to their sees. The emperor, for a reply, could do no more than revile St. Athanasius as his personal enemy and demand that the pope should join in the "universal" condemnation. It was on this note that the scene came to an end. The emperor: "There is only one thing to discuss. . . choose the side of peace, sign and you will return to Rome." Liberius: "I have said farewell to my brethren in Rome. Ecclesiastical law is more important than living in Rome." The emperor: "You have three days to decide. Should you choose to sign you will return to Rome, if not think over to what place you would prefer to be exiled." Liberius: "Three days will not alter my decision. As for exile, send me where you will." Two days later the place was notified to him -- Beroea in Thrace. Before he left, the emperor offered him money for his expenses, the empress also. Liberius refused. The eunuch Eusebius -- the same who had two years before proffered bribes in Rome, and who had played a sycophant's part in the famous interview -- came forward also, offering a bribe. To whom Liberius suggested that before attempting to tip the pope it would be as well first to become a Christian !

The Arian triumph was complete in this, at least, that the Catholics were all completely muzzled and gagged. Not a single bishop was left in possession of his see who dared refuse to condemn Athanasius. But there the triumph ended. The cowed episcopate was very far from being in its heart anti-Nicene, and if no one dared openly defend the homoousion and its champion, no Arian on the other hand dared openly disavow it.

The triumph would only be complete when the bishops who had been forced to renounce Athanasius were brought to renounce Nicea too. To this, then, the Arian energy next turned itself.

The old theological discussions were renewed and presently (357), there appeared a new statement of belief drawn up by the bishops in residence at the court at Sirmium. This is the so-called Second Formulary of Sirmium. Its teaching is Arian, and its manner of expression the most radically Arian so far. Not only does it not declare the Son to be of the same substance as the Father -- the Catholic teaching -- but it states definitely that the Son is unlike the Father. The plan of those who drew it up was that it should be sent round the episcopate to be signed by each individual bishop. But its first effect -- when the collection of signatures began -- was to turn the divergent tendencies among the heretics into so many hostile sects. From the beginning the really radical Arians, in the theological sense, had been very few. More numerous, but still a minority, had been the political Arians, ambitious place seekers, who saw in the trouble a chance for their own advancement, and who had "managed" the party since Nicea. The vast majority of the Arian bishops were what the majority of a new party so often is, enthusiastic, and confused in their enthusiasm, driven as much by the hope of avoiding what they feared as by zeal for anything positive: their only definite characteristics their suspicion of the homoousion and their docility to the ruling emperor. From this section had come the support for that succession of vague, ambiguous creeds which gradually deprived the faith of all definite meaning for those who adopted them.

The publication of the Second Formula of Sirmium, suddenly reviving the most radical kind of Arianism -- patent anti-Niceanism -- as the creed of the party, forced into joint action the vague and hitherto fluctuating body of middle opinion which, although suspicious of the homoousion as a definition of the traditional belief, was yet Catholic in mind and willing to express the relation between Father and Son as one of likeness of substance (homoiousion). St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, was one of the chiefs of this section, but its real leader was Basil of Ancyra. The split between radical Arians (Anomoeans), and these so-called Semi-Arians (homoiousion party), bred in the group of Politicals a new subtlety. In their endeavour to keep the party together they grew ever more carefully vague, proffering

finally as a basis of agreement the formula that the Son is like to the Father (homoios -- whence the name of Homoean sometimes given them). It is round the manoeuvres of these three sections to capture the favour and interest of the Court that the history of the next three years turns (357-360).

The Anomoean formula provoked criticism throughout the scarcely tamed West. It also, in their hour of victory, split the Arians. Immediately the prestige of the Anomoeans fell, and Basil of Ancyra became in Constantius' mind the all-important bishop of the day. The Second Formula was withdrawn. In its place Basil proposed one of his own fashioning -- the Third Formula of Sirmium -- a provisional statement designed to gain the support of the Nicene West, to be the basis of an alliance between the Westerns and those Easterns who, if they differed from the West as to the wisdom of the term homoousion and as to its suitability to express their common belief, agreed in that belief none the less. The moderate Arians in the East whom the sudden revelation of Anomoean aims and strength was driving slowly back towards Nicea would, it was hoped, come in too. Before such an alliance -- and with the imperial favour which Basil enjoyed -- Arianism would be ended for ever.

The new formulary was sent round and signatures began to come in. Its crucial point was its use of the word homoousion where Nicea had used homoousion. To say the Son is of like substance with the Father as a way of denying that He is of the same substance, is of course to deny Nicea. But to make the assertion in opposition to the Anomoean teaching -- that the Son is not like to the Father -- is to use homoousion in an orthodox sense. It was, so those who presented the formulary for Catholic signatures explained, as against the Anomoeans that the new term was used, and to avoid the misunderstandings which the Nicene term had bred.

For the complete success of Basil of Ancyra's scheme the signature of Liberius was essential. The formulary was presented to him and, in the sense in which it was offered, he signed it, adding to his signature a kind of appendix in which he made clear the meaning of his signature by condemning all those who say that "the Son is not like to the Father in substance and in all things." This appendix Basil accepted and he himself also signed it. The rout of the Anomoeans was

complete. The real Arians were defeated now, in 358, as they had been defeated at Nicea thirty years before. A general council would fittingly sum up the whole affair and celebrate the new reunion, and where more fittingly could it meet than once again at Nicea?

At this moment, however, Basil fell out of favour with Constantius II; the Anomoeans and the Politicals came back. The council Basil had asked for was not abandoned. It would meet -- but a dual council, one section for the West at Rimini, the other for the East at Seleucia in Isauria -- and under Arian auspices; its work would be the imposition, not of the Third Formulary of Sirmium but of yet another of the vague Arian creeds that were a betrayal of Nicea. In the formulary proposed there was no mention at all of " substance," only the simple ambiguous declaration, "We declare that the Son is like the Father in all things as the Holy Scriptures say and teach." Under the circumstances this equivocal creed was an indirect denial of Nicea.

To Rimini (359) there came four hundred and more bishops, eighty of them professedly Arian, the remainder Catholic. The pope was not present, nor did he send a representative. The bishops voted against the proposed betrayal, but the imperial commissioner had instructions from Constantius that they were to be kept at Rimini until they signed one and all. The weary business dragged on then all through the year, negotiations, promises, threats, until, with what mental reservations to accommodate the contradiction between their thoughts and their actions we know not, all the bishops signed. At Seleucia there were fewer bishops -- 150 only, of whom only a mere handful were enthusiastic for the Nicene formula -- and the emperor's difficulties were less. The majority -- 105 -- readopted the Eusebian creed of Antioch (341). Thirty-two of the remainder signed a creed vaguer still. It was like to that adopted at Rimini, and it was this which was destined to triumph.

Delegates from both councils met at Constantinople. Those from Rimini made common cause with the Arian minority of Seleucia. Pressure on the delegates of the Seleucia majority did the rest. A joint council, at Constantinople, in the first week of January 360 published to the world their lamentable unanimity. Not the homoiousion of Basil of Ancyra had triumphed, in whatever

sense one took it, nor the radical Arianism of the Anomoeans whom he had ousted. The victory had gone, once again, to the Politicals, to the section which opposed all attempts at precision in the hope of stabilising a happy permanent confusion where all parties, even the most contradictory, should find their place in the Church. Of their victory, and the surrender of the bishops, St. Jerome commented in words which have become famous, "The whole world groaned to find itself Arian." Liberius judged more truly of the surrender's value, writing of the Western bishops' action as a simple surrender to external pressure.

Whatever the next development which the Politicals had planned, it never matured for, within a few months, the power on which the party depended had vanished. The joint Council at Constantinople was held in the January of 360. In the May following, Constantius' cousin Julian, hitherto ruling Gaul as Caesar, was, at Paris, proclaimed Emperor. The West at any rate was delivered from Constantius and the Politicals. Eighteen months later (November 3, 361) Constantius himself was dead, and Julian sole emperor of the Roman world. In the new emperor's councils, bishops, no matter how "political" would count for little. As in 337, an unexpected change of ruler had delivered the Catholics, in the very moment when their cause seemed utterly and for ever lost.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 8: THE CATHOLIC RESTORATION. 359-382

INTRODUCTION

JULIAN'S reign was of short duration. With his death the unity of rule disappeared once more, and under the dyarchy of the brothers Valentinian I and Valens the sequel to the debacle of Rimini-Seleucia was, in West and East, widely different. Valentinian (364-75) was a Catholic and his return to the religious policy of the Edict of Milan put no hindrance to the restoration of Catholicism in the States he governed. " The heads that had been bowed were raised, movements once more became natural. " Liberius had indeed judged more accurately than St. Jerome when he described the action of the bishops at Rimini as a material surrender to external pressure. The advent of Julian removed that pressure, and spontaneously the West returned to its old allegiance to Nicea.

The Arian victory at Rimini was the culminating point of the policy which, for thirty years, had ignored the Roman primacy, had attempted to substitute for it the patronage of the Christian Emperor. It is not surprising that the reaction after Rimini produced strong and explicit declarations of the special prerogative of the Roman Church and, in St. Ambrose, the first theorist of the relations between the Church and the Christian State. "My will is Canon Law, " Constantius had told the Gallic bishops at Arles, and henceforward while, in the East, Caesar continued to rule the Church until his interference became an accepted institution regularly obeyed, there developed in the West -- thanks especially to St. Ambrose -- a clear understanding of the relations between Church and State, and a clearer appreciation of the role of the Roman primacy. For seven years (353-360) the West, unwillingly, had borne the yoke of Caesaro-papism. Its liberty once restored, it rebuilt its strength in a more conscious adherence than ever to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, recognising in loyalty to his teaching rather than to the password of any council howsoever sacred, the touchstone of true faith and membership in the Church.

St. Ambrose, however, a young man of twenty, was as yet only a

catechumen when the coup d'état of Julian's army emancipated the Latin churches from the Arians of the East. The first leaders of the restoration in the West are the three bishops Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari and Hilary of Poitiers, who were exiled under the late regime for their loyalty to Nicea. The first place where the reaction dared to make a public demonstration was, naturally enough, Paris -- Julian's late capital. Here in 360 a council of bishops, led by St. Hilary, excommunicated Saturninus of Arles, Constantius II's ecclesiastical henchman, and sent a letter of sympathy to the deposed Catholic bishops in the East, the victims of the policy of Rimini-Seleucia, in which they confess their late error of tacitly ignoring the testword -- substance -- of the whole dispute. A similar feeling showed itself in Spain and in Africa, but in the Danubian provinces, thanks to the convinced Arianism of the leading bishops, the regime of 359 still held. In Northern Italy, too, the Arians were still in possession of the see of the imperial city, Milan, which remained theirs for yet another fifteen years, the Western Emperors during this time being either Pagan or, Valentinian I, liberally unconcerned with church disputes and so in no way to be relied on to coerce unorthodox prelates.

In 362 Julian's mischievously inspired amnesty to the exiled bishops began to bear fruit. Liberius had issued a formal condemnation of what had been done at Rimini, and he had sent out to all the provinces regulations concerning the bishops who had there betrayed Nicea. His policy -- the policy also of St. Athanasius in Egypt -- was that the bishops who disavowed the signatures extorted by force should retain their sees. With the sudden return from the East of Lucifer of Cagliari the peaceful carrying out of this policy was at once disturbed. Lucifer, one of the three bishops who had bravely withstood Constantius to his face at Milan in 355, was by nature an extremist. His exile he had spent in writing furious tracts against the Emperor. Their titles throw some light on his methods, No Peace With Heretics, Apostate Princes, No Mercy for God's Enemies. He came back, fresh from his unhappy and uncanonical interference in the domestic troubles of the Catholics of Antioch, [] to campaign against the laxity of the Roman settlement and presently, preaching that the Church had ceased to exist except in his own diocese, he retired to Cagliari.

St. Hilary of Poitiers had all Lucifer's courage and all his gift of

blunt, direct speech. With him Catholicism in the West comes for the first time to a clear understanding of the nature of the Church's independence of the Christian State -- and this within less than fifty years of the Christian State's first coming into existence. It is the State which is the new thing, the State which creates the problem. The solution lies in the traditional belief that the belief is essentially a tradition. The Faith begins to be in danger, St. Hilary writes, as soon as "definitions of the Lord's teaching are enacted by a human judge, by the prince. " In his book, *Against Constantius*, he breaks out violently against the emperor, exposing the novelty of his usurpation and its danger, painting for all time the picture of the Caesaro-papist prince who allows himself to define the faith, to distribute sees right and left to whom he chooses, to call councils and override their decisions with his soldiery, while at the same time his munificence covers the churches with gold, his piety embracing the bishops and humbly bowing before them for their blessing, inviting them to his table, and showering privileges upon them.

St. Hilary died in 367. It was not until eight years later that the writer who turns these controversial protestations into a consistent theory was consecrated Bishop of Milan. Nor certainly, in 367, had the thought of being St. Hilary's continuator ever come to St. Ambrose who was then in the early stages of his chosen career in the imperial civil service. It had been his father's career too, and in it, at the time of St. Ambrose's birth, his father had risen to the highest post of all under the emperor -- Pretorian Prefect of the Gauls, with Britain, Gaul and Spain under his jurisdiction, and his residence at Treves. Hence it was that the Roman Ambrose was himself born in the distant provinces. He was, however, educated in Rome, and by 374 he had risen to be Governor of the Province of Emilia-Liguria. When the old Arian Bishop of Milan at last died in that year, the Governor, a Catholic but as yet a catechumen only, foreseeing the inevitable riots which the election of a successor would cause, took personal charge of the policing of the ceremony. It resulted, through the accident of a child's acclamation and the mob's instant appreciation of a rare suitability, in his own election. He accepted, was baptized, consecrated, and immediately set himself to the acquirement of his office's technique. Ruler and diplomat he was already by nature, and by the training of long experience. In the twenty-three years that remained to him he showed himself of the first

rank as the Catholic bishop -- preacher, writer, poet, ascetic, and such an unfearing rebuker of evil-doing in high places as to be ever since the very type and pattern of the heroic virtue of episcopal courage.

Since Valentinian I's accession the court once more resided at Milan, and on Valentinian's death (375) the new bishop found himself the guardian and tutor of the two young sons who succeeded, Gratian, aged sixteen, and Valentinian II, a child of five. In this, as in his presence at the emperor's council and in his frequent employment as an ambassador, St. Ambrose sets yet another precedent for the coming new age, creating the familiar role of the patriot prelate, statesman and diplomatist. But his independence survived the atmosphere of the court and the complications of his high civil importance. When in 384, after Gratian's death, the Pagans, still a force in Rome, demanded the restoration of the idol of Victory to the Senate House, and hoped easily to win it from the Arian empress-mother now the regent, St. Ambrose held firm. While the court hesitated the bishop was urgent that the matter lay beyond its jurisdiction, being a matter of religion -- *causa religionis est*. In such the Church must be heard.

Two years later, the petition of the Arians of Milan that one of the churches of the city be granted to them gave St. Ambrose yet another opportunity to demonstrate the duty of episcopal independence of the State. He refused to make over the basilica they sought, and, cited before the court, was bidden remember that the emperor was but using his rights since all things were in his power (*eo quod in potestate eius essent omnia*). He agreed; but insisted on the exception that what belonged to God was beyond the emperor's jurisdiction (*ea quae sunt divina imperatoriae potestati non esse subiecta*), and in a sermon shortly afterwards he developed the theme for his people, summing up the whole matter in one of his own beautifully cut phrases *ad imperatorem palatia pertinent, ad sacerdotem ecclesiae* (palaces are matter for the emperor's concern, but churches belong to the bishop). The next stage in the affair was a summons to Ambrose to appear before the council to answer for his refusal to hand over the basilica. Once again his reply was a refusal, and in a letter to the emperor he explained his reason. In matters of faith bishops alone have authority to judge. That laymen, in such a cause, should sit in judgment on a

bishop is a thing unheard of. "In cases where matters of faith are in question it is the custom for bishops to judge emperors when the emperors are Christians, and not for emperors to judge bishops. " Bishops who allow laymen to trample under foot this right of the episcopate (*ius sacerdotale*) are, as the emperor will one day realise, rightly considered contemptible. This astonishingly outspoken letter the bishop followed up by yet another sermon in which he explained to his people the latest phase in the struggle. He was not acting in ignorance of the imperial practice where episcopal independence was inconvenient to the State. He remembered, and in his sermon and letter recalled, the tyranny of Constantius II. Valens, dead only eight years, was a more recent memory still. None the less the bishop personifies Christ, and "in the imperial council Christ should be the judge, not the prisoner at the bar. " To Caesar, by all means, the things that are Caesar's -- the bishop will pay the taxes levied on the Church's property, and if the State should confiscate its property he will not resist. But the basilica is God's. No temple of God can belong to Caesar. Then, two wonderful phrases which cover all the differing mentalities which are already preparing the schism between West and East, and which point unerringly to the origin of all the mischief, " The emperor is within the Church, and not above the Church" (*imperator enim intra ecclesiam, non supra ecclesiam est*): it has been the crime of the Arians, the crime which stamps them as the worst of all heretics, that "they were willing to surrender to Caesar the right to rule the Church ". (*Isti imperatori volunt dare ius Ecclesiae*). The emperor abandoned his project.

Valentinian II was a minor in whose name the Arian empressdowager ruled. He was barely past the years of tutelage when, in 392, he was murdered, and Theodosius who had ruled the East since 379 and, only a year before, had restored to Valentinian the states which Maximus had usurped, was left sole ruler of the Roman world. Theodosius was, as emperors went, an exemplary Catholic. But the Bishop of Milan continued to claim from the mature and experienced Theodosius the same complete independence, the same autonomy and authority in spirituals, for which he had fought in the time of his child predecessor.

Even before Theodosius succeeded to the rule of the Empire in

the West he had had experience of the saint's limitless and courageous solicitude for the rights of religion. In distant Osroene a synagogue had been destroyed in a riot. Theodosius ordered that it should be rebuilt at the expense of the local bishop, and the news of this reaching Ambrose he immediately protested. Once more he is concerned that, in a matter which concerns religion, the emperor should act without the advice of his bishops. And since it touches the emperor's conscience, and therefore his soul's salvation that he should act in these matters as God directs, charity demands that the bishop should instruct and warn him -- privately first, as by this letter, but, should it be necessary, publicly before all the Church. The emperor ignored the letter, and Ambrose, true to his word, made the affair the subject of a sermon. Theodosius he compared to David, set by God in the place of the worthless Saul (Valens). God had sent Nathan to rebuke David when, in turn, he, too, promised to be faithless. So Ambrose spoke to Theodosius. And Theodosius present at the service heard the rebuke. As the bishop came down from the pulpit the emperor stood in his way. The bishop insisted. If the emperor would not withdraw his order that Christians should rebuild a house of impiety, the bishop would not offer the sacrifice. Theodosius submitted.

Twelve months later a still graver matter produced a second crisis. A serious riot at Thessalonica, in which a high official had been murdered, had been punished, on the emperor's orders, by an organised massacre. Ambrose waited, resolved, at the last extreme, to do what hitherto no bishop had dared, to threaten the Roman Emperor with expulsion from the Church. As before he first of all wrote to Theodosius. The emperor is only a man. He has sinned. Sin is not taken away but by tears and penance. Until the emperor acknowledges his wrong-doing and submits to penance, in no church, while he is present, will the holy sacrifice be offered. Once more religion triumphed, and Theodosius, his insignia laid aside, publicly confessed his crime and asked God's pardon.

St. Ambrose is, very literally, an epoch-making figure. Thanks to his personality, to the accident that made the very centre of the world's affairs the stage on which his personality was displayed, to his gifts as writer and speaker, his life set the pattern for all the next thousand years of the relations between the Catholic bishop and the Catholic prince. In these few years at Milan he

laid the foundations, in his careful demarcation of the rights of religio and respublica, of all the public law of the respublica christiana of the coming Middle Ages. Theodosius, though neither emperor nor bishop realised it, was to be the last emperor to rule effectively all the lands between the Atlantic and the Adriatic. Slowly increasing and inevitable chaos was to descend upon that vast heritage. One of the few things to survive was the Catholic episcopate, and it survived formed in the mould of Ambrose of Milan.

He has, however, another and more particular importance from his role in the restoration of Catholicism in the Arian-ridden Europe of the years after Rimini, an importance deriving from action once again, and, still more, from his clearly expressed teaching on the nature of the Church, and on the Church's relations to its own rebellious subjects, be they rebels against its government -- schismatics, or, like heretics, rebels against its teaching. In 379 St. Ambrose had to preach the funeral sermon of his own brother Satyrus. He recalled, in testimony of the dead man's Catholicity, how a few years earlier, shipwreck had thrown him on to the coast of Sardinia and how, being thought near to death, Satyrus had sent for the local bishop to baptize him. But for Satyrus not any baptism could suffice. He must assure himself that the bishop was truly of the Church. "He made diligent enquiry, ", the preacher explained, "whether the bishop was in agreement with the Catholic bishops, that is to say with the Roman Church. " Satyrus knew about the schism of the fanatical Lucifer of Cagliari, understood that though Lucifer's belief was in accord with Nicea, nevertheless -- and for this St. Ambrose commends him -- "he did not think he could find the Faith in a schism" (non putavit fidem esse in schismate). Accord with Nicea was not of itself sufficient to make a Catholic. The root of Catholicism lay elsewhere, in the approval of the Roman Church.

Two years after this sermon the Council of Aquileia gave St. Ambrose a better occasion still to repeat that teaching. It was a council of the bishops of the civil diocese of Italy, and though the pope -- Damasus I -- was in correspondence with St. Ambrose regarding the council's business, he was not represented at its meetings. Of that council St. Ambrose is the inspiration and its synodal letter to the Emperor Gratian is his work. The council, the emperor is informed, has just tried and

deposed the two last survivors in the West of the Arian bishops. The prospects of unity and harmony are improved. The bishops assembled at Aquileia beseech the emperor therefore to be on his guard against the intrigues of Ursinus, the anti-pope, "lest the Roman Church, the head of the whole Roman world, be troubled and its most holy apostolic faith, since it is from Rome that the right to communion flows to all the rest. " Ursinus had been a trouble in Rome since the pope's very election. Riots, deaths, and a criminal suit against the pope, from which he emerged, acquitted, had marked the struggle. Ursinus had been condemned and exiled. The bishops still fear his resources and hope to anticipate his wickedness. How literally their declaration of the nature of the Roman Church's importance was meant to be taken, and was in fact understood, we can gather, curiously enough, from an attack on the council, in which that declaration is criticised, by one of the two bishops whom the council had deposed -- the solitary protest of "a prisoner under sentence cursing his judges. " This was Palladius, Bishop of Ratiaria. In his attack he denies that the Bishop of Rome has any rights other than those common to all bishops, and claims that every bishop is as much Peter's successor as the pope, that Peter himself had no superiority over his apostolic colleagues. Therefore he condemns the council for its connivance at Damasus' assumption that he is "The prince of the episcopate" (*princeps episcopatus*) -- Damasus who has not even deigned to attend the Council!

The Catholic reaction in the West is then associated with the direct activity of the popes, with Liberius until 366, and Damasus after him, with renewed assertions of the Church's independence of the State and with renewed recognition of the Roman See's peculiar function as the touchstone of orthodox Christianity. The popes, during this time, are personally overshadowed by the genius of St. Ambrose, the greatest ecclesiastical personality the Church in the West has so far produced; but the whole effort of that genius is given to strengthening the tradition of Rome's hegemony -- *potentior principalitas* -- to a more explicit reference of it to the practice of ecclesiastical life, and to the demonstration in word and in act of the Christian theory of the State. Such a personality the East never knew, and the tradition of the Roman Supremacy, lacking as yet any systematic organisation of detailed control, was to suffer there accordingly.

In the East the new sacrosanct autocracy created by Diocletian, baptized in Constantine, Catholic at last with Theodosius, was related to instincts too deeply rooted in the oriental mind for any Eastern, even the Catholic bishop, not to reverence it as a thing half divine, against which even criticism partook of sacrilege. Where, in the West, the Church, in closer relation with the Roman See, clung desperately to the tradition of its self-sufficiency and independence of Caesar, in the East it tended little further than the ambition of securing Caesar's orthodoxy. Granted an emperor who was Catholic in faith, the Church in the East was always willing to trust its destinies to his direction. Should such an emperor prove anti-Roman, the Eastern episcopate, fascinated by the fact of the semi-divine's acceptance of Christ, would follow him -- logical result of its abandonment of the tradition for the novelty of the imperial patronage -- would follow him in all his patronage of heresy, and into schism itself. How often this happened, and how regularly it was to the intervention of the Roman Primacy -- lacking every resource except the belief in its traditional authority -- that orthodoxy owed its salvation, the next few chapters must tell.

To the Church in the East the death of Julian the Apostate (June 26, 363) and the accession of Jovian brought not only its first experience of the rule of a Catholic prince, but, for the first time almost in sixty years, real peace. Those sixty years (303-363) had been for Catholicism in the East years of continual, breaking strain -- strain mercifully spared to the Church in the West. There had been the terrible years of the Great Persecution -- in the West a matter of months only. There had been the insecurity of the reign of Licinius, ending in a renewal of the persecution and civil war. Constantine's victory had been followed only too speedily by the thirty years of Arian disorders; and, after Rimini-Seleucia, the East had had to bear the brunt of Julian's sour hatred of the faith. The harvest of those years was an indescribable anarchy in every church, good men desperate at the sight of the disorder, a chaos from which the memory of normal, peaceful, Christian life and its tradition of ordered administration had almost disappeared. The Church in the East, at that moment, was as a battlefield from which the armies have scarcely yet retired.

Then, just as the Church, uneasily, dared to breathe once more,

Jovian died, after a reign of seven months (364). Valentinian was hardly named in his place when he made over the East to Valens; and Valens, an Arian, proceeding to show himself another Constantius II, inaugurated yet another stage in the agony of Catholicism in the East. Not indeed that Valens was an Arian of intimate personal conviction. His support of Arianism, thorough indeed, was in itself simply political. The East was in a state of incredible confusion. Half a dozen schools of thought battled for recognition as the true Church; everywhere rival bishops claimed the same see; and beyond the main division of this unhappy Christianity, there were, inevitable legacy of the last forty years of trouble, local schisms, local religious feuds whose interaction on the main complications sometimes made the same combatants simultaneously adversaries and allies. To Valens, a soldier, vigorous in decision, brutal in manner, successful, where successful, through a policy of violence and force, it was an obvious policy to make one of the contending theories his own, and impose it on all. The theory he adopted was not the Catholicism of Nicea but the vague political Arianism which had triumphed at Rimini. It was the religion of the reigning bishop of his capital see -- a fact which no doubt determined its adoption. For all the rest, for the supporters of Nicea in particular, bad days were in store, a renewal of the days of Constantius II.

An incident of the very first days of the new reign revealed the spirit that was to guide its religious policy. In the repression which followed the Council of Rimini-Seleucia, the party of Basil of Ancyra had suffered equally with the avowed defenders of the Nicene formula. The death of Julian and the succession of the Catholic Valentinian encouraged them to ask for a Council. Leave was given, and at the council -- held at Lampsacus -- they issued a condemnation of what had been done at Rimini, and republished, with a Nicene interpretation, their homoiousion formula. By this time Valens was in command in the East. It was to him that the council's delegates had to report, and not to Valentinian. He simply ordered them to come to an agreement with the Bishop of Constantinople -- with one of the chief supporters of the Council they had just condemned. A few months later, in 365, an edict appeared reviving all the sentences of exile enacted under Constantius II. From one see after another, accordingly, the anti-Rimini bishops were tumbled out. The Church in the East was again where it had been at the

accession of Julian, at the mercy of the Arians.

For the moment, however, Valens had more urgent problems than this of ecclesiastical uniformity. First the defeat of a rival to the throne, installed in Constantinople itself, and then a critical phase of the never-ceasing war with Persia, occupied all his energy. Meanwhile the bishops of the Council of Lampsacus, defeated at home, looked to the West for aid. Valentinian I, indeed, ignored their appeal like the liberal Gallio he was. From the pope -- Liberius still -- their delegates had a better reception. They gave the pope satisfying assurance that they accepted the creed of Nicea, and rejected the Council of Rimini. Whereupon Liberius received them into communion and wrote to the sixty-four bishops in whose names they had come. The delegates returned to the East after a series of encouraging receptions from the Catholic bishops all along their journey. All now promised well for the desired union with those Easterns who had never, even nominally, rejected Nicea. A new council was planned to meet at Tarsus which would seal the re-union. But once again Valens, inspired from Constantinople, intervened. The council was forbidden.

By 370 Valens, free of his wars for the moment, was in a position to impose the planned religious uniformity. As in his predecessor's reign, the sacred formula was taken round from town to town by imperial commissioners. The bishops were called on to accept it and to sign. Where they refused, sentences of deposition and exile rained down plentifully, and their churches were taken from them and handed over to the docile conformists. Often there was a spirited resistance, whence often, also, sieges of the churches, sacrilege, and massacre. The temper of the new tyranny showed itself when, upon the emperor's nomination of yet another Arian to Constantinople (370), a deputation came to protest against the new bishop. Its members were ordered into exile, and as the ship on which they sailed, eighty-four of them, passed into the open sea, the crew, under orders, fired it.

So the new desolation spread through Asia Minor and Syria and, after the death of St. Athanasius (May, 373) through Egypt too. Even Valens had not ventured to match himself against the aged saint's prestige, but once he was dead, the Alexandrian churches were witness of horrors that recalled the worst days of

George of Cappadocia. In all the Eastern Empire one see alone, where the bishop remained firm, was spared. This was Caesarea in Cappadocia, the see of St. Basil.

Thanks to the number of his letters that have survived we know much more about St. Basil (329-379) than the mere facts of his career. When elected Metropolitan of Caesarea he was just forty years of age. He came of a distinguished family which had suffered for its faith under the last Pagan Emperors, and he could pride himself that it had been equally constant through all the years of the Arian troubles. His fine mind had enjoyed every chance of cultivation that the time offered, and at Athens, with his friend Gregory of Nazianzen, he had had for a class fellow Julian the Apostate. His studies finished, Basil had turned to monasticism, and he had come to be familiar with the ascetic life in all its forms. He had travelled much, and it was his wide experience of monasticism in different lands which went to make him, what he remains to this day, the Patriarch of monks in the East as St. Benedict is of monks in the West. Inevitably he was drawn into the theological controversies of his time. He was the friend of Basil of Ancyra, and friendly always to the group of Homoiousians whom scruples whether its test word was expedient alone separated from a simple acceptance of Nicea. Of his own full and loyal acceptance there was never any question and when in 360 his own bishop, through fear, accepted the ambiguities of Rimini, Basil broke with him. With the next Bishop of Caesarea he was on better terms, and was the real ruler of the diocese. With St. Athanasius, too, he was in high favour, and his appointment to Caesarea in 370 was hailed in Alexandria as an important gain for Catholicism in that East where Constantinople had, for forty years, been in Arian hands and Antioch was at the mercy of schism.

Basil was of the type with whom to exercise authority is second nature. Thinker, organiser, man of action he ranks with St. Ambrose and St. Leo as one of the bishops whose influence did much to mould all subsequent Catholicism. Inevitably he came into conflict with Valens. He met the aggression with all his own firmness, yet with tact; and with so overwhelming a display of personality that the savage Arian for once was halted. More, the emperor even assisted at the offices in Basil's cathedral, and munificently eased the strain of the bishop's extensive charities -- for all that Basil, to his very face, denounced his impiety and

faithlessness unsparingly. Characteristically so great a mind and heart did not rest content with the measure of peace secured for his own see. The desolation of the East called imperatively, and from the first days of his episcopate he set himself to the work, to unite the broken and dispirited faithful and to bring them something of aid and comfort from the West and Rome. The task occupied all the life that remained to him. Its pursuit brought him the greatest sorrows his life knew, and he died, prematurely at fifty, his end still unachieved.

The insurmountable obstacle was the schism which divided the adherents of Nicea in the see of Antioch and which, because of Antioch's ecclesiastical primacy in the East, reacted upon every stage of ecclesiastical development there. Antioch, ever since Eusebius of Nicomedia had procured the deposition of its Catholic bishop of 330, had been ruled by Arians of one school or another. []

When the see fell vacant in 360, by the translation of its Arian titular to Constantinople, the bishops in whose hands the election lay, chose as his successor Meletius, Bishop of Sebaste, a Homoiousian of the school of Basil of Ancyra. It was a brave demonstration of Nicene sympathy to make on the morrow of Rimini; and within a month Constantius II had expelled the new bishop, exiled him, and installed an Arian of satisfying type in his place. Meletius returned with the rest of the exiles whom Julian recalled in 361; he was again exiled by Valens in 365, and exiled yet a third time two years later. This last exile lasted until 378. Thus of his first eighteen years as Bishop of Antioch, Meletius spent twelve in exile for the faith of Nicea. Whence, throughout the East, he won a great name as a confessor and, titular of the East's ecclesiastical capital, he ought to have been the rallying point for Catholics in the period of restoration.

Unhappily not all Catholics would acknowledge him as Bishop of Antioch; many, despite St. Basil's guarantees of his perfect Nicene orthodoxy, continued to suspect him -- the elect of bishops themselves none too orthodox -- as an Arian. The chief of these anti-Meletians was the Bishop of Alexandria, first St. Athanasius, and then, and with even greater zeal, his successor Peter (373-383). A more serious consequence still was that, in this matter, Alexandria influenced Rome; and for the popes too,

Liberius and Damasus I (366-384) Meletius to whom the Catholic East, St. Basil at its head, looked as to its primate, was simply an heretical intruder. []

The uncanonical interference of a Western bishop, Lucifer of Cagliari, in 362, made matters worse; and however right Rome and Alexandria may have been in the matter of Meletius, when they accepted the fruits of Lucifer's illegal action they put themselves, on that count, as much in the wrong in the eyes of the East, as Meletius and St. Basil were in their own. What Lucifer had done was this. There had always been at Antioch, ever since the deposition of the last undoubtedly Catholic bishop in 330, a tiny minority who refused all contact with his Arian successors and with the Catholics who tolerated them. At the moment of the election of Meletius, the leader of the group was a priest Paulinus. He refused to accept Meletius as his bishop because of the Arian antecedents of his electors, and because his consecration had an heretical pedigree. It was a renewal of the ancient condemned theory that heresy in the minister, invalidates the sacraments which he gives. It was Lucifer's great fault that, without any authorisation beyond his own impulse, and without the assistant bishops whom custom and law required, he consecrated Paulinus as Bishop of Antioch. It was Paulinus, in turn, thus unlawfully consecrated whom Alexandria recognised as Bishop of Antioch; and if Rome hesitated to be equally explicit, it was yet Paulinus who acted as Rome's man of confidence for what related to the Catholic East. A greater tragedy, in the circumstances, and a more complicated one, it is hard to imagine.

From the first year of his appointment to Caesarea, St. Basil set himself to reconcile Rome to Meletius, and Meletius to Athanasius. To the East, if peace were ever again to be its good fate, Rome was necessary. Basil's letters express this clearly. "One solution alone do we wait for, that your mercy would consider a little our terrible plight. " Rome should send someone with authority who, taught by actual knowledge of Eastern conditions, would realise the need to recognise Meletius and realise also the need for Rome to be more explicit in her condemnation of the heresies into which some of her Eastern allies had fallen during the fight with the great common enemy. Here we touch on yet another complication in the story. Rome's supporters in the East had, in more than one case, fallen under

suspicion as heretics, and the Arians had not neglected to profit by the misfortune. So, for example, it had been with Marcellus of Ancyra thirty years before. So too, now, Apollinaris Bishop of Laodicea, while-orthodox on the point at issue with the Arians, was teaching erroneous novelties on the relation between the human and the divine in Our Lord. So Paulinus; and so, too, Rome's latest messenger, Vitalis, whom neither Meletius nor Paulinus would accept and who had therefore launched yet a third anti-Arian claim to be Bishop of Antioch.

St. Basil's solution was simple. Meletius was orthodox-none more so. His election was according to form, therefore he was the Bishop of Antioch. Rome should declare for him, and, condemning explicitly the allies whose company had done so much to lessen her influence, rally all the Eastern Catholics to Meletius. Then, and then only, would the restoration really begin. At Rome the pope was willing enough to condemn the new heresies as he was to condemn again the old. But he refused to condemn by name the alleged heresiarchs before they had been tried. And, in 375, he recognised Paulinus as Bishop of Antioch.

St. Basil had written to Rome as to an ally -- a most powerful ally, and, truly enough, an ally of superior rank. The reply was that of authority instinctively conscious of its own power. Community of faith, he was told, was not by itself sufficient condition for intercommunion. Canonical observance was just as necessary; in other words submission to the Bishop of Rome with whom it lay to decide who was Bishop of Antioch, and who should not be asked simply to ratify a fait accompli. Meanwhile, nominatim, Apollinaris was condemned. The decision was a bitter one for St. Basil. Before he could renew his appeals with the knowledge experience was bringing him of Rome's wider cares, death came to him -- January 1, 379. It came at a moment when he promised to be of greater usefulness to the Catholic cause than ever. For Valens had pre-deceased him, slain in battle with the Goths (378). The new emperor, Theodosius, was enthusiastically Catholic. A restoration of Catholicism, imperially aided now, was certain; and since, despite Rome's recognition of Paulinus, the East adhered to Meletius, the restoration, now that St. Basil was dead, would be guided by this bishop whom Rome would not recognise but who was now, none the less, in the eyes of the East and its new Catholic sovereign, Nicene orthodoxy's greatest champion.

Events moved quickly. In the autumn of 379 Meletius gathered a great council of his bishops at Antioch -- a hundred and fifty-three of them -- and on his suggestion they accepted the profession of faith lately published by the Roman council of Pope Damasus. In February, 380, Theodosius, by imperial edict, ended the State's connection with Arianism. The test of Catholicity was to be acceptance of the Faith "given to the Romans by the divine Apostle Peter. . . the faith clearly taught by the pontiff Damasus and by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria. " All other beliefs are heresy, and heretics are to suffer as the law directs. The State, for fifty years at the service of Arianism, was now for the first time to be at the service of Catholicism. The restoration so long over-due had come at last. But political power was to be its foundation. The circumstance was calamitous, and calamitous, too, the surely related circumstance that Rome was not consulted in the procedure adopted; and also that Meletius of Antioch was the president of the Council summoned by the emperor to carry into effect his good will towards the Church. The council which met at Constantinople in 381, and over which Meletius presided, was hardly likely to be enthusiastically concerned with any practical acknowledgement of the primacy of Pope Damasus. Nor was it favourably predisposed towards that other see, which, Rome's ally through all the disastrous half century which was closing, had been rewarded for its unshaken fidelity to the Roman homoousion by all Rome's confidence, and which had become the pope's natural adviser for all matters oriental. The council was not more likely to over-exalt the power of Alexandria than it was to over-proclaim the primacy of Rome.

The Arian bishops who had accepted the invitation, there were thirty-six of them, repelled all the attempts, whether of the Catholic bishops or of the emperor, to persuade them to an acceptance of Nicea and, faithful to their heresy, left the city before the council began.

When finally, in the May of 381, the Council opened, its first business was to elect a Bishop of Constantinople to supply the place of the Arian who, rather than conform, had gone into exile. Gregory of Nazianzen, Bishop of Sasimos, the life-long intimate of Basil, friend and ally of Meletius, was chosen. Within a few days Meletius himself died and it now lay within the council's

power to end the schism by electing Paulinus in his place. Such would have been the solution preferred by St. Gregory, now the council's president. But the anti-western spirit was too strong. If the East had returned to the faith which the West had never lost, it still preferred to settle matters of discipline as though the West did not exist. So St. Gregory notes and laments. The council left the election to the bishops of the civil diocese whose capital Antioch was. They chose, to succeed Meletius, one of his priests, Flavian. The next crisis arose with the arrival of the Bishop of Alexandria. He protested against St. Gregory's election to Constantinople, citing the ancient canon, a living thing in Egypt and the West, though by now a dead letter in the East, which forbade episcopal translations. The council which had elected St. Gregory failed to support him. The emperor, too, was silent. Gregory resigned. In his place, both as bishop and as president, they chose a retired dignitary of the civil service, Nectarius, an old man of blameless life indeed but not as yet baptized.

The council had no difficulty in framing a statement of the faith upon which, as a basis, the bishops proposed to restore Catholicism throughout the East. After fifty years of controversy and discussion they ended where they had all begun, with the unamended formula of Nicea, the much disputed, much criticised, and altogether necessary homoousion. And, following for once the precedent of western-inspired councils, they refrained from publishing any new creed, any gloss on the invaluable talisman they re-accepted. But the canon which expressed their allegiance went on to condemn severally the various types of Arianism and the heresies into which more than one opponent of Arianism had tripped -- Anomoeans, Pneumatomachi, Marcellians, Photinians, and Apollinarists alike.

The council's next work, with an eye to the future peace, was the stricter regulation of the bishop's extra-diocesan activities. Except the imperial interference in church matters nothing had been so productive of lasting mischief as the interference of bishops in the spiritual affairs of neighbouring sees and neighbouring provinces. Legislation which would confine episcopal zeal to its own well-defined territory should stave off, for the future, one of the plagues which had most grievously affected the past. Henceforward, then, so the council decreed, the bishops of each civil diocese were to confine their activities

within its limits; nor were they to interfere in the affairs of any other civil diocese unless specially invited to do so. The canon goes on to explain in detail what this means for each of the five civil dioceses which made up the Eastern Empire: the bishops of the East [] have authority over the churches in the East alone (while the privileges of Antioch which Nicea recognised are to be preserved); the bishops of Pontus have authority over the churches in Pontus only, those of Asia and Thrace over the churches of Asia and Thrace alone; for Egypt there was the special arrangement that the competent authority was not the bishops of the diocese of Egypt but the Bishop of Alexandria -- a recognition of the special character of that see's Egyptian hegemony; and his authority was limited to Egypt only. Furthermore, the Nicene rule was recalled that the affairs of each province were subject to the control of the bishops of each province.

Never again, if the new rule is observed, will bishops rich in Caesar's favour wander about the Empire, a peripatetic council, deposing at will whoever opposes them. Against that, a remedy is provided in the equilibrium of these five autonomous, self-contained groups. But whatever chance there might be of this new arrangement's success as an antidote to the civil influence of any one particular leading see, the council in its next canon sanctioned an innovation which, in effect, was to neutralise that arrangement. This is the famous third canon, which runs "The Bishop of Constantinople should have the primacy of honour after the Bishop of Rome because Constantinople is New Rome." The canon, though it tacitly admits the new unheard-of-principle that the honour should be according to the civil importance of the see-city, offers, it is true, no more than a title of honour. It does not make any exception for Constantinople in the matter of jurisdiction as settled by the preceding canon. For all his new honour the Bishop of Constantinople remains, in jurisdiction, the simple suffragan of the Metropolitan of Heraclea, with no authority beyond the limits of his own see. The council had merely done for him what Nicea had done fifty years earlier Jerusalem. But for the Metropolitan of Heraclea it had created the embarrassment that one of his suffragans was now, in honorific precedence, not only his own superior but the superior of every other bishop in the Church save the Bishop of Rome. And the embarrassment, inevitably, was to affect a very much wider sphere than the province of Heraclea. Two of the

chief causes of the fifty years chaos in the East, now happily ending, were the continual interference of the emperor in church affairs, and the hardly less continual interference of the Bishop of Constantinople in matters outside his own jurisdiction. The basis of this new uncanonical, ecclesiastical thing was the mere accident of Constantinople's civil importance. Now, in the council called to organise the Catholic restoration, that accident was given legal recognition; the uncanonical novelty, whence had come so much mischief already, was built into the very foundation of the new regime. The primacy of honour was bound to develop into one of jurisdiction.

The work of the council completed, the bishops sent an official report to the emperor, praying him to confirm and seal all they had accomplished. Whereupon an imperial edict published officially the formula of orthodoxy, and indicated for each civil diocese the bishop, communion with whom was to be, for the officers charged to return church property, the proof of a bishop's Catholicism. " Facing the West whose disciplined unity has been in these last years the envy of the East, the Council of 381 has set up an East, harmonious and organised: Theodosius has succeeded in imposing upon the Easterns, in appearances at all events, a quasi-western discipline. Are not the Easterns, in return, turning their backs upon the West?" [] The council, which itself made no claim to be a general council, made no report to Rome. There, as late as Chalcedon (451), its canons were still unknown. But, thanks to the energetic protestations of St. Ambrose the East was to give a sign of its fidelity to the tradition, real enough if only made at the eleventh hour. An embassy of high officials was sent to the pope to announce the election of the new Bishop of Constantinople and to ask letters of communion in recognition of it.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



CHAPTER 9: ROME AND THE CATHOLIC EAST. 381-453

1. *THE PRIMACY OF HONOUR. 381-419*

To anyone who had understood the forces which blighted Catholic life in the East all through the fourth century, the evolution of Constantinople's new primacy would have seemed merely a matter of time; and just as much matter of time the resulting conflict between Rome and Constantinople. The fifty years between the Council of 381 and the next of the general councils-Ephesus -- are in fact filled with the din of that strife, and the fight ranges round one of the greatest personalities of all church history, St. John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople from 398 to 407.

Nectarius, the elect of the Council of 381, died on September 27, 397. More than one candidate was put forward for the vacant see, and at last, to put an end to the intrigue and the tumult, the emperor -- it was Arcadius, for Theodosius had died two years before -- named the new bishop. His choice fell on John, a monk of Antioch, a man of saintly virtue, learned, and reputed the greatest preacher of his time, whom after ages were to call the Golden-tongued -- Chrysostomos. At the time of his consecration he was close on fifty years of age. He had been a monk -- a solitary -- until his first patron, Meletius, called him into the clergy. The successor of Meletius, Flavian, ordained him priest, and at the time of his election to Constantinople he was one of the outstanding personalities of Eastern Catholicism. His appointment was, none the less, an imperial appointment. His early associations, too, were with that imperial Catholicism which had shaped the re-organisation of 381. His nomination represented, even more than that of Nectarius, an Antiochian gain at Constantinople. One of the candidates whom the appointment ruled out had been supported by Antioch's great rival Alexandria, whose bishop was now Theophilus (382-412) a proud man, able and unscrupulous, a sinister figure indeed, in whom there seems re-incarnated something of Egypt's ancient dark mystery. John's election was a defeat for Theophilus -- a defeat which, no doubt, he resented all the more, in that he was

compelled to submit by threats of a criminal prosecution for his misdeeds.

The new bishop was to secure from Rome recognition of the successor of Meletius. The succession of Paulinus had died out. His followers had accepted Flavian; and St. John's intervention removed the last trace of the long unhappy schism. Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, the three chief sees, were once more in communion -- the first time for nearly seventy years. With St. John Chrysostom the bishop remained the monk. He showed himself as zealous in reforming evil as, in his days as priest at Antioch, he had been eloquent in denouncing it. And since much of the evil he wrought against was the affair of those in high places, he soon made powerful enemies.

Nor was his zeal confined to his own city or province. From the beginning of his reign he followed the custom his predecessor had inaugurated of using the prestige of the primacy of honour to settle disputes which, by the strict law of the Council of 381, really lay outside his competence. So he crossed into the neighbouring civil diocese of Pontus, in 398, to depose the Bishop of Nicomedia and, despite opposition from the populace, appointed his successor. More seriously still, a year later, on the authorisation of a handful of bishops whom chance accident brought together in the capital, he undertook to judge between two bishops of the neighbouring civil diocese of Asia. Nectarius had similarly broken through the canon of 381 when, a few years earlier, with the tacit consent of Alexandria and Antioch, he had judged a case between two bishops from Arabia. The ingenious machinery which would secure order in the East without reference to Rome was already ceasing to function. Three years later it broke down altogether, under the weight of the two-fold plague which still oppressed the Eastern Church -- imperial interference and unrestrained episcopal ambition. It is to be noted that all sides tolerated, were willing to use, invited and welcomed the imperial intervention; and that, turn by turn, all the great sees of the East were guilty of these manifest usurpations of jurisdiction. The difference in kind between the jurisdiction they ambitioned and usurped, and that which, turn by turn, they acknowledged or disobeyed in Rome -- none denied it -- is, once more, equally evident.

The aggressor this time was Alexandria, the victim

Constantinople; the means of the aggression was the imperial hold on ecclesiastical obedience, bought now by Theophilus at a great price. Theophilus had never loved St. John, and disappointed to see Antioch installed at court in his person, the Egyptian had filled the capital with spies who might, it was hoped, furnish matter for its bishop's trial and deposition. In the calumnies spread by the wretches whom St. John's reforms had exposed and dislodged, the spies found of course a wealth of material.

Towards the end of 401 there appeared at Constantinople a number of monks expelled from Egypt by Theophilus for, as he alleged, their heretical opinions. They came to appeal to the emperor against their bishop, and they sought the patronage of St. John. Without prejudging the case, he charitably wrote to Theophilus to intercede. For reply Theophilus dispatched some of his clergy with a wealth of "evidence" against the alleged heretics. The newcomers were, in turn, accused of calumny by the monks, convicted and, the bribes of Theophilus alone saving them from the executioner, sent to the mines. Then followed, at the demand once more of the alleged heretics, the first steps in a suit against Theophilus himself.

The emperor, since the accused was a bishop, refused to judge the case himself. He named as judge the Bishop of Constantinople, and sent a summons to Theophilus to come, and to come alone, for his trial. Theophilus obeyed, but brought with him twenty-nine of his suffragans and the ever-useful Alexandrian gold, and he came, as he said in his farewells to Egypt, " to get John deposed. " His trickery, his gold, and the mentality of Eastern Catholicism assisting him, he was successful.

St. John, most correctly, had refused the emperor's commission to judge the Bishop of Alexandria. That, by law, was a matter for the bishops of Egypt. Theophilus, three weeks later, was asking the emperor for leave to judge St. John -- accused, it appears, of all manner of wickedness. The Bishop of Alexandria, whose three weeks at court had been usefully employed, was by now in residence across the Bosphorus, at Chalcedon, in the summer palace known as The Oak. There, in July 403, with his twenty-nine suffragans and half a dozen other bishops, fortified with the imperial favour, he opened what, impudently enough, he called

his council and summoned St. John to appear and take his trial. St. John is to suffer from that very imperial usurpation which he had himself refused to use against the man now wielding it. All is done by virtue of it, and in its presence Church law, even the canon of 381, is null -- and all the bishops concerned are Catholics and the emperor too. Under such a regime how is religion more safe than under Arian princes? Now, as then, it is the emperor's bishop alone who is secure.

St. John once more behaved admirably. He refused to acknowledge the usurpation of Theophilus by appearing. "It is not right that bishops from Egypt judge bishops from Thrace. " The emperor insisted, but the saint stood to his resolve. In his absence he was at length "condemned, " deposed, and by imperial edict ordered into exile. Three days later, through a city whose excited populace looked only for a sign from him to raze all to the ground, he obediently followed his escort to the waiting ship and the distant coast of Bithynia.

The emperor was a weakling. The excitement in his capital shook him from his opposition to St. John, the exile was recalled; while the clerics whose malevolence had functioned at The Oak, took to flight, Theophilus at their head. The emperor next made a show of revising the iniquities, but within a couple of months the old intrigues were once more at work, and finally, thanks to Theophilus and the gang of like-minded bishops whom he led, the emperor, at their petition, confirmed anew the sentence of 403 and ordered St. John's arrest. This time the exile was definitive, and distant. First to Nicea, thence to Armenia, and further still, the saint was harried until, worn out by privation, he died at Comana on September 14, 407. Theophilus was revenged for the election of 398, Alexandria had prevailed against the creation of 381. Clerical disorders in the capital, the intrigues of the disaffected, intrigues of bishops come to the capital from heaven knows where, the corruption of the court, the chance whims of the emperor, " I leave you the lot, " cried St. Epiphanius to the bishops who bade him good-bye on his last visit in 403, " the city, the court, the whole hypocritical farce. " They were still in the East, these things, what they had been for three generations, what they were to be more than once again, an important engine of ecclesiastical government.

Happily for the Church in the East the supreme authority lay

elsewhere. This last great treachery of eastern bishops was to reveal that authority's different nature in very striking fashion. Rome's first news of the new crisis was through Theophilus whose messenger simply announced to the pope that "John has been deposed." This was, apparently, towards the end of May, 404, nearly a year after the "council" at The Oak, and in the last weeks of the semi-imprisonment in his own palace which preceded St. John's exile. Three days later came St. John's messengers-four bishops with a letter for the pope, a letter sent likewise to the bishops of Milan and Aquileia.

Here the whole story is told, the "trial," the exile, the recall. Theophilus and his set are blamed for the outrage, there is not a word against the emperor, and the letter ends with the request for a declaration that the acts of the "council" at The Oak are null and that its bishops have broken the law. To a properly constituted court St. John will gladly submit the proofs of his innocence.

The pope -- St. Innocent I (401-417) -- replied to both the bishops. He condemned the "council," of The Oak, and acquiesced in St. John's request for an impartial council of bishops from West and East. The reply had hardly been sent when, from Theophilus, there came a fuller account of the transaction with the minutes of his "council." The pope answered with a renewal of his proposal for a general council. Then came, from the bishops faithful to St. John, the news of the second banishment, the news too, of the imperial edicts threatening with deposition any bishop who supported the exile and with confiscation of goods whoever sheltered such bishops. Once more from the East the tide of refugees began to flow in to Rome.

The pope's reply to the edicts was to write to St. John assuring him of support, and to write in the same sense to the bishops who had remained faithful. He wrote also to the clergy and people of Constantinople -- a refusal to acknowledge the bishop set up in St. John's place, a strong reasoned protest against the uncanonical proceedings which had driven him forth, and, once more, a plea for a general council to clear the whole affair. At the pope's petition his own sovereign the Western Emperor, Honorius (395-423), joined him in the demand to Arcadius for a joint council of East and West. An embassy of bishops and

clerics conveyed the imperial request, but no sooner did they cross the frontier of the Eastern Empire than they were arrested and their papers taken from them. They refused to be bribed into a recognition of the new bishop, and thereupon, were summarily deported. The refugees who had returned in their company were exiled (April, 406).

Once more the East had bidden the West leave Eastern affairs to Easterns. Before Rome passed to the only measures of protest left to her -- the excommunication of Theophilus, of the new Bishop of Constantinople, Atticus, and of all their supporters--St. John was dead. It had been a quarrel between Easterns and a quarrel on a point of discipline; Rome had intervened, and was to stand by her decision until the unwilling East submitted. Theophilus stood out to the end, and refusing the amends to St. John's memory on which Rome insisted, was still outside her communion when he died (October 15, 412). At Antioch when the new bishop Porphyrios, who had accepted the communion of Atticus, wrote to Rome, too, for letters of communion, the same Roman intransigence refused them. Porphyrios' successor in 413 restored St. John's name to its place among the recognised bishops commemorated in the Mass, and the pope thereupon restored him to communion. "I have made diligent search, " the pope wrote, " whether all the conditions in this case of the blessed and truly religious bishop John had been satisfied. Since what your envoys affirm accords in every particular with my wishes, I have accepted to be in communion with your church. . . . " And he makes the Bishop of Antioch his agent for the reconciliation of the other bishops of the East.

Atticus made more than one attempt to obtain recognition, but so long as he refused to comply with the pope's conditions it was refused. Again St. Innocent's authoritative phrases give life to the routine formality. "Communion, once broken off, cannot be renewed until the person concerned gives proof that the reasons for which communion was broken off are no longer operative, and that what is imposed as a condition of peace has been fulfilled. We still await a declaration from Atticus giving us assurance that all the conditions which at different times we have laid down have been fulfilled. We are willing to renew our communion with him when he makes fitting petition therefore, and when he proves that he merits the favour. " In the end Atticus, too, complied with the pope's demand and was received

back into his communion.

Last of all Alexandria humbled herself, the successor of Theophilus -- his nephew Cyril -- submitting in his turn.

In the East whether the bishops are Catholic or heretic, saints or courtiers, the emperor's good pleasure is law for them. Rome, whatever the civil prestige of the city, remains mistress of herself, and to Rome's primacy even the state-ridden churches of the East ultimately bow, rather than lose that communion which is hers uniquely.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. EPHESUS. 427-433

The crisis of 403-408 had centred around questions of ecclesiastical discipline. All those concerned in it, Theophilus, St. John, Atticus, St. Innocent I, had been united in Faith. There had been no repetition of discussions such as those which the Council of 381 had closed. But within twenty years of the death of St. John, and when all the personalities of that crisis had passed away, the peace of his see was troubled more violently than ever by far-reaching discussions on a fundamental point of faith. In the fourth century Arius had striven against the tradition that the Logos is truly God. Now the discussion shifted to the question of the relations between the Divine and the Human in Jesus Christ. Was there, for instance, a real distinction between the Human and the Divine, or had the Divine absorbed the Human? If the Divine and the Human are really distinct in Him what was the nature of His earthly activities? Was it God acting, or the Man mysteriously and wonderfully united to God? or was the activity sometimes divine and sometimes human?

The practical effect on Christian life of divergent reasoning here cannot, of course, be exaggerated. If the activity is not divine then the gospel loses its chief claim to a hearing, the ecclesia its one claim on the absolute attention and obedience of mankind. It becomes straightway nothing more than the masterpiece of human idealism, in life and in moral teaching. If the Divine and the Human are distinct how can the activity be divine? And if the Divine absorbs the Human how can our vitiated humanity be reintegrated by the mysterious Incarnation of the Logos? Such reintegration demands a full complete humanity in Him Who is thus to restore it. Such a full complete humanity there cannot be in Our Lord if, in Him, the Human is not distinct from the Divine.

One school of theologians, concerned to safeguard the all important truth of the real distinction between the Human and the Divine, pressed the distinction so far that in Our Lord they were inclined -- some of them -- to see two realities, united truly enough, and harmoniously one in action, but united with a union that was no more than a moral union. This was the teaching of the so-called school of Antioch.

The Alexandrians, approaching the problem from its other pole, anxious above all to safeguard along with the Divinity of Christ the unity of His activity, and especially of course the Divine character of His action as Saviour of mankind, stressed the union of Human and Divine in Him, until in some cases, the two seemed for the thinker united in such a fusion that the Human reality ceased to be real. In God the Son incarnate, they urged, there was but one incarnate physis.

This, in words at any rate, was flat contradiction of the thesis of the Antiochians, for the Antiochians used this very term physis to describe each of the realities whose real distinction they were so concerned to defend. In Christ, they taught, there were two physes -- the Human and the Divine. Physis, for this school, meant what the Latin theologians were to call Nature; while the same word, with the Alexandrians, was equivalent to the Latin Person. Both schools thus used the one term physis, and they each used it to express a different reality. The matter of the debate was, then, fundamental. More fundamental matter of debate between members of the Church there could not be. Those who debated it were only too well aware of their subject's vast importance. Each school had worked out its theory as a defence of truth against a particular heresy -- and as the heretics differed, so the viewpoint of the defenders differed too. Hence high feeling and passion in the polemic. Again they were debating the matter for the first time, and without an agreed technical terminology to express even their common ideas, much less their individual differences. Hence, not infrequently, misunderstandings and confusion. A final point to note is that the disputants were, almost all of them, Easterns; Greeks by culture, Egyptian or Syrian by blood, subtle of speech with a subtlety far beyond that of anyone then bred west of Alexandria, and endowed with a tropical luxuriance of rhetoric in the expression of their passionately held ideas, which sometimes did little to help on the work of agreement.

Another factor, too, quite untheological this, played its part in the event, influencing the circumstances of the great decisions if it left the decisions themselves untouched. This was the rivalry now traditional between the three great sees of the East. Alexandria, until the unhappy exaltation of Constantinople in 381, had been unquestioned leader of the East. Her bishop it was who, for nearly half a century, had held fast to Catholicism

while Antioch and Constantinople had fallen to the Arians. Then, at the council which organised the restoration of orthodoxy, Alexandria had seen her prestige sacrificed to the profit of Constantinople, parvenu see as parvenu city, creature of the Court, heretic and Catholic by turn as the emperor chose. But the council's decision was law for the East, and Alexandria had had to bow to the fait accompli. And as the years went by after 381 another interesting development had revealed itself. The predominant influence in the new imperial see was Antiochian. From Antioch, and not from Alexandria, were its bishops taken, and Antiochian theories rather than Alexandrian usually guided its teachers. Alexandria, for the fifty years that followed the restoration council of 381, was, despite its ancient prestige, its services to orthodoxy, and its wealth, decidedly out of the fashion.

In the history of the next two general councils all these elements play their part. The traditional faith is asserted, -- each time by the see which, ever refusing to philosophise, reserves to itself a role of decisive authoritative teaching -- but asserted after a strangely complex exhibition of passionate contending humanity. The story is simple enough, so long as the traditional faith and the traditional procedure for resolving doubts are alone in question. The story only begins to be involved when there enter in these extraneous elements, rival systems of theology, hereditary rivalries of the great sees, the novelty of appealing to Caesar to assist the settlement -- this last above all, for as a result of such appeals, Caesar is fast becoming to the Church in his dominions as omnipresent and paralysing as was ever the old man of the sea.

Atticus, the intruded successor of St. John Chrysostom, died in 425, his peace with Rome made long before. To him succeeded Sisinnius who reigned only for a year and ten months. Whereupon, to cut short the intrigues of interested parties in the capital itself, the emperor, Theodosius II (408-450), decided, like his father Arcadius in 397, that the new bishop should be chosen from outside. And once more, as in 397, it was a priest of Antioch who was elected. His name was Nestorius and already he had made a name for himself as a man, of ascetic life and a notable preacher. He was a pupil of the most celebrated of all the Antiochian theologians, Theodore, now ending his life as Bishop of Mopsuestia.

Theodore, a friend of St. John Chrysostom, had with the saint been the pupil of Diodore of Tarsus (394) whose ideas he had developed, making for himself a name that quite eclipsed his master's. Diodore had been in his time a mighty controversialist. His especial foe was Apollinaris, the Alexandrian Bishop of Laodicea (360-377). Apollinaris, a powerful opponent of Arianism, insisting on the unity of Our Lord's salvific activity, and its divine character, had resolved the main difficulty in the way of his theory by teaching that the humanity which the Divinity associated to itself was incomplete -- a true human body indeed but lacking a human soul. Against these theorisings, condemned often, and condemned most solemnly at Constantinople in 381, Diodore insisted on the truth they denied, namely that in Our Lord there are two natures, really distinct, complete, true natures. Unfortunately he so isolated them that a duality of nature, as he conceived it, was not compatible with any unity of personality. Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia (392-428), developing his master, speaks of the two natures as though they were each complete persons, failing, like Diodore, to understand all that is implied in the notion of "one person, " and that a duality such as he constructs is not compatible with that unity.

Nestorius was not so clear as his master. Like Theodore, while he admits in theory the unity of person, he speaks of the two natures as though these were two independent persons. Again, for Nestorius, the one person is not conceived as the active divine person of the Logos associating with itself the created humanity, but the personality is taken as the result, the effect, of the union of the divinity and the humanity. The Logos and the humanity, anterior to the union, have each their proper person; in the union there is still but one person -- the person of Christ, to which the person of the Logos and the person of the humanity are in a kind of subordination.

Such intricate and involved theorising might have gone the way of much other like speculation had not Nestorius worked it out to the practical conclusions of everyday spirituality, and attempted to impose it as the true tradition of faith upon his clergy and people. What brought the Bishop of Constantinople to this, was the need, now become urgent, to provide in a popular way, some refutation of the many heresies about the

divinity of Our Lord that troubled the peace of the capital, and especially a revival among the Arians and Apollinarians. Constantinople was indeed, at the moment, full of militant heretics. Nestorius had had much to say about this in the inaugural address that followed his appointment to the see in 427. One result of his zeal was a new imperial law against heretics (May 30, 428) and a great campaign to convert them or drive them out. In that campaign the truth of the faith was to be set out cleared of the misrepresentations of it circulated by its enemies. And so it came about that one of the bishop's intimates, the monk Anastasius, announced the " new theology " of the Incarnation in a popular sermon on the Mother of God. "Mother of God" she had always been to the ordinary faithful. It was a title consecrated by long usage and it expressed succinctly the traditional belief that He whose mother she was, was not merely man but also truly God. But the monk, Anastasius, explained that this title " Mother of God, " Theotokos, should only be used with the greatest care, had better in fact not be used at all. Mary was " Mother of Christ " rather than " Mother of God. " The ambiguity of the new teaching, its implication that somehow Christ was not fully divine, were not lost on the audience. A tumult began, a noisy appeal to the bishop to depose the preacher. Nestorius, however, not only refused to do this but took the opportunity himself to preach against the traditional cult. The monks and many of his clergy objected and he excommunicated them, deposed them, even had some of them scourged and imprisoned. Whereupon they appealed to the emperor (428).

But before the emperor acted another power had intervened. This was the Bishop of Alexandria, St. Cyril. Among the excommunicated at Constantinople were monks. Egypt was still the centre of monasticism and its chief bishop the patron and protector of monks wherever found. The news of the excommunications and of the novel teaching in whose name it had been inflicted was, then, not slow in reaching Alexandria. It roused against the unhappy Nestorius the great man of the day. It was not merely that St. Cyril, like his uncle and predecessor Theophilus, disposed of vast material resources, and a highly organised and well-disciplined following of bishops, nor merely that he was a capable organiser gifted with tremendous energy. He was the most powerful theologian the Greek-speaking Church had yet known, a thinker whose subsequent effect on

the definition of doctrine was to be greater than that of any other eastern, except perhaps his predecessor at Alexandria, St. Athanasius.

St. Cyril, informed of the difficulties, studied the whole matter systematically and wrote to Nestorius (February, 430). He wrote also to the emperor and the empress. He wrote, in the third place, to Rome (Easter, 430). To the pope he communicated the whole dossier of the case: the sermons of Nestorius, his own letters to him, a catalogue of the alleged errors, another of extracts from the Fathers that bore on the matter, and a Latin translation of all these. "The ancient custom of the Church" he wrote "admonishes us that matters of this kind should be communicated to Your Holiness. " The matter was too grave for him to act on his own authority. "We do not openly and publicly break off communion with [Nestorius] before bringing these things to the notice of Your Holiness. Deign therefore to prescribe what you feel in the matter, so that it may be clearly known to us whether we must hold communion with him, or whether we should freely declare to him that no one can remain in communion with one who cherishes and preaches suchlike erroneous doctrine. "

Rome's reply was startling, not in its acceptance of the appeal, but in the peremptory arrangements it made for judgment. The pope, St. Celestine I (422-432), already knew something of the controversy. Nestorius himself had sent him some of his sermons; and one of the deacons of the Roman Church, Leo, had had them examined by John Cassian. Only one verdict was possible. The new theories were not in accord with the traditional faith. When the dossier from Alexandria arrived, the pope called a synod and the whole matter was carefully considered: not only St. Cyril's letters, but also the letters which Nestorius himself had sent to the pope enclosing extracts from his sermons to illustrate his theories. After which the pope wrote to all the parties concerned -- to Nestorius, to St. Cyril, to the other eastern patriarchs and to the church of Constantinople: but to the emperor, from Rome, not a word. Nestorius was told that St. Cyril's faith was in accord with the tradition, that St. Cyril's remonstrance should have been a warning to him. This was his last. Should he not, within ten days of being notified by St. Cyril, renounce his impious theories, St. Cyril had it in charge to dethrone him. The Catholics of Constantinople were

congratulated on the stand they made against the heresy, consoled for the persecution Nestorius had inflicted on them, and bidden to trust in Rome, always the refuge for persecuted Catholics. All the sentences of Nestorius were annulled, and finally it was announced that since, in so grave a matter, the pope himself must judge, and since the distance forbade his personal presence, " we have delegated our holy brother Cyril in our place. " To St. Cyril himself the pope sent detailed instructions. Acting in the pope's name he was formally to summon Nestorius to recant, and, should he not do so within ten days, to excommunicate and depose him. All these letters were sent through St. Cyril. The emperor the pope had ignored, or overlooked. A decision in a matter of faith, a dispute between bishops was, by all Roman traditions, matter for episcopal action exclusively. But east of the Adriatic another tradition held. Nestorius had appealed to Caesar, and on Caesar's action much would depend. Much also would depend on the manner in which the Roman commission was executed by Rome's Alexandrian commissioner.

The Emperor Theodosius II was still a young man, thirty years of age, cultured, pious, amiable and vacillating, his judgment always very much at the mercy of his last adviser. The monks and clergy excommunicated by Nestorius had appealed to him. St. Cyril had written from Alexandria in the same sense. But in the end it was Nestorius who prevailed; and before St. Cyril's ultimatum had arrived -- what delayed it all this time, August to November, 430, we shall see presently -- the emperor had decided that the whole affair should remain untouched pending the meeting of a general council which he now [] convoked to meet at Ephesus on the Whit-Sunday of the following year 431. This council, Nestorius wrote to Pope Celestine, would deal with a number of charges brought against St. Cyril and his administration. Had Nestorius, by now, heard something of the Roman reaction? We may well think it, for in this letter he begins to qualify his objection to the expression Theotokos.

The imperial couriers carrying to Alexandria the announcement of the forthcoming council crossed a deputation coming thence en route for Constantinople, and Nestorius. They were four of St. Cyril's suffragans, deputed, by the synod he had called, in November 430, to carry to Nestorius the letters of Pope Celestine as from the pope's commissioner. [] St. Cyril had

chosen, before acting, to summon a council of his suffragans and to give the papal decision the setting of their support. Whence, from the bishops of Egypt, a synodal letter admonishing Nestorius, and attached to it twelve propositions for him to sign and accept. Whence a certain delay, and, because of these twelve propositions, a new source of discord. At the outset let us note that for the consequences which followed from the accidental setting in which Rome's ultimatum was presented, none is to be blamed but the author of that setting, not St. Celestine but his commissioner.

The twelve propositions were the work of a skilful theologian drawn up to provide against any chance of equivocation on the part of the man who was to sign them, and whose sincerity was naturally suspect. Whatever hope Nestorius might have had of retaining both his see and his heresy by a simple acceptance of Pope Celestine's demands, would not survive his reading of this formidable requisitory. Unfortunately, with all their wealth of detail and distinctions, and despite their evident usefulness for nailing down a slippery opponent, they were an addition far beyond what the pope himself had demanded. Nestorius might be well within his rights in ignoring them. More seriously still, as compromising the pope's action, they presented the papal decision about the faith in St. Cyril's own special terminology, a terminology which could be explained in an heretical sense as well as in a Catholic sense, a terminology very like what had been condemned in Apollinaris [] and what was again to be condemned in Eutyches, a terminology by no means beyond criticism and one to which no Antiochian, Catholic or not, was likely to give assent. That the Roman decision should have been presented in what appeared as the trappings of party theology, at the very moment when party feeling ran so high, was a great misfortune. Rome apparently knew nothing about the twelve propositions. St. Celestine never mentions them. They were designed as a personal test for Nestorius, and for that only. Unfortunately they raised the whole Antiochian school against their author, the Bishop of Antioch leading the denunciation of St. Cyril as himself a heretic -- an Apollinarian who believed that in Our Lord there is but one nature. At the request of John of Antioch another great man took up his pen to criticise the twelve propositions, Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus, a greater scholar than St. Cyril and almost as great a theologian.

So the winter passed and the spring (November, 430-May, 431). The pope agreed to the council (beginning of May, 431) and appointed legates to represent him. They were the bishops Arcadius and Projectus, and the priest Philip; and the pope, in their credentials, wrote to the emperor that the legates would explain his decision, to which he made no doubt the council would adhere. The legates themselves he instructed to co-operate with St. Cyril and to follow his lead throughout. To St. Cyril himself, who had written asking, logically enough, whether Nestorius was to be considered already excommunicated since the ten days of grace had long since run out, the pope wrote a reminder that God wills not the death of the sinner but his repentance. It is the salvation of Nestorius that now concerns the pope. Let not Cyril be numbered with those of whom Sacred Scripture speaks "swift to shed blood. "

The council was summoned for Pentecost, June 8, 431. Nestorius had arrived, with his supporters, by Easter. St. Cyril came just before the feast, accompanied by fifty bishops from Egypt; the shifty Bishop of Jerusalem five days later. They sat down to wait for John of Antioch, whom the emperor had appointed to preside, and the bishops of his " patriarchate. " They waited a full fourteen days -- two weeks for both sides to organise, and for their supporters to battle in the streets of Ephesus -- and then, thanks to St. Cyril's urgency and despite numerous protests, on June 22 the council opened with something like 159 bishops present. St. Cyril presided, no doubt in virtue of the commission of 430 deputing him to judge Nestorius. After a formal protest, from the Count who represented the emperor, against the council's meeting before the arrival of the Antiochians, the assembly passed immediately to the business of Nestorius and his theories. The notaries read the charges and Nestorius was formally summoned to appear, summoned three times as custom required, and, of course, he refused. The council proceeded without him. The creed of Nicea was read and hailed as the profession of orthodox faith. St. Cyril's letter to Nestorius [] was read too, and approved as conforming to the creed of Nicea. It was then the turn of Nestorius' reply to St. Cyril. This too was read out, and when the question was put "Whether or not it accorded with Nicea?", the bishops, by acclamation, unanimously anathematised the letter and its author. Next, at the demand of the Bishop of Jerusalem, Pope Celestine's letter to Nestorius was read out, the letter of St.

Cyril to Nestorius which contained the twelve propositions, and the report of the four bishops sent by him to Nestorius. Extracts from earlier writers to show the orthodoxy of the term Theotokos were presented, and after them the passages from Nestorius to illustrate his theories. Finally the council "urged thereto by the canons and by the letter of our most holy Father and colleague Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church, " declared Nestorius deposed for his contumacy, and for the errors publicly proclaimed in his sermons, his letters, and his speeches even here at Ephesus. A report was drawn up for the emperor, and the bishops dispersed to their lodgings, escorted by the enthusiastic populace, through a city illuminated in honour of the victory of truth over heresy, of the Theotokos over her would-be traducer.

But the history of the council does not, by any means, end with the story of its first laborious session. Nestorius, for example, appealed from its sentence to the emperor, alleging that the council should not have begun while so many of the bishops had not yet arrived. And the emperor, irritated by the bishops' independence of his lieutenant, the Count Candidian, lectured them for their disregard of his orders and ordered the council to sit once more and not to disperse until it was unanimous in its judgment (June 29). This perhaps was a reference to the hitherto absent Antiochians, who had arrived (June 24) two days only after the great opening session, and before even the report of this had gone in to the emperor. Upon hearing what had already taken place these bishops had straightway formed themselves into a council apart; the Count Candidian, reporting the events of June 22, renewed his protest before them; and the bishops excommunicated the other council and its president: the council for proceeding in their absence, St. Cyril for his twelve " heretical " propositions. So far had events progressed when, finally, there arrived the legates from Rome. They joined themselves to St. Cyril and on July 10, in their presence, the second session of the council opened -- nearly three weeks after the first. There were present the bishops who had assisted at the first session and those only, St. Cyril still president, still "holding the place of the most holy and venerable archbishop of the Roman Church Celestine. "

It was the Roman legates who now took the initiative. They demanded that there be read the letter of Pope Celestine to the

council, the letter of May 7 which narrates the pope's decision and invites the council to adhere to it. More, when the bishops broke into acclamation of the agreement the legates were careful to interrupt them and to stress the point that, less important than the fact of the pope's decision being in agreement with that of the council, was the pope's demand that the council should execute his decision. The council having reached that conclusion in its first session, it remained only for the legates to confirm what it had done. First of all they must examine the minutes of its proceedings; and the council adjourned to give them the necessary time. It reassembled for the third session the next day, and one of the legates, the priest Philip, in a striking speech notable for the assumption of the Roman primacy that underlay it, declared the proceedings of the famous first session valid and good in law. The minutes were then formally read, and the sentence decreed against Nestorius.

A report of this new session was sent to the emperor, and, an effect no doubt of the more independent Roman spirit, it contained no reference to his recent edict, no apology for the flagrant contravention. Five days later, after repeated unavailing summonses to John of Antioch and his followers to appear before the council and explain their conduct, the council excommunicated them also; to the number of thirty-four. And once more they sent to the emperor an official report, and to the pope an account of all that had happened since June 22.

The emperor in his reply took a truly unexpected line. He declared his approval of the condemnation of Nestorius, and also of the sentence passed by the Antiochians on St. Cyril. To assist in the restoration of unity he now sent one of his Ministers who could explain to the bishops "the plans our divinity has in mind for the good of the faith. " The day that saw the new functionary arrive with this letter [] saw also the arrest of the excommunicated leaders -- St. Cyril as well as Nestorius was in prison. John of Antioch had called in Caesar, and Caesar had acted.

The history now becomes a confusion of protestations and counter protestations, of intrigues at the court, of backstairs influence and bribes to officials. St. Cyril knew the court, knew the only means which at times influence those whose influence in such places is paramount. He had the means to influence the

influential: he made lavish use of them. The emperor slowly gave way. In a joint conference at Chalcedon (September 11, 431) he received delegates from the two councils, and although he refused St. Cyril a hearing, he refused equally to listen to suggestions that the famous twelve propositions were anti-Nicene. He accepted moreover the deposition of Nestorius and he allowed the return of St. Cyril to Alexandria. The council he declared at an end, the bishops might now return to their churches. Nestorius was to go into exile.

But between the rival deputations the division was as wide as ever. The Antiochians the emperor had been powerless to win over, yet " because before us none has been able to convict them" he would not condemn them. The council ended, then, with Nestorius condemned and isolated, but with a new division between Alexandria and Antioch and the bishops of the two "patriarchates". "For all the tactlessness of Cyril, and the obstructions of John of Antioch, it was with the solution which Rome had from the beginning prescribed that the conflict came to its end. It was the Roman See, and that alone, which came through the violent and confused crisis that we call the Council of Ephesus with its prestige undiminished, nay even greater than before. " []

But far more than to the mistakes of St. Cyril and John of Antioch, the responsibility for the confusion is to be laid to the general willingness of the Easterns to make Caesar the arbiter in the things that are properly God's. The monks and clergy persecuted by Nestorius appeal to him, and Nestorius appeals too. The simple ecclesiastical procedure of the Roman See, the traditional procedure for charges against high ecclesiastics, is disregarded again by the emperor, when, to settle between the contending parties, he summons the council. Again he intervenes -- at the demand once more of a bishop, John of Antioch -- to quash the council's proceedings and to order a re-hearing (June 28, 431) and if, at the end, he accepts the solution first proposed by Rome, his acceptance is no more than an act of grace. The emperor's interference had simply increased the confusion and magnified the bitterness in which the affair was conducted, and his interference had been sought and welcomed by all the ecclesiastics concerned, turn by turn, excepting, only and always, one, the Bishop of the Roman Church.

With the meeting between the emperor and the delegates at Chalcedon, in the September of 431, the history of the council ends. Not so, however, the history of the relations between Alexandria and Antioch, and of the theories associated respectively with each. When Pope Celestine replied to the synodal letter of the council he necessarily made reference to the council's condemnation of John of Antioch. He is most anxious that John, too, shall subscribe to the council's decision, although he evidently looks upon him as a Nestorian in his views. He does not, however, endorse the council's excommunication, that matter being too weighty for any authority less than his own to decide. But before Pope Celestine could proceed further with regard to the Antiochians he died, July 27, 432. His successor, Sixtus III, was however of the same mind and, in a letter to the Orientals, he insisted on their submission, since it was to a decision of the Apostolic See that submission was demanded. John of Antioch was not a Nestorian, but he looked askance at the Cyrillian terminology in which the orthodox faith offered for his acceptance was formulated. Before he could accept St. Cyril as a fellow Catholic, St. Cyril and he must mutually explain themselves. In a happier atmosphere than the antechambers of any council could have provided explanations were made and an accord reached, both parties signing the formulary which expressed in terms acceptable to each the faith they had always held in common. John, the formulary signed, accepted the definition of Ephesus, the orthodoxy of the term Theotokos, and the deposition of Nestorius (433).

The celebrated formulary was the work of Theodoret. It is important because it sets out the points of the faith both parties held in common, and is evidence of the sacrifices of individual preferences in terminology, sacrifices made mutually for the sake of peace. The sacrifices were chiefly on the side of St. Cyril. His favourite phrase, "one incarnate nature of God the Word," disappears, and in its place he consents to use the Antiochian term, "the union of two natures." Also, by this time, he had explained away the difficulties occasioned by his twelve propositions, especially the phrase "a natural union" used to describe the union of the Divine and Human in Our Lord. Theodoret had criticised this especially, for it seemed to leave loopholes for the theories which considered the union as an absorption of one nature by the other. St. Cyril explained that

"natural" was used in the phrase in contradistinction, not with "person," but with "moral" or "virtual." Nestorius had taught that the Divine and Human were, practically, distinct existences, only united morally. To make his heresy clear St. Cyril, in the third of the propositions, asked him to say the union was real, not moral merely. The word to which Theodoret objected was simply chosen to express the union's reality. It has to be allowed to Theodoret that St. Cyril did not make very clear the distinction he drew between "nature", (physis) and "substance" (hypostasis), and while what St. Cyril called "a natural union" was, in his mind, something very different from an Apollinarian and Monophysite use of the words would have conveyed, there was certainly room for misunderstanding.

For the moment, however, misunderstanding was at an end, although Theodoret seems never to have been convinced in his inner man of the sincerity of the Alexandrian explanation, or, to speak more truly, of the Alexandrian terminology's being patient of such explanation. St. Cyril as long as he lived could explain to objectors, and decide between the rival interpretations of his terminology, and he could keep his own followers loyal to the agreement of 433; as long as he lived there was peace. He died in 444. John of Antioch had predeceased him, as had Pope Sixtus. Of the chief actors in the drama of 431, three alone were left, the emperor at Constantinople, Theodoret in his great diocese of Cyrrhus, and, away in the distant oasis of the Thebaid, almost at the limits of the known world, Nestorius his friend. The peace endured yet three years longer, and then, in a fiercer heat than ever, the old rivalries flamed yet once again.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



3. CHALCEDON. 446-452

In the theological crisis of 448-451 which draws to a head in the Council of Chalcedon, the rivalry of Alexandria and Constantinople again plays its part. For the third time in less than forty years the Egyptian primate is to sit in judgment on the "primate of honour." But while the Alexandrian is, this time, as much in the wrong as was Theophilus in 407, the issue is not merely personal. As in 431 it is a question of the faith, and it is the successor of Theophilus and St. Cyril who now patronises the heresy.

This time it was the Bishop of Constantinople who was the Catholic, and when, worsted, and obstinate to the last in his heresy, Dioscoros of Alexandria fell, his people, save for a tiny minority of court officials and imperialists, chose to follow him out of the Church. Not that they would so describe their action, nor Dioscoros himself. They were the Catholics, the rest were Nestorians, and Nestorian too that Council of Chalcedon which condemned Dioscoros; while, for the orthodoxy of their faith, the Egyptians appealed to the theology of St. Cyril ! The story of the events of which the Council of Chalcedon in 451 is the centre, offers many points of very high interest. Its definitions brought to a finish the debate on the fundamental theology of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and the council's proceedings were the occasion of the clearest testimony to the Roman Primacy as a primitive Christian tradition, which the collective eastern episcopate, acting freely, ever made. On the other hand, the circumstances in which the definition was adopted by the council produced effects which reacted on the relations between Church and State for centuries. The last long stage now began in the struggle between Rome and the Catholic Emperor for the control of the Church within the Empire -- the struggle which only ended with the destruction of the Church there, with its transformation into a State institution from which, actually, Rome was excluded. Chalcedon is incidentally an important stage in the long road that leads from the Council of 381 to the schism of 1054. We can note, once more, in the history of the intrigues and debates which preceded, accompanied and followed the council, all the features that appeared twenty years earlier at Ephesus. Not one of them is missing: the innovator

with his theory, the bishops, condemnation, the appeal to the emperor, the court's policy of expediency, the pope defining the Faith, the definition disregarded so long as the court bishops are in the ascendant; finally comes the council -- which is not a means of the pope's choosing, but of the emperor's -- and, resulting from the accidental circumstances of the council, a long aftermath of religious feud and civil disorder.

At Ephesus St. Cyril had been the great figure. Twenty years later that role fell to his one time adversary Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus. Theodoret has his place in ecclesiastical history and a great place again in the history of Catholic theology. Theodore of Mopsuestia had been his tutor, as he had been the tutor of Nestorius, but Theodoret had revised his master's theories, expurgated them of their errors and heretical tendencies, and if ever he had leaned to Nestorianism he was by this time most assuredly Catholic. His terminology, judged by the more exact use of later times, is, like that of all these pioneer thinkers, loose and faulty. But he was a more exact scholar than St. Cyril, and if he lacked St. Cyril's intellectual power and depth, he was a useful counterbalance to the Alexandrians, as he was also a barrier against the heretical tendencies of some of his own associates. He was, too, a great bishop, a true shepherd to the vast diocese he ruled for so long, a model of pastoral zeal and charity. St. Cyril's death in 444 left Theodoret the greatest personality in the Eastern Church.

Such was the man whose opposition a monk of Constantinople, Eutyches, now drew down on himself. Eutyches was himself a highly influential person in the religious life, not of the capital only but of all the Eastern Empire. He was the head of one of the city's largest monasteries -- it counted three hundred monks -- and by reason of his great age, and the repute of his ascetic life, a kind of patriarch of the world of monks, while at the court the all-powerful official of the moment was his godson, the eunuch Chrysaphius. Eutyches, then, had the means to impress his ideas on a very large world indeed and in theology his ideas were Apollinarian. Whence bitter opposition to Theodoret and all who shared his opinions, and a long campaign of mischief-making throughout the East designed to undo the union of 433, to destroy the remaining chiefs of the Antiochian school and to impose on all, not only the Alexandrian theology as alone patient of an orthodox meaning, but also the heresy that Our

Lord was not truly a human being. To this Theodoret replied in a work -- Eranistes (The Beggar-man) -- in which, in dialogue form, without naming Eutyches he exposed and attacked the peculiar form of Apollinarianism he professed. At the same time the Bishop of Antioch, Theodoret's superior, appealed to the emperor to suppress the new heresy.

How great was the influence of Eutyches at court was revealed immediately. An edict appeared snubbing the Bishop of Antioch for his intervention, while Irenaeus, Bishop of Tyre, another of the party, was deposed and ordered to resume his lay status--an unprecedented usurpation on the part of the State; whereupon, heartened by these signs of imperial patronage, the intrigues spread ever more widely. One of the most notable of the Antiochian survivors of the crisis of 431 was the Bishop of Edessa -- Ibas. He, too, had been a pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia and a friend of Nestorius. He had turned from Nestorius in irritation and disgust, upon his refusal to accept the Theotokos unreservedly, but, true disciple of Theodore, Ibas, while himself orthodox enough, remained the sworn enemy of the Alexandrian mode of theologising in what concerned the Incarnation. Towards Ibas, too, the intrigues were then directed, as they were directed, once more, against Theodoret and against the bishop who was their superior and the nominal leader of their party, Domnus of Antioch.

In this new offensive Eutyches found a powerful ally in the new Bishop of Alexandria, Dioscoros. Dioscoros comes down to us painted in the darkest of colours, a kind of ecclesiastical brigand and blackmailer, to whom no crime came amiss if it furthered his immediate ambition and greed for money. When, later, Flavian of Constantinople died as the result of the injuries received at the council where Dioscoros presided, tongues were not lacking to say that he died at the patriarch's own hands ! Be that as it may, he had already, in the four years since he succeeded St. Cyril, won a name for carrying things with a high hand, with a cruelty and unscrupulousness that seemed to show a complete absence of heart. For some time, now, this sinister personage had been in close relation with Eutyches. The monk had done him good service at court. Now it would be for him to return the obligation; and how eagerly he welcomed the opportunity !

He began by an imperious letter to Domnus questioning the

orthodoxy of Theodoret, and that of Domnus for tolerating Theodoret. Theodoret received an order from the court to confine himself in Cyrrhus. Everything seemed to threaten a crusade of Eutyches against the Catholics of Syria and Asia Minor. Eutyches had even taken the step of seeing what Rome would do for his party, representing his Catholic victims as Nestorians, of course, when (November 8, 448) the whole situation suddenly shifted. Eutyches was formally denounced to his own bishop, Flavian, for the heretic he undoubtedly was. The tables were turned. The hunter was now himself in the toils.

But a much more anxious man than Eutyches was the Bishop of Constantinople! He had much to fear if he betrayed the faith, but more -- in this world -- if he condemned the all-powerful monk. So far, all through the crisis, he had striven to ignore the crisis. Now he must act, particularly since the denunciation was the work of the bishop who had been the first to denounce Nestorius, and who made every sign that, once again, he would hold on, Eusebius of Dorylaeum.

Eutyches was cited to answer to the charge. He refused to come, repeatedly. His health, his age, his vows, his holy rule, all were alleged in turn, and when at last he did appear it was with a letter of protection from the Emperor and with the highest officers of the court for escort. He refused to give up his theory. There were not, in God Incarnate, two natures, for a humanity such as ours Christ Our Lord had not. And he quoted as his defence the formula dear to St. Cyril "One incarnate nature of God the Word." He had taken this formula in its monophysite sense, and had developed it in his own way, for whatever the consequences of St. Cyril's use of the term physis, the substantial error of Eutyches is his own. It finds no warrant in St. Cyril, nor did the Egyptians who, after Chalcedon, broke away in the name of St. Cyril claim Eutyches, too, as a patron. They were indeed as anxious to condemn him as was Chalcedon itself.

Flavian's council -- thirty-two bishops in it -- made short work of Eutyches once they had forced him into the open. Since he would not consent to admit the two natures they deposed him, from his office and from his orders, and declared him excommunicated. Given the circumstances it was an act of very high courage. Flavian was to pay for it with his life.

Eutyches of course appealed, first to Alexandria and then, the emperor also writing on his behalf, to Rome. Dioscoros acted immediately. Without even the formality of an enquiry, beyond the reading of Eutyches' exposition of his belief, he declared the sentences passed on him null and received him into communion. With the court, too, Eutyches' good favour continued. He petitioned for a council to try his appeal, the emperor consented. The council was summoned (March 30, 449) to meet at Ephesus for the following first of August. Dioscoros was summoned to it, and the pope was invited also.

It was the good fortune of the Church that at this moment the Roman See was ruled by one of the only two of its bishops whom all later history has agreed to style "the Great. " This was St. Leo I. He had, at this time, been pope a matter of nine years and was a man close on fifty years of age. He was gifted in the handling of men, and possessed of a vast experience. For years before his election he had been employed in important diplomatic missions by the emperor as well as by the popes. He was the traditional Roman character at its best, the natural instinctive ruler, and he added to this the less usual happy circumstance that he was a skilled theologian, and for knowledge of the merits and the history of this latest question in no way dependent on the learning of others. But here, too, the Roman genius showed itself in his leaning towards simple formulae to express what could be expressed, and in his silence about matters which lay beyond human powers of elucidation. It is also worth recalling that St. Leo wrote a Latin of singular strength and clearness in which the whole man is admirably mirrored. Of Eutyches he had already some knowledge, from the attempt to trick him into patronising the heresy in the preceding year. Now he had the monk's account of the trial, and the emperor's recommendations too. Finally, but very tardily, as the pope reprovngly noted, he received a report from Flavian.

St. Leo fell in with the emperor's plan for a council and appointed three legates to represent him. To them he entrusted a series of letters (June 13, 449). To the emperor he wrote that in a letter to Flavian he was going to expound " what the Catholic Church universally believes and teaches" on the matter. To Flavian he wrote the dogmatic letter ever since famous as the Tome of St. Leo. It is written with all his own vigorous clearness, and marked by that consciousness of his office that is so

evident in every action of his twenty-one years, reign. Our Lord, it states, is only one person but possesses two natures, the divine and the human. These natures are not confused, not mixed, though the singleness of personality entails a communion in the acts and properties of each distinct nature, the only Son of God having been crucified and buried as the Creed declares. There is, in this historic document, nothing whatever of speculative theology, nothing of ingenious philosophical explanations to solve difficulties. The pope shows no desire to explain the mystery, none at all to discuss rival theories. He makes a judgment, gives a decision, re-affirms the tradition, and all in his own characteristic style which fitted so well the office and the occasion.

The council met -- a week late -- and in the same basilica which had seen the condemnation of Nestorius in 431. There were a hundred and twenty bishops present, and, by command of the emperor, Dioscoros presided. St. Leo, to judge from his letters, although he had consented to take part in the council had not expected very much from it. But there developed immediately such a transformation that in the end the pope could not see the council for the episcopal bandits who composed and directed it--- in illo Ephesino non synodo sed latrocinio to quote his own lapidary phrase. And as the Latrocinium, the den of thieves, of Ephesus it has gone down to history.

The Latrocinium lasted a fortnight, the second session being held on August 22. The first move of Dioscoros was to exclude forty-two of the bishops, some because they had been judges in the previous trial of Eutyches, others because they were suspected of being unfavourable to his theories. What little opposition threatened to show itself Dioscoros quelled with terrible threats of punishment to come, deposition, exile, death; and to give the threats reality paraded the soldiery placed at his disposal.

The pope's letters were ignored, the legates, Julius of Pozzuoli weakly making no protest. [] Next Eutyches was allowed to make a vague profession of faith in which there was no sign of his heresy. His accuser was not allowed to speak, and the sentences on Eutyches were all annulled. He was rehabilitated and restored to his monastery. Finally there came what might be called the trial of Flavian. It could only end in the way Dioscoros

and Eutyches had planned when they worked the summoning of the Council. He was deposed, condemned and marched off to prison. All the bishops present signed the acquittal of Eutyches and the sentence on Flavian, except St. Leo's legates. In the second session it was the turn of the Antiochian theology. St. Cyril's famous propositions, which had slept since the peace of 433, were brought out once more, and confirmed and officially accepted as Catholic doctrine. Ibas and Theodoret, like Flavian, were deposed and excommunicated -- in their absence, for, needless to say, they had been most carefully kept away from Ephesus. Luckily for themselves, perhaps, for such was the ill-treatment to which Flavian was subjected that he died from it. The legates managed to escape.

Once more in the East, then, heresy was supreme, the heresy of a faction, of a small minority, and it was supreme because the heresiarchs had the emperor's ear, and because that influence seemed to a group of bishops themselves not heretical (as yet) an instrument for the subjection of a rival group. The days when Eusebius of Nicomedia "managed" Constantine seemed for the moment to have returned.

There remained, however, Rome, and St. Leo. Flavian, before he died, had managed to draw up an appeal. Theodoret also wrote one in truly magnificent style as became the great stylist of his time. There was, too, the report of the legates when, ultimately, they had made their way back. St. Leo did not lack for details. This was his opportunity to write to the emperor, October, 449, protesting vigorously against the mockery of the recent council, "an insult to the faith, a blow to the entire Church" and demanding a truly general council in which bishops from all over the world should sit, and in which Flavian's appeal could be heard. He wrote also to the sister of Theodosius, the Empress Pulcheria. From the emperor, two months later even, the pope had had neither reply nor acknowledgement. At Christmas therefore he wrote once more, and in the February of 450, at his urgent request, the emperor's western colleague Valentinian III wrote, too, and Valentinian's mother the Empress Galla Placidia. Finally, March 17, St. Leo himself wrote yet again, and once more to Pulcheria. In April the emperor at last replied. His letter is a defence of what was done at Ephesus, pointedly ignoring the fact of the appeals from its victims to the pope, ignoring, too, the reminders of Valentinian III's letters that the Roman See is

supreme in all matters of religion. Theodosius more or less suggests that the East can regulate its own disputes in these matters. Let the most revered Patriarch of Rome -- a new title he coins for the Roman Bishop -- keep to the things that really concern him.

Meanwhile a " successor " to Flavian had been appointed, one of the Bishop of Alexandria's henchmen, and had sent to St. Leo notice of his election. It gave the pope a last opportunity to plead with Theodosius. The pope explained that he could not enter into communion with "him who now presides over the Church of Constantinople" until he is satisfied of his orthodoxy. Such satisfaction he can give by notifying his assent to the letter recently sent to Flavian -- the Tome. The two bishops who bear the letter will receive his submission. This letter bears the date of July 16, 450. Whether or not it would have had any more success than the previous appeals no one can say, but before the two bishops reached Constantinople the long deadlock was ended. Theodosius II was dead, killed by a fall from his horse.

The situation changed immediately. The new ruler was the devotedly Catholic Pulcheria, and the man she married shortly afterwards and associated with herself in the Empire, Marcian, was Catholic too. The exiled bishops were immediately recalled, the body of Flavian brought back to Constantinople with all manner of solemnity. Eutyches was placed in retirement, and gradually, one by one, the bishops of the Latrocinium went back on their acclamations and votes. In all they had done, they now explained, they had yielded only to fear. The council for which St. Leo had pleaded, a truly universal council, would be summoned and St. Leo was asked himself to preside (August to November, 450). The edict convoking the council is dated May 17, 451, and the place and date are Nicea for September 1 following. St. Leo had already decided how the servile bishops of the Latrocinium should be dealt with. The rank and file were to be received back on easy terms, if they acknowledged their wrongdoing. The case of the leaders, Dioscoros notably, he reserved to himself. Now, accepting the plan of a new council, St. Leo named four legates to represent him. One of the legates is to preside. The council is not to discuss the matter of faith involved. It is simply to accept the letter to Flavian and the definition of faith it contains.

There were the usual delays. There was a change in the place of meeting. The council finally opened at Chalcedon on October 8, 451, with between five and six hundred bishops present -- so far as mere numbers went it was easily the greatest council of antiquity, and the greatest of all councils until that of the Vatican fourteen hundred years later. Among the members of the council the Roman legates had the first place. With them lay the initiative. They led the council. But the actual presidency was in the hands of a body of eighteen high officials of the court. Upon them lay the responsibility for maintaining order within the Council. They were, compositely, the Speaker of its discussions. The council's first care was to revise the proceedings of the Latrocinium. Dioscoros was removed from the seat he occupied as Bishop of Alexandria, and, as one of those to be judged, placed in the middle of the floor. Theodoret, reinstated by St. Leo's orders, was next introduced and his appearance gave rise to the council's first "scene." Curses and execrations from the Alexandrians, cheers and acclamations from his own supporters, greeted him as he took his place. Then the minutes of the Latrocinium, amid further demonstrations of emotion, were read out by the notaries and the question being put by the presiding officials the council declared Flavian's condemnation of Eutyches in 448 to have been in accord with the traditional faith, and its own.

But the emperor's representatives were not content with this. They asked the council for a new declaration of faith. Upon which the bishops declared that the Tome of St. Leo was sufficient. The Tome was then read, in company with the creed of Nicea and St. Cyril's two letters to Nestorius. The bishops cheered and cheered again the successive declarations, and the perfect accord between the two theologians, Roman and Alexandrian, between the Tome and the definitions of Ephesus 431. When the Tome itself was read their enthusiasm broke all bounds. "Behold the faith of the Fathers! the faith of the Apostles! So do we too, all of us, believe, all who are orthodox believe the same! Anathema to whoever believes otherwise! Thus through Leo has Peter spoken! "

Dioscoros, in the next session, was tried and deposed. He had protected the heretical Eutyches, had suppressed at the Council of 449 St. Leo's message to the council, and, latterly, had excommunicated St. Leo himself. St. Leo had left it to the

council to sentence Dioscoros, and the council now left it to St. Leo's representatives. " Then, Paschasinus, with his fellow legates, Lucentius and Boniface ' holding the place of Leo the most holy and blessed Patriarch of Great Rome and Archbishop' solemnly recited a summary of the crimes of the Bishop of Alexandria and concluded: ' Wherefore the most holy and most blessed archbishop of great and elder Rome, by us and the present most holy synod, together with the thrice- blessed and praiseworthy Peter the Apostle, who is the rock and base of the Catholic Church, and the foundation of the orthodox faith, has stripped him of the episcopal and of all sacerdotal dignity; wherefore this most holy and great synod will vote what is in accordance with the canons against the aforesaid Dioscoros. ' " []

In 431 Rome had deposed the Bishop of Constantinople, and a General Council had carried out her decision. Now, twenty years later, Rome had similarly deposed a Bishop of Alexandria and a second General Council had once more, unanimously, accepted the decision because of the see whence it came.

The fifth session was marked by a striking protest against imperial interference in matters of Church discipline. "We are all of the same opinion, " the council made known to its lay presidents "that government of the Church by imperial edicts must cease. The Canons are there. Let them be followed. Upon you lies the responsibility. "

The work of the council was now finished, the Tome of St. Leo solemnly accepted, the outrage of 449 made good, the chief criminal punished. The bishops might have dispersed, but the emperor still wished for a declaration of faith, a new creed, a new rule by which to measure orthodox and heretic. To this the council objected; the Tome of St. Leo, the bishops declared, was a sufficient statement of the true doctrine. As for the legates, it was in their instructions that they were not to consent to a reopening of the discussion about the point of faith. But the emperor's representatives insisted, and a profession of faith was drafted, and put to the council at its sixth session, October 22, 451. Most of the bishops liked it well enough, but the bishops of the East -- the Antioch group -- protested; so, also, did the papal legates. The draft had, in fact, omitted all reference to the Tome of St. Leo, and in place of the Roman formulary, "in two

natures", it contained the ambiguity favoured by Dioscoros, "of two natures". The new creed was, seemingly, as carefully ambiguous as all the creeds of State manufacture since the days of Constantine. It was designed no doubt as a statement of Catholic doctrine, but designed also to avoid any provocation of Monophysite [] opposition, a creed which Catholic and Monophysite might sign together. St. Leo's legates would have none of it. Either the Tome of St. Leo -- or they would go back to Rome, and another council there would decide the matter. Whereupon a tremendous eagerness to conciliate the legates, and a commission to arrange a compromise. Finally there came forth a lengthy formulary indeed. The creeds of Nicea and Constantinople (381) to begin it, then an acceptance of the letters of St. Cyril to Nestorius so that no Alexandrian could say that Chalcedon in condemning the heresy of St. Cyril's successor had condemned St. Cyril himself, and finally, for the theological dispute which had occasioned the Council, an explicit acceptance of the Tome of St. Leo, now declared to be "in harmony with the confession of the great apostle Peter, a barrier against all evil thinkers, the bulwark of orthodox faith. " Then followed the formulary stating the faith -- it was in the terminology of St. Leo's letter.

Rome then, in St. Leo, had triumphed once more, the faith over heresy, thanks to Rome; and it was in the clarity of the Roman phraseology that the belief was proclaimed. But this had not been achieved easily, nor was the majority in the council wholeheartedly enthusiastic about the last part of the business-- which involved the victory of a non-Alexandrian manner of speech over the terminology dear to St. Cyril. The greater part of the bishops had been, for a lifetime, too sympathetic to St. Cyril's way of describing the mystery to accept another way easily or wholeheartedly -- even though they accepted that it was a true way of describing it. Already during the very council, in this spirit in which so many of the bishops accepted the formulary of the faith, the dissension was evident that was presently to inaugurate two centuries of acute disturbance and the loss of whole races to the Church. It was only at the emperor's insistence, that these bishops had finally consented to promulgate, in a terminology so repugnant to them, the faith which they held in common with the rest. Had it not been for the emperor, the question would never have arisen; the doctrinal work of the council would have ended - - as the pope intended --

with its acceptance of the Tome as the Catholic faith.

In a lengthy letter to St. Leo the council gave an account of its work. Our Lord, they said, had commissioned the Apostles to teach all nations. "Thou then hast come even to us. To us thou hast been the interpreter of the voice of the blessed Peter, to 211 thou hast brought the blessing of his faith." Five hundred and twenty bishops were met in Council; "Thou didst guide us, as doth the head the body's limbs. " Dioscoros has been fitly punished. Who more criminal than he, who, to the wickedness of reinstating Eutyches, "dared in his folly to menace him to whom the Saviour made over the care of His vineyard, Your Holiness we mean, to excommunicate him whose charge it is to unite the Church's body."

St. Leo had seen orthodoxy vindicated and the privilege of his see proclaimed as never so strikingly before. But not all the council's proceedings were likely to please him. And the council knew it. The council had, once more, following the unhappy precedent of 381, set itself to heighten the prestige of the see where now the imperial capital was established. To the famous "primacy of honour" voted Constantinople in 381 Chalcedon recognised considerable extensions. By its ninth, seventeenth and twenty-eighth canons the council gave legal consecration to all the jurisdiction which had accrued to Constantinople, since 381, though the illegal usurpations of its bishops. The bishops of Constantinople had for seventy years been the spiritual pirates of the Eastern Church. One after another the different metropolitan sees had seen their rights of jurisdiction invaded and captured. Now Chalcedon ratified all that had been done, blessed the spoiler, and gave him, for the future, the right to spoil as he would. The new rights, too, would develop; and to Constantinople would accrue, on this unecclesiastical principle of the city's worldly importance, such an importance in the Church that, by the side of it, the ancient traditional apostolic prestige of Alexandria and Antioch would be as nothing, and the Roman See, in appearance, hardly be more than an equal.

It had clearly been law since 381 that suits between a bishop and his metropolitan should be judged by the primate of the civil diocese in which the litigating prelates lived. The innovation was now made that the judge was either the primate or the Bishop of Constantinople. This was to hold good for the three (civil)

dioceses of Thrace, Pontus and Asia. The "primacy of honour " was now recognised as one of jurisdiction in all those regions where the perseverance of the capital's bishops had already established this as a fact.

The twenty-eighth canon begins by confirming the canon of 381. It goes on to say that Rome owes its traditional primacy to the city's one-time civil importance, and that Constantinople being now the imperial city, to that see too certain privileges are due. Wherefore the council grants to the see of Constantinople the right to ordain the metropolitans of the (civil) dioceses of Pontus, Asia and Thrace, and of all the missionary bishops depending on them. Constantinople is to be in these regions what Alexandria is in Egypt, what Rome is in the West, the effective supervisor of all the other sees. The Roman legates protested, but the council approved, and in its synodal letter to St. Leo made a special request for the confirmation of the novelty. The emperor wrote in the same sense, and the Bishop of Constantinople too.

But St. Leo held firm. In a series of letters to the emperor and to the empress, to the Bishop of Constantinople too, he complained sadly of the spirit of ambition which bade fair to trouble anew the peace of the Church, and suggested that the Bishop of Constantinople should be content that his see, "which no power could make an apostolic see", was indeed the see of the empire's capital. The new canons are contrary to the only rule the pope knows, that of Nicea, and he will not consent to any innovation so injurious to the rights of ancient, undoubted apostolic sees such as Antioch and Alexandria. Let the Bishop of Constantinople obey the Law as he knows it, or he too may find himself cut off from the Church. The innovations then are void, of no effect and "by the authority of blessed Peter the Apostle, in sentence altogether final, once and for all, we quash them. "

Nor was this the end of the pope's protests. To safeguard ancient rights against further encroachment on the part of the parvenu authority at Constantinople, and to keep himself informed as to the reception of the faith of his Tome throughout the East, St. Leo now installed at the imperial court a permanent representative. This was Julian, Bishop of Kos, skilled in both Latin and Greek, Italian by birth, Roman by education, Bishop of

a Greek see.

Finally March 21, 453, St. Leo replied to the synodal letter of the council. He notes the work accomplished by the council as twofold. First of all the acceptance of the defined faith and the revision of the outrages of 449. This was the purpose for which the council had been called and to the council's proceedings in this respect the pope gives all possible confirmation and praise. But the council had gone further, taken upon itself to make other decisions and regulations. Now no matter what the authority invoked to sanction these proceedings, no matter what the council, anything in them that contravenes the canons of Nicea is null and void. Of these canons as implying a derogation from the rights of his own see, there is not in all these letters a word: not a hint that St. Leo so construed the innovations. But such innovations are inspired by worldly ambition, and this, if not checked, must open the way to endless new troubles among the bishops. Therefore St. Leo stands by the old order, the traditional rule. The emperor assented, and finally, by a disavowal of his own share in the measure, and by a letter which implied submission to the papal ruling, the Bishop of Constantinople, too, made his peace. " Better certainly had the Bishop of Constantinople said plainly 'We'll say no more about the decision of Chalcedon which the Apostolic See will not confirm. ' He does not say it. He contents himself with the protestation that he has done nothing in this matter to deserve the reproach of insincerity or ambition. St. Leo believed the cause safe for which he had battled so gallantly, so tenaciously: he asked nothing more, neither of the Bishop of Constantinople whose disavowal seemed to suffice, nor of the emperor whose sincerity was beyond doubt. " []

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



CHAPTER 10: THE TRADITIONAL FAITH AND THE IMPERIAL POLICY

1. *THE AFTERMATH OF CHALCEDON. 452-518*

IN the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon were sown seeds of dissension destined to bear an immense fruit in centuries yet to come. The more immediate trouble was born of the circumstances in which its definition of faith was framed. Here the terminology of St. Cyril had yielded to that of St. Leo, and there were regions in the East too accustomed to St. Cyril's language to take the change easily. Just as there were Catholics after Nicea who dreaded the possibility that the Arians would interpret the homoousion in a Sabellian sense and exploit the misinterpretation against the defenders of the defined doctrine, and, more recently, Catholics after Ephesus who suspected the Apollinarian possibilities of St. Cyril's technical phrases, so now there were to be Catholics uneasy lest Chalcedon might be construed as a posthumous rehabilitation of Nestorius.

The first element to consider, in the resistance to Chalcedon which now began to show itself, is the opposition of those who cannot see truth except through the terminology they have inherited from St. Cyril. Nowhere, it is interesting to note, is Eutyches defended. These "Cyrillians," [] so to call them, condemn Eutyches equally with the council, but they will not condemn him as the council condemns him, since to do so is, they consider, an indirect condemnation of St. Cyril. Thus far the resistance is an academic affair, the conflict of theologians over terms, and its chief importance is perhaps that it explains the luke-warmness of many Catholic bishops in the East in the next few years. At Chalcedon they had whole-heartedly condemned Eutyches as they had whole-heartedly acknowledged St. Leo's claim to define the truth; but it was only after Rome's gesture of authority that they had consented to the definition in the terminology they suspected.

There was, however, another source whence trouble was much more likely to come. This was in the resentment, which it is

hardly incorrect to call national, felt by the people of Egypt at the condemnation of their patriarch. Dioscoros, whatever his misdeeds, was Patriarch of Alexandria, and to the newly-reviving race consciousness of the Egyptians he was the head of his nation. For nearly a century and a half a succession of great personalities had filled that see, and for half a century one of them, backed by his people, had defied successfully all the efforts of the hated power at Constantinople to depose him. The later victory of Theophilus over St. John Chrysostom and that -- admittedly a very different affair -- of St. Cyril over Nestorius had also been, for the Egyptians, the triumph of Egypt over the Empire. In 449, at the Latrocinium, Dioscoros had gained just such another triumph in his deposition of St. Flavian. Now, in 451, his own degradation was felt in Egypt as a national calamity. Well might the bishops of Egypt, prostrate before the great council, beg and implore with tears to be excused from signing the condemnation of their patriarch. They knew their people, knew that in this matter forces far less judicial than those which ruled theological discussions, were moving. If they returned home, and the news spread that they had assented to the condemnation of Dioscoros, their lives would not be worth an hour's purchase. It needed but the interest of the few genuine Monophysite heretics to exploit this immense reserve of anti-imperialist feeling -- and organising it as the cause of St. Cyril they would secure the benevolent neutrality of the "Cyrillian" bishops -- and Egypt would be roused against Chalcedon even more easily than it had been roused for Nicea. The imperial government understood well enough what the immediate future might hold, and it gathered troops to protect the defenders of Chalcedon when the emergency should arise.

It was in Palestine that the trouble began, and the pioneers were people who feared neither Government nor council, the innumerable army of monks and solitaries. The news of its bishop's vote reached Jerusalem long before that prelate, with his new dignity of fifth patriarch, had returned. The cry went round that the faith was in danger, that in Dioscoros St. Cyril had been condemned. The whole city rose, monks and solitaries pouring in by thousands, at the head of the insurrection no less a person than the Empress Dowager, Eudoxia, widow of Theodosius II, and delighted in her exile to find this means of embarrassing the imperial sister-in-law whom she so little loved. New bishops, it was urged, must be chosen not for Jerusalem

only but for all Palestine, to replace those who at Chalcedon had betrayed the faith, and the new Patriarch returned to find his city in the hands of half-mad fanatics, murder and outrage the order of the day. Order was not restored until the monks had been defeated in a pitched battle.

There were revolts of the same kind throughout Syria, and in Cappadocia too, but the scene of the fury at its worst was naturally Egypt. Here the first practical consequence of the council was the meeting to elect a successor to Dioscoros, and at the mere announcement the mob rose. Dioscoros was still alive, therefore still bishop. There could therefore be no need of a new election. Once again the troops had to fight the mob and the monks before the formalities could be gone through and the new bishop elected. Still the fighting in the streets continued, the troops were driven into the great temple of the old religion -- the Serapeion -- and held there until with the buildings they perished in the flames. The imperial government must evidently fight for its own existence. All Egypt was placed under military law and the pro-Dioscoros bishops everywhere deposed. So a certain external order was at last obtained. It lasted for an uneasy five years.

Its first shock was the news (September, 454) that Dioscoros had died in his distant captivity, when it took all the efforts of the government to prevent the Monophysites from electing a "successor" to him. When, three years later, the emperor Marcian followed Dioscoros into the other world the tumult broke out irrepressibly. Marcian had been orthodoxy's chief supporter. Chalcedon was his council, and to repress the Monophysite faction had been for him an elementary necessity of practical politics. Pulcheria had pre-deceased him, and in his place the army and officials installed the tribune Leo. The Monophysites did not wait to learn that the change of emperor meant a change of policy. They elected their successor to Dioscoros, Timothy surnamed the Cat, while the mob once more held the city and the Catholic bishop was murdered, his body dragged through the streets and savagely outraged. For the best part of a year the Monophysites were masters, deposing the Catholic bishops everywhere and re-instating the partisans of Dioscoros while the government looked on indifferently. From Rome St. Leo did his utmost to rally the new emperor to the support of Chalcedon, and finally the government made up its

mind. Bringing in more troops, it deposed the Monophysite bishops and deported Timothy the Cat. Once more there was the peace of repression and it endured this time for sixteen years.

When the Emperor Leo I died in 474 he left as his successor a baby grandson, Leo II, and the child's father, Zeno, acting as Regent, was associated with him as Emperor. The baby died, another claimant to the throne, Basiliscus, appeared, and he was so successful that presently Zeno was an exile, and Basiliscus reigned in his place at Constantinople (January, 475).

One of the first acts of the usurper was to recall the Monophysite exiles. Their chief, Timothy the Cat, was still alive and at the news of his return the Catholic bishop fled from Alexandria and Timothy took possession without opposition, while the remains of Dioscoros were solemnly set in a silver shrine. To Antioch also there returned its Monophysite bishop, Peter called the Fuller, and the new emperor, hoping to establish himself securely on the basis of a re-united people, issued what was to be the first of a long series of edicts designed to undo the work of Chalcedon without express disavowal of the faith there defined. Monophysites and Catholics alike would sign the formula proposed and the religious disunion be at an end. This was the aim of the Encyclion of Basiliscus. It condemned Eutyches and it condemned Chalcedon, it approved Ephesus and it approved the Latrocinium. All the bishops were to sign it under pain of deposition, and laymen who opposed it were to suffer confiscation, of goods and be exiled.

The success of the measure was instantaneous. Almost every bishop in the East signed without difficulty -- Catholics because it condemned Monophysitism in condemning Eutyches, and because, if it condemned Chalcedon too, there was much in the terminology imposed at Chalcedon to which they objected. On the other hand, the Monophysites had never ranged themselves as supporters of Eutyches since the Latrocinium. They were delighted to have an opportunity, in once more condemning him, of affirming the orthodoxy of St. Cyril and of their own claims, and of course, of the orthodoxy of their own opposition to Chalcedon. For the Monophysites the future was now full of promise. They held the two chief sees of the East, and, thanks to the Encyclion, Monophysitism was no longer a bar to the promotion of yet more of the faction. Their one and only

obstacle was the Patriarch of Constantinople, Acacius. He had refused to acknowledge Timothy the Cat when the exiles were recalled, and had locked the churches of the capital against him. Now, almost alone of the hundreds of bishops in the Eastern Empire, he refused to sign the Encyclion. His constancy, or obstinacy, would no doubt have brought his term of office to a speedy conclusion, but the short reign (twenty months) of Basiliscus ended as unexpectedly as it had begun.

In the September of 476 Zeno returned with an army and re-established himself. Basiliscus had seen defeat coming, and in a last wild hope of rallying the capital -- where Monophysites were few -- he had cancelled the Encyclion by the edict called the Anti-Encyclion, and the versatile Eastern episcopates signed this as easily as they had signed its forerunner, excepting always the Monophysites. Timothy the Cat's brief triumph was over, and the deposition of Acacius to which he looked forward as the fitting sequel to the Alexandrian defeat of 451, a fourth condemnation of Constantinople by Alexandria in fifty years, was not to be. Chalcedon was once more in the ascendant, and only the old man's death (July, 477) saved him from arrest and further exile. Secretly and hurriedly his chief lieutenant, Peter Mongos [] was consecrated in his place and, consecrated, immediately went into hiding to avoid the coming storm. The Catholic bishop came out of the monastery where he had buried himself since 474 and, if the government would only put its troops at the disposal of orthodoxy, the Catholicism of Chalcedon might once more hope for peace.

The recent crisis had proved one thing very clearly. In the whole East the great council had scarcely a friend prepared to suffer in its defence. The bishops, evidently, would vote " yes " or " no " as the government bade them. Twenty-five years after Chalcedon it was on the Patriarch of Constantinople alone that, in the East, the defence of orthodoxy depended. Acacius was its sole bulwark against the energy and determination of the Monophysites. And now, whether from fear on his part that the task was hopeless, or whether the emperor, weary of the repression and turning to other means, won him round, Acacius changed his policy.

The occasion was the death in 482 of the Catholic bishop of Alexandria. As his end drew near this defender of Chalcedon

grew more and more anxious that an equally zealous Catholic should succeed him, and that the government should not, upon his death, end the trouble by recognising the Monophysite, Peter Mongos, as the lawful bishop. He therefore despatched to the court a trusted member of his clergy, John Talaia, to urge the matter. Talaia chose his intermediaries badly -- high officials themselves under suspicion of treason -- and compromised his cause accordingly. However, the promise was made that the new patriarch should be a Catholic, and Talaia had in return to promise that he would not seek his own election. But when in the June of 482 the Bishop of Alexandria died, and Talaia was elected in his place, he ignored his engagement and accepted. The emperor, already planning some scheme of reunion, refused to acknowledge him, and, since no Catholic bishop could expect to live in Alexandria once the imperial government ceased to uphold him, Talaia fled to Rome. The government meanwhile had found its formula. Its officials sought out the Monophysite successor of Timothy the Cat and offered him official recognition as Patriarch if he would sign it and admit Catholics to the sacraments. Peter Mongos accepted and signed. This document is the Henoticon, and its author was the Patriarch of Constantinople Acacius.

The Henoticon is more subtly drawn than the Encyclion of Basiliscus which inspired it. It takes the form of a letter from the emperor to the bishops, and it proclaims his faith to be that of Nicea, of Constantinople, of Ephesus (431). It repeats the condemnation of Eutyches, and it accepts the theology of St. Cyril's famous twelve propositions against Nestorius. Of Chalcedon there is no mention at all, nor is there, in the reference to Eutyches, any mention of the Tome of St. Leo which is the official form of his condemnation. In the circumstances, and in the light of all that had happened since Chalcedon, the Henoticon was a jettisoning of the faith there defined, an implicit acknowledgement that Chalcedon was unimportant and henceforward not to be imposed, an equivocal surrender of St. Leo, without whom Chalcedon is a mere pageant and against whom all the Monophysite bitterness of thirty years had been directed. There was nothing in the document which a Catholic could not approve, but to approve the document at that time and in that place was undoubtedly to surrender the controverted point of faith. The issue of the Henoticon, whatever the hopes of its authors, was a triumph for the Monophysites.

Nevertheless it had a very mixed reception. In Egypt Peter Mongos accepted it, but the Monophysites generally refused it, as equivocal, and called for the logical term of its reasoning-an explicit condemnation of Chalcedon. Once more there were riots, and from the deserts an army of 30,000 monks converged on Alexandria to enforce the demands. The Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch too, Peter the Fuller, accepted, thereby winning recognition; and the Monophysites in Syria, generally, accepted it. The same thing happened in Palestine. The situation of 475 was repeated with this difference that the leader of the movement now was the very man who then had been the head of the orthodox opposition. The whole of the East had ceased to fight for the definition of Chalcedon, and on a basis of "silence where we differ" the Catholics there had received into communion those who declared that the definition meant heresy.

There remained Rome. It was the action of the pope St. Leo which in 458 had saved Catholicism in the East from Timothy the Cat, and when that personage returned in triumph seventeen years later the pope -- Simplicius now -- had immediately protested and called for his re-exile. He had been no less insistent, in 482, in his opposition to the emperor's acknowledgement of Peter Mongos as Patriarch, and had pressed Acacius to use all his influence to prevent that acknowledgement. Acacius ignored the letters, but before Simplicius could proceed further in the matter he died (March 10, 483).

His successor, Felix III, was once again the classical Roman, simple, direct, courageous, a man of action. Talaia had arrived in Rome while Simplicius lay dying and had laid a formal accusation against Acacius. The new pope thereupon sent an embassy to Constantinople with instructions to summon Acacius to answer the charges made against him by the exiled Catholic patriarch. When the legates arrived Acacius confiscated their papers and procured their arrest. They were put to the torture and presently went over to the side of Acacius. They, too, signed the Henoticon and assisting publicly, in their official capacity as the pope's legates, at the liturgy when Acacius pontificated, crowned his tortuous betrayal of the faith of Chalcedon with the appearance of the papal sanction. There

was, however, one small group of faithful Catholics in the capital who guessed the truth -- the monks known, from the continuous character of their offices, as the "Sleepless" (Akoimatoi). They found means to inform the pope and when the legates returned their trial awaited them. In a synod of seventy bishops the pope judged both the legates and Acacius. They were condemned and deposed, and Acacius excommunicated for his betrayal of the faith. With him were excommunicated all who stood by him, and as the whole of the East that was not Monophysite supported him, the effect was a definite breach between Rome and the Eastern Church. It was to last for thirty-five years, and history has called it the Acacian Schism.

Acacius died, intransigent to the last, in 489 and two years later Zeno died too. He left no heir and his widow, influential as the Augusta, designated as his successor Anastasius, an officer of the civil service. The contrast between the two emperors could not have been greater. Zeno was the rough, uncultured product of a province where the only influential citizens were brigands, and he was the most notorious evil-liver of his Empire.

Anastasius, already sixty-eight years of age, was the trained official, scholarly, scrupulous, so pious that in 488 he narrowly escaped election as Patriarch of Antioch; he had a pronounced taste for preaching, and he was an ardent Monophysite. The schism therefore suffered no interruption from the change of emperor. In Egypt the regime of the Henoticon, interpreted as hostile to Chalcedon, continued. In Syria, under the same regime, the bishops were pro-Chalcedon and the monks divided. At Constantinople, outside the court circle, Monophysites were rare and the new patriarch was as much a supporter of Chalcedon as he dared be, which was too much for the new emperor, and therefore he was soon replaced.

Felix III, too, died in 492. His successor, one of the great popes of the early Middle Ages, was Gelasius I and he continued his predecessor's policy in his predecessor's spirit. Constantinople must acknowledge the sentence on Acacius before it can be restored to communion. The successor of Gelasius, Anastasius II (496-98), used a somewhat gentler tone. He died before he was able to see what fruit this would bear, and the immediate result was a schism, at Rome itself, on the part of the more intransigent of his own clergy, and the beginnings of a legend concerning Anastasius that grew with the Middle Ages and won

the peace-loving pope a place in the Inferno of Dante. With Symmachus, elected in 498, the party of Gelasius was again in control, but hampered for the next ten years by schism arising from a double election. The situation, after twenty-five years of the breach, was unchanged, except that the East was becoming accustomed to live in hostility to Rome; and then, in 511, change came. From the Catholic point of view it was change for the worse and its author was the emperor, still Anastasius and by this time close on ninety years of age.

The Henoticon had never been a success. It was one of those compromises which satisfy none. It pleased the radical Monophysites as little as it pleased the Catholics, Anastasius the emperor as little as Anastasius the pope. The emperor then, in 511, resolved on a more definitely anti-Chalcedonian policy, the imposition of Monophysitism generally throughout the Empire. His greatest difficulty lay in the fact that only Egypt was sufficiently Monophysite to welcome the policy whole-heartedly. But his purpose was stiffened, and his arm strengthened, by the appearance at this moment of the man who was destined to make a church of the Monophysite party, and to found it so thoroughly that it endures to this day -- the monk Severus.

Severus was a man who had suffered much for his opposition to the Henoticon -- opposition, of course, because that document, he considered, conceded too much to Catholicism. The business of an appeal to the emperor had brought him to the capital at the very moment when Anastasius was planning how best to depose its Patriarch for his anti-monophysite activities. The presence of Severus, whose most remarkable learning, and sufferings for the cause, had made him the leading personality of the party, gave new life to the dispirited Monophysites of the capital. The Patriarch, Macedonius, was deposed and a Monophysite installed in his place. Heartened by this victory the emperor turned next to purify the sees of the East. In Syria the monks were his willing agents and Severus the chief organiser. Within a few months the deposition of the Patriarch of Antioch, too, had been managed and in his place there was elected Severus himself. The bishops of Syria went over, almost in a body, to the strictly Monophysite interpretation of the Henoticon. At Jerusalem, however, Severus was refused recognition, and to reduce this last stronghold more summary measures still were adopted. The patriarch was deposed, banished and provided

with a Monophysite successor by a simple order from the emperor. But, for all its appearance of completeness, the policy was far from successful. Monophysites did indeed occupy the chief sees, and the other bishops had accepted the Monophysite version of the faith. But in many cases it was only a nominal acceptance; the convinced Monophysites among them were a minority; the dissident radical Monophysites of Syria still held aloof; and at Constantinople the opposition of the Catholics--still of course divided from Rome and the West by schism -- to the whole Monophysite movement was as active as ever. The religious chaos after seven years of the new Monophysite offensive was greater than before. Affairs were going steadily from bad to worse when the death of the aged emperor (July 9, 518) suddenly changed the whole situation.

The new emperor -- the commandant of the guard, who had profited by his position to seize the vacant throne -- was not only a Catholic, but, what had not been known for a century and a half, a Latin. With the accession of Justin the end of the schism could only be a matter of time. Events, indeed, followed each other rapidly. Anastasius died on July 9. Six days later mobs were parading the streets calling for the acknowledgement of Chalcedon and St. Leo, and the condemnation of Severus. On the 20th a council of bishops reversed all the policy of forty years and more, recognising Chalcedon and St. Leo's teaching, and decreeing Severus' deposition and excommunication. More they were unable to do for, like a wise man, he was already flown. Everywhere, except in Egypt, the superiority reverted to the Catholics, and on August 1 the new emperor re-opened communications with the pope, Hormisdas.

It was not until the following March (519) that the legates arrived to execute the formalities which would bring the schism to an end. They were simple enough, and strict. Each bishop must sign the formula sent by the pope, and in this he acknowledged the indefectibility of the faith of the Roman Church, condemned Nestorius and Eutyches and Dioscoros, made explicit recognition of the decisions of Ephesus and Chalcedon, accepted the Tome of St. Leo and finally condemned along with Timothy the Cat, Peter Mongos and Peter the Fuller, Acacius too and all who had supported him. Furthermore, the bishop promised never "to associate in the prayers of the sacred mysteries the names of those cut off from the communion of the

Catholic Church, that is to say those not in agreement with the Apostolic See., ' The formula was not drawn up in view of the present reconciliation. It had been devised in Spain, during the schism, as a means of testing the orthodoxy of visiting prelates from the East. Rome now made it her own.

Justin asked for a Council to discuss the matter, but the legates were firm. They had come for one purpose only -- to gather signatures to Pope Hormisdas' formula. They had their way. The patriarch signed and the other bishops, too, amid scenes of great enthusiasm. But outside Constantinople things did not go so smoothly. To begin with, there was an unwillingness to condemn the patriarchs since Acacius, especially those who, for their opposition to the Monophysites, had been deprived by the Monophysite emperor. At Thessalonica and at Ephesus especially was there resistance on this account. At Antioch, Severus having been deposed, there was once more a Catholic patriarch. He signed, and with him a hundred and ten out of the hundred and fifty bishops of his jurisdiction. The monks, however, held firm and nothing short of a wholesale dissolution of their monasteries and a general rounding up of hermits and solitaries reduced their opposition. This necessary work was entrusted to the army. Its immediate result was to loose on the East thousands of convinced, and none too instructed, apostles of the heresy, destined now to wander over the East for another twenty years preaching resistance to the bishops and to the Council of Chalcedon. Their sufferings at the hands of the imperial soldiery naturally added not a little to their eloquence and zeal. In Palestine the change had not been too difficult, but it promised to raise such storms in Egypt that the government, for the moment, left that province untouched; and to Egypt there began to flow in the full tide of the persecuted and dispossessed from all the rest of the Empire. Nor was Severus idle. From his hiding place he still directed and encouraged the whole vast movement, and to take the place of the priests and deacons now reconciled with the pope, wholesale ordinations were arranged and a new Monophysite clergy came into being whose pertinacity no power would ever shake.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. JUSTINIAN. 527-565

The old emperor, Justin I died on August 1, 527, and his nephew, Justinian, who throughout the reign had been the chief adviser and the real ruler, succeeded. The uncle had been one of those rough, hardy Illyrians who had more than once shown themselves such capable administrators, endowed with a hard practical common sense and a natural shrewdness that compensated for their native illiteracy. But the new emperor added to what practical abilities he inherited, a wide and extensive culture, and -- sure menace for the newly-restored peace in things ecclesiastical -- a pronounced taste for theological speculation. Justinian, like his uncle, was a Catholic. He had played an important part in the negotiations which ended the schism, and in the measures taken since to dislodge the Monophysites from the vantage points they had come to occupy during those thirty-five disastrous years. His Catholic subjects were now once more in communion with their chief the Bishop of Rome, but the subsequent measures of repression, of deposition, and confiscation had by no means reconciled the Monophysites of the eastern provinces. At heart they still remained bitterly hostile to the Catholicism of Chalcedon, and the new conformity was very largely a conformity in name alone. One of the first tasks before Justinian was to transform this nominal submission into a submission of fact.

From the new emperor the Catholic Church had everything to hope, but he was not the only figure with whom it had to reckon. Justinian was married, and the new empress, Theodora, a personality indeed, was no mere consort but associated as Augusta with her husband's new rank. They were a devoted couple, and the imperial menage a model to all their subjects. It had not always been so; and long before the time when Justin's unexpected accession had raised Justinian too, Theodora had been already famous, notorious even, as a comedienne, for her feats of impudicity in the capital's less distinguished places of amusement. But whatever her origins, and however true the stories that circulated about her, Theodora had long since broken from it all; and she was already living in decent obscure retirement when Justinian, heir-apparent, found her, loved her, and, despite the opposition of the emperor, his uncle, married

her. Like him, she was now a Catholic, but her own religious inclinations, less theological than those of Justinian, drew her to monasticism; more especially, it is suggested, to monasticism as it displayed itself in feats of unusual austerity. And the most celebrated of these spiritual athletes were, often enough, not orthodox. From their ill-instructed and undisciplined ardour, heresy and rebellion against ecclesiastical authority had drawn in the recent past only too many champions; and as Theodora's association with the monks she preferred increased, so, too, did her inclination to support and encourage the recently defeated Monophysites.

Her great influence brought it about that, in 531, the sentences of banishment were revoked; and the thousands of exiles, bishops, priests, and above all monks, now made their way back, none the less fervid in their hatred of Chalcedon and its teaching for the pain they had had to suffer in its name. They came even -- five hundred and more of them -- to Constantinople itself. Theodora procured them a common house and a church, and, blessed by her patronage, their church speedily became a centre for the capital's fashionable devotees. Justinian, ever perplexed by a religious division which, for the first time in the empire's history, was making the imperial rule a foreign thing in the chief provinces of the State, set himself, along theological lines, to find a reconciling formula. Under his auspices conferences were held between Catholic bishops and Monophysite bishops and, yet once again, the complicated discussion took up its ancient round.

To all the Catholic explanations the heretics made the old reply, that Chalcedon had reversed Ephesus, that its supporters were Nestorians. At all costs, then, if the dissidents were to be argued back to conformity, Chalcedon must be cleared of this charge. To make clear, beyond all doubt, the opposition between what was approved at Chalcedon and what was condemned at Ephesus, a new formula expressive of the Catholic doctrine was therefore prepared. If it was Catholic doctrine, in accord with the faith of Chalcedon, to say, "One of the Trinity suffered in the Flesh", no Monophysite could truthfully assert that Chalcedon had canonised the heresy condemned at Ephesus; for no Nestorian would ever assent to such a proposition, any more than he would accept the term Theotokos. Then, again, this formula would show that Catholics and St. Cyril were of one

mind on the great question, that Chalcedon had in no way condemned the saint in whose name the Monophysites justified their dissidence, for the formula was St. Cyril's very own, devised by him for the very purpose of exposing Nestorius and used in the twelfth of the celebrated propositions of 430. It was as good Cyrillian theology as the most Cyrillian Monophysite could wish for. If it were officially announced as orthodox Catholicism, what further delay could prevent the Monophysite from accepting Chalcedon?

It was not the first time that, in Justinian's own experience, this formula had been suggested. The Akoimetoï monks had sought approbation for it from the legates of Pope Hormisdas in 519. To the legates it had too novel a sound to be welcome, and they were inclined to frown down a suggestion which promised to open new controversies at the very moment when the old ones were about to heal. Justinian was of the same opinion. The monks seemed wanton disturbers of the peace. Nor was the pope, to whom the legates referred the matter, anxious to decide, and despite the endeavours, at Rome, of a deputation from the monks, the matter went no further until Justinian, converted now to the monks's view of the formula's usefulness, made its adoption a matter of State policy. The monks, while in the West, had enlisted the support of a group of African bishops, exiled to Sardinia by the Vandals, among whom was St. Fulgentius reputed in the West the greatest theologian of the time. When in 534, then, the question was, in much changed circumstances, put to the Apostolic See the pope, John II, after consultation, approved it, quoting in his declaration both St. Cyril and St. Leo in support of his approval and once more condemning Nestorius insulsus along with impius Eutyches.

While Justinian drew up schemes for reunion, evolving formularies of reconciliation which should clothe the decision of Chalcedon in a terminology which the Monophysites could accept, showing that on the points at issue St. Leo and St. Cyril were at one, Theodora was left to deal with the more congenial business of ecclesiastical personalities. In 535 the Patriarch of Alexandria died -- a Monophysite elected years before, in the time of the Emperor Anastasius, whom Justin I had found it wiser to leave undisturbed at the time of the great change over. His people were violently divided, though Monophysites all, between the rival systems of Severus and Julian of

Halicarnassus. Whence a double -- Monophysite -- election. There was no thought of a Catholic candidate, but thanks to Theodora the government influence secured the election of Theodosius the candidate of the milder, Severian, school.

The noise of the riots amid which Theodosius was installed had not yet died down when the Patriarch of Constantinople died too. Once again it was Theodora who decided the election. The new patriarch, Anthimos, was one of her own confidants, a man of ascetic life, who, though Bishop of Trebizond, had for long lived at court, and who was known to be a concealed Monophysite. At this moment, ending the resistance of years, Severus himself consented to come to the capital to assist, from the Monophysite side, at Justinian's theological conferences. The first result of his presence was the explicitly declared conversion to the heresy of the capital's new patriarch. It seemed as though the old days of heretical domination were about to return. The two chief bishops of the East known as heretics, and supported with all the prestige of the empress, while the arch-heretic himself lived in her palace as chief adviser, and director-general of the new restoration ! What saved the situation for orthodoxy was the accidental presence of the pope, Agapitus I, in Constantinople, and his energetic action.

It was no ecclesiastical business which brought the pope to Constantinople. He came as the ambassador of the Gothic King in Italy, in a vain attempt to stave off the impending imperial reconquest of the long-lost western provinces. But the recent changes in the personnel of the great churches, and the new doctrinal positions they implied could not but be the main subject to occupy Pope Agapitus. The new patriarch, whatever his beliefs, had been translated to his present high position from the see of Trebizond, and translations were contrary to canonical usage. Hence the pope's first hesitation to recognise Anthimos. The emperor pressing the point, the pope asked next for satisfaction in the matter of the patriarch's orthodoxy. Upon which the patriarch took the simplest of all possible ways out of the approaching difficulty and disappeared. A priest of irreproachable orthodoxy was found to fill the vacancy, and on March 13, 536, the pope himself gave him episcopal consecration.

For the Catholics of the imperial city it was already a great

encouragement to see their heretical bishop deposed and a Catholic in his place. Heartened thereby, they now demanded the expulsion of the other prominent Monophysites, and especially of Severus. The pope gave his own strong support to the requests and, though he died, suddenly, before the defeat of Theodora and her proteges was complete, it was only a matter of four months before an imperial edict ordered the writings of Severus to be destroyed, and himself and his associates once more to be banished.

That Theodora's plans had been brought to nought was due, chiefly, to the vigorous action of Pope Agapitus and to the amount of popular support which that action found because it was the action of the pope. For the success of any future schemes to reconcile the Monophysites the empress must in some way enlist the pope's good will. What better way could be found than by securing the election as pope of one of her own? And Agapitus dead in the moment of his victory, what more suitable moment to install a pro-Monophysite successor than the present? No emperor had, as yet, dealt so imperially with the first of all the sees, but the new policy should be the more easily carried out since, for nearly half a century, there had been a succession of scandals and innovations in the episcopal elections at Rome.

In 498, for example, at the death of the conciliatory Anastasius II, there had been the scandal of a double election in which, while partisans of the deceased pope's milder policy in the matter of the schism of Acacius had elected their candidate, the more powerful majority of his critics had elected the more generally recognised Symmachus. The tumults of this unhappy beginning troubled the whole of this pope's six years' reign. They were only appeased by the election of Hormisdas (514) who thus appeared as the healer of a schism at Rome itself before he achieved the greater task of arranging the schism between East and West.

Hormisdas died in 523; his successor, John I, more tragically three years later. He had been despatched to Constantinople by the Gothic king, Theodoric, who ruled Italy since 493, to plead the cause of the king's Arian co-religionists in the capital. Their churches had recently been confiscated and the Arians forcibly converted. The mission failed, and on his return the pope was

thrown into prison and died there. Theodoric speedily followed him into the other world but not before he had had time himself to give the Roman Church its new bishop, Felix IV ex iussu Theodorici regis says the Liber Pontificalis. Felix IV, pope through this startling innovation, proceeded to introduce into the system a second innovation more startling still, for, as the end of his life approached he named to his clergy as his successor one of his deacons, Boniface. Felix died on September 22, 530. Immediately there was trouble from those of the Roman clergy who held the late pope's nomination invalid. They were in the majority and they elected, at St. Peter's, the deacon Dioscoros, while at the Lateran the late pope's nominee was likewise consecrated and enthroned. Luckily for the peace of the city Dioscoros died within the month, and his supporters recognised his rival. Boniface II now proceeded to imitate the unhappy precedent set by Felix IV, but more solemnly. In a synod at St. Peter's he, too, named the one who was to succeed him, the deacon Vigilius. The clergy agreed; but some time later, under what circumstances we do not know, the pope came to regret what he had done and, just as publicly, he revoked it as an action beyond his powers. Boniface II reigned for even fewer years than his predecessor, and when he died (532) the troubles broke out once again. Once more there were rival candidates, faction spirit running high, bribes from the interested parties till the treasury was exhausted, and a vacancy, long for the time, of four months. With the new pope, John II, came a wholesome decree against the abuses which had marked the recent interregnum and three years' peace. To him in 535 succeeded that Pope Agapitus whose death in Constantinople has been recorded.

Given the history of the papal elections during the previous forty years, Theodora's plan of interference had then, nothing more than usually shocking about it. Nor was any choice of hers likely to be disregarded. Her choice fell upon that deacon Vigilius who, as the nominee of Boniface II, had so nearly become pope in 532. Since then he had risen to be the archdeacon of the Roman Church, the leading cleric after the pope himself. As such he had accompanied Agapitus on his diplomatic mission, and he was still in Constantinople when that pope died. The news of the pope's death travelled to Rome more quickly than Vigilius, and he returned home to find the successor of Agapitus elected, consecrated, and in function, Silverius. Vigilius, with the

assistance of the imperial officials, set himself to oust the pope as the necessary preliminary to his own election. The critical situation of public affairs soon gave him his opportunity.

The war of restoration was by this time in full swing, and for five years now the armies of Justinian had been marching from one victory to another in the desperate endeavour to win back for the imperial government the provinces of the West, lost to it in the disastrous fifth century. The Vandal kings had been dispossessed in Africa, and Sicily; the Goths driven from their hold on Southern Italy. Rome itself had become once more a " Roman " city when, at the moment of Vigilius' return from Constantinople, the Goths turned to besiege in Rome the victorious imperial army and its general Belisarius. Pope Silverius, summoned to an interview with the general, was suddenly accused of treasonable correspondence with the Goths. He was immediately stripped of the insignia of his office and, clad in a monk's habit, secretly shipped from Rome that same night. To the Romans nothing more was announced than that the pope had embraced the monastic life and that the see was therefore vacant.

The clergy were assembled to elect his successor. Belisarius presided, and, despite considerable opposition, Vigilius was elected. He had been privy to the forgeries that cost Silverius his place, and he had been the pope's sole companion in the momentous interview with Belisarius. Now, at last, he was pope himself -- at any rate pope in possession. The unfortunate Silverius did, it is true, thanks to the bishop appointed to guard him, succeed in lodging an appeal against his violent deposition. Justinian ordered his return to Italy and an enquiry into the whole affair. But Belisarius was still in charge, and through his wife, who dominated him, the empress maintained her protegee. Silverius was once more condemned, and banished to the little island of Palmaria off the Neapolitan coast, and there soon afterwards he died of hunger. []

For the next six years all the religious troubles slumbered while Justinian, Theodora, and in Italy Vigilius, found all their energies absorbed by the terrible Gothic war. It was in a province far removed from the seat of that war, Palestine, that the disputes re-awakened. And the question around which they developed was not Monophysitism but the more ancient matter of the orthodoxy

of certain theories attributed to Origen. Among the monks of certain Palestinian monasteries there had, for some time, been a revival of interest in these theories, in the old heresy of the preexistence of souls and a quasi- pantheistic teaching about the last end of man. The old theories daily found new disciples, and the "new theology" found, of course, a host of zealous opponents. Whence through the early part of Justinian's reign (530-540) an ever-increasing disorder in Palestine which was by no means confined to the peaceful solitudes of the monasteries concerned. When in 541 a great synod met at Gaza to enquire into certain serious disorders in the local churches and to try the chief person accused, the Patriarch of Alexandria, it was inevitable that the bishops and dignitaries present should discuss the new trouble and plan a common course of action. One of these dignitaries was the permanent ambassador (apocrisiarius) of the Roman See at Constantinople, the deacon Pelagius, an intimate friend and confidante of Vigilius. Pelagius did all his chance allowed to strengthen the abbots in their opposition to the Origenists, and he worked in the same sense upon the mind of Justinian. He was so successful that, in 543, there appeared an imperial edict condemning the theories, and promulgating a new profession of faith in which they were repudiated. This all bishops and heads of monasteries were now obliged to sign.

Justinian was not, of course, unaware of the trouble until the moment when Pelagius intervened. More than one deputation from the rival disputants had already appeared in the capital. One of these deputies, the Origenist Theodore Askidas, had found in his temporary mission the beginning of a new career. He was named bishop of the important see of Caesarea in Cappadocia, and, his learning gaining him a place in Justinian's confidence, he contrived to live on at court after his consecration. But now, great as the favour he enjoyed, he saw the emperor influenced against the Origenist theories, and his own prestige somewhat lowered through the action of Pelagius. To keep his place he signed the formula: and set himself to prepare a counter-stroke which would dislodge Pelagius.

It was never difficult to interest the theologically-minded emperor in religious matters, and where these touched a question of civil peace less difficult still; where they concerned the reconciliation of the Monophysites least difficult of all. The

plan which Askidas now proposed was just such another as Zeno and Anastasius had attempted. But it was more subtle, in this, that it did not suggest even a tacit repudiation of Chalcedon, but merely the condemnation of three allies and friends of Nestorius, two of whom Chalcedon had re-instated. It would be yet another proof to the Monophysites that Catholics were not Nestorians if Catholics condemned these old opponents of St. Cyril, proof again that Chalcedon had not undone what Ephesus had settled. The proposed condemnations were of Theodore of Mopsuestia -- the master of Nestorius -- and all his writings; of those writings of Theodoret of Cyrrhus which had been directed against St. Cyril during the controversy about Nestorius; and of the letter which Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, wrote to a Persian bishop, Maris, telling, from his point of view, the story of the Council of Ephesus. These three items of the proposed condemnations are the Three Chapters which have given their name to the subsequent controversy. It was to drag on for a good eighteen years and more, to involve the most curious of all the general councils, and finally to issue in a miserable schism that divided Italy for a generation.

The three persons concerned had been dead now nearly a century, Theodore for longer; but then Origen had been dead longer still, and yet condemned only this very year. Askidas in his turn prevailed and in 544 the edict appeared, to the dismay in particular of the Apocrisarius. Pelagius refused to sign it, and upon his refusal the Patriarchs of Constantinople, of Alexandria, and of Antioch would only sign conditionally, the condition being that the pope, too, should sign. Here truly was a difficulty. Chalcedon, more than most, had been the pope's council, and Chalcedon had reinstated both Theodoret and Ibas in their sees upon their express repudiation of Nestorianism. It had then, for the ordinary man, cleared them of any charge of heresy. More, the letter of Ibas, now imperially condemned, had been read at Chalcedon and the Roman legates there had declared that "his letter having been read we recognised him to be orthodox. " Were the pope now to condemn Theodoret at least and Ibas, for heresies they had renounced or heretical expressions which they had explained satisfactorily, it might easily seem, given the circumstances of the condemnation, that repudiating those whom Chalcedon had gone out of its way to protect he was inaugurating a policy that would end in the repudiation of the

council itself. All eyes then turned to the pope. All would depend on his action -- and the pope with whom lay decision, in this tricky attempt to conciliate the Monophysites, was the creature of the pro-Monophysite Theodora. Truly her hour had come at last, as the emperor's commands went westwards to Vigilius; and, as Askidas saw the dilemma preparing for the Roman author of his own recent trouble, he, also, may have felt a like satisfaction.

Vigilius hesitated. For a time the pre-occupations of the Gothic War gave him an excuse for temporising; Totila, the Gothic king, had now taken the offensive and was preparing to besiege Rome yet once again. But finally, as the pope celebrated the feast of St. Cecilia (November 22, 545), he was carried off from the very church by Theodora's orders and shipped to Sicily and thence, after a stay of some months, to Constantinople, where he arrived in the January of 547. During those months in Sicily the pope had learnt of the violent opposition to the emperor's edict which was gradually showing itself throughout the West. He himself adopted the same attitude, and when the emperor refused to withdraw the edict Vigilius broke off relations with the unlucky Patriarch of Constantinople who had led the way in signing it. Little by little, however, the explanations of the court theologians had their effect. By the summer of 547 the pope was once more in communion with the patriarch, and had signed a private condemnation of the Three Chapters. This, of course, was insufficient for Justinian's purpose, and the pope pleading the dignity of his see against the attempts to wring from him a public declaration, he was allowed to assemble at Constantinople a council of bishops to give his new condemnation of the Three Chapters an appearance at least of freedom. At the council, alas, the eloquence of a young Latin bishop defending Ibas was so effective that Vigilius broke up the assembly. Private interviews between the various bishops and the emperor brought them all to a striking unanimity, however, and one by one they sent in to the pope their written opinions in favour of the condemnation. Finally, on Holy Saturday, 548, Vigilius issued his public condemnation, the so-called *ludicatum*. Its text has perished, but we know that, in condemning the Three Chapters, it made such reservations to safeguard the essential teaching of Chalcedon that, so far as concerned the Monophysite reunion, it might just as well never have been issued.

However, issued it was and, despite its reservations, promptly misconstrued in the West, raising storms of condemnation wherever it was known. The whole of the West -- what West remained after the devastations of war -- deserted the pope. A council in Africa excommunicated him as the betrayer of the faith of Chalcedon, and in Rome his own deacons led the opposition and gave the lead in the furious war of pamphleteering which now broke out.

The West, evidently, did not understand. Had not Vigilius himself needed to come to Constantinople to be educated in the complex question? How natural that Latin bishops, too much occupied for a century in saving the elements of civilisation to be worried with such subtleties as those presented by the leisurely Monophysite East, should also fail to understand. A general council at Constantinople might smooth away all the misunderstanding. Meanwhile both the edict of 544 and the *ludicatum* would be withdrawn. So it was arranged between pope and emperor. Both pledged themselves to silence on the question until the council met; and Vigilius, privately, bound himself by oath to Justinian that he would at the council do his utmost to bring about the desired condemnation.

This was in the August of 550. The council did not meet for nearly three years more. The interval was filled with crises. First of all the emperor broke his pledge of silence and, in 551, urged by Askidas, issued a new edict condemning the Three Chapters. The pope protested energetically and excommunicated Askidas, and then, Justinian planning his arrest, he fled for safety to the church of St. Peter. Thither a few days later Justinian sent troops to effect the arrest; at their heels followed the mob of the city. The doors were forced, soldiers and mob poured in. The clerics who endeavoured to protect the pope were dragged out and the soldiery then laid hands on Vigilius himself. He clung desperately to the columns of the altar, until, as the struggle heightened, these began to give way, and to save themselves from injury the soldiers released him. So far the mob had watched, scandalised, at the outrage on the old man who, Latin though he was, was yet the chief bishop of their religion. Now, as the altar and its columns fell in a roar of dust, they turned on the troops who fled for their lives. That night the pope -- marvellous feat for an ancient of eighty years -- escaped over

the roofs of the city to a waiting boat and crossed the Bosphorus. His new refuge was Chalcedon, and, of all places, the basilica where, just a hundred years before, the famous council had sat around whose decision still raged these violent animosities. From his retreat he issued a well-written encyclical describing the recent events, denouncing the forgeries put into circulation in his name, and excommunicating definitely Askidas and his associates.

Justinian had overshot his mark and he knew it. The excommunicated bishops were sent across the straits to make their submission. Processions of monks and influential citizens serenaded the pope with prayers that he would return. A kind of peace was patched up, the edict of 551 was withdrawn, Vigilius gave way and preparations for the council were resumed. They consisted chiefly, on the emperor's part, in eliminating from the bishops who were to come from the West all those who had given signs of opposition to his policy. As the council drew nearer and nearer the pope's perplexity increased. It was increasingly evident that, at this council which was to educate the western bishops and guarantee the condemnation against all chance of misunderstanding, the West would have scarcely any representatives at all. Vigilius would have preferred an Italian city for its meeting place. The emperor insisted on the capital, and as the bishops arrived, all from the emperor's own Greek East, the pope's anxieties grew. One day he seemed willing to take part in its proceedings, and then he would refuse even to speak of the matter. In the end he made it known that although he would not interfere with the Council he would take no part in its deliberations. His decision would be given independently. And so there opened, on May 5, 553, in the new Sancta Sophia, the strangest of all the general councils.

The number of bishops present varied. At the first session there were a hundred and fifty. At the last, a hundred and sixty-four. Save for the picked few from Africa, and a handful of Italians, all were Greeks. The first session was taken up with the solemn reading of the documents to be condemned. In the discussion which followed, the only difficulty before the Fathers was to choose sufficiently vigorous epithets to express their abhorrence. Vigilius meanwhile, with the assistance of Pelagius, was hard at work on his own decision. On May 14 it was ready for the emperor-the Constitutum. It contained a detailed

condemnation of the errors of Theodore of Mopsuestia, but his person the pope did not condemn, alleging the traditional ecclesiastical usage that left heretics once dead to whatever judgment then befell them. The writings of Ibas and Theodoret, since they were approved at Chalcedon, could not now be condemned without such condemnation involving that Council.

Justinian refused to receive the Constitutum -- Vigilius"having already condemned the Three Chapters and having sworn to maintain the condemnation. any more recent retractation on his part was naturally not welcome. The Constitutum then was not presented to the Council. Instead, at its seventh session, Justinian laid before it all the documents in which Vigilius had condemned the Three Chapters, and a decree ordering the pope's excommunication for the way in which, ever since, he had shifted and changed, and for his refusal to attend the council. The Fathers obediently approved. One week later the council came to an end (June 2, 553) with a long final condemnation of " the wicked Theodore and his wicked writings, " his supporters, defenders, and apologists. Likewise, "if anyone defends the wicked writings of Theodoret against the first Holy Council of Ephesus, against St. Cyril and his twelve anathemata, and all the things he wrote on behalf of the wretched Theodore and the wretched Nestorius. . . and does not anathematize these things. . . " he is henceforward himself anathema. Still more definitely, " if anyone defends the letter which Ibas is said to have written to the heretic Maris the Persian. . . and does not anathematize it and all its defenders, and likewise all those who say it is right or right in part, and those. . . who presume to defend, in the name of the Holy Fathers or of the Holy Council of Chalcedon the letter or the impiety it contains. . . let him be anathema. "

The good work done, the bishops dispersed. There still remained Vigilius. Vigilius unconvinced, the council's work was incomplete. Whence a new siege of the unhappy pope. It was eight months before the emperor won him over. But in the end he yielded completely and on February 26, 554, in a second Constitutum, solemnly recognised the condemnation. Then, at last, the pope was allowed to return to his see, from which he had been absent now nine years. He was, however, destined never again to see it, for he had only travelled as far as Syracuse when death claimed him, June 7, 555. He was fortunate in his

death in this, at least, that it spared him the inevitable trouble which awaited at Rome whoever had had hand or part in the alleged condemnation of Chalcedon.

Justinian determined that Pelagius should be the new pope. He was undoubtedly the ablest of all the Roman clerics, and for a good fifteen years now had been the pope's chief adviser. To pass over such ability and such experience would, in the then state of Italy, have been foolish in the extreme. Who could do more as pope for the new imperial re-organisation of the West, and especially for the reconstruction of Italy wasted by twenty-five years of savage war? Who, indeed, could do as much? There was this difficulty to overcome that Pelagius had been the very soul of the dead pope's resistance to the council. It was with his strength that Vigilius had armed himself in the conflict that followed the withdrawal of the *Iudicatum*, and the *Constitutum* of 553 had been his very handiwork. The council over, Pelagius found himself separated from the pope -- as, moreover, were all the rest of the pope's advisers -- and in a monastic prison. From that prison nevertheless he had contrived to conduct a violent literary campaign against the council's condemnations, and the news that Vigilius had submitted drove him to write only the more violently. Vigilius, he explained, to the scandalised uncomprehending West, was old, senile, isolated from his advisers, the victim yet again of the imperial tyranny. That the leader of such an opposition would retract while the air around was still dry with the bitter violence of his polemic might seem the least likely finale of all. Yet so it happened. Under circumstances of argument or blandishment of which we know nothing, Pelagius withdrew his opposition and accepted the council's condemnation. Then, as the emperor's nominee, he set out for Rome to be there consecrated as its bishop.

A more unwelcome successor to Vigilius could hardly have been found, and, popularly considered to have surrendered his opinions as the price of his appointment, the new pope was more or less universally boycotted. In all Italy there could not be found more than two bishops to officiate at his consecration. A priest had to supply for the third. There was no attempt to elect another pope in opposition to him, but simply a cold sullen hostility. Pelagius was left to make the first move. He did it in the profession of Faith made on the day he was consecrated. He

announced his faith to be the faith of Chalcedon, of St. Leo, and of all St. Leo's successors down to the last pope but two, Agapitus. All those whom they had held to be orthodox he, too, held as such, and especially did he hold to be orthodox. . . Theodoret and Ibas. In the whole statement there is not a reference to the recent council, nor to Vigilius, nor to the transactions between himself and the emperor which had resulted in his nomination.

For all its careful omissions the statement, none the less, availed little to help Pelagius. Nowhere did he ask the western bishops to acknowledge the council, nor to condemn what the council had condemned. The utmost of his demands was recognition of his own election, acknowledgement that he was the lawful pope. In his own metropolitan district he had scarcely any difficulty in this. But "Lombardy" and "Venetia", to speak more accurately the bishops of the great sees of Milan and Aquileia with their suffragans, would not enter into communion with him. Pelagius was helpless, for the imperial officials were little disposed to lend the troops for which he clamoured, and when the inevitable pamphleteering began now in Italy, he met with scanty success indeed, refuting as pope the position he had maintained so vigorously as a deacon. From Gaul there came a request that he should satisfy the bishops as to his orthodoxy. The declaration he sent, again made no mention of all the recent happenings that were the source of the anxiety, and as his classic writings against the council were now beginning to pass from one bishop to another in the West also, Pelagius wrote a final appeal for peace and unity. "Why all this recrimination? When I defended the Three Chapters was I not in accord with the majority of the bishops? I have, it is true, changed my opinion, but changed it along with the same majority. Did not St. Peter yield to the brotherly correction of St. Paul? Did not St. Augustine, too, write his Retractations? I was mistaken I allow. But then I was only a deacon and it was my duty to follow the bishops. Now the bishops have decided. Africa, Illyricum, the East, with its thousands of bishops, have condemned the Three Chapters. It would be extremely foolish to ignore such high authority and to follow in preference the guidance of these propagators of forgeries. "

Scholars of a later age, studying at their leisure the detail of these ancient dissensions, can perhaps distinguish easily

between Chalcedon re-instating Theodoret and Ibas in their sees upon their giving guarantees of their orthodoxy at that moment, and the Council of 553, a hundred years later, deciding the wholly different question as to the orthodoxy of their writings at the time when, twenty years before Chalcedon, they were admittedly among the chief supporters of Nestorius.

Chalcedon's approval, and the condemnation of 553, though affecting the same personages, were concerned with realities wholly distinct. [] Between the two councils there is no contradiction. But the Latin bishops, hot and angered with ten years of controversy, always impatient of the theoretical subtleties in which their eastern brothers were so much at home, were in no mood to listen to such distinctions at the time. Hence, on the part of some, a refusal to acknowledge Pelagius, and a schism which lingered for another century, and on the part of others a suspicion of Pelagius which lasted as long as he lived.

Better than any other incident of Justinian's long reign does the story of the Council of 553 illustrate his conception of the emperor's role in religious matters. But it was no isolated incident, and to realise its full importance we must see it against the background of the Christian State as, under Justinian, this was conceived and ordered. Constantine's disestablishment of Paganism, the recognition by Theodosius of the Catholic Church as the State's religion, now receive further development. The emperor now lays claim to an initiative in Church policy, patriarchs and bishops are his lieutenants in religious affairs as his generals are for the army, his silentaries for the civil administration.

Justinian's chief title to fame is his work of legal reform, the careful collection of his predecessors' laws, their "codification" and the elaborate official provision for the study of Law. It is a work that still influences the everyday life of the world. Like all the great emperor's undertakings, this, too, bears the impress of his piety and of his concern to be faithful to conscience in the high state to which God has called him. " Nothing, " he declared in the collection of his own laws, " should escape the prince to whom God has confided the care of all mankind, " and he legislated for churchmen and the Church as instinctively and as carefully as he legislated for everyone else in his world state. Church and State were but two aspects of the one reality, that

Roman Empire conterminous with civilisation, over which Justinian, the divine vice-regent, presided. The system had its advantages. It furnished, perhaps prematurely, what had hitherto not yet developed in the Church itself, a system of continuous day to day control by which the religious life of the whole Church was centralised, with the minimum of local departure from an enacted common practice. Nor was the system either bred of servility in ecclesiastics or the inevitable begetter of such servility. For all the emperor's unrelaxing control there were never lacking Patriarchs of Constantinople -- to say nothing of popes -- who resisted him steadfastly when principles called for resistance. Nevertheless the system was extraneous to the Church. It did not spring from the Church's life and it could not live by what gave life to the Church.

Between the system -- even supposing the emperor a Catholic and friendly -- and the life it aspired to control there must inevitably be friction. The Church would either escape from the system or die under its oppression. History was to show the Church escaping from it as the empire rapidly ceased to be conterminous with the Church's world, while in what survived of the Empire the system remained, grew to perfection, and, under it, the Church disappeared.

The Roman Emperor, then, was now very definitely a Catholic, and an imperial policy in religious matters a duty of conscience for him. Pagans for example, were henceforward excluded from civil office; they lost all power of inheriting. Their last intellectual centre was destroyed when, in 529, Justinian closed the schools of Athens, and in the next twenty years an official mission to convert the Pagans was organised. Occasionally there is a record of executions under the law, and, more often, of mob violence lynching those known to be Pagans. In 546 an edict commanding Pagans to be baptized completed the code. The penalty for refusal was loss of goods and exile, whence, inevitably, a number of nominal conversions and, thereafter, clandestine reunions of these crypto-pagans, with floggings and executions for the participants when they were discovered. To the Jews and to the Samaritans Justinian was equally hostile. Synagogues were forbidden, the Jews lost all right of inheriting, the right to bring suits against a Christian or to own Christian slaves. A succession of bloody revolts, bloodily suppressed, brought the Samaritans almost to extinction and under Phocas

(609) thousands of them were baptized by force. Heretics were pursued no less violently, Montanists, for example -- still after four hundred years awaiting at Pepusa the second coming -- Novatians, Marcionites, Macedonians and, once Theodoric's power was ended, Arians too. To convert the Pagans outside the empire missions were organised, the State taking the initiative and the emperor, often enough, standing sponsor for the Pagan kings and chiefs who were baptized. These missions were not of course without their political importance. The State's attachment to religion is shown yet again in the insistence on the religious character of, for example, the great war with Persia. For the Roman Emperor it was, in part, a crusade against the Sun Worshippers, and the Persian kings were no less clear in their antagonism to Christianity. So Chosroes II, in 616, replied to the ambassadors of Heraclius petitioning for peace, "I will spare the Romans when they abjure their crucified criminal and worship the Sun. "

The newly-enthroned Justin I, through whom in 519 Rome regained the obedience of the Churches in the East, was, it should be borne in mind, the heir to a line of highly successful emperorpopes. For a good forty years before him the emperor's word had been law in matters of religion all through the empire. When, sixteen years after the reconciliation of 519, Justinian's generals conquered the Vandals in Africa and the Ostrogoths in Italy, what, in theory, was the restoration of imperial rule in those provinces, was, in reality, the annexation of Italy and Africa to Byzantium. The new regime was no restoration of what had obtained before 476, but the introduction into the West of the uses -- Byzantine by now -- of the mid-sixth century East. The papacy, for example, had been independent of the old empire of the West in the days of Gratian and St. Ambrose, of St. Leo and Valentinian III, while in the East, during these last hundred and fifty years (381-536), Caesar had been supreme, and the four eastern patriarchs little better than his officers in spirituals. Italy now annexed to Byzantium, the pope came into the imperial system as a fifth, and senior, patriarch, to enter, despite protestations and reminders, on a new role of de facto subordination. There was of course no denial of Rome's primacy in the universal church, nor of its traditional prerogatives. These were indeed fully and explicitly acknowledged. The new Code described the pope as "chief of all the holy priests of God", and Justinian's own laws spoke of Rome as "the source of all

priesthood, " and decreed that " the most holy pope of Old Rome shall be the first of priests. " But henceforward the emperors rudely assume that the primacy is as much at their disposal as the political loyalty of those to whom it is entrusted. Whence, inevitably, two hundred years of recurrent friction until the popes are set free.

Rome, then, is now to be broken in, as Constantinople has already been broken in. It is now that the bishop of the imperial city comes fully to the heights of his place in the Church. When, two hundred years before, Constantine transformed Byzantium into Constantinople its bishop was a mere suffragan of the Metropolitan of Heraclea. The role of the bishop in the Arian troubles (330-381) gave the see a new importance. The Councils of Constantinople (381) and Chalcedon (451) recognised that importance officially, and, the Monophysites having by the time of Justinian's accession destroyed the Catholicism of Egypt and the East, Constantinople enjoyed, henceforward undisturbed, a very real primacy east of the Adriatic. Alexandria and Antioch had fallen below the capital in jurisdiction as well as in honour, and it was the Patriarch of Constantinople who now consecrated the bishops of these more ancient, apostolic sees. As the sixth century developed, Alexandria and Antioch lost steadily in real importance, Catholics were few, Monophysites many in the territories subject to them; and so while Constantinople kept all the fullness of Catholicity in the provinces immediately subject to her -- thirty metropolitans and four hundred and fifty bishops in all -- the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria shrank to mere titularies resident at the court, without flocks, without clergy, without suffragans. Legend, finally, forged for the see of the capital a pedigree of apostolicity. The first Bishop of Constantinople, it was now discovered, was St. Andrew.

The Byzantine bishop is a man of many occupations. He has a place and duties, because a bishop, in the hierarchy of the civil administration. He is already responsible for the care of vast church properties, responsible for the numerous monasteries, for the hospitals and charitable institutions. He is the ordinary judge in all suits to which clerics, monks, and nuns are parties, and in all suits where both parties are willing to take him as judge. Hence a whole legislation *de vita episcopali* in Justinian's Code and the *Novellae*. Qualifications for eligibility are minutely laid down, age, condition and character. The bishops are still

elected, but only the better class are allowed a say in the proceedings, and these have only the right to present a list of three names. It is for the metropolitan, or the patriarch, thence to choose the new bishop. In practice it is the emperor who chooses, for the imperial candidate is never rejected. Rome is a notable exception to this "reform. " The election of the popes remains free, but it is subject to the emperor's ratification, and it is a testimony to the prestige of Eastern Catholicism in the sixth and seventh centuries that for seventy-five years almost every one of the popes was Greek or Syrian.

The civil law requires bishops to live in their dioceses, it orders an annual provincial synod, and it forbids bishops to come to court unless they have, in writing, the permission of their superior -- the bishop of his metropolitan, the metropolitan of his patriarch. Each patriarch is represented at the court by a permanent ambassador, the Apocrisarius. In practice there is, of course, always a crowd of bishops at court, a more or less permanent synod whose personnel is continually changing. This, the so-called synodus endemousa, was an important, extra-constitutional, engine of the politico-ecclesiastical government.

As the law regulated the life and conduct of the bishops, so it provided for the clergy, and for the monks who flourished in the sixth century as never before. It was perhaps the golden age of monasticism in the Eastern Church. Since the reforms of St. Basil monasticism had grown to be an immense power in the empire's religious life, perhaps the greatest force of all. Whoever had the monks on his side had the people too. Hence the close alliance between the ecclesiastical princes of Constantinople or Alexandria and the heads of the vast religious congregations. Hence, too, the repeated occasions where the monks have been the principal means of the defeat of Catholicism. They played a great part in the scandal of the Latrocinium, and ever since Chalcedon their adherence to the patriarch there condemned, and to his successors, had been the very life of the Monophysite party. But although so many of the monks had gone over to heresy, they accepted the decrees of Chalcedon in sufficient numbers for monasticism to continue to be the main driving force in the religious life of the Catholics too. Monasteries abounded. In 536 there were no fewer than 108 in Constantinople and its suburbs and, apart from the army of Cenobites, the solitaries were still numerous. Each monastery

was autonomous. Nowhere, except in the convents descended from the foundations of St. Pakhomius, is there trace of a religious order in the later western sense. All monasteries were, moreover, since Chalcedon, subject to the diocesan bishop. Exceptionally -- by the imperial favour -- they are directly subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople. The law fixes the duration of the novitiate at three years, and the Cenobite is forbidden to leave the monastery for which he is professed, whether it be to join another community or to become a wandering monk. With the Mohammedan conquests of Egypt and Syria, in the early seventh century, the number of solitaries diminished notably, and henceforward the hermit was very much the exception. The rule that the monk or nun shall never leave the enclosure of the monastery became ever more strict, and the bishops of the great synod of 692 insisted, too, that the monk should be decently clothed, and that the scandal of the bedraggled beggar monks of the cities should cease.

One abuse of monasticism is familiar to every student of the political history of these times. The monasteries offer a convenient solution for the victorious usurper embarrassed by the survival of his predecessor. More than one emperor -- to say nothing of lesser dignitaries -- escapes death by taking the monastic habit, as others are despoiled of their chance of a return to power by being forcibly ordained and consecrated. The monks again were the popular preachers and spiritual directors, and from their ranks came most of the great bishops and the ecclesiastical writers.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



3. BYZANTINE CATHOLICISM. 565-711

Justinian died, an old man of eighty-two, in 565. In the half century or so during which he had ruled the Roman world he had been amazingly successful in his ambition to restore the imperial authority in the lost provinces of the West. Rome, Ravenna, Carthage were once more the seats of Roman government. Italy, Dalmatia, Africa, the islands of the Mediterranean, the southern half of Pannonia, the south of Spain had been recovered. If much remained to be won, much had been won already.

But the cost had been too great. It had exhausted the resources of the treasury and it had exhausted the emperor himself. Nor was the reconquest in any sense final. Huns, Slavs and Avars continued to raid the recovered Illyricum. Thessalonica, and the capital itself, more than once were threatened, and the hordes only bought off by the pledge of an annual pension. To Italy, in 568, there came the last, and worst, of her plagues -- the Lombards, and by the end of the century they had wrested from the imperial officials three fourths of the peninsula. On the eastern frontier the war with Persia was almost a habit of life. In all Justinian's long reign there were scarcely ten years of peace, and less than ten in the thirty years which followed his death. To carry through successfully this war, which must be waged simultaneously on every frontier, and to maintain the complex administration of the empire was more than ever an impossible task for the one man with whom, as the superhuman autocrat, all initiative traditionally lay. It is little wonder that after eight years of the strain Justinian's successor, Justin II, lost his reason. Nor that, within half a century of the great emperor's death, with Constantinople beset simultaneously by Avars and Persians, the empire's last hour seemed at hand. It was a general from Africa, Heraclius, who staved off the end and after years of patient and laborious effort -- reconstructing the administration, restoring the finances, rebuilding the army -- finally dictated peace to the Persians in their own capital (628).

In those sixty years of crisis and calamity which separate that victory of Heraclius from the death of Justinian (565-628), the Monophysites are still one of the main problems of domestic

policy. More than ever is it important that Egypt and Syria shall remain loyal, now that the empire is faced with this renaissance of Persia. And loyal they can never be so long as between them and the emperor there lie those decisions of Chalcedon which to the East register a Greek imperialist victory over Syrian and Egyptian. Whence, after a hundred and fifty years, it is still the great aim of the imperial policy to find a reconciling formula which, without repudiating the definition of faith of 451, shall convince the Monophysites that St. Leo is there in agreement with St. Cyril, and that the supporters of the great council are not Nestorians. Whence also, with each scheme for reunion, new trouble between the emperor and the Catholics, and, since one such scheme is based on a new theological theory which conflicts with the tradition of faith, very serious trouble with the Roman See.

Justinian's immediate successor, Justin II, was friendly to Monophysitism and so, too, was his wife, a niece of the old empress, Theodora. The exiled bishops were recalled, the old business of conferences and discussions was resumed. Once more it was the emperor who offered concessions, and this time he offered everything short of an implicit repudiation of Chalcedon. The Monophysites, themselves rent by now into hostile factions, could not agree. Nor, even if the bishops had been able and willing to accept, would their monastic allies have supported them. The fanaticism of the Monophysite monks was proof against all the imperial diplomacy and at last, after six years of fruitless negotiations, the emperor returned to the policy of coercion. Two years later and the policy changed again. Justin II was now out of his mind (574) and the new ruler, Tiberius II, brought the persecution to an end. The Monophysites took advantage of the truce to elect a new Patriarch of Alexandria -- there had been none for ten years -- and the new patriarch, in preparation for future emergencies, consecrated, at once and in the one ceremony, seventy new bishops (576).

For the remainder of the century the persecution was intermittent, and although the Monophysites fought continuously among themselves -- divided, united, then divided yet more bitterly -- they all of them held firmly to their refusal to accept Chalcedon, and with every year the chances of reunion grew fainter. With the new century came the murder of the Emperor Maurice (582-602) and the rule of the worthless Phocas

(602-610). It was now that the Persian offensive began under the great king Chosroes II (590-628). Syria, Egypt and Asia Minor were overrun. Antioch fell in 611, Damascus in 613, Jerusalem -- after a siege where 57,000 were killed -- in 614, Alexandria in 617. The Monophysites did not indeed, play the traitor. But they were anti-imperialistic, and the Catholics, identified by the invaders as the party of the emperor, were dispossessed to the profit of the Monophysites. By 620 Chalcedon had not an adherent in the whole of the eastern provinces which had fallen to the Persians. Also, an unlooked-for coincidence, the Monophysites now patched up their own quarrels, the Copts of Egypt and the Jacobites of Syria combining. When, ten years later (629), Heraclius was once more master of Egypt and the East, he was faced immediately with the necessity of reuniting these provinces, still lost to him by the more fundamental division of religion, provinces where a century or more of religious persecution had bred a tradition of hatred for Constantinople, for its emperor as for its patriarch.

Along with the political restoration Heraclius, then, had no choice but to attempt something in the way of religious restoration too, nor would coercion serve any longer.

Once more the theological subtlety of a Patriarch of Constantinople came to his assistance. He devised a new exposition of the eternal problem. It had the merit that, from the new point of view, it involved neither St. Leo nor St. Cyril, nor did it mention Chalcedon. The Monophysites shrank from contact with the Catholics because these, so they alleged, divided Christ as Nestorius had done. The Patriarch of Constantinople, Sergius, offered as new proof that Catholics were just as anti-Nestorian (and therefore in the Monophysite sense as orthodox) as the Monophysites themselves, their belief that in Our Lord there is only one source of action (*energeia*). To his own Catholic people this could be explained as in conformity with Chalcedon, since action is of persons and therefore the singleness of the source of action in Jesus Christ derived from the single Person -- the Logos-active in the two natures. Ephesus, defining the singleness of Person, Chalcedon defining the duality of nature, and the Monophysites protesting against any division of Christ, were, then, all three here conciliated. On this basis, which satisfied everyone, reunion could now go forward. As with the faculty of action so was it with other

faculties, for example, the faculty of choice, the will. Catholics, it was explained again to the Monophysite critic, did not consider Christ to be two beings mysteriously united, for they believed that in Christ there was but one will. The application of the new theory to the question of the will gave it its most popular development, and also the name -- Monothelism -- by which the whole movement is, somewhat loosely, known.

It was while the East still lay in the hands of the Persians that Sergius elaborated his theory, and it was only after the reconquest that it passed into politics. By then Heraclius had been won over to it, and the Monophysite, Cyrus of Phasis, recently (631) elected to fill the long vacant (Catholic) see of Alexandria (617-633), adopted it as an instrument of negotiation with the Monophysites. The conferences, for once, ended in agreement, and in 633 an Act of Union was signed at Alexandria which ended, after a hundred and eighty years, the feuds and divisions of the Christian East. The discovery of their common agreement in Monothelism had revealed to Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian alike the unimportance of the details which had kept them too long apart. But unfortunately if, for the Monophysite, the new theory was simply an extension of what he had always professed, the Catholic's acceptance of it was not merely a surrender of the point, so long debated, that, whoever refused to acknowledge Chalcedon was out of accord with the Tradition, but it involved recognition of yet another heresy. The theory was simply a radical form of Monophysitism in another guise. And there were Catholics, more acute mentally than Sergius, or perhaps less preoccupied with the hopes of political peace which the theory presented, who saw this from the beginning and who urged their objections. One such critic was the monk Sophronius.

Sophronius was one of the most learned men of the century, and he had an equally wide reputation for holiness of life. He had travelled much, was well known through the East, in Rome, too, which he had visited, and especially well known in Alexandria where he had lived for many years. He was now eighty years of age, but still vigorous in mind as in body and he knew the detail of the long controversy with the Monophysites as perhaps no one else knew it. He was in Alexandria when the Union of 633 was signed, and immediately he set himself to point out its implications to those responsible. Cyrus refused to be

convinced, and took shelter behind the authority of Constantinople, whereupon the ancient Sophronius set out for the capital. There, too, he found little but polite obstruction, Sergius giving him no more than an explanation in writing of the reason for his action. Palestine, where Monophysites were fewer, and where the political preoccupations of Alexandria and Constantinople did not exist, was the monk's next objective, and thither, with Sergius' letter, Sophronius then went. He arrived to find the see of Jerusalem vacant. He was himself elected Patriarch.

This sudden and surprising election changed immediately the nonchalance of Sergius towards his critic -- and towards a more important personage still, the pope. So far, the whole business of the reunion, with its tacit abandonment of Chalcedon, had been carried through without any reference to Rome. Now, obviously, Rome would hear it all from this new Athanasius unexpectedly become Patriarch of Jerusalem. Sergius determined to forestall him. He wrote to Rome himself, and with his letter he sent the explanations he had given to Sophronius. In his letter he gave his own account of the reunion, and of his discussion with Sophronius, and he ended by the suggestion that further discussion as to whether there were one or two "energies" was impolitic; silence was now the wisest course.

The reply of the pope, Honorius I (625-638), is curiously interesting, because he fails utterly to grasp the point of the patriarch's letter. Sergius had before him the Monophysite contention that since Catholics repudiated the Alexandrian phrase "union in one nature, " they must believe that in Christ there are two beings united by a moral union. To disprove this he urges that Catholic belief accords to Christ Our Lord one only faculty of action. This point the pope wholly overlooks or, more truly, misunderstands. Not the singleness of the faculty, but the unity in action between the divine and the human, is the subject of the pope's reply. Certainly, Honorius answers, Christ always acted with the two natures in harmony, no conflict between them being possible, the unity of action being perfect. As to the number of ways in which He acted no man can count them, much less say they were one or two. Questions of grammatical subtleties should be left to grammarians, and he agrees with Sergius that the discussion should be left where it stands.

Obviously Sergius and Honorius are at cross purposes. They are not discussing the same thing at all. But the consequences of the misunderstanding could hardly have been more serious. How far Honorius was from approving the new theory can be gathered from what he wrote to Sophronius. The new Patriarch of Jerusalem, following the custom, wrote to the other patriarchs and to the pope a letter -- the synodal letter -- notifying his election and testifying to his acceptance of the traditional faith. The synodal letter of Sophronius is a long and elaborate criticism of the new theory, which it exposes and refutes as a development of the heresy condemned at Chalcedon. The pope thereupon wrote to Constantinople, to Alexandria and to Sophronius. The first two letters are lost, and of the third only fragments survive. We do, however, possess an earlier letter to Sophronius, written before the latter's synodal letter had been received. Three things definitely emerge from the pope's letter and the fragments. The pope deprecates all discussion as to whether there are one or two "energies, " for, whichever expression is used, misunderstanding is certain. We must, however, hold that Jesus Christ, one in person, wrought works both human and divine by means of the two natures. The same Jesus Christ acted in His two natures divinely and humanly. Finally -- again the fatal ignoratio elenchi -- we must acknowledge the unity of will, for in Jesus Christ there is necessarily harmony between what is divinely willed and what is humanly willed. That Honorius held and taught the faith of Chalcedon is clear enough, despite the muddle. It is equally clear that he failed to grasp that a new question had been raised and was under discussion; clear, also, that he assisted the innovators by thus imposing silence alike on them and on their orthodox critics; and clear, finally, that he definitely said, in so many words, that there is but one will in Christ. It was a patronage of heresy no less effective because it was unconscious.

The next move lay with the emperor, and in 638 appeared an edict, the Ecthesis, which put forward the teaching that in Our Lord there is but one will as the Church's official doctrine.

Sophronius died that same year; Honorius, and Sergius too. A few months later Heraclius died, in 641, and Cyrus of Alexandria in 642. The principal actors in the controversy were gone then within four years of the appearance of the Ecthesis, and in those

same few fateful years there had disappeared too -- and for ever -- the provinces whose pacification had been the original cause of all the trouble. It was in 629 that Heraclius had triumphed over the Persians, and, while the ink was still wet on the treaties, the power was already preparing which was to destroy both victor and vanquished. The new religion of Mahomet, slowly developing in Arabia for the last thirty years, was about to begin its epic conquest of the East. In 633 Damascus fell to it, Jerusalem in 637, Alexandria in 641. The actors gone, the provinces gone, it might be thought that, necessarily, the whole wretched business of this imperial patronage of dogmatic definition was at an end. Alas, the real fury of the Monothelite heresy had not even begun. The dogmatic question once raised must be settled. Honorius, failing to see the point raised, had set it aside. Sooner or later there would come a pope who, more understanding, could not follow that precedent. Rome must teach, and definitely. On the other hand the imperial prestige was bound up with the new theory. If Rome condemned it the emperor must either submit or fight. No emperor yet had surrendered his patronage of heresy at the bidding of a pope. All the emperors who had once adopted heresy had died ultimately in the heresy of their choice -- Constantine and Valens in Arianism, Theodosius II compromised with the Monophysites, Zeno and Anastasius in actual schism. Now it was the turn of the family of Heraclius, and once again, heresy, for forty years, finds in the Christian Emperor its chief and only support, while the traditional faith is proscribed and the faithful persecuted.

The first sign of opposition from Rome came when the envoys of Honorius's successor reached the capital, with their petition that his election should be confirmed. Presented with the Ecthesis and asked to sign it, they would not do more than promise to present it for signature to the newly-elected, Severinus. Shortly afterwards (August 12, 640) this pope too died; and in his place was elected the equally short-lived John IV (640-642). To John IV, Heraclius did indeed write, in the last months of his life, disclaiming all responsibility for the Ecthesis, and naming Sergius as its author. Nevertheless it was not withdrawn and John IV wrote vigorously to Heraclius' successors, Constantine III and Heracleonas, demanding its revocation. At the same time he protested against the use of Honorius' name in support of the heresy. Honorius, he recalls, had written to Sergius that "in our Saviour there can by no means be two contrary wills, that is in

His members since He was free of those weaknesses which result from Adam's fall. My aforesaid predecessor, therefore, teaching on this mystery of Christ's incarnation, declared that there were not in Him what is found in us who are sinners, to wit conflicting wills of the spirit and of the flesh. This teaching some have twisted to suit their own ends, alleging Honorius to have taught that there is but one will to His divinity and humanity which is indeed contrary to truth. "

John IV died in October, 642. His successor, Theodore (642-649), continued the policy of protest, condemning the Ecthesis anew, and sending to the Patriarch of Constantinople a declaration of the true faith to be posted in its place. The patriarch refused, protested the orthodoxy of his attitude and invoked Honorius among his patrons. Finally, in 646, the pope declared him deposed. The sentence was never carried out. Instead, on the patriarch's advice, the Emperor Constans II (642- 668), issued a new edict in place of the Ecthesis. This was the Type [] promulgated in 648. The Type was not merely a profession of faith, as the Ecthesis had been, but an edict forbidding, under heavy penalties, all discussion of the subject. Whether the Monothelites were right or wrong, the pope and those who stood by him must be content to be silent. Bishops and clerics who defy the law are to be degraded, monks to be expelled from their monasteries, laymen to be stripped of their property if nobles, and the ordinary citizens to be flogged and exiled, "in order that all men, restrained by the fear of God and respect for the penalties rightly decreed, may keep undisturbed the peace of God's holy Churches. " It was a warning against interference. Was it meant for Rome too? Events were shortly to show. Pope Theodore died about this time (May 14, 649), and the responsibility of decision fell to his successor, Martin I.

No better choice of pope could have been made. Martin had been his predecessor's ambassador at Constantinople, and had been entrusted with the delicate task of warning and excommunicating the patriarch three years before. He knew the problem thoroughly and he also knew well the personalities opposed to him, the Patriarch Paul and the young Emperor Constans II. The new pope made no attempt to obtain the emperor's confirmation of his election, but, planning a courageous defiance of the Type, he summoned a synod of bishops to meet in the Lateran basilica for the October of 649.

One hundred and five bishops answered the summons, and the sessions occupied the whole of the month. All the correspondence and documents of the twenty years' controversy were read, the complaints of the persecuted and their protestations. Finally, in a series of canons, the Type and its promoters were condemned, and an official declaration given that in Jesus Christ Our Lord there are "two natural wills the divine and the human, and two natural operations the divine and the human. ", Nor did Pope Martin rest content with his great council at Rome. Its decisions were transmitted to every part of the Church, to missionary bishops in Holland and Gaul as well as to Africa and Constantinople. Local councils were to be organised to support and to accept the Roman decision.

The emperor replied by action. A high official arrived in Rome with instructions to force an acceptance of the Type on the pope and all the bishops. He could not, however, rely on the loyalty of the soldiery. Pope and clergy and people were too united for intrigue to have any chance of success, an attempt at assassination failed and finally he came to an understanding with the pope and proceeded no further with his mission. Four years later arrived another envoy of a different stamp (653). The pope, a great sufferer from gout, foreseeing trouble, had his bed carried before the high altar of the Lateran and there the troops found him when they broke in. The envoy brought an imperial decree notifying him that he was deposed and ordering him to be arrested and dispatched to Constantinople. Another pope was to be elected in his place. The pope forbade any attempts at resistance and, surrendering to the officers, was straightway carried off.

It was more than a year before he reached the capital, and during all that length of time he suffered greatly from the brutality of the soldiers. When, finally, the convoy arrived at the quays of the imperial city the old man, helpless and confined to his bed, was left on deck for the best part of a day to be the butt of the populace. Then for three months he lay in the dungeons until, on December 19, 654, he was brought before the Senate to be tried for, of all things, treason. The cruel farce of a State trial, with the usual apparatus of trained official perjurers, dragged on and the pope was found guilty. They took him next to a balcony of the palace, and, to the acclamation of the mob, went through the ritual ceremony of degrading the pope, stripping him of his

vestments and insignia. Then, half naked and loaded with chains, he was dragged through the streets to the prison reserved for wretches awaiting execution, the executioner, bearing a drawn sword, marching before him. This sentence, however, was not carried out. Constans II, who had enjoyed, from behind a grille, the scene he had so carefully arranged, went from his triumph to recount it in detail to the patriarch, ill at the time and thought to be nearing his end. The recital struck terror into the prelate. "Alas, yet another count to which soon I must answer, " was all he could say, and it was at his earnest entreaty that Constans commuted the sentence for one of exile. Three months later (March, 655) the unhappy pope, half dead with his privations and sufferings, was shipped off to the Crimea where new hardships speedily put an end to his life (September 16, 655).

St. Martin I, in whom the incompetence of Honorius was so gloriously redeemed, was not the only martyr to Constans II's barbarity. The abbot Maximus, a one time secretary to Heraclius, and two monks, one of them the pope's late ambassador to the imperial court, were likewise put on trial. The skill of the one time secretary had no difficulty in stripping the trial of its pretences and in forcing an admission that the real cause was loyalty to the Roman decisions. The three were exiled, horribly tormented, mutilated even, and in the end, like the pope they had defended, they, too, died from the results of their ill-treatment.

One very unpleasant feature of this episode is the attitude of the Roman clergy to their persecuted bishop and his supporters. It is also illuminating testimony to the hold which, in this new Byzantine Catholicism, the emperor had managed to gain even on the clergy of the supreme see. Before St. Martin had been tried, before even he had arrived at Constantinople, the wretched Roman clergy had obeyed the imperial order and given him a successor. Hence, in his prison at Constantinople the old pope waited in vain for help, for even the support of friendship from his own Roman people. The election of Eugene was a sad disillusioning of the valiant soul who had expected that something of his own spirit would keep his clergy loyal. Worse still was the news that the ambassadors sent by Eugene to petition for the emperor's confirmation of his election had gone over to the heretics, and, if they had not accepted the Type, had fraternised with them to the extent of concelebrating with the

patriarch. This was one of the new facts thrown in the teeth of St. Maximus as he protested that he had for his warrant the teaching and practice of the Roman See. In desperation he turned to prayer that the divine mercy would somehow make manifest the gift of truth with which It had enriched the see of Peter.

He had not long to wait. The new pope, Eugene -- really pope since Martin's death -- was already, by 656, a source of anxiety to those who had contrived his election. The new patriarch at Constantinople had sent to Rome the synodal letter announcing his election. It was read with the wonted ceremony at St. Mary Major's before a great assembly of clergy and people, and its language on the crucial point of "energies" was considered too obscure to be orthodox. Cries of opposition broke out. The pope tried diplomatically to calm the tumult, but was forced to promise that he would never acknowledge as patriarch the author of the letter. Then, and then only, was he allowed to proceed with the mass. At Constantinople the news of this rejection of the new patriarch roused the official world to new fury, and one of St. Maximus' judges referred to the incident "Know this, Lord Abbot, as soon as the Barbarians leave us a breathing space we shall treat as we are treating you this pope who dares now to raise his head, and the rest of those folk in Rome who cry out so loudly, and your own disciples with them. We shall bury the lot of you, each in his own place, as we did for Martin. " However, Eugene I died before the emperor's hands were freed (June 2, 657), and his successor, Vitalian, made his peace and recognised the new patriarch unmasked.

Six years after Vitalian's election political affairs brought Constans II to Rome, the first emperor to appear in the ancient capital for more than two centuries. Whatever the orthodoxy of his belief, he was the sovereign, the pope was his subject, and pope and clergy headed the citizens in the demonstration of loyalty which greeted the tyrant who had sent St. Martin to his death not ten years before. From Rome the emperor went south and he was still in Sicily when (668) the dagger of an assassin put an end to his life. His sudden death so far from the capital seemed likely, for the moment, to be the prelude to civil war. That his son, Constantine IV (668-685), succeeded peaceably was due in no small measure to the activity of Pope Vitalian, and, possibly in gratitude for the pope's service, with the new

reign the Type, though not disavowed, disappeared into the lumber rooms of history. There was henceforward a kind of peace, but neither of the popes who succeeded Vitalian -- Adeodatus 672-676, and Donus 676-678 -- were recognised by the patriarchs at Constantinople, nor were the patriarchs John V (669-675) and Constantine (675-677) recognised at Rome. It was the initiative of the emperor which brought the estrangement to an end, and from his letter to Pope Donus asking him to send representatives to a conference, there developed the sixth general council of 680-1 (Constantinople III).

Two years of delays followed the imperial invitation. To begin with, the pope to whom it was addressed died before the letter arrived. Then his successor Agatho (678-681) decided, before he replied, to consult the western episcopate generally. His acceptance should go to Constantinople bearing the signatures of as many Latin bishops as possible. There was at Rome the usual council of the pope's own immediate suffragans, in which an English bishop, Wilfrid of York, took part. There was a council at Pavia, and other councils, apparently, elsewhere, following the procedure of St. Martin I in 649. As his principal legate the pope would have liked to send the Greek monk who at the time occupied the see of Canterbury, Theodore of Tarsus. The difficulties which prevented this, delayed the mission yet further. Finally, in the September of 680, the delegates reached Constantinople and an emperor who had almost despaired of seeing them. They were eleven in all: two priests and a deacon representing the pope himself, three Italian bishops -- the emperor had asked for twelve -- a priest of Ravenna and, as the emperor had desired, four monks chosen from the Greek monasteries of Southern Italy.

The legates presented to the emperor a letter from the pope, the three bishops the profession of faith which the western bishops had signed -- a hundred and twenty-five of them. On November 7 the delegates came together under the presidency of the emperor. The project had grown since he wrote to the pope, and with the mission from the West there were present the bishops of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and what could be gathered to represent the three other patriarchates where, thanks to Monophysitism and the fifty years of Mahometan occupation, Catholicism as an organised thing had practically disappeared. In all one hundred and seventy-four bishops were

present.

The sessions of the Council -- eighteen in number -- did not end until the following September (681). [] The Monothelites were allowed to state their case, the whole vast literature of manifestoes and synodals was read, with the acts of the previous councils on which the Monothelites based their new claim to orthodoxy.

Agatho's letter to the emperor was read to the council. Like the Tome of St. Leo, two centuries earlier, it is a simple statement of the belief as traditional that in Christ Our Lord there are two wills and two operations. As St. Leo at Chalcedon, so now Agatho, was acclaimed as Peter's successor "Peter it is who speaks through Agatho. " In the eighth session the emperor intervened and demanded that the two patriarchs should give their opinion as to the doctrine of Agatho's letter. The Patriarch of Constantinople declared it to be the Catholic faith and the immense majority of the bishops agreed. His colleague of Antioch -- a patriarch in partibus these many years -- held firmly to his Monothelism. Sergius, Cyrus, Sophronius, and Honorius, dead now half a century, came to life again in the debates. Sophronius was hailed as the defender of the true faith, the rest condemned; Sergius as the pioneer of the heresy, Cyrus and the successors of Sergius as his supporters, all of whom, the decree notes, have been already condemned by Agatho, "the most holy and thrice blessed pope of Old Rome in his suggestions to the emperor. " To this list, sent on from Rome, the council added the name of Honorius "because in his writings to Sergius he followed his opinions and confirmed his impious teaching. " The emperor accepted all the council decreed, he presided at the closing session, and by an edict gave the definitions force of law.

The council, following immemorial tradition, wrote also to the pope, begging him to confirm what had been decreed. At the moment the Roman See was vacant. Agatho had died (January, 681) before the council was half way through its labours, and his successor, Leo II, was not elected until nearly a year after the council had ended (August 17, 682). To acknowledge its synodal letter and to send a reply was one of his first duties. This he did in a letter to the emperor. The pope confirms the decrees, and re-echoes the condemnations of his predecessor, and in even more

indignant terms, he makes his own the council's condemnation of Honorius "who did not make this apostolic Church illustrious by teaching in accord with the apostolic tradition, but on the contrary allowed its spotless faith to be sullied by a sacrilegious treachery. " He used a similar hard phrase in a letter to the King of the Visigoths. But it is in a further letter to the bishops of Spain that this pope, in a sentence, most clearly describes the fault for which Honorius merited these condemnations:

"Honorius who did not extinguish the fire of heretical teaching, as behoved one who exercised the authority of the apostles, but by his negligence blew the flames still higher., ' The condemnation of Pope Honorius does not seem greatly to have moved those who witnessed it. It was recorded in all solemnity in the Acta of the council, it appears in all the correspondence which notifies the decision of the council to the rest of Christendom. In the archives where these rested, his memory, too, slept until, centuries later, controversial archaeologists, straining every resource to embarrass the champions of the Roman primacy, turned to the record of the sixth general council and with more ingenuity than good faith tried to put on the decrees a meaning they were never meant to bear. Much more singular than the inclusion of the negligent and misunderstanding Honorius among the condemned of 681, is the entire absence of any reference in the council's proceedings to the memory of the story's heroic figures, St. Martin I, St. Maximus and the rest. The ingenuity of Constant II, condemning for treason where he dare not proceed on a cause of faith, was successful to the end. No council, no pope, under this Byzantine regime, would glorify the criminal convicted for treason, any more than it would condemn the emperors who had fostered and encouraged the heresy, opposition to which was the martyr's real crime. The memory of Heraclius and of Constant II was officially undimmed, while that of St. Martin and his companions remained officially infamous.

In the council of 680 Rome and Constantinople came together after a breach of relations that had lasted thirty-five years. The acknowledgement of the Roman primacy then made was as full, and as spontaneous, as at the time of Hormisdas, or at Chalcedon, two hundred and thirty years before. Nevertheless in those two hundred and thirty years a new world had slowly been coming to birth. It is always difficult to draw the dividing lines of historical periods, but certainly by the end of the seventh

century the world into which the Church had come had definitely given place to another. That world had been a civilisation, Roman politically, Hellenistic culturally, imposed on and adopted by a score of peoples, overlaying, in East and West alike, older cultures still. By the time of the Council of 680 the West had long since slipped from the grasp of the one-time world State. For nearly three centuries now, Gaul, Spain and Britain had been outside its boundaries. Italy, too, which Justinian had recovered, was by 680 once again "barbarian", save for Sicily, Calabria and a few scattered vantage points along the coast. Africa had recently (695-698) fallen to the Arabs, who, as has been noted, had, sixty years earlier made themselves masters of Egypt and the East. The Slavs were now established south of the Danube. The State, which had not been a Roman empire for three centuries, was by this hardly an empire at all. More and more it was become a Greek-speaking nation, whose strength lay in the peasantry of Asia Minor; and if it still retained in Constantinople a European capital, it was to the East that its capital looked for inspiration, to the lands and the traditions of those ancient cultures whence had derived that non-European conception of the semi-divine despotic ruler whose influence, since Diocletian, had done so much to make the Empire a new thing. The lands had vanished, the culture had changed, the inspiration of life was other, and it was in a world already changed that this last great controversy between the Roman See and the Roman Emperors was fought out. Nevertheless, since the affair of the Monothelites is the last chapter of the history which begins with the Edict of Milan it is best told here in order to complete that history. To show in what degree the world in which the controversy ended was a different world, and how truly a new age had begun with Constantinople's pride of place reinforced by the consciousness of its cultural and even "national" superiority to Rome -- a consciousness now characterised by deep anti-Roman feeling -- it remains to say something of another council at Constantinople, summoned twelve years after the council of Pope Agatho and Constantine IV. This is the famous synod in Trullo [] -- so called from the place where it met, the great domed hall of the imperial palace at Constantinople.

It was summoned by the son of Constantine IV, the youthful Justinian II (685-95, 705-711). This emperor's reputation has left him the very type of that treachery and sadistic cruelty which,

for so long, was all that the world "byzantine" conveyed to western minds. He was, however, no friend to the defeated Monothelites, and he needed little encouragement to busy himself, after the pattern of his great namesake, with the Church's internal discipline. It was represented to him that neither of the last two general councils (553 and 680) had occupied itself with questions of discipline, and to supply what was wanting Justinian called the Council of 692.

It was a purely Byzantine affair. The pope was not invited, and there was no East to invite. Two hundred and eleven bishops attended, and the papal ambassadors at the imperial court were present too. The council did little more than publish once more, in collected form, laws which had come down from earlier councils. There were, however, some new canons and, bearing in mind the emperor's aim of elaborating in this council a common ecclesiastical observance for the whole empire, their anti-Roman character is very significant. The famous 28th canon of Chalcedon is, of course, re-enacted, and the eastern discipline in the matter of Lent and of clerical marriage is extended to the whole Church in language designedly insulting to the Roman See. Equally significant of a new, aggressive anti-Roman spirit was the fact that, among the avowed sources from which this code was drawn, were councils which Rome had never recognised, and others which Rome had definitely rejected. The code went through, however, without a protest, and the pope's ambassadors to the imperial court signed with the rest.

It remained to be seen what the pope himself would do, and so much importance did Justinian attach to his signature that six copies of the decrees were sent to Rome. Each of the patriarchs, as well as the emperor, should have his autograph copy of the papal submission. The pope, Sergius I, was himself an oriental, Syrian by blood though Sicilian by birth. He refused the council all recognition.

Straightway the old tyranny began to function, officials coming from Constantinople with an order to drag the pope in chains to the capital. But it was not so easy now as it had been fifty years before in the time of St. Martin. The troops mutinied, the mob drove the high officials out of Rome with appropriate indecencies, and shortly afterwards a revolution at

Constantinople drove out Justinian too -- his nose slit in the latest fashion of mutilation. Ten years later, wearing a new nose of gold, he returned and, once securely established, his thoughts turned again to the decrees of his council still lacking the pontifical signature. Once more this half-crazy fanatic addressed himself to the task. The pope, John VII, was asked to note the canons to which he objected, and to sanction those he approved. The poor man was not only himself a Byzantine but the son of an official of the imperial service. Obedience to the emperor was in his blood, and yet he was pope. Something of the tradition triumphed despite the "human frailty" of which the *Liber Pontificalis* speaks. He did not dare to pick and choose, but sent back a kind of vague and general approbation. Justinian found it lacking, and sent orders for a fuller and more definite assent. Pope John was dead by this time. It was his successor, Constantine, who had to face the difficulty and an order to proceed himself to Constantinople. The pope was received everywhere with the utmost ceremony and reverence. The emperor too, most astonishingly, threw himself at his feet, begged the privilege of assisting at his mass and receiving Holy Communion from his hands. And thanks to the diplomatic skill of the future Gregory II the affair of the Council of 692 was left as it was. The emperor asked no further approbation. The pope abstained from further condemnation. To this day the place where the pope's name should show is blank. After which happy ending to what had promised to be so tragic, the pope was allowed to return to Rome. Two months later the mob rose once again, and this time the emperor and his son died in torments at its hands (December, 711).

Here ends the story of the Church and the world into which it was born. But the regime of Byzantinism under which the Church's ruler had been so oppressed, continued still. It was to last -- so far as it affected the popes -- just something short of fifty years more. Then a liberator came, in the person of the Catholic king of the barbarian Franks. He beat off from the nominally imperial lands the Lombards who menaced St. Peter, and "for love of St. Peter and the remission of his sins" made over his conquests to the pope (754). St. Peter is thenceforward no longer the subject of the successor of Augustus and Constantine. The alliance of the Papacy and the Franks has most momentously begun. It is a warning, if warning is needed, that the Middle Ages are upon us, that the Roman Empire is

already a matter of history. Just two hundred years had passed since Justinian's re-conquest of Italy. For so long, and for no longer, had (Caesar imprisoned the Papacy in his Byzantine State.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)



A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH To the Eve of the Reformation

by Philip Hughes

Vol. 2: 313-1274

CHAPTER 1: THE CHURCH IN THE WEST DURING THE LAST CENTURY OF THE IMPERIAL UNITY, 313-30

1. *THE DONATIST SCHISM, 311-393*

Let us begin by making clear what we mean by " The West." It is the western half of the Roman Empire as Gratian reorganised it in 379, the Pretorian Prefectures of Italy and the Gauls, the dioceses of Italy, Rome, Africa, Gaul, Spain and Britain, all Europe west of the Rhine, south of the Danube and west, roughly, of the meridian of 20 deg. E. with, in Africa, the modern Morocco, Tunis and Tripoli. The West had not been created a separate empire by Diocletian's far-reaching reforms in the administration. It was, in his time, simply the sphere of jurisdiction of the junior of the two partners who, henceforward, were jointly to share the indivisible imperium?.

This new system was only more or less preserved in the next hundred years. For thirteen years (324-337), under Constantine the Great, the Empire had but a single emperor; and after a short interval it was again united under his son Constantius II (351-361). Valentinian I divided it once again in 364, and so it remained until the assassination of Valentinian II nearly thirty years later. This emperor left no heir, and his eastern colleague, mastering the usurper who had murdered Valentinian, now became sole emperor of the Roman world. This was Theodosius, called the Great, destined, though he could not know it, to be the last man to rule effectively the vast heritage in which, since the days of Augustus, the lands that encircle the Mediterranean had been politically and culturally united. Theodosius died (January

28, 395) prematurely, only a few months after his final establishment, and within ten years the forces, to ward off which the best efforts of every great mind in the last hundred years had been directed, surged up yet once again, this time to have their will. They were destined -- these forces which, carelessly and none too accurately, we have come to lump together as the Barbarian Invasions -- so to transform the West that, in the end, it became a new thing, politically and culturally. In that long process political unity disappeared and the Western Emperor, too, who was its symbol and its source. The Catholic Church survived.

To understand what this meant we need to recall how much of Catholicism there was to survive; we must survey the Catholic achievement in the West at the moment when the Barbarian Invasions began, describe the history of the Church in the West between the act of Constantine which definitely gave it legal security and the death of the last great personality whom that new age of the Christian Empire produced, St. Augustine. It is the story of Catholicism in Africa, perhaps the most Catholic province of the West, slowly shaken to pieces by the terrible experiences of the long Donatist schism; the story of Spain similarly disturbed but in less degree by the friends and the enemies of Priscillian; the story of the first attempts to evangelise what was the least Catholic part of all -- the countrysides of Gaul -- and of the Roman See's careful organisation of new means through which to develop the exercise of its traditional primacy. It is the story, too, of a great dogmatic conflict about the fundamentally important truth of the nature of the divine activity in the soul's progress towards God. It is the story, finally, of the life work of St. Augustine, the greatest mind as yet given to the Church.

The Donatist Schism, which, in the fourth century, wrought as much damage to the Church in Africa as did the contemporary Arian trouble to the Church in the East, was a legacy from the persecution of Diocletian. Africa, on that emperor's partition of the State, fell within the jurisdiction of Maximian and although with Maximian's abdication (305) the persecution practically ceased, it had been, for the two years it lasted, a very bitter reality indeed. The Church had suffered particularly from a very stringent inquisition after the sacred books and vessels; and a very great proportion of the numerous nominal apostasies

which occurred, had taken the form of surrendering the sacred books and vessels for profanation and destruction.

Against such traditores, now more or less repentant, there was the same indignant feeling that had shown itself fifty years before in the time of St. Cyprian against the semi-apostates of the persecution of Decius. In Egypt, too, and in Rome, the Church was experiencing a similar period of strain. And, in Africa, as elsewhere, amongst those accused, or suspected, of thus throwing the holy things to the Pagans were a number of the bishops.

One such episcopal suspect was the Bishop of Carthage, the Primate of Africa himself, Mensurius. Whatever the degree of his apostasy, [] Mensurius had had to face from a number of those whose loyalty won them imprisonment -- the confessors -- the same kind of trouble that had marked the beginning of St. Cyprian's episcopate. History was repeating itself; the confessors, once again, were endeavouring to subordinate episcopal authority to their own personal prestige. The bishop had to take disciplinary action. He made careful distinction between the real victims of the persecution and those who, in danger of the law for other, less avowable, reasons, now used their faith to win alms and help from the charity of the faithful, or who were in prison as the inevitable result of their own acts of bravado. Whereupon the self-created and self-glorified "confessors" declared him cut off from communion with them and therefore from the Church.

Mensurius died in 311. In his place the Church elected the deacon Cecilian who had been his chief ally in the recent troubles, and to whom there had fallen the unpleasant task of carrying out the details of the late bishop's policy in respect of the rebellious "confessors." Immediately all the latent hatreds fused. There were the "confessors," now long freed from prison, and their cliques; there were Cecilian's rivals, embittered since his election; there were his predecessor's trustees whom Cecilian had, at the eleventh hour, just been able to foil in a scheme of embezzlement; there was a pious and wealthy woman -- Lucilla -- mortally offended by Cecilian's refusal to enthuse over her private cult of her own privately canonised "confessor"; there were the bishops of Numidia, already embittered with Mensurius and very willing to embarrass his

successor. Finally, there was Donatus, Bishop of Casae Nigrae in Numidia, but living now in Carthage, a born leader of men with a genius for organisation and propaganda. He it was who organised the party, and from him it has its name.

The discontented appealed, then, against Cecilian's election; and the Primate of Numidia, whom it in no way concerned, came into Carthage with seventy bishops to try the case. Cecilian ignored the " council's " summons; he was declared to be an intruder. As " successor " to Mensurius the assembled bishops, and their motley of cranks and fanatics, elected one of Lucilla's clerics, half-chaplain, half-secretary, the lector Maiorinus. But the most serious feature of the affair was not the mere fact that a second Bishop of Carthage had been intruded, but the theological basis by which the intrusion was justified and Cecilian condemned.

Cecilian's consecrator had been the Bishop of Aptonga, Felix; and Felix of Aptonga, it was alleged, had in the recent persecution been among the traditores. Such apostasy, declared the electors of Maiorinus, a fall from grace, entailed necessarily the loss of all spiritual power in the apostate. Felix could no longer be a means of grace: he could no longer baptise, no longer ordain, nor consecrate. It was the old theory of St. Cyprian which Rome had condemned so vigorously, which he had died without retracting, and which had survived him as a peculiar tradition of the African Church, to be used now against his own legitimately elected successor. Cecilian was, then, no bishop, according to this theory; the priests he ordained were no priests; the sacrifices they offered a mere parade, their baptisms a ceremony only. Whoever depended on Cecilian ceased by the fact, necessarily inevitably, to be in the Church at all. Whence from the very beginning of the schism a terrible aggressive bitterness on the part of the schismatics; and within a very short time the quarrel within the Church had become a problem of public order. The civil authority could not but intervene.

Cecilian was elected in 311, Maiorinus in 312 -- in the October of which year, Africa, by the battle of the Milvian Bridge, came under the control of Constantine. It was the very moment of the emperor's conversion, and to arrange the religious troubles of the province was one of his first concerns. He decided in favour

of Cecilian, and the letter to the imperial Vicar of Africa, notifying this decision, is interesting witness to the emperor's high conception of his new role as the Church's protector. " I must admit," he wrote, " that I do not feel free to tolerate or to ignore these scandals, which may provoke the Divinity not only against the human race but against myself. For it is an act of the divine good pleasure which has chosen me to rule the world. Should I provoke Him, He may choose another. True and lasting peace I can never achieve, nor can I indeed ever promise myself the perfect happiness which comes from the good will of God Almighty, until all men, united in brotherly love, offer to the most holy God the worship of the Catholic faith."

Constantine, thirty years of age, had marched from victory to victory ever since, on his father's death, he had forced himself on the other emperors as his successor. He was now, thanks to the unfamiliar nature of the problem, to meet a decisive check. His dual role of head of the State and protector of the Faith, his double anxiety for public order and the unity of the Church, were to be his undoing.

He began (313) by recognising Cecilian and ordering the local authorities to effectuate the dispossession of the Donatists where these were in power. The Donatists appealed against the decision, alleging the invalidity of Cecilian's ordination and asking for judges from among the bishops of Gaul; and Constantine agreed that the question should be reopened. He chose three Gallic bishops, ordered others, Italians, to be added to them and with the pope at the head of the tribunal the affair was solemnly judged at Rome (October, 313). This episcopal court, sitting in the Lateran (the first appearance in ecclesiastical history of that famous palace), heard both sides and declared that Donatus had not proved his case. Cecilian was, undoubtedly, the lawfully elected Bishop of Carthage.

The Donatists appealed once more. The affair was spreading rapidly, and already, in most of the African sees, the Catholic bishop had a Donatist competitor. Constantine ordered a new enquiry. Its subject this time was not Cecilian but his consecrator, the alleged traditor Felix of Aptonga, and the enquiry was an affair of State, conducted by the imperial officials in the courts. The police books of the time of the persecution were produced; the magistrate who had ordered the

search and the arrest of Felix appeared to give evidence. It was proved that Felix was innocent, that he had in fact never even been arrested during the persecution, and also it transpired that the Donatists had been busy forging an official certificate of Felix's guilt. This evidence the emperor sent to Gaul where, at Aries, a great council from all the West had been convoked to adjudicate on the matter once more. The council (August, 314) examined the whole affair and, noting the Donatists as " crazy fanatics, a danger to Christianity," it declared for Cecilian.

The Donatists appealed yet again, and for a third time Constantine listened to them. He summoned both Cecilian and Donatus [] to Brescia, and while he kept them there, sent to Carthage a commission to see if, with both of the leaders away, the rival factions could not be reconciled. Only when this was found impossible and the commission had reported that a decision must be given, did he judge. And once more, after another examination, he decided for Cecilian (November, 316). This decision Constantine followed up by an order that the churches which the Donatists held were to be restored to the Catholics, and that the Donatists were to be forbidden to meet.

Constantine's unwillingness to enforce the judgements of the different judges to whom he had referred the matter and his readiness, time and again, to reopen it, are to be put down to his anxiety for the preservation of public order. He knew his Africa, and knew that this was no mere question of a theologians' quarrel. It was, then, with the greatest reluctance that he issued the orders which were the logical consequence of the judgement, and the reception which met them must have seemed to justify his hesitation. Everywhere there were riots, destruction and bloodshed; and nowhere more of it all than in Numidia where, in the five years of the agitation, the Donatists had gained the upper hand and had driven the Catholics under.

The movement, like Monophysitism a century later in Egypt, was beginning to draw to itself all that survived of the native tradition below the veneer of Roman civilisation, all that life so long exploited for the benefit of the cosmopolitan capitalist and adventurer, ancient social hatreds which would find in this religious crusade a long awaited opportunity, and which would turn it very soon into a peasants' war of rapine and murder. Wherever the Donatists gained ground, indeed, there soon

appeared, as the militant auxiliaries of their bishop, the organised bands of the Circumcellions.

It is not easy to find, in later history, a parallel which would serve to explain them. They were nominally Christian, fanatically attached to their own interpretation of the Gospel's social teaching, self-appointed judges and avengers of social inequality, rigorist in matters of morality in the narrow sense, and wholly unconcerned with its obligations where these stood in the way of their customary procedure. Armed with bludgeons they roamed the countrysides, ravaging the estates of the wealthy, compelling assent by outrage and terror, with forever on their lips the incongruous war cry of Deo Laudes. Their dearest aspiration was to die for the Faith, and if, since there were no longer any persecutors, this was now a matter of some difficulty, then to die at any rate and to seek death at the hands of the chance passer-by. So the tragicomic spectacle, at times, of the peaceful citizen bidden to murder the fanatic under the menace of the like fate for himself. Donatism did not invent the Circumcellions. Their extravagance was a local product of the spirituality of the century, akin to the extravagances of the undisciplined pioneers of monasticism in the deserts further to the East. But Donatism, with its insistence that the Catholics were laxists, the descendants of traditores, and with its profession of a higher and more rigorous sanctity, rallied these bands to the schism. As long as the schism lasted they were the picked agents of its propaganda, terrorists who came to hold whole provinces in their grip. Wherever they gained the upper hand the Catholics who held firm were massacred, those who yielded, re-baptised, and, if clerics, re-ordained. The churches which escaped destruction were washed and re-washed to purify them from the effects of the rites of the traditores, the Blessed Sacrament consecrated by Catholics thrown to the dogs. In the days of the Donatist power whole provinces laboured under this tyranny.

Under these circumstances the policy of repression speedily developed into a local civil war, which another war of propaganda kept active and alive for years; and at last when, in 321, the Donatists made an appeal for toleration, Constantine granted it. He did so in letters which make no secret of his disgust and contempt for the sect. They are not to enjoy the privileges which the Catholics have; nevertheless they may live,

and live as Donatists; the Catholics he exhorts to remember the Gospel and the duty of pardoning, and even of loving, those who hate them; the Donatist bishops were freed from prison: and the movement proceeded to consolidate what it had gained.

The regime of tolerance inaugurated by Constantine lasted for just over twenty-five years until his son, Constantius, in 347, felt himself strong enough to pick up the long-standing challenge. For that quarter of a century had been for the Donatists-- especially in Numidia -- a period of licence, in which their violence had had full play. Now at last the Government proposed to come to the aid of the oppressed Catholics. It needed an army to execute the edict. Once more there were riots and massacres, but finally the Donatist bishops were rounded up and exiled, their churches handed over to the Catholics, and for fifteen uneasy years there was peace.

That peace endured until Julian the Apostate, in the acknowledged hope of embarrassing Catholicism, recalled the exiles. Their return was the signal for a renewed reign of terror, and although Julian died the next year (363), his successor, Valentinian I, did not reverse this part of his policy. Valentinian was indeed a Catholic, but his religious belief was most carefully kept out of his public policy. Religious disputes, he held, were the bishops' affair, and he declined to take official notice of them. With his accession there set in for the African Church the worst period of its history so far. From the State it no longer received the protection of a privileged party. Donatist and Catholic were alike in the State's regard.

The Church was dependent entirely on its own resources and unhappily these, at the moment, were not great. Notably it suffered from a lack of leaders, and from a hierarchy in which the proportion of nullities was unduly high. Restitutus, the Catholic primate, had even played a prominent part in that Council of Rimini which a few years earlier (359) had capitulated to the Arian Constantius II, while the Donatist primate -- Parmenian -- was a man of real ability, an organiser, a scholar and a good controversialist. His one competent Catholic opponent was the Bishop of Milevis, Optatus. But despite the logic of Optatus, and despite the jealousy that tore the Donatists into rival factions, and despite the differences which led to the expulsion of their greatest writer Tyconius, the schism

maintained its gains. In 372 there was a great native rising against the Roman power. Many of the Donatists were implicated, and henceforward the government of Valentinian was a little less neutral; but for all that, and especially in Numidia, the Donatist supremacy was far from destroyed.

Then, as the century came to an end, three things happened which promised to reverse the history of the thirty years since Julian. In 390 Parmenian died, after ruling his church for thirty-five years, and the Donatists were never again able to produce a leader of his ability. Two years later, by the death of Valentinian II, Africa came under the rule of Theodosius the Great, a convinced and enthusiastic Catholic, a stern Spaniard for whom compromise and half measures had no meaning. But more important, by far, than either of these events was the entry into Catholic life of St. Augustine, ordained priest in 391, Bishop of Hippo from 396.

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



2. ST. AUGUSTINE AND THE DONATIST SCHISM

St. Augustine's first official connection with Donatism was his attendance at the Council of Carthage in 393. He was then a man close on forty []; he had been a priest two years, and a Catholic for six. He was, like many another in this century of religious transition, the child of a mixed marriage in which the mother was Catholic and the father Pagan. From that mother he had gained, in earliest infancy and childhood, his first notions of Catholicism, a knowledge and love of God and of Jesus Christ which remained, despite the Pagan education of boyhood and adolescence, to be the source of never-ceasing self-questioning and discontented criticism of whatever system of thought attracted his mind. He was intellectually precocious, with the temperament of the artist, and all the frank sensuality of the Pagan. From his very schooldays, in the matter of sexual morality he ran amok, to settle down at the age of eighteen to something like sobriety with the girl who bore him the child Adeodatus.

Meanwhile, amidst all his dissipated recreations and the financial anxieties that accompanied them, the thought of God and the attraction of Christ never left him, and with this, an ever-growing anxiety for intellectual security about God's nature and about the nature and origin of evil. The Church's doctrine on these problems, like many another since, he partly misunderstood and wholly disliked. Catholics, he thought, had an anthropomorphic idea of God (whence their retention of the Old Testament); and a doctrine which made man's free will responsible for evil, not only conflicted with his philosophical creed (which made evil to be a thing material), but conflicted also with his desire to possess Christ and yet follow his own way of life. Cicero's Hortensius set once more aflame his old desire for wisdom -- though he grieved that the wonder book lacked the savour of Christ; and then, at nineteen, he gave himself to the Manichees.

St. Augustine's adherence to Manicheism is one of the earliest, and perhaps the most noteworthy, of all the contacts between Catholicism and a religion that harassed it for a good thousand years. Mani, its founder, was a Persian, and it was about the year

240 that he began to publish his supplement to the world's revealed religion. Mani, it is his own account of himself, is the herald of a doctrine in which all revelation is summed up and completed, the successor of Buddha, Zoroaster and Our Lord Himself. The Paraclete promised by Our Lord has appeared, revealing all truth to Mani, past and future equally with the present, and Mani is now one body and one soul with the Paraclete. But there is nothing of the Montanist ecstatic about this Persian prophet. Clear, cool-headed reflection marks all his writings. The chief influences upon his thought are eastern. There is in it nothing directly Hellenistic. The prophet never himself crossed the frontiers of the Roman Empire. His religion is not a product of Paganism, but a kind of bastard Christianity, the outcome of Mani's ambition to complete Christianity, and of the accident that his own life coincided with the flood tide of the syncretist movement observable in the religious world since the death of Alexander the Great. It is this Syncretism that is responsible for the curious juxtaposition of Christian and anti-Christian elements in the work. It is responsible, too, for the presence in Manicheism of a particularly disgraceful mythology. In some respects the system recalls those of the Egyptian Gnostics, and in others Marcionism.

Mani was a capable organiser. He not only prophesied that his religion would conquer the world, but, like Marc ion, he set it in a strong close-knit framework. Like Marcionism it taught a dual origin of life and the universe, and the perpetual antagonism of the two supreme principles, the one good and the other evil. It advocated much the same kind of materially inspired austerity, prohibitions of certain foods and drinks and of marriage. On the other hand the sect was twofold. There were the Elect, bound to all observances, and the Hearers who accepted the system and would one day qualify for salvation by passing into the ranks of the Elect, but who, until then, had no more onerous obligation than to hold fast to their resolution to do so.

For St. Augustine the system had the same general attraction that all Gnostic systems held for the educated mind. It professed, ultimately, to give a purely rational explanation of the riddle of life, of man and his destiny, the nature of God, the problem of evil. It did not, like the Church, offer a teaching which, very often, was above the power of reason to understand. The Manichees knew; and they would, in time, teach the disciple

all. There was about the system a great parade of learning, philosophical and astrological; it had all the appearance of being the academic thing it seemed. It had the further advantage, for Augustine, that it offered a way to be at rest intellectually without first regulating the moral disorder of his life.

For nine years he remained in the sect -- never quite so secure as he would have liked; and then came Scepticism, and enough of Aristotle to shake to bits what security he had; and, the great Manichee of the day failing to restore his confidence in the system, Augustine abandoned it. He was back once more in the chaos of conflicting doubts and then, in 383, there came a nomination to the chair of rhetoric in the western capital, Milan.

Augustine accepted it gladly and, with the sermons of the city's bishop, St. Ambrose, at which he most assiduously assisted, his intellectual life passed into another and richer phase. In the first place St. Ambrose, too, was a rhetorician -- though by genius and not profession; and through his oratory something of the thought of the greatest of Christian philosophers hitherto, Origen, came to influence Augustine. Catholicism and philosophy were, then, by no means incompatible. The religion of the Church could survive the test of philosophical discussion, could possibly be the shrine of that Wisdom so long sought. Also the sermons at Milan enlightened Augustine's prejudiced ignorance. Catholics, he knew now, had not an anthropomorphic idea of God.

Nevertheless, Augustine was still far from Catholicism. There still remained his old difficulty that all is matter; and since it was impossible to explain materially the God of the Catholic Theology how could the Church's religion be true? Deliverance came through Neoplatonism, [] with its insistence that the spiritual world is a reality, that it is self-sufficient, immutable, its truths necessarily, universally valid, and that to the spiritual the material is, and must be, subject. God then, his reason now acknowledged, was Spirit -- and spirit, too, the soul; evil was no creature but lack of being. The last barrier between Augustine's intellect and the Church was down. There still remained the facts of sense, and the legacy in his soul of the years of moral disorder.

Here, too, alas, his primary deliverer was Neoplatonism -- alas,

for just as truly as the Neoplatonic speculation about spirit ran easily to Pantheism, so, in the practical order, it ran to a wrongly ordered asceticism, an asceticism based on the idea of the radical opposition of spirit and matter. The divine in man, the soul, is the prisoner of the material. The soul can never be free, never realise its possibilities until the body is broken by systematic constraint, the sense-nature ruthlessly destroyed. In nothing is the opposition of spirit and matter so evident as in what relates to sex, and after a life of sexual disorder Augustine verged on desperation. faced with the habits that threatened to keep him permanently exiled from the Church and Christ. To the Church he came but, in morals as in intellectual assent, by way of Neoplatonism -- whence the violently- phrased reaction, the language, for example, about sex that is almost a denunciation, the statements that even Christian marriage involves a contamination of spirit. It is a reaction whose colour here is Neoplatonic and not Christian at all. but from it derived a tradition that lived on among Christian writers for centuries. []

The immediate effect upon Augustine of his new discoveries was to drive him yet nearer to despair. Despite the very evident urge of his senses -- Adeodatus' mother had gone, and he had taken a mistress in her place -- he refused to marry. There was a last most violent struggle of all, and then it ended as the saint himself describes in the most famous passage of all his writings-- the reading of the heroism of the Christian ascetics, the ensuing hour of despair broken by the child's voice " Tolle, lege" and the happening on the words of St. Paul. "Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and impurities, not in contention and envy: But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh in its concupiscences." []
Grace alone can set man free from the slavery to sin.
Thenceforward he knew only peace, and giving in his name he was prepared for the sacrament, and at Easter, 387, St. Ambrose baptised him.

Since that time Augustine had lived with his friends the life of a monk on what property he retained at Tagaste, the little town in Proconsular Numidia where he was born. He was no doubt the most famous man of the place when, in 391, an accidental circumstance of a visit to Hippo compelled his acceptance of the priesthood. Two years later, and with the Council of Hippo he made his first entry into the history of Donatism.

In the June of that year (393) the domestic quarrels of the Donatists had come to a head and a great council of their bishops at Cabarsussi had deposed the primate, Primian, and installed Maxim Ian in his place. There seemed a chance of appeals from the defeated party for admission to the Catholic Church. One of the matters for which this Council of Hippo was called was to decide the conditions on which such reconciliation should be effected, and at the council St. Augustine, simple priest though he was, was asked to preach to the bishops. Three years later he was himself Bishop of Hippo, in the very heart of the Donatist country, the stronghold of the party of Primian, where the Circumcellions had it all their own way; and where once he came himself very near to death at their hands. He was soon the recognised leader of the Catholics. By his tireless activity, his innumerable letters, his sermons, his treatises, songs he wrote for the people, and anti-Donatist placards to cover the walls, he was gradually putting new life into the laity, while the sudden apparition of a first class mind among the bishops was transforming the hierarchy also.

To win victories in controversy, however, was far indeed from Augustine's aim. It was the re-union of the Church and the convincing of the Donatists that he desired; and side by side with the controversy there went on a persistent effort, maintained with a patience and charity that never tired, to open up negotiations with the Donatist bishops. The council of Catholic bishops decided for this policy in 401, and again in 403. But each time the Donatists held aloof. On the other hand the anti-Catholic violence steadily increased, and after the failure of the last attempt at negotiation the bishops appealed to the emperor, Honorius, (395-423) for protection. The edict of February, 405, was his reply. The Donatists were to be considered as heretics, to be proscribed as such and rooted out.

The new edict was undoubtedly a severe blow. The realisation that the State would now protect the Catholics, lost to the Donatists all those converts whom they had gained through the terror, and it doubtless lost them also a great number of their own more indifferent members. But the edict was by no means so consistently applied as to destroy the sect outright. With the assassination of the all-powerful minister Stilico (408) there came a change of policy. But the bishops appealed, and the

edict of 405 was renewed. In 410 the policy was a second time reversed, and an edict of tolerance published. The situation was by this time easily worse than at any time for twenty years.

Once more the bishops appealed, and this time the emperor adopted the often discussed plan of a conference between the two episcopates. It was to take place at Carthage under the presidency of a high imperial official; the procedure was carefully drawn up; official stenographers were appointed, and on June 1, 411, the rival armies of bishops -- 286 Catholics and 279 Donatists, two bishops to almost every see in the country -- came together. It was a weary encounter, as all who knew the history of the controversy could no doubt have foretold. The Donatists had no case in theology, in law or in history. They had no argument except the fact that they had survived for a hundred years. Naturally and necessarily they made the greatest possible use of the only tactics open to them -- obstruction and delay. The president decided that they had no case and must submit, and the following January (412) a new imperial decree confirmed his judgement. All Donatists were ordered to return to the Catholic Church under pain of banishment; their churches and other property were confiscated and handed over to the Catholics. Commissioners appeared everywhere to carry out the decree; and since, this time, there was no reversal of the policy, the end of Donatism seemed assured. But before the Catholics could flatter themselves that the double influence of Catholic propaganda and the imperial laws had converted the mass of the schismatics, the Vandal invasion came (429) to wrest Africa for a century from the rule of Rome and subject it to barbarians who were militant Arians, fanatically anti-Catholic.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



3. ST. AUGUSTINE AND THE HERESY OF PELAGIUS

Donatism, for all the importance of the questions it raised as to the nature of the Church and the validity of sacraments, had been, in itself, a purely local matter. It was hardly disposed of by the imperial decree of 412 when there came to Africa a more far-reaching trouble. This was a new theory of the relation in which the restored humanity of the Christian stood to its Restorer, a theory so far-reaching, indeed, that it involved nothing less than a revolution in the traditional idea of the redeeming activity of Jesus Christ. The author of the theory was the British monk Pelagius, important hitherto not so much as a scholar or theologian, for all his learning, but as a director of souls. He was a man of holy life, given to ascetic practices and held in high esteem at Rome, where he lived during the closing years of the fourth century. With him were associated another Briton, Celestius, and, later on, an Italian bishop, Julian of Eclanum, who organised the ideas of Pelagius into a reasoned system of thought. []

Man, according to the new theory, was by his nature free to do evil or not. Whatever his activities they were his alone, and they were the only source of what merit he possessed in the sight of God, his only title to any reward. The human will is all-powerful, and there is nothing to hinder the man who so chooses from living a life of perfection. The traditional Catholic doctrine that the sin of the first man Adam had, for one of its effects, the loss to all Adam's descendants of certain of the privileges with which he was created, and for another the sowing in their souls of an inclination to sin, was rejected. Adam's sin, the Pelagians maintained, affected his progeny as a bad example indeed, but not otherwise. Human nature itself had not in any way suffered by his lapse. As Adam was created so were his descendants, who, therefore, stood in no need of any special divine aid to heal their nature. Nor did they stand in need of any special help in order to act rightly. For this, the free will of their unimpaired human nature was all-sufficient. Divine intervention could make the right choice in action easier, but the choice itself was within the capability of all. Men, since Adam had chosen to choose wrongly, had shown themselves depraved; but, since the nature of man remained unimpaired, no restoration of human nature

was called for, no new life needed to replace an old thing tainted and vitiated, no regeneration. Baptism then was not a new birth. The divine action of the Redeemer upon the souls of the baptised, whether in the redeeming action of His death or in His subsequent glorified life, is not a principle animating man from within his very soul, but a thing wholly external -- the stimulus of a moral lesson, enforced indeed by the most powerful of all examples, but nothing more. The mystery of the Redemption, if Pelagius was right, was emptied of its main significance, the Incarnation became a wonder wholly out of proportion with its object. Finally, if in the work of his salvation man can succeed without the divine assistance, what place is there in the scheme of things for religion at all? God becomes a mere inspector of man's chart of duties, any inter-relation of love, confidence, gratitude disappears. Prayer is a non-sense. The theory was, in fact, a most radical deformation of the very essence of Christianity, and it must produce inevitably in all who held it a corresponding deformation of character. The Pelagians, for whom humility was an impossibility, were, in their spiritual life, really cultivating themselves. Their own spiritual achievement was the chief object of their attention, and with their theory all the old harsh pride of the Stoics returned to the Christian Church.

It was as refugees fleeing before Alaric that, in the year of the sack of Rome (410), Pelagius and Celestius came to Africa, Pelagius halting there but for a moment on his way to the East, Celestius staying to seek admission into the presbyterate of Carthage. Carthage, Jerusalem and Rome are the theatres of the different crises of the next ten years.

Celestius, apparently, made no secret of his views and when he applied for ordination found himself denounced to the bishop as a heretic (411). There was an enquiry, Celestius was asked to abjure a series of propositions that summed up his theory, and when he refused he was excommunicated. Whereupon he too left Africa for the East, and, at Ephesus, succeeded in obtaining the ordination he sought. He left behind him in Africa a great number of disciples, drawn chiefly from the better educated classes and from those dedicated to the higher life of asceticism. It was in the endeavour to undo this work of Celestius that St. Augustine first came into the controversy, exposing the tendencies of the theory in private letters, in

sermons and in books.

Pelagius himself, meanwhile, was well established in Jerusalem and thanks to the severity of his life, to his powerful friends, and to the Greek ignorance of Latin, he pursued his way unhindered. There was, however, another Latin ascetic in Palestine, a much greater man than Pelagius, and, even in his old age, an utterly tireless hunter-out of novel untraditional theories. This was St. Jerome, and it was only a matter of time before he turned upon Pelagius all the attention of his acute mind -- and his biting pen. The Bishop of Jerusalem, Pelagius' patron, was forced into action, and his protege summoned before a synod to explain himself. He evaded the points at issue by using phrases whose ambiguity was not apparent to the Easterns, inexperienced in the tierce and quart of this particular controversy, and the synod, without condemning Pelagius, recommended that the matter be referred to Rome (July, 415).

St. Jerome was left to prepare his next move. This time he was reinforced by allies from the West -- two bishops of Gaul, exiled through a political revolution, and a young Spanish priest, Orosius, sent by St. Augustine. The Bishop of Jerusalem had proved fallible. The appeal was now made to his superior, the Metropolitan of Cesarea. A new synod was called to meet at Diospolis, and at Diospolis (December, 415) the comedy of the earlier synod was repeated. The bishops from Gaul were kept away by illness; Pelagius again had his skilfully ambiguous submission to offer; and, yet again, the bishops found it satisfactory. Orosius returned to Africa with the news of his failure; and the African bishops determined on a formal joint appeal to Rome. Two great councils were held, at Milevis and at Carthage, and with their exposition of the traditional doctrine there were sent also to the pope -- Innocent I, 402-417 -- letters from the two Gallic bishops, the minutes of Celestius' condemnation in 411 and a letter, drawn up by St. Augustine, explaining the controversy: all this was some time in the late summer, or autumn, of 416. In March of the new year the pope's reply arrived. The African doctrine was approved and the excommunication of Pelagius and Celestius ratified. []

So far the controversy had progressed along the accustomed lines, according to the normal procedure in cases of a charge of heresy. If progress was slow that was but natural, considering

the distance which separated the protagonists. But now, in 417, there came into the affair, to add very much to its complexity, the old trouble of ecclesiastical politics, of episcopal ambitions and jealousies. The death of the pope (March 12, 417) was its opportunity.

The new pope, Zosimus, was, for some reason or other, very much under the influence of Proclus, Bishop of Arles, the city which was, at the moment, the most important city of the Western Empire, the seat of government of the day's one strong man, the future Emperor Constantius III. Proclus had helped Constantius and Constantius had made him bishop, and upon the Bishop of Arles the new pope now heaped privilege upon privilege, making him to all intents and purposes a vice-pope in southern Gaul-despite the protests of the other bishops. One urgent motive of their protests was their poor opinion of this favourite of both pope and emperor. Proclus had been installed as bishop in the place of a bishop uncanonically thrust out to make room for him. That predecessor was still alive -- was none other than the chief accuser of Pelagius at the synod of Diospolis! Now, thanks to Proclus' influence with the new pope, the most active adversaries of Pelagius in the East were themselves excommunicated. The hopes of the Pelagian party rose, and Celestius himself went to Rome, offering submission to Zosimus and offering, too, an acceptance of the doctrine of Pope Innocent's letter to Africa, though he still refused to abjure the propositions for maintaining which he had been condemned in 411.

Pelagius, too, made a kind of submission, sending to the pope a long treatise on the freedom of the will in which, more haeretic, carefully chosen ambiguities masked what was new in his teaching.

Influenced by these reasoned protestations Zosimus reopened the case, and wrote to Africa what amounted to a panegyric of Pelagius and Celestius, in which they figured as the calumniated victims of the malice of the bishops! (November, 417). The African bishops sent an elaborate reply, detailing the shiftiness of Pelagius' habitual mode of procedure and the pope (letter of March 21, 418) thereupon capitulated. His letter reached Carthage just as a great council of two hundred and more bishops was about to open. Of this assembly St. Augustine was

the soul. It drew up a statement of the faith against Pelagius in nine canons and sent these to Zosimus with a letter asking his approval. Also, to leave no stone unturned, the African bishops approached the emperor, Honorius, and obtained a rescript ordering the pursuit and suppression of Pelagius wherever found. The pope now acted with decision and in a document called the Tractoria [] definitely condemned Pelagius and Celestius and their doctrines. About the same time an eastern council, too (at Antioch, in 418), condemned Pelagius, and with this he disappears from history.

Pelagianism was now an officially proscribed heresy, and orders went forth from the government that all the bishops should formally sign a prescribed form of condemnation. In Africa there was nothing but willing support for the measure, but in Italy, while there was no objection to condemning Pelagius, there was a certain reluctance to sign the condemnation if in so doing the signatory was taken as approving the theories of St. Augustine. This was especially the case in southern Italy, among the bishops who were immediately subject to the pope. Eighteen of them openly repudiated what they styled "the African Dogma", and the pope promptly deposed them. With this resistance a new phase of the heresy begins, its leader one of the eighteen, Julian, Bishop of Eclanum.

Julian was a scholar, a master of logic -- an Aristotelian it is interesting to note -- a controversialist, perhaps, rather than a theologian. He it was who worked the ideas of Pelagius into an ordered system, and the history of Pelagianism is, very largely, the history of Julian's controversy with St. Augustine. With Julian, who was personally well known to the saint, as his father had been before him, the whole character of the movement changes. It is no longer merely defensive, resorting to one subterfuge after another in its furtive endeavour to escape condemnation. Henceforward it is a bold and vigorous attack on St. Augustine in the name, of course, of a more primitive and truer faith.

But Julian found himself isolated. He went to the East, as Pelagius had done, and in the East, too, he found hardly a supporter except in the old Bishop of Mopsuestia, Theodore, with the tendencies of whose naturalistic theology [] -- he was the real father of the Nestorian heresy soon to trouble the East --

Julian's theories of grace accorded well. In Theodore of Mopsuestia, then, Pelagianism found its last patron, and in far off Cilicia the main movement gradually faded from sight. Julian survived until 454, never reinstated, despite his efforts, as Bishop of Eclanum.

The only other country where, after the condemnation of 418, Pelagianism survived in any force, was Britain. Here, since the Roman general Constantine had led away the legions to assist him in his desperate bid for the imperial throne nine years before, the imperial mandates could safely be ignored. More than one bishop was openly Pelagian, and the heresy seemed likely to prosper. That it ultimately failed, and that its followers were rallied to the Roman faith, was due to Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, whom in 429, and again in 447, the pope, St. Celestine I (422-432), sent to Britain for this purpose. With this triumph of St. Germanus in Pelagius' native country the history of his heresy, as an organised anti-Catholic thing, comes to an end.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



4. THE INFLUENCE OF ST. AUGUSTINE

St. Augustine, however, did more than merely fight the Pelagians as the great controversialist he undoubtedly was. The need of the moment brought from him the work which is his chief title to glory as a theologian, the construction of a whole theory to explain the original state of man, the nature and effect of the first man's fall, the nature of the Redemption, and the way in which, in virtue of the Redemption, God acts upon the souls of the redeemed. It is a work in which he had singularly little help from preceding writers, and a work which was to give rise, as it still gives rise, to passionate discussions; a work, too, since proved erroneous in more than one point, but a work which in its main lines has long since passed into the traditional theology of the Catholic Church.

Adam was, by a special act of the divine liberality, created with the gift of immortality, with a will inclined to good, a harmony of reason and senses, with infused knowledge, in habitual justice. He sinned, and his sin is transmitted ever after to all his posterity, as Scripture, the Christian writers, the rite of Baptism and -- a point of which St. Augustine makes very much indeed -- the chronic misery of mankind testify. The universal misery from which no man has ever escaped, the opposition between spirit and flesh, especially in what relates to sex, are for the saint a final culminating argument, and in the anarchic desire for sex pleasure that, of itself, denies all restraints, he sees that effect of Adam's sin through the instrumentality of which it is transmitted to us. "Hoc est malum peccati in quo nascitur omnis homo." []

This is not a radical vitiation of human nature. Human nature is not, since Adam, a thing of simple badness. But it suffers a permanent inherited weakness, a disability that is inherent and is therefore transmitted to all who possess a human nature. The channel by which that transmission is effected is, once again, the anarchic activity of sex-desire which accompanies the act of sex. Adam's progeny then, is, inevitably, born deprived of those special gifts -- immortality and the like -- which graced him, and, deprived of the will's inclination to good, needs henceforward a special divine help if it is to avoid sin. All mankind, since Adam's sin, left to itself is inevitably, eternally, lost: a mass of perdition,

a mass condemned -- of itself helpless, in a pit whence nothing but a new divine act can extract it. From this abyss God has in fact delivered us all, creating man anew, giving mankind the beginnings of a new life through the Redeeming death of the God-Man Jesus Christ. For St. Augustine the religion of the Church is essentially a redemption, a redemption based on the Incarnation.

In the new arrangement, God, as always, gives everything, even the first help to arrive at that belief upon which all is built. With the God-Man Jesus Christ, by incorporation with Him, Humanity is to be re-created, made one with Him in Baptism and the Holy Eucharist -- and this not in so many isolated individual unions, but as a corporate body. This idea of the salvation of Humanity as the members of Christ -- members of a body whose head is the God-Man -- is the very heart of St. Augustine's theology. His explanation of the system by which from the head the members receive direction and power to move -- in more technical language his theory of Grace -- is but his application of this theology to a special point.

The Redemption is the work of the Incarnate God in His historical earthly activity. This activity is continued, and continuously manifested thenceforward, in all the subsequent supernatural activity of the redeemed: manifested as the very source and internal principle of that supernatural activity. It is then really Jesus Christ Who prays, Who lives, Who performs the salvific actions in the individual. This is the meaning of St. Augustine's elaborate, well-articulated theory of Grace. It is St. Paul re-thought, the tradition set out afresh with new profundity, new lucidity, with passionate fervour, disciplined logic and a wholly new rhetorical splendour, in answer to the menace of Pelagius' sterilising divorce of man from God in the spiritual life. Thanks to St. Augustine's genius the tradition would conquer and mould anew the piety, the interior life, of all the succeeding centuries. It is this which most of all survives of his work. Far from Grace -- the freely- given divine aid that makes possible man's production of actions supernaturally valuable -- being unnecessary to Christians, Christianity is essentially Grace! and the primary attitude of the Christian is humility, the complete consciousness of his unlimited dependence on God. Nor can the Christian be solitary in his Christianity, for Christianity's very life is the union between all who are Christians, the union between

each as a Christian and Christ Himself, so that the whole Church is nothing more than "the one Christ loving Himself." The importance of the Church in St. Augustine's theology it is impossible to overestimate.

The system constructed by St. Augustine had its difficulties- particularly in the matter of adjusting the relations between the divine activity of Grace and man's free-will, difficulties about which, after further centuries, men still dispute as keenly as in St. Augustine's time.

To the Catholics of his own day St. Augustine was the great champion of the church against the Manichees, the Donatists, the Pelagians. To the Catholic of a day fifteen hundred years later he is still the doctor of Grace and Ecclesiology, the builder who set on the stocks every single one of the later treatises of systematic theology. But to Catholics of the thousand years which followed his death he was more even than all this. He was almost the whole intellectual patrimony of medieval Catholicism, a mine of thought and erudition which the earlier Middle Ages, for all its delving, never came near to exhausting. He was the bridge between two worlds, and over that bridge there came to the Catholic Middle Ages something of the educational ideals and system of Hellenism; there came the invaluable cult of the ancient literature, the tradition of its philosophy and all the riches of Christian Antiquity. In St. Augustine were baptised, on that momentous Easter Day of 387, the schooling, the learning, the learned employments, and the centuries of human experience in the ways of thought, which were to influence and shape all the medieval centuries. His own great achievement, and the authority it gave to his genius, legalised for all future generations of Catholics the use in the service of Catholic thought of the old classic culture. For this prince of theologians is no less a prince of the humanities, and in himself he determines, once and for all, the Christian attitude to the pre-Christian arts, poetry and thought. This genius, the range of whose mind is encyclopaedic, gifted with an insatiable desire to know yet more, with a passion for work and the temperament of a poet, the disciplined thinker whose very profession it is to reason and expound, saw Christianity as a whole, with a completeness beyond anything that any of his philosophical predecessors had known. And from his masterly understanding there comes the most masterly presentation hitherto seen, and

which will endure for nearly a thousand years without a rival, until there comes another mind, as great as his own, and equipped with still better instruments. []

In theology, beyond what has been already described, St. Augustine is responsible for a philosophically inspired exposition of the teaching on the Trinity which is one of the marvels of Christian thought; and which remains to this day impossible to better. In his teaching on the Incarnation, there is, once again, a richness of new light and a new precision, thanks to his philosophical mind; and as his exposition of the Trinity precludes the difficulties over whose solution Eastern Catholicism tore itself to shreds, so here his solutions leave no place for the misunderstandings out of which Nestorianism and Monophysitism were to rise.

He readily gives philosophy a role in the provinces of faith. Philosophy it is which first of all must test the credentials of faith. If these satisfy the mind, then faith henceforward has the principal role. By faith the mind accepts the mysteries. The office of reasoning is now secondary: the better understanding of truths acquired by faith, the explanation of them and of their mutual harmony. In his own use of reason to explain the truths of faith, St. Augustine employs the philosophy of his adoption, Neoplatonism as he had re-thought it. It was by no means a perfect instrument, as he himself uneasily realised. But with a happy confidence in the ultimate coincidence of all true teaching, relying on the surer way of faith where philosophy failed, he yet managed to build up with Neoplatonism the greatest philosophical exposition of its religion which the Church had yet seen. His was a mind that never ceased to develop, and a recent writer has been able to describe the years of Catholic life to which, with Grace, Neoplatonism brought him as "a continual argument with Neoplatonism. . . a progressive deliverance from Neoplatonism and a growth into essential Christianity". [] Something of the Neoplatonist spirit, however, survived all this argument, to provide him with problems he never lived to solve and which, unsolved, remained to confuse the philosophical Catholic until the great deliverance wrought by St. Thomas.

Like his secular master Plato -- and unlike Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas -- St. Augustine has, from the very beginning,

been eagerly read far beyond the limited circle of professional philosophers and theologians. "There was passion in his philosophy," [] it has been excellently said; and again, equally truly that " everything he writes is inspired by (his own mystical experiences) and looks backward or forward to them." [] No other theologian is so personal. Never before nor since, was there given to the sacred sciences a thinker for whom, in this passionate degree, there was but one reality -- the action of God in his own soul -- and a thinker of genius so mighty that, writing all he wrote in the light of this reality, he has somehow written the history of the hearts of all who read him. It is this passion for psychological self-portrayal, the dominant colour of all his work, which has led so many of his admirers to see in him the first of the moderns; and it is undoubtedly the explanation of his unsurpassed hold-which not even his most serious defects have shaken -- on the Christian imagination, affection and understanding. It is also, inevitably, one great source of weakness.

Another source of weakness is the fact that his great corpus of thought and learning lacks systematic organisation. The score of mighty tomes that confronts the student of St. Augustine is the varied production of a man, who, for all that nature cast him for a student, was forced for the best part of his time into the less congenial life of a man of affairs. His works are the productions of a busy bishop, harassed with a thousand temporal cares, from the ordering of diocesan charities to the high business of the State, and it is not surprising that, occasionally, they suffer from a lack of co-ordination and harmony. Thence, too, no doubt, derive in part the apparent and unexplained contradictions -- despite the famous *Retractations* written as a correction at the end of his days. St. Augustine never had Newman's comparative leisure in which to revise and to bring into harmony the detail of his vast output of half a century's exposition and polemic. Hence it is, that often enough, both sides in a vital dispute can make some claim to call him their master; and that partial study has sometimes been able to make out of him whatever it chooses. But whatever the flaws in the vast work, the work remained and remains. St. Augustine, in the East only a name, is in the West everything for the next eight hundred years, and without some knowledge of him the life of these centuries is unintelligible.

There is one book, especially, of St. Augustine which never ceased to be read and studied for the next thousand years and to influence western thought and even political action -- the De Civitate Dei. [] Not only was this a principal means whereby much of the saint's theological teaching passed into the minds of others than the professional theologians, into the minds of schoolmasters and lawyers and administrators and even rulers, forming the mind of the educated layman, but the book was the first attempt to understand the meaning of history, and it was the foundation of all the later Christian speculation about what we now call social philosophy. For a thousand years it was the European's guide to the rights and duties of man vis a vis the state, his vade mecum in the complexity where he found himself, subject at once of his temporal lord and of the spiritual kingdom which was the Church. It is a very lengthy book, [] and, in its discursive somewhat meandering fashion, it is encyclopaedic in the generality of problems it raises and endeavours to solve. There is here, in fact. a little of everything: brilliantly written religious apologetic; criticism of non-Christian ideals and solutions, that is humane, humorous, witty; expositions of the Christian mysteries fired with the fervour of a great love. It was the most popular, and to this extent, the most influential, book St. Augustine ever wrote; and its influence is by no means ended yet.

The City of God took the saint something like fourteen years to write, and he published the parts as they were completed, between the years 412 and 426. When he began it he was in the full maturity of his powers; he was an old man of seventy- two when he wrote the last wonderful pages "on the quality of the vision with which the saints shall see God in the world to come," and " of the eternal felicity of the City of God, and the perpetual Sabbath." What inspired the book was the storm of anti-Christian recrimination that followed Alaric's sack of Rome in 410. Had the empire not gone over to Christianity, said the pagans, those things would never have happened. So the saint examines Paganism, and its history, in the light of Christian teaching and ideals. He lays bare what Paganism was, and must be. and what its effects on human nature. And he sets forth, constructively, the positive hope, and achievement, of Christianity and the Catholic Church. The Church as it exists, is not, indeed, adequated with the saint's City of God, any more than the ancient pagan empire is identified with that other "city"

which is under the rule of sin. But the vision is presented of the Church, God's creation, as "the new humanity in process of formation, and [of] its earthly history [as] that of the building of the City of God which has its completion in eternity." []

Not only is a solution offered for the difficulties urged by the pagans, [] but a solution too for those difficulties which the facts of imperfect Christianity present, only too continuously, to believers also. The work brings out the ideal of the Church "as a dynamic social power," and it expounds a Christian social doctrine, of moral freedom and of personal responsibility, that is necessarily fatal to ideas of the state as superhuman and ever omnipotent, and to an organism so destructive of human personality as was the ancient Roman empire. St. Augustine is commonly declared to be, by this book, the founder of what is called the philosophy of history. It is no less true that the theories he there sets forth "first made possible the ideal of a social order resting upon a free personality and a common effort towards moral ends." []

The City of God was the favourite reading of Charlemagne, whose empire may be fairly considered as the mighty attempt of a somewhat less than saintly Christian genius, to set that City up as an actual political institution; and seven hundred years later still, it was with a series of public lectures on the work that the author of the Utopia introduced himself to London, and to Europe, as a political thinker and reformer.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



5. PRISCILLIAN

Of the history of the Church in Spain in the first three centuries after Christ we know almost nothing. St. Paul was, in all likelihood, one of its first evangelists. It gave martyrs to the Church in the persecution of Decius. Fifty years later than Decius, on the eve of the greater persecution of Diocletian, its bishops, to judge from what we know of the Council of Elvira (c. 300-305), were preoccupied with the problems of a Catholicism so extensive and so universally popular that in many respects it had become gravely relaxed. There were Catholics who, even in time of peace, continued to make their offerings to the pagan gods. Marriages between Christians and the heathen priests were not unknown. The clergy showed too keen an inclination to engage in commerce -- bishops no less than priests and deacons. Others practised as moneylenders. The habit or example of idolatry was still strong and, lest they should be worshipped, all pictures were now ordered to be removed from the churches. Clerics who are married are to live with their wives as with their sisters, under pain of deposition. Rules are laid down for the cases of conversion from such special classes as the charioteers of the circus, and the comedians from the theatre who, once converted, are strictly forbidden to return to their unhallowed profession. With this council, held in the first ten years of the fourth century, the veil falls once more on our knowledge of the early Spanish Church. When it lifts, some seventy years later, it is to disclose a Church torn by internal controversy, and to reveal one of the most curious figures of all Church history. This was Priscillian. He was a man of great distinction, well-born, cultivated, wealthy, gifted with eloquent speech, with a genius for propaganda, and he was wholly devoted to the cult of the ascetic life.

The different churches in Spain already by this time had each of them its circle of ascetics -- men and women who had specially dedicated themselves by a vow of continency in a spiritual union with Our Lord. They would continue to live in their own homes, but all follow a more or less universal rule, which prescribed special daily prayers, daily reunions in the church, additional fasts, and abstinences, and a sober manner of dress -- the women for example were veiled, wore no jewellery, used no

cosmetics. They would be, in Spain as elsewhere, the local church's agents in the organised charities that played so great a part in the primitive Christian life, care of the sick, of widows and orphans, relief of the indigent poor. Priscillian was not in any sense a pioneer in this ascetic movement, but his powerful personality gave it a new impetus and speedily began to transform it.

Gradually, the multitudes whom he influenced -- and his disciples grew in number very speedily indeed -- looked to Priscillian for direction and not to the head of the local church, to Priscillian and his private inspirations. And Priscillian was not limited by the traditional sources of Christian Asceticism. The myths of the Gnostically-inspired, apocryphal gospels served him with ideas no less than the genuine Scriptures. The basis of his ascetic practices again was not Christian, but the old oriental theories of the radical badness of matter, and of the inevitable fundamental opposition between matter and spirit. This showed itself in the exaggerated abstinences to which he was given and which he recommended, condemnation of marriage, of the use of wine, and the use of flesh meats as things bad and to be shunned. Little by little his followers began to have the appearance of a sect apart, to whom other members of the Church were as an inferior race. The Priscillianists -- to anticipate a later name for them-habitually went barefooted. Periodically, at fixed times, they withdrew themselves from the world to give themselves to their own peculiar religious observance in a kind of "retreat." They had their own use of the Holy Eucharist. Women, especially, had an important place in the movement.

It was not long before the genius of Priscillian had completely disturbed the Spanish Church, especially in the west and northwest, in Portugal and Galicia. His ascetic reputation and what was known of the severity of his life, were, for many people, decisive. Thousands joined him and among them even some of the bishops. Other bishops began to question the tendencies of the movement, to suspect the principles that inspired it and then to organise against it. In 379 they sent to consult the pope, Damasus I, and the following year, in a great council at Saragossa, a number of the practices to which the followers of Priscillian were said to be given, were forbidden under the strictest penalties.

How strong, by this time, the movement had grown may be judged from the next event in the story -- the election of Priscillian himself as Bishop of Avila on the very morrow of the Council of 380. Immediately he assumed the offensive, and made a great effort to oust his superior, the Metropolitan of Lusitania. But that bishop, Idace, was not to be easily overthrown. He had an influential friend at the imperial court -- no other indeed than St. Ambrose -- and the only result of Priscillian's manoeuvre was an edict from the emperor, Gratian, in general terms, against "false bishops and Manichees." Already there was, in this, menace of what the future might hold for Priscillian, for the Manichee-to whose anti-social morality his own alleged customs bore so striking a resemblance -- had been under the ban of the empire since long before the conversion of Constantine. Priscillian, with some friends, then set out for Italy, for Rome and Milan to assure himself of the support of both pope and emperor. The pope would not receive them; but from Milan they obtained, in the end, a decree which in effect annulled that from whose execution they had fled.

Once more Priscillian was free to take the offensive, this time with the civil authority behind him. The leaders opposed to him, menaced now by the State as disturbers of the peace, took themselves to Treves, the seat of the pretorian prefecture of the Gauls in which Spain lay. There they found support in the bishops and the high officials, but Priscillian's influence in Milan was still too great to be overthrown. Suddenly the whole situation changed when, in 383, Maximus, the imperial commander in Britain, declared himself emperor. He landed in Gaul with an army and Gratian, marching north to meet him, was assassinated at Lyons. Maximus was master of Britain, of Gaul and of Spain. Of this empire Treves became the capital, and still at Treves was the bishop who was Priscillian's chief enemy -- Ithacus, a man of loose life, worldly, ambitious and, as the enemy of the bishop who had found protectors at the court of Milan, likely to find a favourable hearing with the victorious Maximus.

Maximus was sufficiently won round by Ithacus' charges to order that Priscillian and a like-minded colleague, Instantius, should be arrested and tried at Bordeaux by a council of bishops. Instantius was deposed, but Priscillian, refusing a trial,

appealed from the bishops to the emperor. The scene changed to Treves and this time it was to the criminal courts, on criminal charges, that Ithacus denounced his rival. Priscillian was tried on an indictment accusing him of sorcery, of diffusing obscene doctrines, of presiding at midnight reunions of women, and of stripping himself naked to pray. With six associates he was condemned; and, since sorcery was a capital offence, executed.

The sentences and their execution caused a sensation. St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, had protested in advance against any sentence of death. Ithacus, in his plea against Priscillian, had made the most of his congenial opportunity to demonstrate publicly against all asceticism and all ascetics, even to the extent of denouncing St. Martin himself as a Manichee. The saint, undismayed, had continued to urge his plea that in an affair which concerned questions of Catholic doctrine, the lay court had no jurisdiction. The emperor had promised that there should be no question of a death sentence and the bishop returned home. Then, influenced by the anti-Priscillianist bishops, Maximus had ordered an enquiry and, on the prefect's report that Priscillian was guilty of sorcery, had ordered the trial that resulted in the conviction and the executions. Nor was this the end. Commissioners were sent to Spain to deal similarly with Priscillian's adherents.

St. Martin returned to Treves and broke off all relations with the Bishop of Treves and those who had shared in the enquiries and the trial. Nor did he cease to protest against the iniquity of the death sentences, until the emperor promised, as the gauge of his communion, to halt the persecution then beginning in Spain. The pope, too (Siricius, 384-396), asked for an explanation of the proceedings and, fully informed by the emperor, excommunicated Ithacus and his associates. Nor would St. Ambrose when, in the course of the year, a political embassy brought him to Treves, give any recognition to the bishop, "not wishing to have anything to do with bishops who had sent heretics to their death."

For three years, however, despite St. Martin, the repression continued until in 388 Maximus was slain and the West was once more ruled from Milan. With this restoration of Valentinian II, Priscillian came, posthumously, into something like his own. With the other supporters of the late usurper the persecutors of

Priscillian paid the inevitable penalty. Ithacus and the others were deposed and exiled. The remains of Priscillian were brought back from Germany with all manner of ceremony to become the centre of a popular cultus, and soon Spain was once more given over to the bitter fights of religious factions, Galicia and the West ever more strongly Priscillianist, Betica and Carthagina just as strongly orthodox. For years the episcopate was divided. A council at Saragossa (395) excommunicated the Priscillianist bishops and these, reverting to the manoeuvre of their master, fled to Milan to enlist the support of the court. St. Ambrose showed himself sympathetic, but insisted on an abjuration of Priscillian's distinctive doctrines and on the renunciation of the cult of his memory and his remains. The exiles consented, and thereby gained the support not only of St. Ambrose but also of the pope. They returned to Spain only to break their promises, and at a new council (Toledo, 400) they were yet again condemned. This time the condemnation broke the unity of the party, for while some of the bishops submitted, others remained obstinate. Curiously enough the submission was the cause of yet another division. Rome, consulted as to the procedure to be adopted towards the repentant bishops, gave its traditional advice that they should be shown every consideration. Whereupon, as always, a faction "more Catholic than the pope" showed itself, declining to re-admit the repentant Priscillianists to communion and breaking off all relations with those who did so. There were now three kinds of Christians in Spain, the Priscillianists, the moderate Catholics with whom, thanks to Rome, the repentant Priscillianists were now united, and the fanatical Catholic opponents of the reunion -- a lamentable state of affairs after thirty years of controversy. Before any real improvement could take place there came, in 406, the flood of the great barbarian invasion to submerge for a time, with much else, these evidences of religious weakness and dissension.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



6. THE ROMAN SEE AND THE WESTERN CHURCHES

The history of the Roman Church in the first three centuries is noteworthy for two things. First, there is really very little mention of it at all -- for much of the period we have little more than the names of its bishops. Secondly, whatever record of it has survived is almost invariably concerned with its exercise of a supervisory authority in the affairs of the other churches. It is in this role, indeed, that the Roman Church makes its first entry into history with the intervention at Corinth which is the subject of St. Clement's celebrated letter. Later still, the exercise of this primatial power, so to call it, and the reactions to that exercise, are the chief matters of the history of some seventy years -- the years when in turn Rome imperially corrects all the great churches of Africa and the East; Ephesus in Polycrates, Carthage in St. Cyprian, Alexandria in St. Denis. The Roman primacy, whatever the use its bishops made of it, is one of the undeniable features of primitive church history. But it is also a thing which functions only on special occasions.

There existed also, side by side with this universal jurisdiction of the Roman Church, and in addition to its purely local authority over its own actual members, the clergy and the faithful of the city of Rome, yet a third and intermediate kind of jurisdiction whose sphere was originally the bishops of Italy and which eventually grew to be, what it is to-day, an effective, continuous, supervision over all the churches of the Church Universal, really felt in the everyday life of each. That development which has made the papacy of modern times the source and centre of all Catholic life, and thanks to which the popes can, and do, effectively control that life's every movement, has been the work of the sixteen hundred years between Constantine and Pius XII, Trent and the Council of 1870 being its latest stages.

Its first stages are to be observed in the first century in which the Roman Church had any real opportunity to organise the administration of its primacy, the century following Constantine's conversion. It was also the last century, for very long indeed, in which political conditions made any such organising really possible; for it closed with the " Barbarian

Invasions " and the dislocation, for generations more, of all organisation but the most primitive. In what relation then -- beyond that of final and ultimate authority -- did the pope stand to the bishops of the West in this last century before the West was transformed into something new? []

The bishops of Italy form the nearest group of extra-Roman churches with whom the pope is in contact. Over them, so the canons of Nicea (325) are witness, he exercises such a supervisory jurisdiction as that possessed by the Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt. Thirty years later the Arian troubles have brought the pope of the day, Liberius, into conflict with the emperor. He has been ordered into exile and an imperialist, Felix, intruded into his see. The Bishop of Milan too, the new Western capital which has now displaced Rome, is exiled for the same good reason, and he, too, is given a successor, the notoriously Arian Auxentius. And the imperial power has gone still further. Henceforward it is the Bishop of Milan who exercises this archiepiscopal jurisdiction over the bishops of northern Italy (the civil diocese of Italia). To Rome are now left only the churches of the civil diocese of Rome. Milan, it might seem, was to be an imperially created rival to Rome in the West as Constantinople was about to become in the East. But when the end of Auxentius' long episcopate (355-374) came, he was succeeded by the most eloquent defender of the Roman Supremacy the Church had yet known, St. Ambrose (374-397); also, within seven years of that great man's death Milan had ceased to be the capital. None the less, the metropolitan jurisdiction of the see endured, save over such churches as it had lost to the new centres Aquileia and Ravenna. Over the churches in central and southern Italy and the islands, about 200 sees in all, the pope, during the fourth century, continued to exercise, then, a close and continual supervision.

Within this sphere no bishop is consecrated without the pope's consent. The local church elects, but its choice must be ratified at Rome, and the newly-elect must be consecrated by the pope. This is a discipline much older than the letter of Pope Siricius (386) in which it is formally recalled. It is the reason for the mention, in the notices of these earlier popes in the Liber Pontificalis, of the number of those they ordained. For example "This pope," it is Fabian, "held five ordinations, [ordaining] 22 priests, 7 deacons, and 11 bishops for various places." In later

times the number grows. Damasus (366-384) ordains 62 bishops, Innocent I (402-417) 54, and St. Leo I (440-461) 185! These bishops of the pope's special province meet annually at Rome on the anniversary of the pope's own consecration (Natale Papae) unless, for some special cause, they are explicitly dispensed. To Rome they apply at every turn for advice in difficulties and the Roman practice is a norm to which they endeavour to conform their own administration. At Rome itself the administration is in the hands of the seven deacons. They are the chiefs of the growing ecclesiastical bureaucracy, and it is from their ranks that the pope is usually chosen. The archdeacon is at this time the most important personage after the pope, and the office is very often a last step before the highest office of all. So was it, for example, with St. Leo the Great.

It is to the pope directly that complaints against these bishops are addressed. He investigates, either personally or by delegates, and, when necessary, he deposes the guilty bishop; and the basis and justification of this authority, as the successive popes never tire of repeating, is that they are the heirs of St. Peter.

In the affairs of the other churches of Italy, those subject now to the metropolitan authority of Milan, of Aquileia, of Ravenna, the pope interferes but rarely. Normally he has no share in the election of their bishops nor does he consecrate them. Here, as between each church and the Roman, there is yet no systematic centralisation. For all the community of Faith and the full acceptance of the Roman Supremacy to which, let us say, St. Ambrose witnesses, these churches in their everyday administration went their own way. Only for the greater councils did they go to Rome, and only in cases of disputes and appeals did Rome intervene in elections. Otherwise there is a complete administrative autonomy -- strikingly in contrast with the dependence on Rome in matters of Faith.

Beyond the limits of Italy the churches divide into four main groups, those of the (civil) dioceses of Spain and the Gauls, the churches of Africa, and those of the two dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia. [] Like those Italian churches which lie outside the sphere of Rome's special supervision, these churches too enjoy a wide autonomy. Their bishops are normally elected -- and if

need be deposed -- without any reference to Rome; and in their ordinary administration they follow each their own interpretation of the traditions. Nevertheless, communication with Rome is frequent, is even continual, and the relation in which these churches all stand to Rome is undoubtedly one of subordination.

Spain, when the century opened, numbered close on fifty bishoprics. Its bishops were represented in the several great councils of the century, at Arles in 314 for example and at Sardica in 343 and one of them, Hosius of Cordova, actually presided at Nicea. But though there were so many sees, the higher organisation was defective. There were several metropolitan sees around which the others were grouped provincially, but there was no one central see and never any real unity among the bishops. How extensive the effects of this disunion could be, the troubles centering round Priscillian made very evident. The detail of their history brings out, also, the role of the Roman Church in this distant Western province. It is from Rome that the bishops seek counsel when first they approach the question of Priscillian's orthodoxy; and it is to Rome that Priscillian goes, for the declaration of the purity of his faith that will reinstate him: "ut apud Damasum obiecta purgant" says the contemporary historian-Damasus, whom Priscillian salutes as senior omnium nostrum, senior et primus. Later still, after the executions of 385, there is again reference to Rome for direction at every stage of the complex sequel, the question of the reconciliation of Priscillian's followers, and the question, deriving therefrom, of the ultra-rigorous Catholic opponents of the reconciliation.

There is also the famous letter of Pope Siricius in 385. The Spanish bishops had applied for a ruling on a whole series of important matters. The evils to which the Council of Elvira was a witness, eighty years before, still afflict the Church. There are still to be found Christians who dabble in Paganism and clergy who, after ordination, continue to live with their wives as before. The pope's reply is no mere solution of a case of conscience. It is a peremptory reminder of the law -- "the things the Apostolic See has decided". "We order," says the pope, "We decree," and to coerce any reluctance to obey there is the menace of excommunication from Rome, and for justification of the threat and proof of the power there is the reminder that through

Siricius it is Peter who is speaking. The Roman Supremacy is writ large all over this letter -- and Rome's consciousness of its universal acceptance in the Church.

Nor is it otherwise in Roman Gaul, the vast tract that stretches from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, whose capital is Treves on the Moselle. Gaul was the one province of the West which Arianism had really troubled -- thanks to the manoeuvres of Constantius II and his Council of Arles in 353. The formation round Saturninus of Arles of a group of pro-Arian bishops, the struggle with them and the easy task of reconciliation once Constantius had disappeared (361) are the most important events of the century which have come down to us. The hero of this struggle and of the restoration was St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, one of the greatest of the earlier Latin ecclesiastical writers, and -- himself, for four years, an exile for his staunch defiance of the Arian emperor -- the chief forerunner of St. Ambrose in the theoretical exposition of the limits of Caesar's rights in the Church of Christ. Related to the events of this restoration of Catholicism is the letter *Ad Gallos Episcopos*, seemingly of Pope Damasus and dating from about 374. Whatever pope wrote it -- one theory puts it down to Damasus' successor Siricius -- the letter is a reply to an appeal for judgement. Some sixteen points in all are dealt with, the question of consecrated virgins who have broken their vow, of clerical celibacy, and of the conditions requisite for the lawful ordination of clerics and the consecration of bishops. In the reply the typical Roman notes are all immediately observable -- the insistence, for example, that no bishop be consecrated without the consent of his metropolitan, since such would be contrary "to the episcopal discipline of the Apostolic See." The pope nowhere suggests that he is enacting a law. Everywhere he is but reminding the bishops of Gaul of existing law, and yet he speaks as though he were its author and the one primarily responsible for its observance. Ten years later and Rome is again intervening to excommunicate the Gallic bishops who had shared in the grave irregularities which preceded the execution of Priscillian, and in 400, fifteen years later still, a council of Italian bishops [] continues to refuse these bishops recognition since they have not fulfilled the conditions laid down years before by Ambrose (the late metropolitan of the Italians) and the Roman bishop.

Two replies of Pope Innocent I (402-417) to Gallic bishops-

Victoricius of Rouen and Exuperius of Toulouse -- have passed into the very foundations of the great corpus of the Canon Law; and the reign of his successor Zosimus saw the papal intervention suddenly pressed forward to a development that was revolutionary when that pope gave to the Bishop of Arles a kind of superiority over all the metropolitans of Gaul, decreeing that all ordinations of bishops should be referred to him and that through him all the other bishops should henceforward transact all their business with the Roman See. The policy was as unpopular as it was unprecedented, and after a short twelve months it was set aside by the new pope, Boniface I (418- 422), and the old regime restored of autonomous provinces each under the rule of its own metropolitan, the Bishop of Narbonne being specifically authorised to disregard the extra-provincial jurisdiction of Arles and to proceed "metropolitani iure munitus et praeceptibus nostris fretus." What the pope was for the scattered churches of Gaul during this century is aptly described in a letter of the pope whose reign brings it to a close -- Celestine I (422-432). The pope, he declares, is in a post of observation and general superintendence, to arrest untimely developments, to decide and to choose, a post such that "no violation of discipline escapes us" -- for so far there is but question of discipline.

With Africa we come to what probably was the most Catholic province of all the West -- certainly the province where the Church was most completely organised. To begin with, it was a region extraordinarily rich in bishops; at the time of the Council of 411 there were 470 of them. And, unlike the bishops of Spain and Gaul, this vast assembly was a well-organised body. The bishops of each of the six civil provinces formed together an autonomous ecclesiastical province over which presided, not the metropolitan of any fixed see, but the senior of the bishops. But, in addition to this machinery of provincial councils, the Bishop of Carthage had, since the beginning of the third century, exercised a superior primatial jurisdiction over all. There was also the Concilium Universale of all Africa, and this, meeting regularly once a year, was, with the primacy of Carthage, a most potent means of unity. The churches of Africa were the most perfectly organised of all, and it is symbolical of that organisation that it was from this group that there came the first code of canon law -- the Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Africanae, published by the Council of Africa of 419.

The African Church had another distinction, the tradition of a singular "insularity" in its activity. In the long fight with the Donatists, for example, it never makes appeal for help to other churches; even in this controversy which, more than any other, brings out African understanding of the nature of the Roman primacy, a controversy in which the fact of that primacy and African acceptance of it is the very foundation of the Catholics' case, there is never an appeal to Rome for assistance. And, it is to be noted, Rome allowed for this "insular" habit when it permitted the Africans in the matter of reconciling the Donatists to depart very seriously from the accepted discipline in such matters. The relations with Rome are continuous and friendly. The faith in Rome's supremacy is as evident here, and at this time, as in any other part of the Church. But the administrative separation could hardly be more complete. Before the period had ended, and the Vandals come in to make an end for ever of Roman Africa, a series of crises were to bring out very strikingly what a high degree of autonomy Rome could allow in matters of administration and discipline where there was no question of the unity of faith.

The history of Pelagius has shown the African bishops turning to Rome once the controversy ceases to be merely local. In this matter where the faith is at stake there is no mention of Milan, the capital, along with Rome. It is to the pope they appeal because " You, from the Apostolic See, speak with greater persuasiveness." And in his reply Innocent I greets them as one episcopate among many who come to drink of the fons apostolicus. "Like yourselves, all bishops, whenever the faith is in question, can do no more than refer it to Peter who is the foundation of all episcopal dignity."

Under Innocent's successor, the rash and hasty Zosimus, the rare pope of whom one is tempted to say he must have been a nuisance to all concerned, the loyalty of the Africans was seriously tried. There was, to begin with, his apparent eagerness to reverse his predecessor's judgement on Pelagius; and next, when the firm and dignified protest from Africa halted him, there was a conflict over appeals to Rome which, for its intensity, recalls that of St. Cyprian with St. Stephen I. The African Church -- by a singular exception to the general practice -- had ceased to allow appeals to Rome from its final judgements, and even

menaced with excommunication whoever pursued such appeals. Zosimus not only ignored this legislation, by receiving and deciding appeals, but sent a commission into Africa itself to examine the facts of the case and to bring the bishops to reverse their policy. How the matter would have developed had he lived it is not easy to say, but he died while the dispute was barely begun and his successor, busy with the anxiety of a disputed election, went no further with it. But six months-after Zosimus' death, the Council of Africa (May 419) published its code -- and the law forbidding appeals to be taken overseas, with its penalty for disobedience, appeared in its due place.

Seven years later the conflict broke out once more, and over the same miserable person whose misdeeds had been the occasion of trouble in 419, the priest Apiarius. Pope Celestine acted just as Zosimus had done. He received the appeal and he sent legates to Carthage. The Bishop of Carthage agreed to reopen the case and then, while the Roman legates were eloquently pleading for Apiarius, the wretched fellow made a clean breast of his crimes. As far as Apiarius was concerned the affair was ended. But not so for the African bishops. They determined that the question of Roman intervention in disciplinary matters should be settled once and for all. Accordingly, the Council of 426 made a formal request to the pope that he would not for the future be so ready to receive appeals, and that he would not receive to communion those excommunicated by the African bishops, and that he would not restore those whom the African bishops had in council deposed; that he would not for the future send any more commissioners into Africa, much less commissioners charged to enlist the services of the police, since nowhere can the bishops find these things are allowed by the synods of the past, nor should the pride of this world find any counterpart in the Church of Christ. To this extraordinary remonstrance -- the most extraordinary surely it has ever received -- Rome made no reply. As with the Catholic council of Sardica's attempt to prescribe to Rome the manner in which its primacy should function, [] so was it with the attempt of these African bishops, equally loyal in faith. Rome made no sign; but in her own time, and as opportunity called for it, she continued to exercise in respect of Africans, as of Gauls, Egyptians and Orientals, all the fullness of her right.

The prefecture of Illyricum completes the round of these more

distant churches of the West; and here, in the last half of the fourth century Rome, to meet a wholly exceptional difficulty, created a really exceptional regime. The difficulty arose from the transference to the Eastern Empire, by Gratian in 379, of the civil dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia. Henceforward in temporal matters they would be ruled from Constantinople. The popes, however, did not intend that in spiritual matters, too, these churches of what was now called Illyricum Orientale should look to Constantinople; and to counteract any influence tending to draw them thither, the popes established the bishop of the chief see of the prefecture, Thessalonica, as their permanent representative for these provinces. He was charged to supervise the elections of all the bishops and, although the existing system of metropolitans was retained, he was given authority over the metropolitans too. All the business between the different bishops and metropolitans was to pass through him, and his jurisdiction was enlarged to try appeals, with discretion to decide himself what appeals were to go forward to Rome. The Bishop of Thessalonica from the time of Pope Damasus (366-384) is the papal agent, a kind of permanent legate, for these border provinces where Greek and Latin meet, acting, as say the letters of Boniface I, *vice sedis apostolicae, vice nostra*.

Inevitably the system met with opposition. Many of the bishops of Illyricum disliked it, and not least from the barrier it raised against all chance of making an ecclesiastical career via the court at Constantinople. The emperor too, Theodosius II (408-450), showed himself hostile and in 421 a rescript was published attaching the sees of Illyricum to the jurisdiction of Constantinople. The pope, unable or unwilling to make any open reprisal, persuaded the Western Emperor, Honorius (395- 423), to intervene with his nephew and, Theodosius giving way, the incident closed. But the ambition of Constantinople persevered, as did also the desire of the Eastern Emperor to see no exception to the rule that all the sees of his empire were grouped around the three great sees of the East, Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople. The question of the Roman jurisdiction over Illyricum Orientale remained, to be for the next two centuries one of the chronic causes of trouble between West and East.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 2: THE CHURCH AND THE DISRUPTION OF THE IMPERIAL UNITY, 395-537

1. THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SITUATION IN THE FOURTH CENTURY: DIOCLETIAN TO THEODOSIUS, 284-395

CATHOLICISM was not the product of the civilisation in which it first appeared; nor did it draw from that civilisation the strength by which it developed and spread abroad. It could not, in the nature of things, be essentially dependent on that civilisation, but it was immensely conditioned by it in all the circumstances of its growth. The Roman roads, the ease of communication, the internal peace and order secured to a whole world through the single political administration, the common languages, the common cultural idiom of Hellenism, all these undoubtedly helped the early propaganda. With the fortunes of the Roman State those of the new religion were, inevitably, very closely linked indeed. Whatever menaced the one would certainly handicap the other.

It so happened that, in little more than two centuries from the first preaching of the Gospel, the political regime we call the Empire was brought to the verge of disruption. The basis of the Empire was military power. The emperor was, in essence, the magistrate to whom the command of the army and dictatorial power were made over for life. Upon the commander-in-chief's hold over the army, therefore, upon the reality of his command, all was based. The senate's delegation of powers, its assent to his nomination were, from the beginning, formalities merely. The real power lay with the army, and increasingly, as the first two centuries went by, it was the man who could manage the army who ruled. Periodically the army got out of hand. Rival armies supported rival claimants to the supreme power, and civil wars had to be fought to settle the issue. There was one such crisis in 68-69, another in 192-193, and the emperor who emerged victorious from this last, Septimius Severus, summed up for his successors the policy which alone would make the position safe for them, "See that the soldiers have plenty of money. Nothing else matters."

In the seventy years that followed the death of this shrewd realist, the weakness inherent in the State's foundations bred all its fullness of destruction. Emperor after emperor was set up by the soldiers, only to be murdered when he ceased to please them, twenty-six emperors in fifty years. One they slew because he proved an incompetent general in the field; another because he strove to restore military discipline; another because, his private fortune exhausted, he ceased to be able to be generous; others again from sheer boredom. In different parts of the empire different armies set up their own emperors, none of them strong enough even to attempt to suppress his rivals, and for the best part of a generation whole provinces were ruled as independent states. Finally, a succession of able soldiers from Illyria (Diocletian and Constantine the chief of them) halted the long anarchy. The State was now reorganised. Every last vestige of the republic was swept away. The emperor was, henceforth, an absolute monarch of the oriental type; and by a careful redistribution of the powers of his subordinates -- whether generals in the army or governors of provinces -- and a systematic separation of the civil and military authority throughout the administration, barriers were set against any return of the anarchy. Diocletian recognised, too, how inevitable was the competition for the supreme position, and to guard against this he associated others with himself as joint emperors of the one state. There were two emperors from 285 and four from 293.

Even this far reaching change did not immediately succeed. On the retirement of Diocletian and his senior colleague in 306 the new senior looked outside the imperial families for his two new assistants. Whereupon Constantine and Maxentius, the sons of the late emperors, Constantius and Maximian, took up arms, and a new civil war began among the six emperors. It ended in 312 with Constantine master of the West. Eleven years later he had conquered his eastern colleague and was sole lord of the Roman world. He was almost the last to hold that place for any length of time. When he died (337) he left his power by will-betraying thereby an un-Roman conception of political power simply monstrous in its scale -- to his sons and nephews. Organised murder disposed of the nephews, a civil war of the eldest son (340), and for ten years the dyarchy was restored to the profit of Constans and Constantius II. In 350 Constans was murdered, and three years of war followed between his murderer

and his surviving brother. Constantius was in the end victorious and thenceforward, until the one surviving nephew of Constantine rose to contest his supremacy in 360, he ruled alone like his father thirty years before. Death came to him in 361, just in time to prevent a new struggle between himself and Julian his cousin. Julian, in his short reign of twenty months, had no rival nor had his successor Jovian in his still shorter reign. But with the accession, on Jovian's death (364), of Valentinian I, the army insisted on his associating his brother as emperor. Thenceforward, except for a brief three months at the end of the reign of Theodosius I (November, 394-January, 395), no one man ever ruled again the lands of the empire of Augustus.

For all who could read, death was written very evidently on the face of the imperial system. It was, indeed, only the chance of the succession of great princes in the second century that had preserved the empire beyond its first hundred years. The empire was a pyramid balanced on its apex and the most marvellous thing about it is that it survived at all. Thanks to Diocletian and to Constantine in the first place, it survived even the wholesale destruction of the third century and, even as a united political system, it was to outlive in the East by many centuries its disappearance from the West. But there was a further fundamental weakness against which even the greatest of emperors could not secure the State -- weakness of an economic nature. It is one of the capital facts of the situation that the political breakdown and the invasions of the fifth century occurred while an economic revolution was in progress.

The world in which the Church was founded and in which it had so far developed, was a world in which the town was all important, and in which the countryside existed only for the sake of the town. It was the towns that were, necessarily, the first centres of the new religion; and the bishops, one in each city, the cells which together made up the Church Universal. By the time of Diocletian's restoration of the Roman State -- or, to look at it from another point of view, by the time of Constantine's conversion -- the first beginnings were, however, apparent of a social revolution whose final effect would be to reverse this relation of town and countryside. The towns were already beginning to lose their primacy as social organisms. During the whole of the fourth century the pace of this new development

increased rapidly. It was still in its first stage when the mainstay of the town's importance as against the countryside -- the central imperial government -- disappeared altogether from the West. Simultaneously with that disappearance there broke over the ill-defended frontiers wave after wave of primitive nomadic peoples bent on plunder; and there also took place, through the so-called barbarian troops of the army, the establishment in Spain, Gaul, and Italy itself, of kingdoms which, theoretically within the empire, were in fact autonomous. In these momentous years were laid the foundations of that new civilisation in which the Catholic Church was to work for the next eight hundred years. To understand at all what the Church did for that civilisation, to understand how the Church's development was in turn conditioned by it, there must be borne in mind something of its leading characteristics as they differentiate it from the older world in which the Church was founded. The army, at the end of that century whose early years saw Constantine's conversion, still kept the frontier. What of the life within?

From about the end of the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161-180) there is observable a slow but unmistakable drift in the economic life of the Roman world, a strong ebb towards a more primitive (or more natural) system. There is a persistent debasement of the coinage (hardly checked until Diocletian). There is that debasement's inevitable effect in a chaotic flux of prices. Money-gold coins which really are gold, silver which really is silver-disappears. All that remains are the copper coins covered with a mere wash of silver, "metal assignats," as Mommsen called them. The State begins to be willing to take its taxes in kind, in goods and services. It even begins to grade and to pay its salaries, too, in kind. The army had always been the empire's greatest burden, and in this third century (Septimius Severus to Diocletian) the army was absolute master, greater than ever, better paid, the empire its prey to be looted at will. The bureaucracy, too, swelled its numbers beyond anything hitherto known. Industries -- the commercialised industries of modern times--there were none to speak of, none to be a source of wealth to the State. Commerce on the large scale, again hardly existed. The one real source of wealth was land. The chief means, apart from land, open to the man who wished to "invest" money was the letting it out at interest or the farming of taxes. The towns in such a system, were parasites, places where the

middlemen lived, markets where they traded, barracks where were housed the soldiers who protected the exploitation. For exploitation was really the ultimate end of the system. The very rich grew richer still, the poor remained poor. The middle class disappeared.

Diocletian's success as restorer was, in the economic sphere, inevitably limited. His reforms amounted, often enough, to little more than a legal consecration of existing abuses. He restored the coinage; he simplified, while he extended, the system of imperial taxation; he tried, but failed signally, to stabilise prices by imperial edict; his great feat was to inaugurate a regime in which the whole population of the empire was gradually conscripted and bound down, each class with its descendants -- for the burden was hereditary -- to work for the welfare of the State. The taxes are not excessive, the administration is not extravagant. But every possible source of wealth is surveyed and its owner assessed -- land, cattle, slaves, serfs, peasants and owners too. All are now bound by law to the trade in which they work, and their children are bound to follow them in it -- civil servants, the artificers in the armament factories and in the textile factories where are made the costumes for the court and the uniforms for the army; the ship owners, millers and bakers on whom the population of the cities depends for its daily food-allowance; the various building crafts and trades; the bath keepers, and by no means least, the army of workmen, keepers, charioteers, gladiators, actors -- "slaves of the people's pleasure" the law styles them- who produce the public games given now, at Rome, on 175 days of the year. The free farmer, the colonus, is likewise bound to the land. The owner cannot dispossess this class of tenant. If he sells the land the coloni go with it. It is to the land, rather than to the owner, that the new regime enslaves them. The free peasants of the villages are likewise bound to their village. No man shall escape his due share of the great burden. Nor is this a matter that affects only the trader and the working class. For there is yet another conscription -- of the time and brains of the more leisured class to the service of the city where they live.

The Roman civitas is more than a town. It is the town and the hinterland of countryside, often very extensive, upon which the town lives. It is a thing founded for the purpose of exploiting that countryside. It has its "constitution," its senate and its

magistrates. It is a tiny State in itself, with considerable autonomy, and from this point of view it is not incorrect to describe the empire as a federation of self-governing municipalities. For the senate and the high offices there is a considerable property qualification. It is the local aristocracy who rule, and amongst whom the honours, the titles, the social consideration of high office are shared. This *cursus honorum* entails expense on whoever proceeds through it, expense which is ever increasing. Moreover, the class from which the office-holders are drawn is made responsible for the taxation. In case of deficit or maladministration this class, as a class, is liable. Whence supervision from- the central government and, often enough, an endeavour to escape from the burden of one's rank. Whence conscription here too, and a conscription which, once more, is hereditary. The man born a *curialis* cannot escape his destiny of ruling the *civitas* and of being responsible to the State for the quota it should contribute to the imperial revenue. One way out there did remain -- a way only the very wealthiest could take. This was to buy rank as an honorary member of the Roman senate itself. It was a way all who could ultimately went, and these last two centuries of the Empire in the West saw a steady flight of these *clarissimi viri* from the towns to their country estates.

The towns, then, slowly shrank. They became once again mere centres for bargaining, and for the offices of what local government still went on. The great landed estate, on the other hand, gained a new importance. It was a fiscal unit independent of the *civitas* and gradually it became, under the protection of its privileged owner, an asylum for all who fled the heavy burden of the urban regime, for the impoverished *curialis* and the harassed artificer alike. Economically the landed estate had always been self-sufficient. Now it slowly began to acquire a political self-sufficiency too. The owner gradually began to exercise judicial authority over those who lived on his land, settling their disputes, punishing their misdoings. He had his prison. He had his armed guards. The emperors protested and legislated, but in vain. Nor was it merely in an accidental fashion that one wealthier private citizen thus became the master of his co-citizens, and his private will more powerful in their lives than the law. Already, from the beginning of the fourth century, the weaker man had begun consciously and deliberately to surrender himself to the more powerful, the poorer man to the

richer, for the sake of the influential patronage he thereby gained. This is the patrocinium and here, too, the emperors legislated in a contrary sense and here, too, they legislated in vain. Here, very notably, the coming "invasion" will wear down to nothing the check of their government.

The federation of self-governing municipalities is, throughout the later fourth century, steadily losing its importance. More and more there is beginning to count this new arrangement of patron and client -- we cannot yet say overlord and vassal -- and the empire in the West is beginning to be a mass of such private associations, based on ownership of land, associations not yet legal, a mass held together by one thing only, the fact -- itself steadily less and less of a reality -- that all these inhabitants are citizens of the one state that the central government protects. That central government is, too, the last support of the importance of the towns, and with the fifth century it is to disappear.

During these centuries of the steady decay of the imperial regime, of alternate chaos and temporary restoration, the Catholic Church has steadily grown and developed. It is the one institution that escapes the universal mortification, the one living free thing amid the new all-embracing mechanical despotism. Here alone does the tradition of individual initiative continue, of spiritual liberty, of social activity. Here alone do men continue to govern themselves, to find an escape from the paralysis to which, ultimately, the over-governed succumb. Popular life can, here, still find corporate expression; personality, stifled elsewhere, save in the army, can flourish. It is no matter for surprise that the best thought of the time is within the Church, that it is the Church alone which continues to breed thinkers and orators and rulers. The only live literature of this dull stagnant time is ecclesiastical, and inevitably the bishop's power and prestige increase enormously. He is indeed, in the city, the "one power capable of counterbalancing and resisting the all-pervading tyranny of the imperial bureaucracy." When that bureaucracy disappears what will be left to rival his place? Moreover, the possession of land is, in this new regime, to be the all-important, determining factor of political importance. The owner of land is to be ruler. In the coming age the Church is to be one of the greatest landowners of all. For in the new system of a rural economy the abbeys are to be, in the flourishing

countysides, what the bishops continue to be in the diminished towns.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CHANGES DURING THE FIFTH CENTURY, 395-526

The Empire which, at the time of Constantine's conversion, had thus, for a good hundred and fifty years already, suffered the continuous strain of these internal weaknesses, had during the same time been obliged to face the menace of troubles no less serious from beyond its frontier -- the menace of the "Barbarians." These were the people who dwelt beyond the frontier -- Picts to the north of Hadrian's wall in Britain, Goths, Franks, Alamans and other tribes of Germanic race to the east of the Rhine and the north of the Danube, Moors and Nubians to the south of Roman Africa. They were pastoral and agricultural peoples, living on the produce of their lands, civilized in various degrees, with a primitive and fluctuating political system and an equally primitive social organisation. For those among them who lived near to the frontier, the life within the empire was a source of perpetual attraction, partly from the comfort its superior material civilisation promised, partly from the greater security and protection of its more settled organisation. For these pastoral Barbarians were, and had been for centuries, at the mercy of peoples still more primitive, the hordes of fierce nomads whose sphere of operation was the vast continent that stretches from the Carpathians across the steppes of Russia beyond the Urals and the Caspian Sea as far as the very wall of China, a world of savage plunderers and destroyers never at rest, yellow-skinned non-Aryan peoples, Huns, Avars, Magyars, Tartars, Mongols, Turks. Against these the pastoral tribes had no defence. The organised might of the Roman world, its guarded frontier, its settled towns promised them security; and from a very early time they sought to enter it.

From the time of Marcus Aurelius (161-180) the defence of the long northern frontier was the chief anxiety of the State, the final reason for the army's domination of its life, political and economic. This anxiety was, in the later empire -- the empire of the third and fourth centuries -- enormously increased by the new developments within the army itself. In the first place the tactics, strategy and system of fortification were so altered by the necessity of this frontier warfare that the army almost disappeared as a mobile thing, before the demands made on it

to provide the innumerable garrisons of the new system. It was indeed a serious development that the time had now come when it was hardly possible to put 10,000 troops in the field, for all that the army numbered half a million. But far more serious was the fact that the army had really ceased to be Roman at all. Since Septimius Severus (193-211) it had been more and more recruited from the Barbarians themselves. By the time of Valentinian I (364-375) it was entirely Barbarian. The words "soldier" and "Barbarian" were henceforward synonymous.

It was a still graver development that the command, too, had ceased to be Roman. In the third century (Gallienus 253-268) the Roman senator and his class had been debarred from the command. The exclusion had then been extended to the provincial aristocracy, both the senatorial and that of the curiales. Already in the time of Constantine's father the officers of this almost Barbarian army were of the lowest ranks of provincial citizens. By the time of Constantine's death (337) they had ceased to be Roman at all. The army was, henceforth, a wholly Barbarian thing, officered by Barbarians, armed as the Barbarians were armed, using their methods as it used their weapons, even beginning to be clad in the once-despised Barbarian dress. Constantine favoured Franks; Theodosius Goths. Vandals and Alans, too, were to be found, and in the very highest posts. As in the third century the low class of officer had produced, inevitably, a low class of emperor in this state where the soldier was ruler, so now the Barbarian-held command brought the supreme posts of the empire within the Barbarians' grasp. No Barbarian, it is true, ever took for himself the imperial crown, but the daughters of Barbarians married the sons of emperors and Theodosius the Great's own grandson was thus half Barbarian in blood.

In addition to the now Barbarianised "regular" army, the empire disposed also of the troops of its allies, the Foederati. These were groups, tribes, "nations" of Barbarians, admitted within the Empire, granted lands on which to live, and giving in return military service. Such a nation were the Goths, settled on the Danube by Valens in 376. These Foederati kept all their national organisation, including their king, and their own laws. As it suited the imperial policy, or as their kings were able to exact the concession, they moved about within the empire for the empire's service.

The difference between the western empire in the fourth and in the fifth centuries is the difference between the first and second stage of a continuous development. In the fifth century that empire as a political unity disappears, but the disappearance is not due to revolution nor to conquest by foreign peoples. It is the term of the previous development -- a development whose pace has been accidentally quickened by unforeseen events, and which has of course been conditioned in its detail by the chance of the particular personalities engaged in it. The emperor has steadily ceased to count. The sixty years which followed the death of Theodosius the Great saw in succession two crowned weaklings -- his son, Honorius (395-423) and his grandson, Valentinian III (423-455) -- inert, incompetent princes who lived in an orientalised retirement at Ravenna while mightier forces decided the fate of their world. The Barbarian elements, already present in overwhelming force in the army of the fourth century had come, in the fifth century, to dominate it entirely and to dominate the court too. Between these Barbarians and what remained of Rome in the high places of the State, the rivalry was continuous. Ravenna is a court of endless intrigue. More than once the all-powerful subject is murdered: Stilicho, a Barbarian, by the order of Honorius; Aetius, the last great man of the Roman line, by Valentinian III -- a miserable debauchee who recalls the last of the Valois. In the next stage (455-476) the Barbarian is more powerful still. He murders Valentinian, the last of the line of Theodosius, and for the next twenty-one years sets up and dethrones and sets up again as emperor whoever seems most likely to play the part as he desires. For a short period there is no emperor at all. The Barbarian has not thought it worth while to nominate one. Finally, in 476, the Barbarian decides that the institution may just as well end. He orders the child who holds the title -- Romulus, whom in a kind of appropriate mockery men called Augustulus -- to resign, and he sends the insignia of the office to the emperor at Constantinople. No more emperors are needed in the West. The Barbarian will continue to rule as for the last fifty years, to rule nominally in the name of the remaining eastern emperor as, for those fifty years, he had ruled through his western colleague.

This period of the passing of the emperors was marked by the most serious breakdown of the frontier yet known, when hordes of the fiercer Barbarian nomads poured into Gaul and Spain and,

unhindered, ravaged and plundered for the best part of two years (407-409). From the anarchy of those years the imperial hold on these provinces never really recovered. It was now that the kings of the Barbarian foederati, thanks to accidental combinations of favourable circumstances -- the emperor's weakness, the unstable position of his Barbarian ministers, the jealousies of the court, and the scale of this unprecedented invasion -- were able to wrest unheard-of concessions, and so to achieve the beginnings of real independent political power.

To dislodge the marauding hordes the government at Ravenna could do no better than despatch into Gaul the nation of the Visigoths who, since the death of Theodosius in 395, had been a continual embarrassment. Their king, Alaric, had turned against the eastern emperor in whose territories this people was first settled, and, disappointed in his hopes of advancement, he had then for two years (406-408) ravaged Macedonia and Greece as far as the Peloponnesus. Next, as the price of peace, he was named commander-in-chief of Illyricum -- the key province where the two empires met. He used his position to attempt to dislodge his enemy the Vandal, Stilicho, then supreme at the western court. But Stilicho was too much for him, and Alaric's invasion of Italy from Illyricum was turned back. Stilicho's murder in 408 left the road open, and after an attempt to wring from the western emperor a concession of rank and a commission Alaric and his people swept down upon Italy as far as Rome, which in 410 fell to them. Alaric died shortly after, as he was preparing to cross from Sicily to Africa, and his nation was still in southern Italy when it was "commissioned" to serve in Gaul and Spain to deal with the remnants of the great invasion of 407-409. In southern Gaul the fighting went on in a haphazard, Barbarian fashion for another ten years, Visigoths as foederati in the service of Honorius fighting first against Alans, Suevi and Vandals, and then against the emperor's own Barbarian army under Constantius. The new feature of this war was that it ended in the establishment of the Visigothic king as the emperor's representative in the lands where he had defeated the empire's invaders. The first of the Barbarian kingdoms was thus founded, Toulouse its capital.

The Visigothic king at Toulouse was not independent of the emperor. The cession involved no revolution in law or administration, no wholesale change in ownership. It was not in

any sense a conquest. The king of a Barbarian allied nation was now the supreme authority, under the empire, in territory governed for the empire until now by imperial officials. The emperor's hold on these provinces through these officials had been lessening steadily before the change. With the change it shrank to a mere formality. Everything was still done in the emperor's name, but it was the new king's will that settled what should be done. For his own nation he was, as he had always been, master so far as their own law made him so. For the Roman population his rule was exercised through the Roman law and the courts and administrative service which, in the main, the Romans still manned. It cannot be too often emphasised that, in the establishment of these kingdoms, no political revolution was involved. What did accompany them was a wholesale material destruction, towns sacked and burnt, countrysides ravaged. The material organisation by which the ordered central government lived -- means of communication for example -- suffered too. And, the most important point of all, the substitution of Barbarian kings for the centralised rule of the *Respublica Romana* aided most powerfully that social revolution already in progress by which one class of citizens was becoming the master, the political and juridical lord, of another, and in which ownership of land and political authority were becoming fast associated. This revolution, under the new regime, proceeded, one may say in very general terms, with the positive assistance of the rulers.

The Barbarian kingdoms of this kind, ultimately established within the limits of the Roman Empire of the West, were five in all -- the Visigoths in Spain and Gaul; the Burgundians, from 443, in the valley of the Rhone and the lands between the Rhone and Italy; the Vandals in Africa from 430; the Franks in northern and western Gaul from 486; and the Ostrogoths in Italy from 493.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



3. THE CHURCHES OF THE WEST DURING THE CRISIS SPAIN, AFRICA, GAUL

The transformation of Western Europe in the course of the fifth century was by no means a uniform affair. The Barbarians were not all equally Barbarian. The mode of their establishment differed very greatly, and since the degree of the Catholic conquest, before the upheaval, also differed from province to province, [] the effect of the transformation was as varied in the religious world as in the political. Two questions naturally arise: the effect upon the papal centralising policy of this violent disintegration of political life; and its effect on the Catholic establishment in the several provinces, in Spain, Africa, Gaul, and Italy.

Spain had suffered greatly in this century of change. There were the invasions of 407-409, then the long war of Visigoths against Vandals, and Suevi. The Vandals soon passed into Africa, but the Suevi remained, established in Portugal and Galicia, to carry on for the next eighty years a sporadic warfare with the Visigoths.

Almost the only incident of the religious history of which any record remains, is the intervention of the pope St. Leo I in the controversy over Priscillian. Not all the losses of the upheaval had diminished that fierce animosity, and at the very beginning of St. Leo's pontificate, in the years 444-447, Turribius Bishop of Astorga in Galicia sent to Rome a kind of memorandum explaining that Priscillianism was by no means dead, that it numbered even bishops among its supporters, and asking the aid of the Roman See. St. Leo, in his reply, refers to the difficulty of communication with this distant country since the breakdown of the imperial system. There is no authority to enforce the old anti-Priscillianist legislation -- so useful a complement, with its heavy sanctions, to the Church's clemency -- synods are no longer held and therefore the heresy has a new lease of life. To sift out the hidden Priscillianists from the hierarchy, the pope sends a syllabus condemning in sixteen propositions the chief doctrines of the sect, and, his only means of intervening, he suggests that a general council of the bishops of Spain be summoned and the syllabus proposed for their signature. Those

who refuse to sign are to be excommunicated. If it is not possible to summon a general council the bishops of Galicia, at any rate, should meet.

Neither council could meet. Instead a formulary was drafted and sent to all the bishops. They signed without an exception: more than one, however, with strong reservations. There, apparently, the matter ended. The pope could advise, could command, but in the circumstances of the time, he must leave the execution of his decision to the local council and if this council could not meet the trouble must endure.

Apart from this incident we know little until, seventy years later, there is record of yet another Roman intervention. Spain had, for the time, passed under the rule of Theodoric the Ostrogoth, the Barbarian king who from Ravenna had ruled Italy since 493. In a sense Spain and Italy were, for a moment, reunited. The years of Theodoric's rule were years of peace, and it is perhaps to a new facility of communications that we owe the appeal of the Bishop of Ilice to Pope Hormisdas in 517. It was for a decision in disciplinary matters that Rome was approached. There was the question of communion with what Greek clergy came to Spain, for the sees of the East had been in schism for now thirty years and more. There was, too, the eternal question as to the lawfulness of episcopal elections, the ever-increasing complaint of simoniac prelates. Hormisdas replied by letters for all the bishops of Spain. The old laws governing elections were recalled, the sanctions against simony re-enacted. Provincial synods were to be held annually, and to provide for the execution of the reforms the pope named the Bishop of Astorga his vicar. As to the Greeks, they were to be received only on condition that they signed the formulary which the pope sent with his letters. []

The Vandal kingdom in Africa was exceptional in its relation to the empire for it was definitely the result of conquest, and the Vandals henceforward continued to be actively hostile to the empire now ruled from Ravenna. The Vandals first came into the empire as a body in the great invasion of 407, and not for nearly a century did they lose their original character of ferocious marauders. From Gaul they passed to the south of Spain, where the province of Andalusia to this day preserves in its name their memory. Thence they crossed the narrow strait into the Roman

Mauritania and, at the invitation of its governor, into Africa itself, as his allies in a revolt against the central government. They occupied Africa by conquest, with pitched battles and regular sieges, sacking and pillaging as they went. It was while they were besieging his city of Hippo that St. Augustine, in 430, sickened and died. The fruits of this conquest the government of Ravenna confirmed to the Vandals in a whole series of treaties. The great man of the movement was their king, Genseric, under whom they not only conquered Africa but, taking to the sea, became for half a century the terror of the Mediterranean. Political intrigue had brought them into Africa, and it invited Genseric to Italy too where, in 455, he sacked the ancient capital and carried off into captivity, in true Barbarian fashion, the widow and daughters of the recently murdered Valentinian III. One of these girls was married to a Vandal, and it is with the last of the Vandal kings of Africa that the race of Theodosius finally disappears from history.

The kingdom was exceptional, too, in that the Vandals, alone of these Arian barbarian rulers, were bitter persecutors, and under their rule a last chapter was added to the African Church's martyrology. The Vandals brought with them into Africa an organised clergy, and soon there began what was, to all intents and purposes, a war of Arian revenge on Catholicism. The churches were burnt, all assemblies of Catholics forbidden, the bishops and priests rounded up and deported. After twenty years of this the emperor, Valentinian III, intervened and Genseric answered his pleas to the extent of allowing a Catholic bishop at Carthage. This bishop died in 457 -- two years after Valentinian's murder, at the opening of the last twenty years of the imperial regime -- and Genseric reverted to the policy of repression. It was forbidden to elect a new bishop and for another twenty years the persecution resumed its way. The administrative system had remained unchanged since the days of the Roman governors, and its personnel was still Roman and therefore Catholic. Whence an active Arian propaganda among the official classes and, from the refusals, numerous martyrdoms.

Genseric died, after a reign of fifty years, in 477 and was succeeded by a still more fanatical Arian, Huneric. The new king set himself to exterminate Catholicism within a given time. A great congress of Catholic bishops was summoned -- they still

numbered as many as 466 -- and on their refusal to be convinced by their Arian rivals, the king announced that the full Roman law against heretics would now be applied against the Catholics, who were given four months in which to apostatize. The bishops were exiled, some to Corsica where they were set to work in the forests, others to the interior of Africa. The laity found every profession and every trade closed against them unless they could produce a certificate of conformity. There were numerous apostasies, numerous forced baptisms. There were also many martyrs, who died in terrible tortures. Within the year the persecutor was dead, putrefactus et ebulliens vermibus, but the work of extermination continued. The pope, Felix III, and the emperor, Zeno -- excommunicated through the Acacian schism -- both intervened, pleading for a mitigation of the terror, but in vain.

Meanwhile, within African Catholicism chaos reigned. There were no bishops, no churches, hardly any priests, apostates of all degrees, and in 487 the pope, in a council at Rome, drafted a series of rules to regulate the reconciliation of the apostates.

That same year the persecution began to slacken. Once again a bishop was allowed in Carthage and then, in 494, other bishops were recalled from exile and their churches restored to them. In the provinces where the Arians were fewest, there was a kind of peace. Elsewhere the old law of repression was maintained in force.

The peace, such as it was, lasted but a short time. With the accession of Trasimund (500) the bishops were once more deported -- this time to Sardinia. Among them was the most distinguished Latin theologian of the century, St. Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe. For the quarter of a century during which Trasimund reigned the persecution continued and then, with the accession of Hilderic in 523,-it ceased as suddenly as it had begun. This king was the son of the savage Huneric by his marriage with the captive daughter of Valentinian III. In him the line of Theodosius the Great plays its last part in history. He recalled the bishops, restored the churches, allowed all the vacant sees to be filled. For the first time in almost a hundred years African Catholicism knew the peace of ordinary life.

In that hundred years Mauritania, the most westerly province

had been abandoned to the native tribes; the Moors had occupied Numidia, and from Zeugitana the Church had disappeared entirely. The Vandal kings ruled over an Africa that had shrunk very considerably by comparison with the Africa they had conquered in the last days of St. Augustine's life.

Hilderic, by blood half Roman and the last descendant of the old imperial family, pro-Catholic in his religious sympathies, in friendly relation with the reigning Roman Emperor, Justinian, was too novel a type to win much sympathy from his Vandal nobility. That he was not a soldier increased their hostility, and in 532 a revolt broke out headed by the heir to the throne. Hilderic was captured and dethroned and thereupon Justinian -- braving the warnings of counsellors who recalled the disastrous defeat at sea of the last Roman force that had ventured itself against these barbarians -- intervened with a fleet and an army. Hilderic and his friends were promptly massacred and then, on the 14th September, the imperial general Belisarius laid hold of Carthage. His victory was the beginning of the end of the Vandal regime. With ease, almost, in the next few years he subdued one district after another and by 539 Africa -- as much as the Vandals had managed to keep of it - - was reunited to the empire. The empire's religion was Catholicism and it was now the Arians who were persecuted as heretics.

The Church in Gaul, at the moment when the upheaval of the fifth century began, had just lost its first great historical figure. This was St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, who died in 397 and whose work was the foundation upon which all the later structure of French Catholicism was built, for it was St. Martin who first systematically undertook to convert the pagan countryside. He was not himself a native of Gaul but was born in Pannonia, about the time of Constantine's conversion. His father was a soldier and a successful one and this determined the saint's early career. He, too, though much against his will, must be a soldier. His first preference, for a life of prayer and solitude, survived his military life, however, and a meeting with St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, led to his establishment as a solitary in the wild and inaccessible retreat of Marmoutier, on the Loire, nor far from Poitiers itself. Disciples gathered round him and here, between 360 and 375, there was formed the first monastic settlement of the Western Church.

Like the monks of the earliest Eastern groups, these disciples of St. Martin lived as solitaries, coming together for certain common exercises of piety, and practising heroic austerities. Unlike their Eastern models they lived in the midst of a population wholly Pagan and, inevitably, they added to their monastic occupations the work of their neighbours' conversion. Sermons, instructions, the exposure of the foolishness of the rustic Paganism, the practical exercise of the charity of Christ, the example of their own heroic virtue began gradually to tell. By the time of St. Hilary's death much had been accomplished and more still when, eight years later, the clergy of Tours came to announce to Martin that he was their new bishop. His elevation was for the saint simply an occasion of extending the scope of the work to which he had given himself. He established a new monastery at Tours and, dressed in the same simple costume, he continued as a bishop to live with the same austere simplicity to achieve which he had left the world thirty years before. Long before he died he was the greatest force in the Church of Gaul. Everywhere in the West his monks were sought as bishops. From his death (397) his tomb at Tours became the goal of innumerable pilgrimages, the scene of many miracles, and to Martin were speedily paid the same liturgical honours which, for a long time now, it had been customary to pay to the martyrs. He is the first holy man not a martyr to be regarded officially, as we say now, as a saint.

The west of Gaul had been the field of Martin's apostolate. In the generation that followed his death a new centre of similar work, also monastic, arose in the south. This was the settlement on the island of Lerins, off the coast of Provence. The monks, here also, lived a life that followed Eastern fashions, a combination of the solitary and the cenobite, an austerity in the matter of abstinences that verged on the heroic, with an attachment to the practice of manual labour and, also, a devotion to the study of Sacred Scripture.

In the first quarter of the fifth century, as the range of the central power began to shrink, Treves had lost its civil importance; it was Arles that was now the chief town of Roman Gaul. To the west of it the Visigoths were established, with Toulouse as their chief centre. To the east the Burgundians would soon be ceded a similar settlement. But for yet another fifty years or so, the centre of Gaul with Arles for its capital would continue to be

occupied by armies and officials obedient to the, by now, distant emperors in Ravenna. Something of the ecclesiastical history of Arles we have seen in Pope Zosimus' exaltation of its bishop as a kind of papal vicar with authority over all the other metropolitans and in the speedy revocation of this novelty by Pope Boniface I. The bishop for whom it had been created, Patroclus, survived by just five years the death of the Emperor Constantius III, whose favour had been the true cause of his temporary greatness. To succeed Patroclus the Church of Arles called in Lerins, electing as bishop the founder of that holy place, Honoratus (426). He reigned, however, for two years only and in his place yet another monk of Lerins was chosen -- Hilary.

St. Hilary of Arles showed himself a true bishop. He continued his life of mortification. He gave himself to preaching and to the conversion of the countryside, to the correction of his clergy and of his suffragans, and to providing good bishops -- very often from Lerins -- as the sees fell vacant. Like every reformer he made enemies, and these appealed complainingly to Rome. Finally, his zeal to correct abuses took him into territories beyond his metropolitan jurisdiction. He was found arranging episcopal successions as far away as Besancon -- and that before the bishop, Celidonius, was really dead. When the bishop recovered and found that, during his illness, St. Hilary had consecrated a good man to take his place there was more than a little trouble. St. Hilary then took it upon himself to summon a council and depose Celidonius.

Celidonius had in his time served the emperor as a judge. The death sentences he had passed on criminals were, it was now said, an obstacle to his consecration. Again, he had been married and, it was said, he had married a widow. This again made his consecration irregular. Celidonius appealed to Rome (444) and went there in person to see the case through. St. Hilary followed, actually to lecture the pope on the facility with which he listened to complaints from the disaffected and disobedient and then, in his simplicity, to depart with the appeal still pending, in what looked very like flagrant contempt. The trial finished. Celidonius cleared himself. Then the storm broke over the unlucky Bishop of Arles. The pope, unfortunately for Hilary, was St. Leo the Great. Celidonius he reinstated, and in a letter to the bishops of the province he denounced the usurpation of the Bishop of Arles unsparingly. As a punishment he stripped him

of all his rights as metropolitan, attaching his province to the see of Vienne and only allowing him to retain his own see as a special act of grace. It was an execution with the full rigour of the law, nor, despite St. Hilary's endeavours, did the pope relent. After St. Hilary's death (448) a new division of provinces was indeed made, and Arles recovered its rank as a metropolitan see, but for as long as St. Hilary lived he was a living witness of the reality of Rome's superior jurisdiction (as was to be, a few years later, a much greater than he, the Patriarch of Alexandria) and of the West's unquestioning acceptance of it.

The year that saw the death of St. Leo (461) saw also the murder of the last emperor to matter in the West -- Maiorian. He was also the first emperor for nearly a century to show himself in Gaul. Three years later the death of the patrician Aegidius removed the last Roman general who remained in touch with Ravenna. The last days, the last hours of the Roman rule were approaching. The Visigoths at Toulouse knew it well and, abandoning the fiction of their status as the emperor's men defending a menaced province, they set themselves to capture what they could of the now deserted centre of Gaul.

One by one the great cities were attacked and fell to them, the inhabitants sometimes resisting not unsuccessfully until orders came from the emperor to surrender. He had found it more convenient to arrange with the enemy.

Of the life, ecclesiastical as well as civil, of this unhappy time, we possess a by no means inconsiderable memorial in the work of St. Sidonius Apollinaris. He was himself of Lyons, sprung from a family of senatorial rank. His wife's father -- Avitus--was for a brief moment emperor, and Sidonius climbed the cursus honorum to its heights, becoming Prefect of Rome in 468. He returned to Gaul and in 470 was elected Bishop of the Auvergne. It needs no great effort to believe how greatly this was against the wishes of this cultured, leisurely aristocrat upon whom, now, the end of all things seemed come. The Visigoths were attacking. He was isolated from Ravenna, even had Ravenna been disposed to help him. He rallied the city to defend itself and resisted stoutly. In 475, however, the end came. The empire -- it was almost its last act -- ceded the city to Euric the Visigothic king. The bishop was carried off a prisoner to Toulouse. From his letters written during this time we learn

much of the " Barbarians " -- amongst other things that their Arianism seems to have sharpened with the new spirit of conquest, and that the king had found means to prevent the election of bishops to many of the sees. Two years later Sidonius was allowed to return. Euric had no longer any anxiety that the ex-emperor's son-in-law, the one-time prefect of Rome, might combine with Ravenna against him. Since 476 the emperors had gone. At Ravenna, too, the Barbarian now ruled openly.

During these twenty years that lie between the deaths of St. Leo and of St. Sidonius (461-479) the council of bishops continued to meet, irregularly, haltingly, in a kind of ever feebler decrescendo. The Visigothic advance toward the east, and the Burgundian advance down the valley of the Rhone slowly set up a new barrier against communications with Italy. The action of the Papacy on these now distant churches is felt more and more rarely. To the north of the new Visigothic conquests, however, all isolated Roman army still maintained itself: Its leader was Syagrius whom the Barbarians called "the King of the Romans." He was the son of that Aegidius who died in 464, and he too was about to disappear.

The conquerors of Syagrius were not, however, the hitherto invincible Visigoths. They were the Franks, associated with the empire for two centuries, now as -foes and now as foederati, and settled under their several kings (for they lacked the unity of the Visigoths) on the lower Rhine since the time of Constantine's rather, Constantius I (293-306). The Franks were, of all the foederati, the least civilised. There was still about them a crude brutal bloodthirstiness that had long disappeared from the Goths and the Burgundians, and, another mark of the small effect of their long contact with the empire, they were still pagans. The final stage in their history, in which they, too, begin to occupy the territory of the empire as rulers really independent, begins with the succession of Clovis as king of the Franks centred round Tournai. This was in 481. Five years later he had overcome Syagrius and was master of the north of Gaul as far as the Loire. He then turned on the Alamans whom he drove back across the Rhine, and upon the other kings of his own nation whom he also defeated and slew. In 493 he married, and his wife, a Burgundian, was a Catholic. Three years later he himself became a Catholic and was baptised at Rheims by the

bishop, St. Remy. Thousands of his warriors followed his example.

The stupendous importance of this conversion to all the succeeding history of the Church is one of the commonplaces of history. At the moment when it took place not one of the princes who ruled what had been, and what still was, the Roman Empire was a Catholic. The remaining emperor, Anastasius, was a Monophysite and his Catholic subjects were cut off from the head of the Church by the Acacian Schism. [] The new Barbarian rulers of the West, Ostrogoths, Burgundians, Visigoths, and Vandals were, all of them, Arians. That the new conqueror of the north should prefer to be Catholic was the first break in a century of steady loss, the first sign of Catholicism's future grip on the public life of the new Western world.

Its effect upon the future of the Franks was not less momentous. In their case, and in their case alone, there was not between the civilised subjects and the Barbarian ruler the greatest of all barriers, namely, that the one was Catholic and the other anti-Catholic. Here alone was the fusion of Roman and Barbarian possible from the very beginning, and it began from the very moment of the baptism. The bishops, who, when the chaos of the change had passed, were everywhere revealed as the only leaders of what still endured, were, in the kingdom where the Catholic Franks ruled, not merely neutral spectators of the new order but its most active supporters. Alone of these Barbarian kingdoms the kingdom of the Franks survived, and it gave their name to the vast Roman territory where they established it. The Vandals in Africa lasted until 534, the Ostrogoths in Italy till 554, the Visigoths in Spain until 711. But under the Franks, Gaul became France, the fruit of the union between Frank and Gallo-Roman based on their common acceptance of the Catholic Faith. Gibbon was right when he spoke of the French monarchy as founded on the Catholic bishops.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



4. THE ROMAN SEE AND ITALY

St. Leo, pope from 440 to- 461, is the first of the three popes who alone of the long line are popularly styled "the Great." He was not Roman by birth, but from an early age he was one of the Roman clergy. He rose to be one of the seven deacons, and he was by 430 sufficiently important for St. Cyril of Alexandria to enlist his support against Nestorius. He was the friend also of Cassian, and with Cassian he assisted Celestine I in the Nestorian trouble. So, too, a few years later, it was his advice that guided Sixtus III in the final despatch of Julian of Eclanum. The imperial court, also, realised his worth and made use of his diplomatic talents. He was, in fact, acting as its ambassador in Gaul when, Sixtus III dying (August, 440), he was elected pope. As pope he was destined to fulfil all his early promise, to be, above all, the firm administrator and ruler, the touch of whose hands of steel an apostolic diplomacy kept ever from harshness. To this invaluable asset of a truly Roman spirit informed by the charity of the Gospel, St. Leo added intellectual attainments of a very high order. He was master of a singularly beautiful Latinity, clear, simple, and strong as his own disposition, and he was that rare thing among popes, a constructive theologian. He is almost the last pope to use as his mother tongue the Latin of classical antiquity, and the only pope to add his personal quota to the corpus of early Catholic theology. With St. Leo the golden age of the fathers reaches its term. His theological competence found full scope in the controversy as to the relations of the human and the divine in Our Lord which, twenty years after Nestorius, still divided the East, and which issued, in St. Leo's time, in the two great opposing councils at Ephesus (the Latrocinium and at Chalcedon (431 and 451). []

The West knew the pope rather as an administrator and, in the domain of faith, as the most brilliant exponent so far of the prerogatives of his primatial see. How he exercised that superior authority in the distant churches of Gaul and Spain has already been noted. He was equally active in what provinces of the diocese of Africa remained to the empire. From the most of them he was cut off once the anti-Catholic Vandals were possessed of them, but for fifteen years yet western Numidia and Mauretania Cesariensis escaped Genseric; and during that

time St. Leo's intervention, in the traditional manner, is constant. He had heard of disorders in the matter of episcopal elections and in a letter to the hierarchy of the province of Mauretania he commissioned the bishop, Potentius, to enquire into the matter in his name. The enquiry proved the accusations true. Men had been consecrated who were the husbands of widows, or who had themselves been twice married. Others again had been elected who were not already clerics. St. Leo acted with moderation. Except for the bigamists (in the canonical sense) he would overlook what had been done, confirming these irregularly elected bishops but insisting that the law must be observed for the future. A convert Donatist bishop -- for from the moment of the Vandal invasion the penal code against the sect was no longer enforced and it revived in more than one place -- he allowed to keep his rank and authority over his people converted with him. Other cases he left to the judgement of the local bishops. Finally he directed that, for the future, care should be taken not to create sees outside the cities. To set up bishops in the villages would bring the episcopate to ridicule.

To appreciate as it deserves the record of St. Leo's intervention in Africa, we need to recall the relations between the African bishops and Rome twenty years earlier, in the days when St. Leo was still but a deacon of the apostolic see. [] The pope makes no apology for his intervention, nor does he seem to think the occasion has come for any comment on the anti-Roman legislation of the famous Council of 427. Nor does he propose himself as the obvious substitute for that great annual council whose operation the invasions have so rudely interrupted. Like his predecessors before him, he makes the fact of his holding the Roman See the sole reason for all he says and does, in Africa as elsewhere. All that the Africans in 426 had protested the pope must not do -- hear appeals from Africa, send legates into Africa to hold enquiries and execute his judgements -- St. Leo, twenty years later, continues to do, and this as simply as though none had ever questioned these rights of his see. He was of course fully aware of the delicate susceptibilities of these African bishops and, if he was resolute in his practical affirmation of the rights of Rome, he could, on occasion, study their sensibilities. So it was, for example, in the case of the bishop Lupicinus who had appealed to him from their excommunication, and whose case he sent back to them to be re-tried. Nevertheless the pope desires that in all future cases

where there is question of litigation between the bishops, a full report shall be sent to him of the matters in dispute and the solution arrived at, so that it may be strengthened by his sentence too.

St. Leo was the pope in whose time fell Attila's invasion of Italy and Genseric's descent on Rome. Tradition describes him as warding off the first from the threatened city by the sheer might of his own holy personality, and history records how he persuaded Genseric to retire with what booty he cared to take. The saintly pope is already creating the role in which the medieval bishop was so often to figure, the protector of his people in temporals no less than in spirituals. In the affair of the Manichees -- the one domestic event of his reign known to us in any detail -- it may be conceived that he protected them in both.

It was the fate of Manicheism to be universally persecuted. On account of the moral aberrations it harboured and encouraged, it was proscribed by pagan emperors like Diocletian, by Buddhists in India and China, and of course by Catholic princes too. Already before the conversion of Constantine, Manicheism was reduced, in the Roman Empire, to the condition of a secret society. From time to time there were arrests, trials, and revelations of disgusting moral disorder. Rome was the scene of such an exposure in 443. The ancient capital had been for some years a natural place of refuge for the Africans in flight from the Vandal invasion. They brought with them a proportion of Manichees, to swell the ranks of the existing organisation in Rome. The expansion of the sect did not escape St. Leo. He brought the matter to the notice of the civil authority and soon, at Rome, too, there were arrests and trials and revelations. Those proved guilty were condemned to life imprisonment. St. Leo did more. He circularised the bishops of Italy, communicating the official reports of the trials and bidding them guard their people from the new contamination. The emperor, Valentinian III, on his side, renewed the law of his pagan predecessor, but, it is interesting to note, he did not renew the penalty of death by fire there enacted.

Rome itself was by the time of the death of St. Leo (November 11, 461) a Catholic city at last. All that was left of the old religion were the temples, unoccupied, empty, falling slowly into ruin (for as yet none had been consecrated to Catholic uses), and the

social habits of such feasts as the Lupercalia. It was Gelasius I (492-496) who finally brought about their suppression. Year by year the churches increased in number, and around them a first beginning of the system of parishes. The dissident heretics who, in one degree or another, had troubled the unity of the Roman church for two centuries were gone, Donatists, Novatians, Manichees and their "Bishops of Rome" with them. Gone too were the Pelagians, although sufficient of these survived in Venetia to provoke from St. Leo a strong reminder to the metropolitan of Aquileia of his duty as guardian of the purity of the faith. Thirty years later still and Pope Gelasius is again exhorting to the same effect. To this universal submission of Rome to its bishop there was but one exception. The Barbarians who were now Rome's real rulers were Arians, and the popes had perforce to submit to the facts of Arian churches in their own city and an Arian bishop. To distinguish themselves from the heretical titular they signed themselves " Bishop of the Catholic Church of Rome," or " Bishop of the Catholic Church," a style which has survived to this day as the consecrated formula for certain official acts.

These years so barren, in the West, of events of ecclesiastical importance are years in which the routine of administration becomes more and more of a tradition; and for all that the new "national" frontiers are proving more and more of a barrier to easy communication between the pope and the bishops of the more distant sees, the tradition of intervention, of appeal and judgement, never weakens, is never lost. The opportunities are fewer, the intervention less efficacious. But the Roman habit remains, nor is it ever repudiated by the churches of these countries now politically independent of that power on which, in its last years, the popes had begun to rely as on the effective agent through whom their sanctions might function.

The main centre of interest in the Church History of the fifth century is of course east of the Adriatic, in the great Christological controversies associated with the Councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451), and in the long drawn out social and political crisis which follows this last. [] Syria and Egypt are, during this half-century, the scene of a never ending religious warfare that strains all the resources of the imperial government, until, to save the empire's political unity it devises a compromise between Catholics and heretics. This is the

famous Henoticon of the emperor Zeno (482). Its author is the Catholic Bishop of Constantinople, Acacius. For his share in it he is excommunicated by that zealous guardian of orthodoxy Pope Felix III (483-492), and his church -- and indeed all Eastern Catholicism -- supporting him, there begins, in 484, the long Acacian Schism (448-519). The century ends with the pope in a curious isolation. Throughout the West the rulers, with one exception, are heretical Arians: and the exception is the one real Barbarian among them, and a Catholic of very recent conversion. The ruler of the East, the Roman Emperor, is a heretic too, a Monophysite; and the Catholics of the empire, thanks to Acacius, are in schism. It is at this lamentable time that the ambition and jealousy of some of the leading Roman clergy inaugurate a series of disputes which are to trouble the peace of Rome itself for nearly forty years. Before they are healed there is once more a Catholic emperor at Constantinople. The peaceful relations of the Arian king in Italy, Theodoric, with the Empire are broken. There is a kind of persecution, and the pope dies in Theodoric's prison (526), and the last great intellectual of Christian Antiquity, Boethius, is put to death at his command. The truce between Italy and the desolation, which until now has spared her, is at an end; nor will] peace return until Italy, the old Italy, is burnt and ravaged as was no other part of this unhappy empire.

The Roman Church itself had been singularly fortunate during this century of political revolution. While the empire was fast disappearing, and while everywhere in the West Catholicism was becoming subject to Arian rulers, its calm, ordered life went on with hardly any disturbance. But as the century drew to its close this happy state of things came to an end, and, thanks very largely to clerical ambition, an age of bitter dissension succeeded, marked by schisms and destined to leave to future generations more than one mischievous precedent in the matter of papal elections.

The choice of the Roman bishop, like the choice of every other bishop, had originally been the exclusive business of his own church. Disputed elections were not unknown, even in the days of the persecutions, nor scandalous attempts to enthrone a rival to the pope. It was one of the inevitable consequences of the growth of the Church after Constantine, and its new status as a body recognised and protected by the emperor, that,

henceforward, such disputes passed rapidly into the political life of the city, so that the government could no longer be indifferent to the circumstance of the election. Twice in the fourth century, when the hostility of the rival parties had developed into riots and pitched battles in the streets, the government had intervened in the interests of public order. The first occasion was during the reign of the usurper Maxentius (307-312). We know almost nothing about it, except that a faction set up Heraclius in opposition to the pope, Eusebius, that the emperor banished both pope and anti-pope, that the pope died shortly afterwards, and that the Roman See then remained vacant for nearly two years.

The second occasion was the much more serious affair of Ursinus fifty years later. This dispute went back to the exile of Pope Liberius in 356 for his opposition to the Arian emperor, Constantius II. Liberius exiled, the government installed in his place Felix, his archdeacon. Three years later Liberius was allowed to return and, although the government seems to have had in mind a regime where Liberius and Felix would together rule the Roman Church, the faithful were of another mind. They rose and Felix fled. Later he returned, and made another bid for power. He was once more defeated and thenceforward lived in retirement until his death (365) when, thanks to the tact and clemency of Liberius, his followers submitted and unity was restored. Nine months later, however, before there had been time for the old bitterness to disappear, and while the expediency of Liberius' policy was still a subject of bitter disagreement, Liberius too died. The minority of intransigents whom the dead pope's mercy had scandalised, thereupon elected Ursinus. The majority elected Damasus -- a one-time supporter of Felix. The immediate sequel to the election was a siege of the basilica held by the Ursinians and a three days' riot in which many lives were lost. The government recognised Damasus. Ursinus and his supporters were banished. None the less, so long as Damasus reigned (366-384), they continued to be a menace to the peace of his Church.

Thirty years after Damasus the civil authority once more had occasion to intervene, and again on the ground of public order. This time, however, it seems to have made its own convenience the rule by which it decided which of the rivals was the legitimate bishop. Pope Zosimus, as the story of his intervention

in the affair of Pelagius has shown, was as headlong in his methods as he was imperious in his tone. Long before the end of his short reign there were complaints from his clergy and petitions to the emperor. These were still undecided and Zosimus occupied with the petitioners when, somewhat unexpectedly, he died (December 27, 418). The division in the Church showed immediately. While the majority of the clergy were burying the pope at St. Laurence-outside-the-walls, his chief assistant Eulalius assembled his supporters at the Lateran and had himself elected. The next day, ignoring this coup de main, the rest of the clergy met in accordance with canonical custom, and elected the priest Boniface. The government decided for Eulalius and Boniface was banished. He appealed against the decision and, thanks to the influence of the Empress Galla Placidia, the emperor [] now allowed that the election was doubtful and summoned both parties to Ravenna where a council would judge the matter. The council, however, could not come to a decision, and a greater council was thereupon convoked to meet at Spoleto in six months. Meanwhile neither Eulalius nor Boniface were to return to Rome. This pact Eulalius broke, in his ambition to pontificate at Easter in the Lateran basilica. He was, however, arrested and expelled while, under the protection of the soldiery, the Bishop of Spoleto, whom the emperor had appointed to administer the Roman Church until the coming council, carried out the accustomed solemnities. This raid of Eulalius ended the government's dilemma. He was simply set aside and Boniface recognised without further formality. The council at Spoleto was revoked, and the incident closed. The twelve weeks it had lasted were the sole brief interruption of a peace otherwise unbroken for a hundred and twenty years (379-498).

The disturbances that marked the end of the fifth century were of a more serious character. Their cause did not lie solely in differences of policy, but, to some extent, in the increasing attraction of the papacy as a source of wealth and power. The see had been liberally endowed by Constantine, and the social importance of the pope fifty years later had been the subject of the pagan Prefect of Rome's reply to Damasus asking when he too would become a Christian, "To-morrow -- if you will make me Bishop of Rome." Now, in 483, the Pope Simplicius -- either to check a growing custom or to provide against an abuse that threatened -- forbade and annulled in advance any alienation of

church property by a future pope made as a reward to those who had hoped to elect him. The decree witnesses certainly to a decline from the primitive simplicity of the Roman clerical life.

In the two elections which followed, those of 492 and 496, the decree does not seem to have been transgressed, but when Anastasius II died, in 498, there was a double election and a division which lasted throughout the whole pontificate of the new pope Symmachus (498-514), and in the course of this schism the decree of 483 was renewed in a rather curious fashion. Anastasius II, like Liberius in the previous century, had alienated many of the clergy by his conciliatory policy towards repentant schismatics. At his death each party elected its pope, the intransigents Laurence and the late pope's supporters Symmachus. As in 418, and in 366, there were riots, battles in the streets between the two parties, sieges of basilicas, general disorder and not a few deaths. There was no longer any emperor in Italy. It fell to the Gothic king Theodoric to intervene, and Theodoric was an Arian. He decided in favour of Symmachus and Laurence made his submission.

It was, however, a submission in name alone, for Laurence turned next to direct a campaign against his rival's good name and he was so successful that Symmachus was summoned to Ravenna to clear himself, while Theodoric appointed a Visitor at Rome to rule the see until the affair was judged. It was Theodoric again who chose the judges -- a council of bishops which met in Rome in May, 500. Symmachus, after a first consent, refused to appear. The bishops, refusing to judge an absent man, wished to go home. Theodoric constrained them to remain. The deadlock was complete and it lasted for eighteen months until in October, 501, the council solemnly left the question of the pope's guilt to God. They would not condemn where they had not judged, nor would they consent to judge the accused in his absence. It was indeed "absolution by default." [] 'The council then broke up and, to add to the trouble, Laurence reappeared, strong this time in support of Theodoric. The riots and the street fighting were resumed.

Symmachus, free from the royal council, now called his bishops together and in November, 502, solemnly protesting that his see was beyond man's judgement, he consented to clear himself of the charges made. It had been alleged that he had contravened

the decree of 483. This he did not so much deny as declare the crime impossible since the decree, from the circumstances in which it was made, was null and void. Now, remodelled, he presented it to the council. It was accepted, and confirmed, too, by Theodoric. Symmachus, however, did not manage to secure more than a minority of his clergy, and despite the council of 502 the miniature civil war continued for another five years, until Theodoric abandoned Laurence, whereupon his party collapsed. Symmachus, for the remainder of his reign, was undisturbed, but it was not until his death (514) and the election of Hormisdas that the dissentients really submitted and that unity was restored.

Hormisdas (514-523) owes his place in Church History to the settlement of a greater scandal than the local dissensions in Rome. This was the schism of Acacius, which for thirty-five years had divided East and West, and given the Monophysites a whole generation in which to entrench themselves unhindered in Syria and Egypt. The religious reunion involved of course a renewal of relations between pope and emperor, between, that is to say, these Roman subjects of the Gothic king and their distant sovereign at Constantinople who was also, nominally, Theodoric's sovereign too. The schism -- which antedated Theodoric's coming into Italy -- had certainly helped to make his independence a reality. Its termination might be expected to have some reaction on his standing. Theodoric had also been intimately concerned with the affairs of the Roman Church, and it was very natural that when, in 515, the new pope first approached the emperor, the Gothic king should be consulted. He made no objection to the scheme which would bring together once more his Catholic subjects and their ancient sovereign. Perhaps the fact that the sovereign was himself as little a Catholic as Theodoric -- Monophysite where the Goth was Arian -- made it easy to acquiesce. The negotiations, however, failed.

Four years later, in very different circumstances, the matter was reopened. The Monophysite emperor was now dead. His successor was a Catholic and, a thing unknown for more than a hundred years, a Latin. This was Justin I, and to seek reconciliation with Rome was the first act of his reign. Hormisdas stated his terms -- the famous Formula of Hormisdas [] which all the bishops of the East were to sign, renewing their belief in the traditional primacy of the Roman See -- and soon

the Eastern Empire was the scene of a vigorous restoration of Catholicism directed by the imperial government. One of its features was the renewal of the old policy against religious dissidents. The remnants of the old heretical sects were persecuted, their property confiscated, and their churches handed over to the Catholics. Among these sects were the Arians.

Theodoric moved by the complaints of his co-religionists, undertook their defence. The news of the persecution, apparently, fanned into flame Theodoric's growing suspicion -- bred of the new frequency of relations since the healing of the schism -- of a plot between his Romans and the emperor. A timely denunciation led to the arrest and trial for treason of three officers of high rank, almost the last representatives in public life of the old consular stock, the Patrician Albinus, Boethius, and Symmachus his father-in-law. They were judged by the senate and unanimously judged guilty. After a longish interval they were put to death. That interval Boethius employed to write the classic ever since associated with his name, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, one of the world's great books. But in Boethius the Gothic king's fury slew a much greater man than even the author of this famous meditation. Boethius was perhaps the last man in the West to possess, as his natural inheritance, the philosophic and scientific culture of classical antiquity. He was a Catholic and a theologian and, most important of all for the historian of the medieval culture, a student of Aristotle. His translations and commentaries of Aristotle were, in fact, almost the only source through which the early Middle Ages knew anything at all of the thought which its greatest mind was one day to use to make good the insufficiencies of St. Augustine and to give the Christian faith, at last, an exposition rationally adequate. []

Boethius and his companions were not Theodoric's only victims. To save the Arians the king despatched an embassy to Constantinople with the request that the forcibly converted should be given back their religious liberty, and that the confiscated churches should be restored to them. It was a request for the restoration of Arianism, and to lead the embassy that made it, Theodoric chose the pope. This was John I, who had succeeded Hormisdas two years before. The mission made its way to the capital and the pope, the first pope ever to set foot

in Constantinople, was received with every imaginable honour. But his diplomacy gained nothing for Theodoric, and on their return, empty handed, the king threw the ambassadors into prison. There, in May, 526, the pope died of his sufferings. []

Three months later Theodoric, too, was dead, but not before he had made over the Catholic churches of his capital to the Arians. Also he had perpetrated the striking innovation of naming the new pope -- Felix IV, ex iussu Theodorici regis, to quote the simple phrase of the Liber Pontificalis which is all we know of the affair. With this heretic king's nomination of Felix IV in 526 there opened for the Roman See a highly disturbed ten years. Felix, pope by grace of Theodoric's innovation, proceeded, by an innovation still more striking, to nominate the cleric who was to be his own successor, giving as his reason that this method would save the expense of the inevitable disputes. He first of all made certain of the support of the new king who had succeeded Theodoric, and then named the man of his choice, the archdeacon Boniface. The senate, too, supported him, and all went well until, November 22, 530, Felix died. His procedure had been novel and it had also flagrantly broken the law of Symmachus, not yet thirty years old, which forbade such preoccupation with the succession while the pope was yet alive. The majority of the clergy, therefore, ignored the late pope's nomination and elected Dioscoros, an able Greek to- whom had been owing the final victory of Symmachus over his foes, and who had been the chief agent of the peace with the East in the time of Hormisdas. Boniface of course had his partisans. Both were consecrated, and only the sudden death of Dioscoros saved Rome from a renewal of the scenes of 499. His party were sufficiently disinterested not to give him a successor but to recognise Boniface. Once more all seemed well.

Boniface, however, was not of those whom success chastens. He treated the one-time supporters of his rival with contumely and then, but more solemnly, in full synod, imitating Felix IV, proceeded also to name his successor -- the deacon Vigilius. Some time afterwards he rescinded the decree as being beyond his powers, and then, October 17, 532, his short but not uneventful reign ended. At his death the disorders, to whose presence the unseemly transactions of the last few years point so unmistakably, broke out in all their unpleasantness: intrigues, of course, riots, and bribes, to pay which even the

church plate was sold, are what the history of the vacancy has to record, and one of the chief acts of the pope who followed -- John II -- is a strong law against simony.

John II reigned for little longer than his predecessor (532-535) and his successor, Agapitus I, died abroad -- at Constantinople, where he had gone as the envoy of the Gothic king in a hopeless attempt to ward off Justinian's impending reconquest of Italy. It so happened that his arrival at Constantinople coincided with an attempt of the empress, Theodora, to install a Monophysite there as bishop. The pope was- able to defeat her and to secure the succession-for a-Catholic, whom he himself consecrated. Whence, on the pope's sudden death (536) the not unnatural scheme on the part of the empress to secure the election- as pope of one who would be her tool. Her choice fell on one of the dead pope's entourage -- the deacon Vigilius who had been Pope Boniface II's nominee in 532. Vigilius, with this illustrious patronage to support him, hurried home to find, however, the election over and-the new pope, Silverius, consecrated. It was not, of course, too late to intrigue. Silverius was given his chance of making the concessions the empress desired. He refused. The Gothic army, meanwhile, had begun the siege of Rome, and Vigilius presented to the imperial commander, Belisarius, forged letters according to which the pope promised to deliver to the enemy the gate nearest his palace of the Lateran. Silverius was summoned to the palace. An interview with Belisarius followed at which Vigilius alone assisted, and Silverius disappeared. It was announced that he had gone to be a monk and that the see was vacant. At the assembly of the clergy Belisarius presented Vigilius as the imperial candidate and he was elected. A few months later Silverius died of starvation, on the island off the Italian coast whither he had been exiled. []

Theodora's plan had succeeded and the precedent of imperial intervention in papal elections thus set was to hold for the next two hundred years. For in the Gothic war just beginning the empire was victorious. Its practical result was the annexation of Italy to that Eastern political system whose centre was Constantinople -- the empire that had long ceased to be Roman and was already Byzantine -- and although in the election of the pope the clergy kept their freedom, it was henceforward the practice that their choice should be confirmed by the emperor

before the pope-elect was consecrated.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



5. ST. PATRICK AND THE CONVERSION OF THE IRISH

The century in which the central government in the West collapsed, and whose close saw barbarian kings ruling in all the old provinces, was not the most favourable time for propaganda and expansion. Western Catholicism might be thought fortunate, if, amid the new chaos, it contrived to hold what it had already gained. In two respects, however, it did more than this. It converted the Irish and it produced the Benedictine rule, thereby preparing all-unconsciously two of the chief instruments for the future Catholicising of the Western peoples and for the restoration of letters and thought when, after a century yet more barbarian than the fifth, they seemed about to perish entirely from continental Europe.

The agent of the conversion of the Irish was St. Patrick-about whose life we know so much and so little. He was born, where exactly no one knows and all the authorities dispute, somewhere in Britain towards the close of the fourth century. Maximus, the commander of the legions in Britain, had lately crossed with them to the continent to dispute successfully with Gratian the sovereignty of the West, and, more recently still, he had in his turn been defeated and destroyed by Theodosius (388). These were years in which Britain was increasingly the objective of pirate raids from the coasts of Germany and from Ireland, and in one such raid Patrick, a lad of sixteen, was captured by the Irish and sold into slavery. In Ireland he remained for six years, a slave shepherding his master's sheep, and in the long nights of vigil discovering the joys of union with God in prayer. In a vision or dream he was bidden to make his escape, and after an adventurous journey across the whole length of the country, and a sea voyage on a pirate ship, he came to south-western Gaul-then in the throes of the struggle between contending Roman armies. The interval of eighteen years between this escape and the saint's return to Ireland in 432, as a bishop commissioned to preach the faith, he employed in preparation for the work to which already he knew himself divinely called. In Italy, or in Gaul, he embraced the monastic life and, like many another, wandered from one centre to another always seeking yet better teaching. Amongst other places Lerins, then in the glory of its first beginnings under St. Honoratus, almost certainly knew him,

and Marmoutier too where the memory of St. Martin, dead only twenty years before, was still fresh. Later, for a long time, Patrick lived at Auxerre. It was here that he was ordained deacon and here, under its famous bishop, St. Germanus, he made his studies and perfected his ascetical equipment. He was still at Auxerre when the great moment of his life came and he was chosen-the first nominee Palladius having seemingly died unexpectedly-to lead this new venture "to the Scots who believed in Christ." []

That there were already Catholics in Ireland before St. Patrick's mission is certain, possibly even scattered groups of them, the fruit of commercial relations with the already evangelised Britain and Gaul. They were, however, so few as to be historically unimportant. Irish Catholicism, henceforth an astonishingly permanent feature of the life of the universal church, undoubtedly has St. Patrick for its founder. And the foundation was his personal work. [] For the next thirty years the saint unceasingly toured the country -- preaching and instructing, establishing centres and ordaining from his converts bishops to rule them. From the beginning the new conquest was markedly monastic in its inclinations. The number of those of both sexes among the first converts who sought to follow the apostle in the perfection of his own monastic life moved his deepest admiration. In this willingness of the first neophytes to embrace a life of ordered austerity, there lay dormant a force which, in the next century, was to revolutionise the new ecclesiastical organisation and produce a most singular anomaly in Church government.

There was in Ireland nothing of that urban organisation of life which characterised the empire in which Patrick was born. There were no cities in which to place his numerous bishops. The seat of the primitive see was a kind of clerical village, founded for the purpose, where dwelt together bishop and clergy, catechists, monks and nuns, a centre of administration and of further propaganda. The distance between such settlements and monasteries of the Eastern type is not very great. In a country already enthusiastic for the life of perfection under a vow of obedience, and in an age of monastic propaganda, that distance was soon bridged. It was from Britain that the first impetus came of that new development, which, sixty years after St. Patrick's death (461), began to sweep all before it and transform the Irish

Church. Here, in the dark century which followed the Roman abandonment of the province, the church was organised on strongly monastic lines and the personage to whom the new prestige of monk over cleric, of abbot over bishop, owed its being was, apparently, the British monk St. Gildas. Once this new influence had crossed the Irish Sea with the British-trained Irish monks like St. Enda and St. Finian of Clonard, the clerical settlements became monasteries and their abbots the first ecclesiastical personages of the country. The see is now lost to view behind the monastery. Jurisdiction is no longer confined to bishops, nor even to bishops who are also abbots. It comes, in the course of the sixth century, to be exercised by abbots who are not bishops at all. The line of bishops continues, but, while the government is in the hands of an abbot in priest's orders, the bishop -- one of the monks, chosen for consecration by his abbot -- confines himself to the ritual and sacramental functions proper to his order. All the great names henceforward are abbots and if, at the same time, the abbot is a bishop, it is as the abbot that he is celebrated. Even the metropolitan see fixed by St. Patrick at Armagh ceased to function as such, and the all-conquering prestige of monasticism is witnessed by descriptions of the pope as the Abbot of Rome and, even, of the devil as the Abbot of Hell.

For a hundred years after St. Patrick's death his work steadily developed, and then, the country converted and the church " monasticised," the zeal and asceticism of the Irish monks began to look overseas for new objectives. So there began that astonishing missionary odyssey of the race that is still with us. Upon Britain and Gaul and Germany and Italy they poured out, taking with them much of their own peculiar spirituality, and, through their own stark asceticism, scaring into repentance the decadent Catholics of the now barbarised Roman provinces.

The earliest influences in Irish Monasticism were, it seems agreed, Egyptian, passing to Ireland through such Western centres as Lerins. Obedience to a superior, publicly vowed for life in an explicit formula, is the foundation on which it rests. The earliest rule that has survived -- in the modern sense of a code of regulations -- is that of St. Mochuta (637). The most famous of all, that of St. Columbanus, drawn up for continental monks, reflects Irish conditions and is inspired by the Irish spirit. The monasteries were of the utmost simplicity, collections of tiny

huts of wood or stone with one or more oratories, a kitchen, and a common refectory; the whole enclosed by a wall. There were convents too for women, the oldest known of which is St. Brigid's (450-525) famous foundation at Kildare. The novices were recruited almost exclusively from the higher and middle classes. Monastic life as these Irish founders conceived it, and as their disciples practised it, was a life of continuous, incredible severity -- the "white martyrdom," it was called, in contradistinction to the more suddenly ended "red" martyrdom of persecution. The standard for all was not merely high but heroic: in Irish Monasticism there was no place for mediocrity. Obedience, of course, was absolute, nor could the monk own. There was an absolute avoidance of the other sex, and generally no communication at all with one's family. Prayer, manual work and study filled the monk's day. Prayer, the recitation day by day of the psalter interspersed with readings from Holy Scripture and the Fathers; and prayer, too, as a penance -- with peculiarities that were to mark the Irish and their converts throughout Europe, with endless prostrations and genuflections, and the Endurance of the "crossfigel," prayer, that is to say, with the hands stretched in the form of a cross: prayer too with the pray-er immersed in icy water. Manual work might be agricultural, and it took in all the crafts and the arts necessary to provide for the community's needs. Mass was celebrated, with much diversity of rite, on all Sundays and feasts, and the monks communicated.

Almost every day the monk fasted. His one meal he took about three in the afternoon, vegetables, eggs and fish. Meat he never ate. For drink there was milk, whey and a beer that is likened to whey, and water. To drink nothing but water was a special asceticism, and for the practice of it tradition honoured St. David of Wales as "the Waterman." Silence held the monastery all day. On the rare feast-days there was a milder regime. The tale of the rule's austerity ends with the mention that it allowed as little sleep as was necessary. Breaches against the rule were punished by corporal punishment liberally administered. The monk who broke the silence received six strokes, for leaving the monastery without the abbot's blessing twelve strokes, for needless gossiping conversation fifty, for speaking to a woman a hundred. This particular austerity was all the more shocking in a country where flogging had no place in the civil law. The sick of course were exempted from these rigours and tenderly cared

for. The dead were buried with special office and mass for three days-suffrages repeated annually at the anniversary of their death. For the repose of their souls the brethren offered prayers and fasts and alms. By the year 600 there was a certain uniformity of observance along these lines, and we can speak of Irish Monasticism as a definite recognisable force.

The monks also studied. "To the Irish mind an illiterate monk was a contradiction in terms. [] The summit and crown of their learning was the knowledge of Holy Scripture. It was for this that, in the conning centuries, students were to cross to Ireland in their thousands. All other study was, originally, ancillary to this. The Gospels, the epistles of St. Paul and the Psalms -- these, above all, were the objects of this devoted meditation. The monks learned the text by heart and gave themselves lovingly to the commentaries -- allegorical, in the fashion of the time. It is impossible to exaggerate their familiarity with the Bible. Its imagery, its histories, passed into the common treasury of the writers; and in one saint's life after another the re-appearance of the biblical stories in a new dress witnesses to the lore in which the hagiographers were steeped.

But the Latin bible which they studied was written in a foreign tongue. Western Catholicism was, for the first time, faced with the problem of converting a people to whom its own language was unknown. Whence in these Irish schools a preliminary course of Latin studies, the essential grammar alone at first and with it the Fathers. Then, inevitably, with the study of those last great products of the ancient-classical culture something, little by little, of that culture itself, the Latin poets and orators, the Hellenistic mathematicians and natural philosophers. The accident that for the study of Sacred Scripture -- the aliment without which no monk could live -- the Irish monk must learn the classic Latin language, and learn it, necessarily, in the masterpieces, made the Irish monk something of a cultured scholar at a time when, in the monasteries of the Latin culture itself, such scholarship was frowned on as worldly, and the masterpieces banned.

The accident had thereby another important effect. It did much to preserve for the later centuries a knowledge of the Latin language that was scientific, for it was taught and learnt in Ireland as a dead language, carefully and, if at times

pedantically, correctly -- where, universally, throughout the continent, its purity was suffering violence from the tongues of the new Barbarian kings. In the religious homes of this remote isle the light still painfully burned from which, a little later, the continental church was to be re-illuminated. The old native Irish culture was at first most carefully shunned as a Pagan thing. Then, as the new faith showed itself unquestionably victorious, this, too, began to influence the monks, and from the end of the sixth century a certain fusion is evident and a mixed Biblical-Classical-National culture is in process of formation. A system of orthography was devised and now, for the first time, the ancient Irish language began to be written with letters.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



6. ST. BENEDICT AND THE HOLY RULE

In St. Patrick's boyhood the Empire still ruled all the West, even his native Britain. He had been dead nineteen years when St. Benedict of Nursia was born (480) and by that time the Empire had disappeared even from Italy. The Italy of St. Benedict was the Italy of the Ostrogoths and Theodoric, of Belisarius and Justinian's war of recovery. The seventy years or so of his life covered that period when plague and famine and war cleaved the abyss that separates Romans from Italians. He himself is one of the last of the Romans, and it may be safely said that the spirit of Rome, baptised now, is the inspiration of all that is new, revolutionary even, in his work. St. Benedict was not, however, Roman by birth, although educated in the ancient capital. He came from Nursia, which is near Spoleto, and his family were wealthy country landowners. At the age of seventeen he fled from Rome to live as a solitary, thirty miles away, in the wild fastness that is now Subiaco (c. 497). Disciples gathered round him whom finally he organised in twelve communities of twelve monks each. There were rebellions against his rule, attempts even to poison him, and twenty years or so after his first coming to Subiaco he moved to Cassinum, half way between Rome and Naples. Here he dwelt for the remaining years of his life, the years that saw the murder of Boethius, the downfall of Theodoric's kingdom and the victories of Belisarius and Narses. Here the Gothic king Totila visited him, and heard the prophecy of his fate. Here, too, most important of all, the saint wrote the Holy Rule. The date of his death is not accurately known. The year which used, traditionally, to be considered correct -- 543 -- is almost certainly wrong and the latest, well-reasoned, theory would place it between 555 and 557.

The circumstances in which the great work was composed are not known. The latest and most ingenious suggestion is that it was written, not for any particular monastery St. Benedict had founded, or was about to found, nor for any particular group to be formed in the future from his own foundations, but simply as a universal rule for monks: that it was compiled to serve for all time as the quasi-official code of monastic life and compiled at the request of some pope, most probably Hormisdas (514-523). [] We do, however, know of St. Benedict's varied experience

through twenty-five years of life as a superior of monks, and the text of the rule itself reveals him as a man thoroughly well acquainted with all the earlier literature of Monasticism. Holy Scripture, the preceding rules of the Egyptians and Eastern founders, the lives of the primitive saints, the works of the Fathers -- especially of John Cassian who, founder of the monastery at Marseilles, was to the West the greatest of all guides in this matter -- a knowledge of all these is easily traced in the rule. It is however no mere mosaic of compilation, but a work of striking originality.

Earlier rules had been little more than lists of prohibitions, or of spiritual maxims, with brief statements of practical details. Now, for the first time, there came into being an ordered practical code, covering every aspect of the monk's life, a code which itself created a way of living and would, ultimately, create a type of monk. Monastic life, so far, had been life in the tradition of some great monastic personality. Henceforward not personalities, but the universal decreed law is to form the monk, the "Holy Rule" (a new expression), the "Mistress Rule" to use the saint's own phrase. Not the abbot as such is supreme, but the rule which he administers and whence he, too, derives. It is the old Roman notion of the rule of law transferred to the service of the religious life, and thence derives one of the rule's leading characters -- it does not counsel but commands. It is objective, permanent, absolute. The superior does but apply it.

The Holy Rule-begins with a succinct survey of current monastic practice, and its decision that monks who "fight under the rule and an abbot" lead a life superior to that of the solitary who is his own lawgiver, ended for all time in the West the prestige that so easily accrues to more picturesque methods of asceticism. The rule describes itself as "a little rule for beginners." It sets up "a school of divine service," and its whole spirit is described when it orders that "all things must be done in moderation for the sake of those who are less hardy." Again and again this experienced discretion shows itself. The first psalm of the night office is to be said slowly, in order to give the laggard a final chance. The food is to be sufficient and, since what suits one may not suit another, two dishes are always to be provided. Again, "Although we read that 'wine is not the drink of monks at all,' yet, since in our days they cannot be persuaded of this, let us at least agree not to drink to satiety, but sparingly, Because

wine maketh even the wise to fall away." []

A sufficiency of sleep is prescribed and of clothing too. There is no such thing as corporal punishment, nor any provision for such penitential exercises as hair-shirts, spiked belts, self-inflicted scourgings. Private feats of this nature are sternly discouraged. The monks should do nothing except what the common rule of the monastery and the example of superiors exhorts. Once and for all, with this "Rule for Monks," the extravagance of the East, whose example burdened early Western Monasticism beyond what the ordinary man could bear, is set aside. In the matter of mortification, as in all else, individualism ceases to be set at a premium. Rivalry in such things is not to be tolerated. Association in a common mode of life is the way of the monk's sanctification. This twofold break, with corporal austerities and individual self-maceration, is again revolutionary.

The asceticism of the rule is none the less real. Its basis is, of course, an utter renouncement of one's own will "to walk by another's judgement and command." The routine of prayer, study and work; the frequent fasts; the perpetual abstinence from meat; -- these were the monk's aids, striving ever more earnestly to strip himself of all slavery to self, that he might give himself wholly to God. The monks "do not live by their own free will, or obey their own desires and pleasures, but walk by another's judgement and command." "It is not lawful for monks to have either their bodies or their wills at their own disposal."

The rule carefully prescribes the hours of rising and for sleep, different in winter and summer. It regulates in detail the order of the day's occupations, the different hours for the common prayer, which is "the work of God," for the reading, the manual labour, the meals. Monks who are priests are exceptional, and they are warned against temptations to pride and insubordination which may arise from the distinction.

The nature of the primitive life under the rule of St. Benedict has, in recent years, been the subject of much discussion. The first monasteries, it is suggested, would be founded by the generosity of the wealthy, endowed with lands and all that then necessarily went with the land, its villages, its slaves and its serfs (mancipia and coloni). The rule seems to suggest that

agricultural work would be exceptional, a thing to which the monk ought gladly to submit if poverty or local necessity made it inevitable. Abbot Chapman even says, "the idea that monks were agriculturalists would have horrified St. Benedict." What then was the work which occupied the monks? The different arts and crafts necessary for the maintenance of the property, and the household duties: kitchen, cellar, service, garden, wood and metal work; copying, teaching the younger monks "To 'study' or to write books would be rare" [] and St. Bede is almost the only simple monk of the early times to be an author (as he remains the one Benedictine canonised as a simple monk). "The sixth-century monk was not a scholar nor an author like some of the Maurists, nor a farm labourer like the Trappists. But he worked hard and he read enormously." []

The discipline is never that of a regiment, but that of an ordered Christian family whose aim is to realise the gospel ideal. The continuity of this family spirit is based upon yet another of St. Benedict's innovations, the famous vow of stability by which the monk pledges himself, not merely to live as a monk for ever, but to live as a monk for ever in the community which now receives him. This has been described as St. Benedict's most important and most characteristic contribution to Monachism in the West. Since the rule contemplates a family, the superior is primarily a father, and if the rule gives to the abbot practically unlimited discretion, it never ceases to remind him that his authority is paternal and that his pattern in its exercise is Christ Himself-- Whose name indeed few pages of the rule are without. Here, again, is to be noted the trace of the saint's experienced humanity -- the abbot is bidden to consider the weaklings and not to allow the strong to set the pace of the monastery's observance, and he is warned "not to be too suspicious, or he will never be at rest." It is the monks who choose their abbot, and they choose him for life. In turn the abbot chooses his assistants -- chooses them and changes them at will.

A compassionate understanding of the weakness of human nature, a serene patience in presence of its failure, a calm confidence in the ultimate attainment of the highest ideals through the perfecting of the ordinary ways of life, an absence of exaggeration -- in the Holy Rule the Gospel finds the greatest of its human reflections. It was to produce in the ensuing centuries hundreds and thousands of communities, and the autonomous

self-sufficing monasteries where they dwelt were to be, in the nature of things, centres of economic and social life no less than of religion. With their slaves, their tenants, the pilgrims whom religious motives drew, the abbeys became inevitably centres of trade, fostering the arts and crafts, with a social role like to that of the Roman cities now rapidly decaying. Along with the bishop, the abbey was to be the greatest force staving off the universal tendency to social disruption; and for the Church it was the appointed instrument of apostolic work in the age of transition from an urban to a rural economy.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 3: ST. GREGORY THE GREAT AND THE BEGINNINGS OF RESTORATION

1. ST. GREGORY, FOUNDER OF THE MIDDLE AGES

ST. GREGORY THE GREAT was Roman by birth and heir to one of the last surviving names of the old pre-Christian aristocracy. He was born during the first period of Justinian's war to recover Italy for the central government, and his boyhood saw the successive sieges of Rome by Goth and Roman, years of famine, plague and destruction which left on his sensitive spirit an expectancy of doom thenceforth ineffaceable. He was a child of six when, in 546, Totila, meditating to erase from memory the very knowledge of where Rome had stood, cleared the city of its entire population and left it for six weeks abandoned to the beasts of the Campagna. He was fourteen when, the last Goth driven out, Justinian, in the Pragmatic Sanction, gave the ruined country its new constitution as a province of the empire whose centre was Constantinople. Another fourteen years and then, in 568, over the Alps from the north-east came the last and most savage of Italy's barbaric invaders: the Lombards. In ten years they wrested from the empire the greater part of the interior, and inaugurated a war of raids and sieges on the rest which was to go on with little intermission for another two centuries.

St. Gregory, at the time of the Lombard invasion, was already well advanced in the public life which his rank and wealth opened to him. He was by now Praetor of Rome, responsible for the city's financial administration and for the police, sitting as judge in the courts and, an immense responsibility in these days of continuous warfare, charged also with the task of maintaining the city's supply of food. At the age of thirty-five the praetor became a monk, after long hesitation bred of doubts whether in such time of crisis it was not his first duty to serve the State. He sold his vast property, and from part of the proceeds founded seven monasteries. One of them was his own Roman house on the Coelian. Here he continued to live as -one of the monks, following, the thing seems certain, the rule of St. Benedict. He was allowed just five years of the peace he craved. Then, in 579 the newly-elected pope, Pelagius II, ordained him deacon and

despatched him to Constantinople as apocrisiarius -- ambassador at the Imperial Court. There he remained for seven years, occupied with the delicate business of restraining the Byzantine habits of the cesaro-papist sovereigns whenever they threatened to invade the sphere of the papal primacy. Political affairs, too, were in his charge: the Lombard menace to Rome the insufficiency of the imperial representatives who, from Ravenna, governed Roman Italy; the plight of Rome itself where, already, the pope was de facto ruler. The city often enough was undefended, lacked troops, and, almost as often, when it had a garrison it lacked the means to pay it. Hence the Romans feared the troops within as much as they feared the Barbarian without. The responsibility for the city's welfare was already falling on the pope, who, however, before the law, was only the emperor's subject. There was abundant matter to occupy the diplomacy of the apocrisiarius.

The contrast between the half-abandoned, ruined city from which he had come and the glory of Constantinople as Justinian had left it would matter the less to the new ambassador since, during all his stay in the splendid capital, he still contrived to live as a monk. Several of his brethren went with him from Rome and the embassy became a monastery. At Constantinople St. Gregory met the Spanish bishop, Leander of Seville, then in exile and negotiating the emperor's help for his patron, the Catholic heir to the Visigoth throne. So began one of the many great friendships of St. Gregory's life. Here too, in conferences given to his monks, he began one of the most celebrated of his works, the Commentary on Job, and in a matter of theological controversy he engaged no less a personage than the Patriarch of Constantinople himself.

So for seven years the rich new experience continued and then the pope needed him in Rome. In January 590, four years later, Pelagius II died and the expected happened: St. Gregory was elected in his place -- the place two of his family had already filled before him, Agapitus I, and his own great-grandfather Felix III.

The new pope revealed himself immediately as a reformer of abuses. The archdeacon -- now and for a long time yet to come the first personage in the Roman Church after the pope -- was dismissed for peculation, the deacons ordered to confine

themselves to their original duty of relieving the poor and the relief service of the Roman Church was reorganised from top to bottom. The papal household, too, underwent a similar reform. The lay element disappeared. The Lateran, hitherto the palace of an ecclesiastical prince, was henceforward a house where none but clerics dwelt, where business was transacted in an ordered round of prayer. It was almost a monastery. Fees for ordinations were abolished, fees due from those who received the pallium, fees for dispensations, and special licences. Finally St. Gregory took in hand the reorganisation of the great estates in Sicily, Italy and Gaul which were the source of the Roman Church's vast wealth-the Patrimony of St. Peter. This was his own personal work, and many letters remain to show how intimately he scrutinised its personnel and their accounts, and how scrupulously he observed the principle that these revenues should be employed in unstinted almsgiving.

One of the most distinguished of French scholars [] has borrowed all English idea hi which briefly to sum up the essence of St. Gregory's personality. He sees in him the "landlord" of the best type, with the tradition of unstinted service for the public welfare, a sense of responsibility, and care, for dependants that knows no limits. To his rulership of the Church he brought something of the technique of the old imperial administration, and all the best of the Roman tradition: fidelity to law, respect for rights, impatience of disorder, whether from insubordination or injustice, and the courtesy of business regularity.

It is this same shrewd, kindly, fatherly spirit, practical always, never speculative, that informs all his writings. For St. Gregory wrote much, despite his well-filled days, and more directly even than St. Augustine did he, through his writings, influence the next thousand years. He is no scholar writing for scholars -- or the scholars for whom he writes would hardly have been recognised as such by the earlier writer -- but he is a great populariser of doctrine, the principal source of the forms of the popular piety and preaching of the early Middle Ages, the storehouse whence derived much of its legend and a hagiographical tradition, the creator of its liturgy, and the creator of the ideal by which it judged its spiritual rulers. As a theologian he is never, it is true, all original thinker. He has, in this respect, all the mediocrity that characterises all age of intellectual decline. He is not widely read. St. Cyprian, St.

Ambrose and St. Augustine are his sources -- St. Augustine above all, not the boldly speculative St. Augustine but the preacher, the mystic and the moralist.

It is the moralist who is supreme in St. Gregory. He is indeed one of the master moralists of Catholicism, and he sums up Catholic spirituality, as a life, in a wealth of clear and adequate phrases. His *Moralia* is an extension of the conferences on Job begun during his stay at Constantinople. It is a free running commentary on the text as it lies before him, whence a certain prolixity that runs out into thirty-five books. The sense of each verse is expounded, the literal, the allegorical and the moral, this last in the place of honour, the literal being no more than "the bark of the tree." The *Moralia* is a practical guide to the spiritual life. For centuries after St. Gregory it was the classic vade mecum of spiritual directors, thanks to its wealth of teaching on, for example, the contemplative life, its nature and the signs by which an aptitude for it is discerned, thanks to its directions for fostering and safeguarding that life, and to the saint's analysis of the temptations that beset it. Job, and the exegesis, are secondary to this practical aim. Equally important in its universal and long-lived influence was the book of St. Gregory's sermons, *The Homilies*. These are simple familiar " talks " on the gospel, preached during Mass. There is no rhetoric, no dogmatic profundity, but much allegory -- perhaps to our modern notions fantastic at times -- and the gift of summing up a lesson in axiomatic phrase, real genius for spiritual epigrams. There is, too, an abundance of stories, stories of the saints and stories of their miracles. St. Gregory, and through his book known as the *Dialogues* [] above all, is the great storyteller of the early Middle Ages, and here again he is one of that culture's primary founders.

Finally, to conclude this rough summary of the most important of his many writings, he wrote the *Regula Pastoralis* -- a rule for bishops as important in its way as St. Benedict's rule for monks. It is a book to train and instruct and its aim is to raise the tone of the episcopate generally, to serve as an examen de conscience for those who are bishops. How much the book was needed other sections of this chapter will perhaps show, and the remark of a friend of St. Gregory's who had read it, " You lay down that no one should be consecrated who is not trained. Where then shall we find bishops at all?" [] The book was, from the first, an

immense success. St. Gregory himself gave copies of it profusely, and it was immediately translated into Greek -- a rare honour indeed in this new age when the Romans of Constantinople were beginning to speak of Latin as a barbarian tongue. Many centuries later, as is well known, our own King Alfred had it translated into Anglo- Saxon for the benefit of a church more afflicted even than the church for which St. Gregory wrote it. All through the Middle Ages it continued to be copied and studied, and to be the basis of the spiritual formation of the medieval clergy. Had St. Gregory as pope done no more than write these three books he would still deserve his unique place among popes. But he was also, and primarily, a man of affairs, ruler and restorer of the spiritual kingdom committed to him.

It was to a troubled heritage that St. Gregory came, the care. of churches universally afflicted, some of them seemingly to death. He took up that heritage in the spirit of one for whom the future could hold little promise, convinced as he was, and by signs apparently certain, that there was not even to be a future. None the less, his charge is henceforth his life; to it he consecrates all the energy of his practical administrative genius; he consoles the failing churches of the West; and he lays there the foundations of a new church, where the ancient cultures which are his by inheritance will shortly find their chief refuge when new barbarism drives them from their own homes, a church whence these cultures will return, to be the basis of the first revival of thought once the long night of war and rapine is passed. The first of the long line of monk-popes is, in the event, the greatest of all papal administrators; the saint whom only the sense of duty held from despair, and from the temptation to flee into solitude from the chronic desolation of his age, builds the foundations on which, even yet, much of our political and social life rests. More than any other. St. Gregory is, if any man can be it, the founder of Medieval Europe.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. ITALY, GAUL AND SPAIN IN THE CENTURY OF ST. GREGORY

In Italy by the time the Lombards arrived (568) the municipal regime of the empire as Diocletian rebuilt it had disappeared. In every city it was the bishop and the tribune who supported the burden of government, the ecclesiastical power and the army: at Rome the pope and the duke. From the safety of Ravenna and its lagoons the exarch ruled, in the emperor's name, what parts of Italy had escaped these Lombards: strips and patches along the coast-line, Rome, Naples, Aquileia, Apulia and Sicily, and kept the road between Ravenna and Rome. As the years went by this rule was less and less of a reality. Rome, in particular, the Lombard kings and dukes never ceased to covet. Its danger was henceforward a permanent feature of life. The emperors could not spare troops enough to clear the Lombards out of Italy, could not, very often, even defend adequately the towns the Lombards menaced. Policy and tradition, on the other hand, forbade them to negotiate with the Barbarian. They could not make war, they would not make peace. To protect Rome, and yet not betray the imperial policy, was already the great problem of papal diplomacy.

Pelagius II had, in 586, successfully negotiated a three years' truce. It ended in 589 and three years later the Lombard army again marched on Rome. It fell to St. Gregory to organise the defence, to find money to pay the arrears of the imperial army's wages, to appoint military governors. There followed a military demonstration in the Campagna, and the Lombards retired. Next year they returned, in greater force than ever, headed by their king. This time it was by spiritual weapons that the pope conquered, and by the offer of tribute. In an interview he bought off the Lombards with an offer of 500 gold pounds annually. His real aim was a perpetual peace throughout Italy between the emperor and the Barbarian. Meanwhile he acted as intermediary, working on behalf of the prisoners taken in the numerous raids, finding ransoms, and assisting their distressed families. All this to the mixed amusement and annoyance of the incompetent Byzantine functionaries at Ravenna, who put every obstacle in his way, even to denouncing him at court as a traitor. In the end the pope's patient diplomacy won this much of success at least

that, in 598, after thirty years of war, the emperor and the Lombards signed a definitive treaty.

In matters more purely ecclesiastical St. Gregory exercises, and with refreshing vigour, all the rights of his see over the other churches of Italy. Dioceses depopulated in the long wars are united, vacant sees visited and administered by his delegates. Complaints against bishops are received and heard and decided without the intervention of any council. The Bishop of Amalfi is warned that if he will not reside in his diocese he will be interned in a monastery. The Bishop of Tarentum is suspended for causing a woman to be flogged. The Bishop of Naples is deposed.

Outside the special sphere of St. Gregory's jurisdiction as metropolitan, there lie the suffragans of the other metropolitan sees, Milan, Aquileia, Ravenna. With these bishops the pope has, still, little direct relation. It is still their own metropolitan who confirms their election and gives them episcopal consecration. On the other hand the metropolitans themselves are in close relation with the pope. When the See of Ravenna falls vacant, it is the pope who names the Bishop of Cervia to make the visitation, and the newly-elected metropolitan goes to Rome to be consecrated by the pope. In 595 neither of the candidates proposed to the pope suited him, and he named one of his own monks. With Aquileia relations were still strained. After thirty years the schism bred of the action of Pelagius I during and after the General Council of 553 still endured. [] Nor was St. Gregory's patience ever able to end it. It survived his death, and Aquileia was only reconciled under Honorius I (625-638). If Aquileia was in schism, Milan was by this time foreign territory, in the power of the Lombards. It was as a refugee at Genoa, still imperial territory, that the successor of Laurentius (593) was consecrated. St. Gregory's delegate assisted, to confirm the election and to see that the newly-elect was consecrated by bishops of his own province as the custom there demanded. To him, as to the Metropolitan of Ravenna, St. Gregory sent the pallium.

The leading figure in the religious life of Gaul during the first part of the century of St. Gregory was St. Caesarius, Bishop of Arles. Like St. Honoratus and St. Hilary, Bishops of Arles a hundred years before, he was a monk of Lerins. Like them, too,

he was a zealous missionary who by his continuous preaching and his endless journeys throughout the province where- he was metropolitan, did much to give the fervent ideals of Lerins a very wide influence indeed. He was also himself a monastic founder and the author of a very famous rule which, particularly in convents of women, carried all before it in Gaul until the coming of the rule of St. Benedict. But St. Caesarius has a greater claim to a place in history, as the agent responsible for a work of more general importance than the maintenance of the good Arlesian tradition of religious life. It was due to his decisive action that, after a century of more or less open conflict, the debates of the rival schools of Augustinians and semi-Pelagians were brought to an end. St. Caesarius is the hero of the Council of Orange of 529.

To explain this we must go back to the closing years of St. Augustine's life, when his great theories on the nature and the working of Grace, after routing the pretensions of the system of Pelagius, were beginning to be a cause of lively discussions among the Catholics of southern Gaul. To make the story clearer it is perhaps better to anticipate what the controversy ultimately showed to be true -- that although the Church recognised officially the main lines of St. Augustine's teaching as against Pelagius, there were elements in that teaching -- on predestination, for example, and on the fate of unbaptised children -- which it did not make its own. It was in part around these points that the new discussions took place (419-429); but in opposing what we may call St. Augustine's personal theories, his critics -- followers of Cassian at the beginning of the fifth century and of St. Faustus, Bishop of Riez, at the end of it -- fell foul of the implications of the official anti-Pelagian teaching. The story can hardly be told, even summarily, without the introduction of more theological matter than there is space for here. []

The troubles came to a head -- and Rome was brought into them at the time of the reconciliation of the Eastern churches in 519. [] The treatise of St. Faustus, directed against the supporters of St. Prosper, who was himself a strong Augustinian, had come into the hands of those monks of Constantinople who, throughout the late schism, had been Rome's constant supporters. They read it as Pelagianism, and appealed for a decision to the Apostolic See. They also brought the book to the

notice of the greatest theologian of the day, the African bishop, St. Fulgentius, then exiled for the faith to Sardinia. The pope, Hormisdas, referred his enquirers to the writings of St. Augustine and St. Prosper, and especially to the decision of the Roman Church given in the previous controversy a hundred years before. This, in the circumstances, was not enough to halt the discussions; and soon all southern Gaul was again filled with their noise

It was how that St. Caesarius, metropolitan and also, by appointment of Pope Symmachus (498-514), papal vicar for the Visigothic Kingdom, took up the matter. He drew up and sent to the pope, Felix IV, a list of nineteen propositions which purported to resume the Catholic teaching on the disputed points, and asked the pope officially to sanction it. The list was returned, with some changes: the sections that treated of predestination and of reprobation were struck out; other clauses, taken from the *Sententiae* of St. Prosper (which again derived from St. Augustine), were added. St. Caesarius added to the list thus revised more matter of his own, touched up the whole, and presented the document, thus arranged, for acceptance to the bishops of his province assembled at Orange for the dedication of the basilica there (July 3, 529). They signed it; and St. Caesarius next sent the document to Rome for ratification. Felix IV was dead. It was to his successor, Boniface II, that the decree came. He approved it, January 25, 531, [] as an adequate expression of the Church's teaching, and thus gave it all the force needed to end the controversy.

Little by little, as the decree circulated, the controversy died out. The critics of St. Augustine had to admit, as part of Catholic teaching, that, even for the first movements of man in the work of his salvation, grace was needed; and that, apart from grace-left to its own resources -- human free-will is incapable of sustained moral goodness. On the other hand, those developments which had, in part, caused the controversy -- St. Augustine's theory on the intrinsic malice of concupiscence, on the transmission of original sin from parent to child through the parental concupiscence which the act of generation involved, on the lot of unbaptised children, and some of his ideas regarding predestination--none of these were approved. [] The Augustinian doctrine, as against Pelagius, was fully confirmed. On the other hand the controversy had brought out clearly that others of the

saint's conclusions -- and some of them are extremely repugnant -- were no more than the theories of a learned theologian: and were not the Church's teaching. []

The Gaul of St. Caesarius, however, where Arian princes ruled, Visigoth or Ostrogoth, was soon to give place to a new condition of things once the now baptised Franks of the north made themselves masters of the whole country. By the time of St. Gregory the Great, all Gaul was Frank and Arianism had disappeared. The saint's task in Gaul was, however, hardly easier, for all that the princes with whom he had to deal were Catholics.

The first important event in the ecclesiastical history of the new Barbarian kingdom, after the baptism of Clovis, was the national council held at Orleans in 511. Clovis was by this time master of two-thirds of Gaul. He had, in a few years, destroyed the Visigothic sovereignty of the south-west and with the victory his new religion, too, had triumphed. "I cannot tolerate that Arians should rule so great a part of Gaul," he had declared; and on his way south he had prayed as a pilgrim at the shrines of St. Martin and St. Hilary. The Council of Orleans was the first event to mark the new national unity. It marked also the beginning of those close relations between Church and State that were to characterise all later French history. Clovis, apparently, had summoned the council; and to Clovis it made its report, begging him to support with his power the decisions it had made. The whole of Gaul was represented, bishops even from the districts still in the hands of the Burgundians. On the other hand there was not a single bishop from the sees of the distant north-eastern frontier -- Mainz, Treves, Cologne, Tongres, Metz, Toul, Verdun -- some of which had apparently disappeared in the century of disorder which began on that fatal day, in 407, when the great flood of marauders had destroyed the Rhine frontiers once and for all.

With Clovis the 3,000 soldiers of his guard accepted the new faith in 496. The rest of his people remained, for the moment, pagan, their conversion an additional task before the Gallo-Roman Church still occupied with the conversion of the pagan countrysides. The Catholicism of the ensuing century was necessarily a very mixed affair. St. Gregory of Tours, our chief source for the history of the Franks at this time, has left us a

dark picture indeed, of a society almost wholly pagan in its morals. Cruelty, drunkenness, debauchery, sacrilege and superstition are its leading features, and Catholicism a thin, scarcely recognisable veneer. The reigning princes set the fashion, their nobles follow it, and in the train of their crimes come blood-feuds and private wars to destroy all security. To add to the causes of misery, the kingdom of Clovis is, upon his death (511), divided among his sons. Reunited in 558, it is once more divided in 561, to remain divided for another fifty years. Between the closely related kings civil war is continuous, and the pages of St. Gregory are a record of revolting cruelties.

Good men are, however, by no means lacking; there are saints even, and in every walk of life. Preachers like St. Caesarius of Arles remind these decadent and half-civilised princes and their associates that God is just and the avenger of wickedness in high places. Missionaries tour the pagan countrysides risking, often enough, their very lives, in an endeavour to make the Gospel known. For paganism dies hard, its devotees, lords as well as peasants, resist violently this new "Roman" conquest. Even so late as 626 councils are still legislating against sacrifices, and against Catholics who assist and take part in them.

One method of stabilising the spiritual conquest and of guarding against any relapse into the attractions of the old servitude is the substitution of Christian feasts for the pagan saturnalia. Shrines are built in the place where once the gods were worshipped--shrines of the martyrs and, more often still, of the champions of ascetic austerity, such heroic bishops as St. Martin, St. Hilary, St. Germanus of Auxerre. The cult of the saints spreads rapidly. Every town, every village has its patron. He is its special protector and in time of crisis he is expected to deliver his clients -- if need be, by miracle. It is the age of the miraculous. The lives of the saints are, often, little more than a catalogue of marvels; and the popular conception of sanctity, the test which gives the right to veneration, is the power of working such miracles. In the shrine there is preserved the body of the saint, or, where this is not possible, some relic: not, as yet, a part of his body, for in the West such mutilations are held in horror. "Who dares to touch the bodies of the saints dies," St. Gregory wrote to the empress when she asked of him the head of St. Paul. He sent instead part of the saint's chains. The saints

are a coveted treasure. Around their earthly life a new genre of literature grows. First the neo-Manicheans, to capture the prestige of the saints for their sect, and then the Catholics, produce a whole series of romantic histories, with one or other of the saints for the hero. Soon a type is created, a fixed formula of events and characteristics, and for one life historically valuable there are a score of these colourless legends based on a common pattern. The prestige of a town, of a see, of an abbey is not infrequently measured by that of the saint it possesses. Fights over relics are not unknown, and pious thefts. A more permanent influence, possibly, is that the local chapels gain in importance and achieve a first beginning of administrative independence from the church of the episcopal city.

The bishop of this sixth-century Gaul is not merely a pastor of souls but the chief personage in the social life of his see city and of all its neighbouring territory. He has the immense prestige that falls to the one surviving institution of the imperial regime, to which men look back, already, with an almost religious veneration. The bishop is a royal officer. Almost always he is of good family; and not impossibly the same see has been held in his family for generations. So it was with St. Gregory of Tours, who wrote that all the bishops of Tours save five were of his family. It is the bishop who stands between the people and the exactions of the king's lay representative, the count. Often the temporal administration is in his hands and he makes himself responsible for public works, for dykes, canals, fortifications. He undertakes the burden of finding ransoms for the innumerable victims of the endless wars, and systematically, with registers, poor-house and hospitals, he provides for the destitute. Especially is he the protector of widows and orphans and, from 585, [] no judgement can be given in any suit that relates to them without the bishop's intervention. Another thoughtful council even forbids bishops to harbour fierce dogs lest they scare away the poor seeking alms and comfort. The church itself was a sanctuary, in which the criminal was safe from the unlawful violence of the mob or of the royal officers. Only on their swearing to give him a fair trial would the bishop hand him over. The serfs again, if they were the property of the Church, were to be treated with especial consideration, [] and the development began which ended in assimilating the serf to the cleric and placing him wholly under the jurisdiction of the bishop's court. Others gladly made themselves the bishop's

men by recommendation, free men as well as serfs, and transferred to him their domain. Hence the subjects and dependants of the bishop could often be numbered by tens of thousands.

The churches were inevitably increasing in wealth. Generous giving was the great virtue of the time -- whether in expiation, or from devotion or from interest. The custom of tithes too, though not yet of obligation, was slowly spreading. By the time of St. Gregory the Great, the Church was easily the greatest proprietor in Gaul. Its vast personnel was, by royal concession, immune from the numerous customs and tolls, as it moved about the country on business; and the church lands enjoyed a like freedom. They enjoyed, too, as the lands of all the great lords were beginning to enjoy, and again by royal grant, immunity from the action of the king's officers. On the domain of his church the bishop was ruler, judging and taxing his people; and his own personal subjection to the king was the only link between them and the crown. The property of the Church was inalienable--because it was the property of the poor; of which the bishop [] was only the administrator. This inalienability, partial at first, had been absolute since the intervention of Pope Symmachus in 513.

The bishops themselves enjoyed complete immunity from the royal jurisdiction. As bishops, only bishops could judge them. They made the like claim for their clergy, but, at first, with only partial success. The conflict between the two tendencies went on throughout the sixth century. Finally, in the great council of 614, a compromise was arranged. Civil suits between clerics were to be decided by the bishop. If one of the parties was a layman, a mixed tribunal should judge. In criminal cases if the accused cleric was subdeacon, deacon or priest, the bishop was to judge him: if he was only in minor orders, the count.

This system of immunity and privilege was of course always at the mercy of the half-civilised Barbarian upon whose good will it was built. "It is the conqueror who commands. I obey," said St. Remy, the bishop who baptised Clovis, in explanation of some departure from the canons; and the great council of 511, in which that far reaching conversion produced its first effects, laid the foundation of that dependence on the State which was to characterise ever afterwards the Catholicism of the French.

No layman, it was there enacted, should be ordained or consecrated without the king's consent. Where Clovis had -- and of course successfully -- suggested candidates for the vacant sees, his still more brutal sons imposed them. Gradually laymen, their own brutal warriors, came to be named, and to be consecrated even, without that year's novitiate which the canons prescribed for such cases. The councils protested, but in vain. Saints were never lacking in the hierarchy. More than one paid with his life for his bold reproof of wickedness in high places. But bad bishops abounded; and the pages of Gregory of Tours are filled with the record of these drunkards, debauchees and brigands, monsters of cruelty and avarice, politicians and intriguers.

There was no centralisation of the Church in Gaul, no one primatial see. The old predominance of Arles had never matured. The century of invasion, and its division of Gaul into three mutually hostile kingdoms, had broken up the first attempt at any unity of ecclesiastical administration. The councils apart, each bishop was a law unto himself. Rome was far away, and, by now, in a foreign country where a heretic ruled. Communications were more difficult than ever.

None the less the churches increased, and religious life within their boundaries. New sees had been established in the fifth century, and in the hundred years between Clovis and St. Gregory still more were added. The development of chapels outside the episcopal city, begun already in the fourth century and then so rudely interrupted by the invasion, was renewed. There were, for example, the private chapels established by the lords of the great estates for their population of Catholic dependants, and there were the new chapels erected as memorials to the saints. These last were at first regarded as the property of the local see and what revenues they possessed went to the bishop. From 511 the clergy who served them were allowed to keep two-thirds of the casual offerings they received. From 527 a permanent funded revenue was guaranteed to them and finally, at the Council of Orleans, 538, the principle was fixed that the clergy of such rural churches live on their revenues. The bishop, of course, retained all his authority, though he is warned not to abuse it, by, for example, robbing the church of its movables during a vacancy. A more serious menace than the

chance of such a bishop was the permanent lay patron of the chapel built for the great estates. He was often an obstacle to the development of clerical discipline. Often he kept the revenues, and even the offerings, and in some cases the parish, by recommendation, made him its rector.

These rural clergy were simply trained. The Council of Vaison, 529, urges the priest to house and supervise those who wished to be priests. If they are not free men, the lord's consent is necessary. If they are married they must promise to live henceforth in continency, though, as yet, there is no obligation to separate from their wives. The scholastic training is the very minimum. The priest must be able to read, must know something of the chant, of Holy Scripture, and how to baptise. To safeguard his good name the councils lay down a minute code of observances in all that relates to his business with the other sex. That there were abuses and disorders in this primitive organisation is certain-as it is certain that such disorders cause more comment, and leave more trace, than the humdrum virtue of the rest. The brutality of the time finds its habitual reflection in the clerical scandals that are recurrent. Drunkenness, incontinence, scandals from the renewal of married life after ordination, theft and murder -- all these occur in the indictment. That these rural clergy were, personally, poor enough may be gathered from such counsels as that of St. Caesarius that the priest should supplement his income by manual work. St. Caesarius, himself a tireless preacher and missionary, would have the priest supplement his first primitive schooling. He should, for example, read through the whole Bible four times a year. He should also preach to his people -- an office so far reserved to the bishop and to supply the less competent with the means, the saint compiled a whole series of homilies.

To this live and turbulent Church so large-hearted a man as St. Gregory the Great could not be indifferent. His first opportunity came in 593 when Childebert II, King of Austrasia, [] became, by the death of his uncle, King of Burgundy too. Childebert, now the most powerful of the Frankish kings, wrote to St. Gregory asking him to restore the vicariate at Arles. The pope readily consented. It would be a means of extending his direct influence on affairs in Gaul and of introducing the much needed reforms. In his reply he goes to the root of the troubles when he asks the king never again to appoint a layman to the episcopate, and

warns him that such practices imperil his salvation.

The hope of royal assistance in the work of reform died, however, almost as soon as it was born. By 594 Childebert was no more. His kingdom was divided between his baby sons, Theodebert II and Thierry II, and their grandmother Brunhilda ruled as regent -- a valiant woman truly, who shrank from no extremity of violence and treachery to repel that with which the baby princes' inheritance was attacked by their next of kin. For the next few years this task was her sole occupation. The outlook for religious revival was decidedly poor and the stream of exhortations from Rome fell on deaf ears. The aged queen did indeed pause in the midst of her strife with her rival fury, Fredegonda, to assist the mission of St. Augustine on its way to England, but that was the limit of what St. Gregory's patience and piety achieved. His aim was a national council, and he even selected his legate -- one of his own monks. Brunhilda, needing the pope's assistance in a negotiation with Constantinople, listened with a show of interest and consented. This was in 599, but though St. Gregory lived until 604 the plan never went any further. When the council finally met, St. Gregory had been ten years in his grave and a new religious force had entered Gaul and the Catholic life of the continent. This was the mission of the monks from Ireland, and its pioneer was St. Columbanus.

St. Columbanus, the incarnation of Irish monasticism's uncompromising austerity, was a man sixty years of age when, with a dozen companions, he left his monastery of Bangor in self-inflicted penitential exile. Providence guided the band to Gaul, and in 591 they appeared at the court of Gontran, King of Burgundy. Monasticism was, of course, by no means unknown in Gaul. The pioneer work of St. Martin, of St. Caesarius and the saints of Lerins had flourished exceedingly. Monasteries of men and of women were numbered by the hundred, and monastic saints among the Franks themselves -- St. Radegonde of Poitiers for example (for whom Fortunatus wrote the *Vexilla Regis*) -- were known and revered and a real force in religious life. But the Irish monks were almost a new revelation.

The king treated them kindly, edified by the miracle of their surviving such austerities, and gave them site after site in the wild abandoned mountain country of the Vosges. There they founded successively the monasteries of Annegray, Luxeuil and

Fontaines. Presently this deserted corner of Gaul became a centre of the most amazing spiritual revival. The new monks were the most zealous of apostles, the most terrifying of preachers. They knew no other desire than to win souls from sin, and presently disciples flocked in by the hundred. Presently too their troubles began, for trouble was inevitable once these saints turned to save the souls of the kings and their courts. Their blunt rebuke of the customary sexual licentiousness lost them their first patron. Next there was trouble with the local bishops. Monasteries in Gaul, as universally throughout the continental churches since the Council of Chalcedon, 451, were subject to the local bishop. The Irish monks brought with them a very different tradition. Also they brought their own local customs in such matters as the date of the feast of Easter, which was the centre of the year's liturgical cycle.

The disputes ended with the condemnation of St. Columbanus by a synod of bishops (600). Whereupon he wrote the famous letter to St. Gregory in which, among other matters, with the blunt direct speech characteristic of his whole activity he rebuked the pope for his approval of the General Council of 553. No one escaped this new, hardy, undiplomatic, if not too well informed, sincerity, whether the kings for their animality, the bishops for their servile connivance at the royal sins, the very pope himself for his orthodoxy! The day came when kings and bishops united and the fearless monk, after twenty years of labour in Burgundy, was driven forth. For three years he wandered -- Paris, the west of France (Neustria), the Rhine valley, Mainz, Zurich, Bregenz-sowing monasteries as he passed, and finally came to Bobbio where, under Lombard protection, he founded the most famous of all his abbeys, and there in 615 he died, an old man of eighty-five. His vigorous missionary spirit survived in all his abbeys, and in the century which followed they continued to be centres from which, year by year, missionaries pushed out ever further into the hitherto untroubled Paganism of the German lands.

St. Gregory had met with little success in Gaul. In Spain, however, his lifetime saw the great change of the conversion of the royal family to Catholicism. Ever since their first occupation of Spain, in the early fifth century, the Visigoths had clung to their own old-fashioned heresy, the vague Arianism of the Council of Rimini (359). Of their relations with their Catholic

subjects during the fifth century we know very little, except that Euric (485), towards its end, for political reasons, persecuted them more or less. With the end of that century, and the Visigothic conquest of the north-east of Spain, Catholicism began to know peace once more. The custom of provincial councils was revived, and once again relations with Rome were renewed. These councils make hardly any reference to the Arians or to their Arian sovereign. Their one positive achievement is the development of the primacy of Toledo, and the establishment of a single liturgical observance.

In 552 the empire once more reappeared, after a hundred and fifty years, called in by rebels. Justinian's armies, fresh from the reconquest of Italy and Africa, regained a great part of the provinces of Baetica and Carthage and henceforward, almost until the Mahometans swept all into a common oblivion, a Byzantine Spain continued to exist along with the Visigothic kingdom. One result of the reconquest was to link, in the minds of the Visigothic kings, Catholicism -- the religion of Justinian -- with treason, and to add to their existing grievances against the Church. These grievances were largely domestic, and arose from mixed marriages; for by this time the Visigoths were the only survivors of the once large group of Arian royalties. The daughters were married to Frankish princes, and on their marriage they went over to Catholicism. The sons married Frankish wives, and the new Spanish princesses remained Catholic, despite a certain persecution. The French wife of Hermenegild, for example, was forcibly re-baptised by an Arian to please her Arian mother-in-law.

It was not among the Visigoths that Catholicism made its first gains, but among their neighbours to the west and north-west, the Suevi, settled in Galicia since the time of the great invasion of 407. The hero of the conversion of the Suevi is St. Martin of Braga, and the first preparation for the change was the miraculous cure of the king's heir through devotion to St. Martin of Tours. This was about 550, and it was about the same time that St. Martin came to the Suevi. He was a monk and an oriental, a learned man and a writer, bishop, first of all of Dumio and then in 570 of Braga. By 560 the king had become a Catholic, and the remainder of his court soon followed. In 561 the bishops of the kingdom met in council at Braga at the king's command. What remains of their deliberations is the last

evidence of the survival of Priscillianism. Of Arianism, curiously enough, there is no mention at all.

St. Martin died in 580, by which time the conversion of the Visigoths, too, was in operation -- a story whose centre is a family tragedy. Their king, at this moment, was Leovigild (567-586), an administrator and lawgiver, and a mighty warrior who, before he died, was to destroy the kingdom of the Suevi and make the Visigoths supreme in Spain. His eldest son was the husband of that Frankish princess, Ingonda, whose forcible re-baptism has been mentioned. To ease the family situation Hermenegild was sent, in command, to Seville. There he met the Catholic bishop, St. Leander, and himself became a Catholic. The next act in the drama was a civil war in which Hermenegild, allied to the Suevi and to the Byzantines, attacked his father. Leovigild, in reply, adopted a new policy of religious uniformity -- on an Arian basis of course -- and for the next five years (579-584) waged a war of repression. Ingonda was banished and took refuge at Constantinople. Leander accompanied her, and at the capital met St. Gregory. It is from Leander's story, given to St. Gregory, that this account of the matter derives. Galicia was annexed, the Suevi monarchy destroyed, and Hermenegild murdered. []

Two years later (586) Leovigild died. His younger son, Reccared, succeeded. He recalled Leander, and the bishop was henceforth his chief adviser. The new king wished to embrace the faith in which his brother had died, but he also wished for national unity, and before he made his submission he spent two years in an endeavour to win over his co-religionists. The national Council of Toledo in 589 was the scene of this solemn reconciliation. The king and his nobles and the Arian bishops -- eight in all -- made their submission. Two liturgical details of this council's proceedings are of interest. The Filioque made its first appearance in the so-called Nicene Creed, and the Creed was ordered henceforth to be sung at Mass "as is the custom in the East."

In this unexpected spiritual conquest St. Gregory had had no share. He was not, even, at the time pope. It was largely the work of his friend St. Leander and it was several years before the official reports of what had happened reached Rome. Of St. Gregory's relations as pope with Visigothic Spain little survives.

We have his joyful letter to Leander acknowledging the news of the Council of Toledo, and a reply to the homage of the newly converted Reccared and his thanks for Reccared's present of a chalice to St. Peter. In return he sent the king relics of St. Peter's chains and of the wood of the true Cross. To Leander he sent the pallium, sparing him, the pope gracefully says, the usual admonition to live worthy of this new dignity, "since your good deeds outstrip my words."

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



3. THE CHURCH IN ROMAN BRITAIN: THE CONVERSION OF THE ENGLISH, 313-735

St. Gregory's labours for the Church in Gaul had borne little fruit. Owing to the increasing difficulty of communications, Spain was becoming more and more remote. In the third of the lands which had once formed the Roman West, the saint was, however, able to lay the foundations of the most papal of all extra-Roman Churches. This was in Britain, henceforward to be known as England, from the name of one of the barbarian tribes who now occupied it. The saint, in the same time that he began this far reaching work, also gave the Benedictine rule its first great mission, for it was to these monks, from his own monastery at Rome, that he entrusted the task. England, the most papal in its origin of all the Christian conquests, was also the first great stronghold of Benedictine monasticism.

One of the most important of St. Gregory's works, from the point of view of his influence on the Catholicism of the whole Middle Ages, is undoubtedly The Dialogues. Its original object was to gather up the traditions of the saints of St. Gregory's own country, or, more exactly, to preserve the tradition of the miracles they had wrought. It was written after his election to the papacy, in the years 593-594, and his own title for it was The Miracles of the Italian Fathers. This is not the place to discuss the alleged credulity of St. Gregory as displayed in this collection, where he is so careful to give his reader the provenance of his information. It is the matter of the second book which is our concern, for this is the primary source of what we know of the life of the great monk who wrote the Benedictine rule. The pope, Gregory the Great, writing as pope the first life of St. Benedict, a panegyric of the thaumaturge and saint, giving thereby an extrinsic prestige to what of itself possessed incomparable value, laid the foundation of the later Benedictine conquest of western Europe. Whatever truth the conjecture may hold that St. Benedict wrote his rule at the bidding of a pope, it is true beyond all doubt that the later commendation of the first monk-pope was the beginning of the rule's opportunity. And the first scene of that opportunity was England.

At the moment when England came into St. Gregory's thoughts

it had ceased to be a province of the empire for a matter of nearly two centuries. Of what went on in the island in those centuries, of the details of the slow, hardly-won success of the pirates from Frisia, Jutland and the north German coast, of the breakdown of the system of Roman administration, of the relations between the newcomers and the more civilised peoples who resisted them, we know almost nothing at all. These centuries are truly, to us at least, the Dark Ages.

Of the Church as it existed in the island in the last century of the imperial regime, that is, between Constantine's conversion in 312 and the withdrawal of the Roman garrisons in 410, we do not know much. There were bishops at London, Lincoln, York and Caerleon, for their presence is recorded at the Councils of Arles (314) and Rimini (359). Like the rest of the episcopate of the Western Church, their ecclesiastical life moved in subordination to the Roman Church, and with the majority of their brethren they fell victims to the manoeuvres of the Arian emperor, Constantius II. These few details, and the names of three martyrs, put to death in the time of Diocletian -- St. Alban at Verulam, SS. Aaron and Julius at Caerleon - - are all that has survived in literary record.

Relations with the central government of the empire ceased in the reign of Honorius (410) and the next glimpse of the religious condition of the country is the anti-Pelagian mission of St. Germanus of Auxerre (429), at which time, it has been reasonably conjectured, the whole country was Catholic. Twenty years later came the first settlement, in the county of Kent, of the Barbarians who, for a century and a half already, had been the scourge of this most exposed province. With these invasions a period of wars began that lasted for a hundred years and more. The material achievement of the Roman rule was largely destroyed, and with it a great part of the Christian fabric too. St. Gildas, writing a century and more after the events he describes, hands on a tradition of churches destroyed, of priests massacred, of loot and sacrilege, and of a wholesale flight of the survivors.

The century in which the troubles of this British Catholicism began, troubles from Pelagianism, troubles from the invasions, was apparently the century in which the monastic life was first introduced, and it is with visits of St. Germanus of Auxerre (429

and 447) that the event is generally associated. He is said to have founded the first monastery, for all that he himself was never a monk, and to have ordained St. Illtyd -- the first great abbot of the British Church. Illtyd was the master, possibly, of St. Gildas and of St. David -- the first of whom was the greatest influence in that monastic transformation which is the leading feature of the Irish Church's history in the next century. Another great name in British monasticism is that of St. Cadoc. His first master was an Irishman, but in the monastery which he himself later founded, at Llancarvan, there was formed the first of the great monastic founders of Ireland, St. Finian of Clonard. Such evidence as we possess of the interaction between the monasteries of Britain and Ireland throughout the sixth century goes to show that, despite the barbarity of the Anglo-Saxon invasion, the life of the Church was by no means wholly destroyed. Monasteries, clergy and bishops undoubtedly survived and flourished in the parts of the island still defended against the Barbarians. Even so late as 615 -- a hundred and sixty years after the appearance of " Hengist and Horsa " -- the great monastery of Bangor, near Chester, numbered a community of some 2,000 monks. Even in the parts of the island where the invaders ruled, there were still traces of what had been -- the Roman church, for example, which St. Augustine found at Canterbury.

While in the east of what is to-day England the religion of Roman Britain had been practically destroyed, and while in the west it survived and, apparently, became more and more monastic in its organisation, in the north of the island Catholicism won new victories over the Celtic peoples hitherto pagan. The workers, here again, were monks and from Ireland. Voluntary exile was, with the Irish, a peculiar and favourite penitential discipline, the crowning exercise indeed of the ascetic life. As with St. Columbanus it led to the evangelisation of eastern France, of Switzerland, Bavaria and northern Italy, so, earlier in the same century, it had driven others to the north. It was, for example, from Irish solitaries that the Orkneys and the more distant Faroe Islands first learnt of the Gospel. The stories of St. Brendan's voyages are another testimony to the existence, and the popularity, of the practice.

One of these pioneers, and one of the greatest, if we are to measure by his personality and the ultimate results of his

achievement, was St. Columba -- or to use his own native monastic name, St. Columcille. He was a man close on forty years of age when, about 563, after a richly varied religious training at Moville and Clonard, and after founding the great monasteries of Derry and Durrow, he left Ireland for ever, "desirous to be a wanderer for Christ." He was a scholar as well as a saint, "of an excellent nature, polished in speech, holy in deed," and with his twelve companions founded his new monastery in the little island of I, seventy miles from Ireland and a mile or so from the great island of Mull in the modern county of Argyll. The kingdom of Dal Riada in which Iona lay (for, thanks to a scribe's mistake, it is thus that we call the island) was an Irish conquest and the people were nominally Christian. To the north lay the fierce pagan Picts; to the south, in Galloway, other Picts converted once by St. Ninian but who had long since lapsed into paganism. Iona was a centre from which other monasteries were formed and the monks undertook their apostolic work. For thirty-four years St. Columcille trudged and laboured, converting the king of the Picts and many of his people.

The new conquest was organised after the monastic fashion then beginning to sweep all before it in Columcille's native land. The head of the vast whole, of the confederation of monasteries, the priests, the bishops, was -- to the surprise of St. Bede -- the Abbot of Iona, who was himself only a priest. Gradually from the isles of the west the new force spread to the south-west, the Galloway of St. Ninian, and to the eastern lowlands. Nearly forty years after the death of Columcille it crossed the frontier of the Celtic culture, and made its first contacts with the victorious Barbarians from the German coasts.

St. Gregory's first recorded interest in the religious conditions of the distant island of Britain goes back to the years between his return from Constantinople and his election as pope (586-590), and it relates not to the desolated church of the Britons, but to their heathen conquerors. It is the well-known story of his sight of the English captives in the Roman slave market. He designed to be himself their apostle, but popular opposition, recognising in him Rome's coming salvation, compelled the pope of the day to recall him. Five years after his election as pope he had another scheme. The official in charge of the papal estates in Gaul was commissioned to buy young English slaves and to

send them to Rome, there to be formed in the monasteries as missionaries and teachers. A second letter of the pope, of July, 596, to Brunhilda, makes known that the English themselves had asked for teachers and that, since the neighbouring bishops were utterly unconcerned, the pope himself would find a means.

By the time this letter was written, the band of chosen missionaries had already left Rome. Its leader was the superior of St. Gregory's own monastic house on the Coelian -- Augustine. As the monks made their way into southern Gaul they heard terrifying reports of the savagery of the English, and, discouraged, they halted while Augustine went back to Rome for new instructions. St. Gregory consoled him, gave him new courage, letters to several of the Gallic bishops, to the kings of Austrasia and Burgundy and to Brunhilda their grandmother, and sent him north once more. From the Franks they were given interpreters, and finally, towards Easter, 597, they landed in Kent at Ebbsfleet. Here the king's wife was a Catholic, a Frankish princess and Brunhilda's niece. She already had her priests and a church.

The king, Ethelbert, received the newcomers very hospitably and listened to their preaching. By Christmas of that same year, thanks to the preaching of the missionaries and to the miracles wrought at their prayers, the converts were to be numbered by the tens of thousands. Augustine was by this time a bishop, and soon a second party of missionaries arrived from Rome, while the pope, for whom this marvellous conversion was the great joy of his life, strove to interest in it the Frankish bishops too. In 601 he sent to Augustine the pallium, a new custom to mark the especial favour of the Roman See to subordinate bishops, and with it the plan of the new church's organisation. There were to be two provinces. The first should have the metropolitan see at London (Augustine had fixed his see at the Kentish capital Canterbury) and twelve suffragans. A bishop was to be placed also at York, and as the people were converted, York, too, was to become a metropolitan see with twelve suffragans. Augustine, for his lifetime, was to rule both provinces. Slowly, very slowly, the pope's great scheme began to take shape. London and Rochester received their bishops in 604, but Augustine remained at Canterbury. It is interesting to notice that the government set up by the pope is the normal system of metropolitan and suffragans. There is no provision for a special

vicar of the Apostolic See such as St. Gregory had recently hoped to establish in France. Nor is any place whatever given to the royal authority. From the very beginning this English Church, the direct creation of the pope, is free of the State.

St. Augustine of Canterbury lived only three years to enjoy his new pre-eminence. He died in 604, but not before he had attempted, and failed, to win for the mission the co-operation of the other bishops of the north and west, the successors of St. David and St. Ninian. How they regarded the heathens who had despoiled them, massacred their priests and sacrilegiously destroyed the holy places, we can only guess. How far had they refused to attempt their conversion, how far did they still mistrust the foes only recently so savage? St. Bede, an Englishman undoubtedly, saw in the slaughter of the monks of Bangor, in 613, the justice of God on a church that refused to spread the light. The Irish chronicler gives us the Celtic view when he speaks sorrowfully of the same event as "the massacre of the saints." Ethelbert's protection covered the new missionaries to the very confines of the conquest, and it was in the west, probably near Chepstow, that the celebrated conference between the two hierarchies took place. At first no one of the British bishops would consent to appear. The priests they sent to represent them saw little in the Roman apostle but the bishop who invited them to bless, and spiritually enrich, their bitterest enemies. Even a miracle did not move them. At a later conference, seven British bishops took part and with them the Abbot of Bangor and some of the most learned of his monks. The discussion was long and heated. The Britons reproached the Romans for their patronage of the English and, through the Abbot of Bangor, swore yet again that they would never preach the faith to the cruel and treacherous race who had deprived their ancestors of their native land. By comparison with this strongly worded declaration, the disputes on such liturgical differences as the date at which Easter should be kept, the shape of the clerical tonsure, the details of the rite of baptism, had little importance. Henceforward, for the best part of two centuries, the two hierarchies ignored each other, with what disastrous results who shall say?

The Britons refused to share in the toil: they could not rejoice in the success it brought; and for the first few years the success was great indeed. Ethelbert's nephew was king in Essex.

Augustine consecrated Mellitus as Bishop of London, and soon, with the church of St. Paul for its centre, a movement of conversion was working strongly throughout that kingdom, too. St. Augustine's own successor was Laurence, another monk from the Coelian. One of his difficulties, too, was the hostility of the British. It showed itself in an aggravated form when an Irish bishop, or abbot, passing through Canterbury refused to acknowledge the archbishop or even to lodge or to take a meal with him. Nor did a letter from the new hierarchy to the bishops of Ireland and Scotland have any effect.

Meanwhile the king of East Anglia, too, had become a Catholic -- for political reasons apparently, for on the death of Ethelbert (616) he returned to his idols, compromising with his newer faith by erecting a Christian altar side by side with the one to the pagan gods. Ethelbert's own successor, his son, was a pagan and so, too, were the sons of the king of Essex who had died in the same year. A general restoration of paganism seemed inevitable. The Bishops of London and Rochester abandoned the seemingly hopeless task and fled to Gaul. The archbishop was preparing to follow them when, in a vision, St. Peter appeared to him, upbraided him, and scourged him so severely that the next morning he could show his pagan sovereign the bruises in testimony of the miracle. Apparently this, for Eadbald, was the turning point. He asked for baptism and for the rest of his life remained loyal to the Faith. Kent was assured if Essex had fallen away. The work of St. Augustine, threatened for a moment with extinction, was saved. It was scarcely more than saved, for outside Kent it had ceased to be, and from Kent it had for the moment ceased to spread.

It was from Kent, nevertheless, that the next development came, through the marriage of the King of Kent's sister to the pagan King of Northumbria, Edwin, who now (624) occupied that position of preponderance among the seven kings which had been Ethelbert's in 597. With the new Queen of Northumbria there travelled to the north yet another of the Roman monks, Paulinus, newly consecrated a bishop. York was at last to have its bishop as St. Gregory, years before, had designed. For the moment, however, the new bishop's flock numbered no more than the new queen and her attendants. The king received him courteously and there the matter ended. Victory in battle which Edwin believed to be the result of the bishop's prayers, and the

king's recognition in Paulinus of the man whom, years before, he had been mysteriously warned would appear in his life to be his guide, won him over. At the Christmas of 625 the king was baptised and with him many of his nobles and the high priests of the old religion. For eight years Paulinus and his priests were free to labour and, with the king's patronage and the prestige of his example, to reap a rich reward. But in 633 Edwin fell. An unnatural alliance of the Christian British king of North Wales and the pagan Saxon king of Mercia, Penda, was too much for him. He was defeated and slain at the battle of Hatfield Chase near Doncaster, and his army annihilated. His widow fled to Kent, with her children and Paulinus, while the British king laid waste Northumbria. Once more a political revolution had destroyed in a day the religious work of years. Restoration was however to follow, and speedily, but its agents were not the monks from Rome. It was from the north that the new missionaries came. They were monks of Iona.

The family to which Edwin belonged was one of two rivals with claims to the Northumbrian throne. He had himself spent his youth in exile, and his death and the flight of his family were the signal for the return of the prince whose father Edwin had overthrown in 616. This prince was Oswald. He, too, was a Catholic, converted in his exile by the monks of Iona to whom now he offered a new field of work that stretched from the Forth to the Humber. The greatest figure of this new apostolate is that of the lovable St. Aidan, who established the monastic centre from which he worked his vast diocese, not in York, Edwin's old capital, but on the tiny island of Lindisfarne, two miles from the rock fortress of Bamburgh where Oswald resided.

The work of Edwin and Paulinus was resumed, the preaching, the baptisms, the pious foundations and then, after another brief nine years, disaster came upon the nascent Church as it had come upon that of Paulinus. In 642 Oswald, too, fell a victim to the ruthless Penda. At the Maserfield he was slain and his army defeated. But Oswald's work did not die with him. His brother Oswin, who succeeded, shared his faith and assisted St. Aidan as Oswald had done. Oswin, however, reigned only in Bernicia, the northern half of Oswald's kingdom. The south had fallen to a kinsman of Edwin. Another nine years and the strained relations between the two ended in war, and once again St. Aidan's patron was slain (651). The saint's grief overwhelmed him and eleven

days later he died.

In the twenty-six years since the coming of St. Paulinus, Northumbria had been converted. Of the remaining Barbarians, the West Saxons had been won over by a third mission from Rome, led by the bishop Birinus whom Pope Honorius I (625-638) had himself consecrated. Mercia was the last of the kingdoms to be opened to the mission -- thanks to the intractable Penda. But in 655 Penda was slain in battle. His successor was already baptised, and in the next few years the people of the Midlands, too, were brought into the Church. A native clergy was already in being. The first bishop of English stock -- Ithma of Rochester -- was consecrated in 644, and in 655 the first English Archbishop of Canterbury, Frithonas, a West Saxon who took the name of Deusdedit.

Thus, in a fashion very different from that he had planned, slowly, and with many vicissitudes, the hopes of St. Gregory were realised, within a lifetime from the first hardy expedition of 597. South of the Thames the conquest was due to the monks sent directly from Rome; in the north, the midlands, and the east it had been largely the work of the monks of Iona. It only remained to secure uniformity of religious practice where, indisputably, there was unity of belief, and to centralise the supervision of the different sees. This done, there would be a Church of the English people. Its founder in this sense was a monk of yet a third school of monasticism, the Greek Theodore of Tarsus whom, like Augustine in 597 and Birinus in 635, the pope consecrated and despatched to England. He arrived in 668 to find the most delicate part of the work -- liturgical uniformity -- already arranged.

The liturgical differences between the Roman monks who came with St. Augustine and the British bishops have been noticed. As the double conversion of the English proceeded it could only be a matter of time before the age-long controversy began to divide the newly-converted. In Northumbria especially was the question acute where Roman and Celtic missionaries had both worked. Bernicia was entirely Celtic in its observance, Deira partly Celtic, partly Roman. The chief point of difference was the date at which Easter should be celebrated, and since the whole cycle of religious life depended on this, and since with this first generation of converts religious life was the foundation of social

life, the question was by no means a mere matter of archaeology. Like the Irish Church from which they had originally come, and the still older British Church, the Celtic missionaries in England calculated the date of Easter according to a system devised in the early fourth century, which was, at that time, the system used also by the Roman Church. It was a faulty system and in 447 it was considerably modified. Ten years later the Roman Church gave it up entirely, and adopted the new system of Victorius of Aquitaine. This system it was which the mission of 597 brought to England, and which St. Augustine sought to impose on the British bishops. How they refused it has been told, and also how the Irish and Scottish Churches still held out for the older system in the time of Laurence, St. Augustine's successor. But twenty years later the situation had changed. Thanks to the intervention of Pope Honorius I, the southern Irish had, in 628, adopted the system of Victorius. The northern Irish, however, still stood firm, despite an admonition from Rome in 640. Nevertheless, even among the northern Irish, there were critics of this conservatism, and they began to make themselves heard in the foundations beyond the sea. The dispute soon spread to Iona, and thence to the Northumbrian foundation at Lindisfarne. In the time of St. Aidan's successor, Finan, it became especially bitter when one of the monks, an Irishman, returned from Rome with a new enthusiasm for the Roman practice. The question then was eminently actual, awaiting only the arrival of a strong personality whose insistence should force an open conflict and decision. That personage now appeared, an Englishman, Wilfrid, Abbot of Ripon, and Bishop of York to be.

St. Wilfrid, at this time (664), was perhaps thirty years of age. He was of noble birth, handsome, educated, and he had travelled as few men of his time. He had lived as a monk at Lindisfarne, had been initiated into the clerical order at Lyons, and had gone thence to Rome along with a fellow noble turned monk, the scholarly Benet Biscop. At Rome his doubts on the Easter question were solved and he learnt, not merely that the Celts in Northumbria were in the wrong, but that the Roman Church had introduced yet further improvements into the elaborate system of calculation. He also, at Rome, made his first acquaintance with the rule of St. Benedict -- which since the flight of St. Paulinus thirty years before had disappeared from Northumbria. Wilfrid returned to Deira, to become a power at Court. It was

possibly his influence that moved the king to suggest to the monks at Ripon that they should adopt the Roman use and when, refusing, they returned to Melrose, the king gave the abbey to Wilfrid.

A year or two later, in 664, a conference was called to settle the whole question. It met at St. Hilda's abbey of Whitby. The two Northumbrian kings took part, Wilfrid of course, and, among the bishops who shared his views, Tuda, a southern Irishman then labouring in Northumbria, and Agilbert of Dorchester who had recently ordained St. Wilfrid. The Roman chaplain of the Bernician queen assisted and, venerable relic of a bygone time, the deacon James who had first come to Northumbria with Paulinus forty years before. On the other side were Oswy, the King of Bernicia, and St. Colman of Lindisfarne. The debate was decided as soon as the king learnt which was the system of the successor of St. Peter. He demanded if both parties agreed that it was to Peter that Christ had given the keys of heaven. Here they all agreed. Then said the king, "I cannot decide against him who holds the keys of heaven, or when I appear at the gate he may not open it to me." The majority submitted to the decision, but St. Colman with many of his monks, Northumbrians as well as Irish, made his way back to Iona and thence to his native land, to Inishboffin, a tiny island off the coast of Mayo. There ten years later he died.

Whitby settled the dispute once and for all as far as it had affected the English. It was from an English abbey in Northumbria, Jarrow, that, in the next generation, the northern Irish were won over to the Roman calendar (688-704), the Picts (710) and even Iona itself (716). The British Church, too, ultimately came in: Cornwall about 705, thanks to St. Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, and Wales from about 768.

Within a year or so of the Synod of Whitby Tuda, the Irish champion of the Roman uses, was dead of the plague. Wilfrid was named in his place as Bishop of York and, declining to receive consecration from any prelate less Roman than himself, crossed to Gaul for the ceremony. It took place at Compiègne. Meanwhile Deira, Wilfrid's country, had passed again to the King of Bernicia, and since it had no bishop he named one of the Celtic monks, Chad, Abbot of Lastingham. Chad, who since the great synod had adopted the Roman uses, was himself in a

difficulty to find a consecrator. Canterbury, to which he first went, was vacant and Agilbert of Dorchester was abroad (he had just assisted at the consecration of Wilfrid). It was the Bishop of Winchester who in the end performed the rite -- a bishop whom Agilbert would probably not recognise, since the diocese of Winchester had been carved out of Dorchester by the royal order and without Agilbert's consent. Worse still, as later events were to show, the assistant bishops at St. Chad's consecration were from the British hierarchy of the west. Chad returned to rule his see, and some time afterwards Wilfrid too returned, and finding himself thus dispossessed returned to his abbey of Ripon. Then, in 669, there arrived from Rome the new Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore, the direct nominee of Pope Vitalian.

The new archbishop was reputed one of the most learned men of his time. With him he brought the abbot Hadrian, an African, and Benet Biscop, books, equipment, a plan of organisation, and a live tradition of culture. With Theodore of Tarsus the English Church passes very definitely out of its pioneer stage. His school of Canterbury was to be one of the springs whence flowed the culture of the next two hundred years. Hadrian was its chief, and thanks to the Greek archbishop and this African, the school was delivered from the intellectual sterility that lay over so much of the West. Its intellectual life was real, its mastery of the ancient tongues more complete. Latin was taught as a dead language by the ancient rules, and in the coming centuries English-trained scholars were to return to the continent and re-instruct the semi-barbarised descendants of Caesar and Cicero in the language of their ancestors.

The new primate's first task was to end the chaos in the hierarchy Chad was asked to resign York, and Wilfrid was restored. Then, for Theodore recognised the man's saintliness, he appointed Chad to be the bishop of the Mercians, with a see fixed at Lichfield. In 673 the Church held at Hertford its first national synod. The bishops were henceforth to confine their zeal within geographical limits. The free and easy Celtic system was to go. The clergy were to be strictly subject to their proper diocesan bishop, the monks to their abbots. Neither monk nor cleric was, for the future, to wander about as his taste and zeal suggested.

In that same year a second see was formed in East Anglia, and the Bishops of London and Rochester were deposed for various misdemeanours or disobedience to the archbishop. Next came the creation of five new sees in the midlands -- Worcester, Leicester, Stow, Dorchester and Hereford. In the north Benet Biscop founded the monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow, under the Benedictine rule, and they speedily became the centres of a new intellectual life for the north as Canterbury for the south. Lindisfarne was by this "romanised," and ruled by the monk Cuthbert whose sanctity was later to make the northern see so famous. At York Wilfrid, with all his great energy, was introducing a systematic organisation into his vast territory and, inevitably, making enemies. One of these was his sovereign and when, with the king's assistance but without Wilfrid's consent, Theodore divided the diocese of York, the Bishop of York resisted. He appealed to the pope, and Theodore, once he had left for Rome, judged him to have resigned, and consecrated another bishop in his place. Dogged by the hired assassins of the Northumbrian king, Wilfrid made his way to the papal court. There he assisted at the synod preparatory to the General Council of 680. He won his case, but on his return the king first threw him into prison and then exiled him. Not for seven years was he free to return to York. He used the years of exile to convert the people of Sussex -- the one kingdom that still remained pagan.

Four years after Wilfrid's return Theodore died (September 19, 690), an old man now, close on ninety. Of whatever unity English Catholicism possessed, of its scholarship and culture this learned Greek is the undoubted founder. To none of its saints is our country more indebted. That he treated his subordinates with undue rigour cannot be denied and although, before the end, he made his peace with Wilfrid, the mischief lasted. No more than Theodore himself was the prelate he had planted at York disposed to obey the Roman decision. A second appeal from Wilfrid to the Apostolic See, decided in his favour as was the first, was likewise ignored. A third, eleven years later, led to a lengthy investigation, and mandatory letters from the pope -- John VI to the different kings and bishops and to the new Archbishop of Canterbury ordering Wilfrid's reinstatement. This finally took place, after violent discussions, at a great council of Northumbrian notables at which the archbishop assisted. Five years later Wilfrid died (709). He had been born in the terrible

time which saw the death of Edwin and, as it seemed, the definitive ending of the missionary achievement of St. Paulinus. Now, not only Northumbria, but the whole of the English conquest was Catholic, and not only Catholic but united in discipline as well as in belief, organised on the systematic Roman model. To that work of conversion, and of disciplinary unity, and especially to the extension of the prestige of the Roman See, Wilfrid had contributed more than most. He has a claim to stand here as the peer of Theodore who had done so much to thwart the even way of his episcopal life.

There is hardly a better way of realising how much the initiative of St. Gregory the Great did for the heathen conquerors of England than by a consideration of the life and achievement of the Venerable Bede. Here, in an Englishman, born within seventy years of the great pope's death, and within twenty years of the defeat of the last pagan offensive, we are face to face with the greatest scholar of his age, and an original genius from whom much of our historical studies derive. The mere fact of St. Bede is witness to the power of the new monasticism as an agent of culture as well as religious devotion.

St. Bede was born at Wearmouth or Jarrow in 673. His parents died while he was very young and from childhood to his death he lived in the great monastery of SS. Peter and Paul lately founded by St. Benet Biscop -- in St. Bede's time the latest product of the direct action of the Roman See in English affairs. He was a boy in the school, he became a monk. In 692 he was ordained deacon, in 703 priest, and in 735 he died, after a life of uninterrupted prayer and study. St. Bede's works, which fill five of Migne's closely printed tomes, are universal in their content. Like St. Isidore of Seville, almost a century earlier, one of St. Bede's achievements was to salvage and to store all he could find of the culture of antiquity and of the earlier Christian centuries. He writes on the theory of poetry, on modes of reckoning time, on the nature of things, something of philosophy, something of science; He is -- and in his own view it is the central point of all his studies -- a keen student of Holy Writ, and a careful commentator. We have forty-nine Or his sermons on the Gospels, and a smaller number of his letters. Also he wrote verse, and though most of this has perished a hymn has survived in honour of St. Audrey, one of the innumerable crowned saints who are the peculiar distinction of

this early age of Anglo-Saxon Catholicism. Bede was an omnivorous reader. With the Fathers -- particularly St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine and St. Gregory the Great -- with Cicero and Virgil too, he is thoroughly at home. As a theologian he does little more than hand on the tradition to the coming generation. For speculation he had, apparently, little taste. Philosophy had, by this time, almost disappeared from the equipment of the theologian, and Bede could say, truly enough if somewhat harshly, that there is no school of philosophy which has not been charged with lying by some other equally imbecile school. There is in the reference, and in others, something like a general impatience with merely human reasoning about things divine.

But for all his immense importance as perhaps the most gifted of the band that salvaged so much from the wreck of the ancient world, St. Bede's ultimate importance is of another order. For, besides his innumerable theological and scholastic works, he wrote the Ecclesiastical History of the English People. The character of this work, its literary grace, the even critical fairness of the treatment, make St. Bede the superior of any other historian for centuries yet to come. It is the one production of his century that is still alive, the only thing between St. Augustine and the twelfth century that is to-day more than an important piece of archaeology. Of itself it sets St. Bede in a class with the very greatest of the pioneers of scholarship. The scholarship with which, through Theodore, Abbot Hadrian and Benet Biscop, Rome in 668 endowed the English Church, was already producing something greater than its founders. The heritage was secure for yet another generation, for it was a living thing and no sterile pedagogy that Bede in turn handed down to Egbert of York, to Alcuin and through Alcuin to Carolingian Europe and the whole Church.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



4. MAHOMET AND THE RISE OF ISLAM

At the time when St. Gregory, still laboriously striving to protect his people from the barbarian Lombards, was finding the great consolation of his life in the first success of the mission in England, a new power was preparing that was to show itself, within fifty years, the greatest scourge the Church had yet known -- the religion of Mahomet, Islam. Not for the next generation merely, but for the next thousand years it was to be an ever present menace, a factor which would influence every aspect of Catholic development and life.

The scene of the new world-religion's origin was the peninsula of Arabia, a curiously neglected no-man's-land where the Roman and Persian empires fought through tributary kingdoms and "spheres of influence." The centre was desert and the bulk of its inhabitants warlike nomad tribes, whose chief source of living was pillage of the caravans that came and went, continually, from Egypt and the west to Persia and India. Along the coast there were towns and a settled, traders' civilisation; to the south an organised Arab state. The religion of these tribes was polytheistic, and of all the sanctuaries the most famous was at Mecca, the chief of the trading cities and the centre of an annual religious festival to which Arabs came from the whole peninsula. Here was worshipped, with bloody sacrifices, a smooth black stone-the Kaaba. It was a brutal and degrading cult. It was not, however, the only religion known to the Arabs. In all the cities there were Jewish colonies, and the vassal states to the north had many Christians among their subjects. The southern kingdom was for a hundred and fifty years a battle ground between Jewish and Christian influences, and the kings were now Jewish, now Christian, in belief. Along the Persian Gulf there were five bishoprics. Few of these Christians were, however, Catholics. They were mostly exiles, either by compulsion or choice, from the Roman laws against heresy and religious dissent, and they brought to Arabia the fundamentally impaired Christianity of Nestorianism or Monophysitism, according to which Christ Our Lord was not really divine or not really human.

A further source through which the Arabs had some knowledge

of Christian ideas was the professional story-teller who wandered from place to place, charming his audience with, for example, picturesque and detailed descriptions of Paradise and Hell. But, of the Christians themselves, it was the solitary ascetics of the desert who most influenced the Arabs -- the hermits, and the strange figures of the column-dwelling saints of whom St. Simon Stylites may serve as the type. There are many traces in Arab poetry of the admiration which these feats of austerity and self-forgetfulness aroused -- admiration, too, for the ideals and beliefs which formed such heroes.

The Arabia of Mahomet was the vast central region where the native paganism dominated. It was strongly "nationalist", for it had never known foreign domination. On the other hand it had never known unity, for the tribes were continually at war, and in the cities the rivalry of the clans brought about a like continual unrest.

Mahomet was born at Mecca, about 570-580, and educated by his uncle, a wealthy trader and a personage of importance in the life of his clan. The nephew followed the family career, and his business journeyings took him to the West and to Christian Syria. He was already far removed from the primitive Arab cult, when, about 610, he announced to his family the vision that called him to be the herald of Allah -- the supreme God of his native religion, too long overshadowed by the goddesses worshipped conjointly with him. Mahomet was now one of the many "Hanifs" -- Arabs, that is to say, who, in their search for a purer religion, had evolved a belief that there is but one God; they refused to worship the Kaaba, had a certain knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures, and practised the beginnings of a religious morality. It was Mahomet's first innovation that he was a Hanif who aimed at converting others.

His first teaching was very simple. There is only one God, and Mahomet is his prophet. God will one day judge all men, and according to their conduct will reward or punish them everlastingly. A ritual of prayer and ablutions is prescribed, honest dealing and almsgiving are recommended. More significantly still, the wickedness of the clan which dominates Mecca -- its commercial dishonesty, its oppression of the poor -- is unsparingly denounced.

The first followers were the Prophet's own kinsfolk, and then a great number of the down-and-outs and the slaves. The natural result followed. There was a persecution of the sect and its members fled. A second revelation to Mahomet now most opportunely made known that the goddess whom his persecutors worshipped had great power with Allah. The Prophet was revealing himself as a political genius too. Soon he was back in Mecca and peace reigned once more. It did not endure for long, and by 620 Mahomet was again an exile. Two years later he had found at Medina not merely a refuge, but, thanks to the political circumstances of the place and to his own genius, honour and acceptance as a civic leader. The bitter rivalry of Jew and Arab, and of the Arabs among themselves, was ended by a compromise which Mahomet proposed. All in Medina were to have equal rights. There was but one enemy -- the wealthy clan which had driven Mahomet from Mecca. They were Allah's enemies too and to destroy them was a first religious duty.

Mahomet was now Medina's supreme judge, and the commander-in-chief of its forces. He set himself to organise the temporary alliance and to prepare it for the coming war. The religious reformer disappears for the moment behind the statesman, the organiser, and the warrior. The religious observance is modified. The almsgiving is directed to replenish the war chest, food taboos of a Jewish character are introduced, and Abraham, revered hitherto as the Father of all the truly religious, of Mohammedan, Christian and Jew alike, is now discovered to be the father of the Arab alone. He is Mahomet's precursor, and Mahomet's mission is to purify Abraham's religion from its Jewish and Christian accretions. More than ever is it necessary to capture Mecca, for Mecca -- the one common centre for Arab life, with its superstition and idolatry -- is Abraham's institution. The new religion is now an exclusive, independent thing; and its immediate aim is the capture of Mecca. This it achieves, in alliance with paganism, by the Holy War -- in other words by treachery and massacre, with, in addition to the necessary lure of pillage, the promise of eternal felicity, since the Holy War is of all duties the one most pleasing to Allah. By 630 Mahomet had succeeded. He was master of Mecca and of all central Arabia, strong enough now to disembarass himself of his allies, pagans and Jews alike. Some he exiled, others he massacred. In 633-the year of the defeat of Edwin of York at Hatfield -- he died.

That Mahomet sincerely believed in his mission to destroy idolatry is certain, and it is equally certain that his idealism declined in proportion to his success. Success, indeed, revealed him as the prince of opportunists, a spirit for whom morality had no meaning. Trickery, pious trickery, theft and murder beyond what even the paganism of his origin allowed -- all these were, when useful, lawful means. His revelations and their teachings are contained in the Koran, a collection made after his death by his secretary and officially published in 660. There is also the sacred book of his sayings -- Hadith -- more than a million of them by the ninth century, very few of which go back to the Prophet. The chief sources of the religion are the Old Testament and the Talmud, and there are traces, too, of a considerable knowledge of the apocryphal gospels. The leading doctrines remain what they were originally -- that God is but one, that Mahomet is his prophet, and that there is for all men judgement by Allah, reward or retribution. There have been other messengers of Allah before Mahomet, the greatest of whom is Jesus Christ, Who, for Mahomet, is everything but God and second only to Mahomet himself. As Mahomet expressly rejects the doctrine of the Trinity, so he rejects that of the Redemption, giving the crucifixion a Docetist explanation. His doctrine of the end of creation, of judgement, heaven and hell, is derived from Christian sources, with every metaphorical expression now given its most literal meaning. Heaven is a place of never-ceasing pleasure, where every human desire, even the most lowly, finds limitless opportunity for its fullest satisfaction. A prominent feature of the believer's religious duty is the Holy War to destroy the infidel. "Kill all pagans wherever found." It is not a war to convert, or to impose the new religion on others, but, in the event, becomes a simple canonisation of natural bloodthirstiness and the instinct for pillage. It is the most meritorious of good works, death in battle is better than martyrdom; and in this primitive religion where neither asceticism nor mysticism find any encouragement, "The Holy War is Islam's monasticism."

Within ten years of Mahomet's death, his invention had not only overrun the whole of his own country but had conquered the Persian Empire and robbed Rome of Egypt, Palestine and Syria. Something must be said to explain some of the circumstances which made it possible for a system so lacking in any appeal but

the most lowly to achieve so surprising a success. Islam, to begin with, had made a nation of the scattered mutually hostile Arab tribes. The strong clan spirit survived, but the clan was now the nation and the aggressiveness directed outside Arabia. All the traditional ideals of vengeance remained at its service, given a higher value, even blessed as a virtue, in the new system. Outside Arabia the prospects for a new military venture were more inviting than for centuries. Rome and Persia, the two neighbours, before whose alternate supremacy the middle east had been so long powerless, were, each of them, at the time of Mahomet's death, exhausted from a long thirty years' war. In the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire -- Egypt, Palestine and Syria -- the mass of the population had for nearly two hundred years, ever since the General Council of Chalcedon in 451, been waging an intermittent war on the government for religious reasons. They had long since ceased to be loyal to the sovereigns who stood to them chiefly as persecutors. Finally, in this moment of Arabia's opportunity, when in Islam the East had at last produced its reply to the Hellenism dominant since Alexander, there was given to the Arabs a military leader of genius, Omar. Omar's adherence to Mahomet had been one of the turning points of the prophet's later development. He was the embodiment of the reforming spirit of Islam, a man who lived hardly, and used himself hardly for the cause, the proverbial fighting Puritan. On Mahomet's death he succeeded to his place.

Palestine and Persia were simultaneously invaded in 634. In each country the Arabs advanced steadily from victory to victory. Persia was conquered in two years, and in 636 the last Roman army in Syria defeated too. After a thousand years of Hellenism and seven hundred years of Roman rule Syria was again in the hands of the East. That same year Damascus fell, in 638 Jerusalem, in 640 Cesarea, Ascalon and the coast. To the Monophysite inhabitants -- who, despite all that they had suffered, did not play the traitor -- the revolution was no tragedy. It was simply " deliverance from the cruelty of the Romans." Egypt was invaded in 639. In 640 Heliopolis was taken, to become, as Cairo, one of the greatest centres of Islam. Here, too, the Monophysites went over to the new rulers. Alexandria fell the next year and, to add to the confusion, Heraclius died -- the emperor who, thirty years earlier, had saved the State after a similar catastrophe. The succession was disputed, and meanwhile in 642 the- Romans evacuated Egypt. With the armies

and the officials there went, too, the little that remained of the country's Catholicism.

There, for a space, the movement halted, after annihilating the power of Persia, and reducing the empire of Rome by a good two-thirds. In its richest provinces there was now installed this new, aggressive, hostile thing; and of the native population there were none who wished the Romans back. If the movement halted, it was only because internal troubles, and a civil war, had begun to occupy its leaders.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



5. SPANISH CATHOLICISM AND ST. ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, 589-711

The hundred years that follow St. Gregory's great effort, the years between his death and the appearance of the next outstanding European personality, Charles Martel, are years that see an interesting diversity of development in the Catholicism of the new Western realms -- Italy, Gaul, Spain, England and Ireland now begin their national history.

In Spain, from the moment of the conversion of the Arians (589) the Church had a unique position in the national life. It was, very evidently, the only source from which unity could come. So far there had been in Spain two laws, one for the conquering Visigoths, the other for the "Romans." The Church, on the other hand, had never made any distinction between the two races. The kings, henceforth, regularly employed the clergy in the service of the administration. The church councils, now held regularly, and meeting year by year in all the great cities turn by turn, were attended also by the royal officials. Civil business was transacted there as well as ecclesiastical. They became national councils in a very real sense, and a final court of appeal. The Church, with its permanent, stable, objective law and teaching, was all the more important since the monarchy of the Visigoths was elective -- a political weakness whose ultimate effect was to leave Spain an easy prey to such an organised despotism as the Arabs were, at this time, developing. Church and State in Spain tended to become one thing. It was the king who summoned these national councils, and the decrees passed by the bishops about religious matters became thereby the law of the land. The Church of Visigothic Spain, not unnaturally, was one of the first to produce a body of canon law, the famous collection Hispana. The Spanish Church was well organised. The sees and the metropolitans, too, were grouped round the primatial see of Toledo, and the primacy of Toledo was a reality. It was, for example, the primate who, in concert with the king, nominated all the other bishops.

Relations with Rome, if always good, were very interrupted. Spain was more and more at the end of the world. The route by land lay through the territory of the Lombards and Franks and

little ordered security, while the sea route, since the Arab advance, was no less dangerous. Certainly the mention of Rome in the affairs of Spain is rare during all this time (604- 715). Only eight letters survive of whatever correspondence passed from Rome to Spain. There is one of Honorius I urging the bishops to show greater eagerness in religious matters, and not to be dumb dogs who never bark. There are the letters of Leo II communicating the decisions of the General Council of 680, and two letters of Benedict II (684-685). To Pope Honorius the Council of Toledo, in 638, sent an official reply protesting the virtue of the bishops. To Benedict II's first letter, also, a Council of Toledo (the fourteenth) sent a reply which the Primate of Toledo, Julian, composed. The pope found his letter -- an acceptance of the condemnation of Monothelism -- unorthodox in its expressions and desired him to correct his words. This Julian did -- with none too good a grace.

The isolation of the Spanish Church, the long severance of relations with Rome, the civil importance of the bishops, the royal interference in their nomination, were, it has been suggested, beginning to tell. A new spirit of national self-sufficiency was developing.

The greatest figure of this Spanish Catholicism of the seventh century is the Bishop of Seville, St. Isidore. He was the brother, as well as the successor, of St. Gregory's friend St. Leander who had played so important a part in the troubles that preceded the great reunion of 589. Leander died in 600 and for the next thirty-six years Isidore ruled in his stead. He had been a monk before his appointment and, as a bishop, he composed a monastic rule. One of its characteristics is a most rigorous insistence on the obligation of the enclosure. The monastery is to have but one door and it is to be well guarded. The monks are to renew annually their vow of poverty. The abbot, three times a week, is to preach them a homily, and the monastic day opens with a distribution of manuscripts for the community to study. This last prescription is what we should expect from St. Isidore, for he was the one scholar of his age. To his contemporaries he seemed the equal of any of the Fathers, as the early writers now begin to be styled, and if he never makes any show of original thought, and quotes very often only at second-hand, it is certain that his erudition was really very great. Never had the authority of the Fathers, as a witness to tradition, stood higher, and-it was

in the collection, from their writings, of texts to illustrate and prove particular doctrines that St. Isidore excelled. The philosophical presentation of Catholicism he ignored entirely. Like every Latin writer of the previous two centuries he makes St. Augustine's teaching on the Trinity his own, though he makes no mention of the work of Boethius that was to influence in centuries to come the great medieval scholastics. It is St. Gregory he follows in his teaching that the origin of the human soul is unknown, but that it is in no way corporeal. He accepts the teaching of the council of 529 that grace is necessary for man's very first movements towards God, and that his free will is of itself incapable of sustained and lasting moral good. In the other great controversy which survived from St. Augustine's intervention, he follows St. Augustine faithfully. Predestination is absolute, and independent of God's foreknowledge of merits and faults, Who is "just to those whom He rejects, merciful to those whom He chooses." Children who die unbaptised expiate in hell the guilt of original sin -- another Augustinian influence without even St. Augustine's apologetic adjective that makes the prospect almost inviting. It is St. Augustine again whom he follows in his explanation of man as redeemed from the power of the devil by the devil's abuse of his power over humanity in the death of Christ. The Church is not an assembly of saints. It does not cease to be the Church because some of its children show themselves evil livers. Whoever deserts the Church turns his back on salvation.

The close union of Church and State in St. Isidore's time leaves a very evident trace in his teaching that " as the heavenly kingdom advances by means of the kingdoms of this world, so those who, placed within the Church, conspire against its faith and discipline should be crushed by the power of the State." St. Isidore's explanation of the sacraments is Augustinian in its distinction between the rite and the grace it produces. But he adheres to a much older theory when he attributes the effect of the sacrament to the blessing previously given to the matter used in its administration. It is to the fact that the baptismal water has been duly blessed that the baptised owes his baptism. Only thus does the divine force latent in the sacrament operate. In the debated question as to the validity of heretical baptism St. Isidore, like St. Gregory and St. Leo before him, follows St. Augustine and the constant practice of the Roman Church -- the sacrament is not to be repeated, for although the heretic who

receives it is not thereby cleansed from sin, he is none the less baptised. Such heretics when converted to Catholicism were, in the Spain of St. Isidore, admitted to the Church in the rite of Confirmation. Confirmation, otherwise given immediately after baptism, is an imposition of hands followed by an anointing of the forehead with chrism. [] Its usual minister is the bishop. Should a priest administer Confirmation the chrism he uses must have been blessed by a bishop. St. Isidore's teaching on the Holy Eucharist is slightly influenced by the Eastern theory that the bread and wine are changed in the Mass, not by the words of consecration, but at the prayer invoking the Holy Spirit's action which follows. As to the use of the Holy Eucharist, St. Augustine, in the heat of the Pelagian discussion, had taught that even children must receive It as a condition of salvation. St. Isidore, who does not follow him here, follows him in his insistence that It may be received even daily provided that the recipient is free from serious sin and motivated by religious devotion and humility. The Holy Eucharist is, again, a sacrifice that Christ Himself has instituted and St. Gregory's doctrine of the power of the sacrifice to atone for the sins of the dead finds an echo, too, in the Spanish bishop.

Christian marriage, since it is a figure of the indissoluble union between Christ and the Church, is itself indissoluble. It was to be blessed by the priest and religious considerations had their role in the matrimonial relations.

St. Isidore, in whose writings the Middle Ages found an encyclopaedia of human knowledge, is certainly not one of the greatest names in theological history. In the general history of the Church, however, he is more important, for he is one of the chief links between the golden age of the Fathers and that of the medieval scholastics; and he is almost the last writer for four centuries to merit the name of theologian at all. His work has this additional importance, for us, that it mirrors the belief and life of the Church on the eve of the next catastrophe to overwhelm it.

The history of Catholicism in Spain after the century which followed the reunion of 589 is not well known to us. If it produced an Isidore of Seville, it had never a Gregory of Tours nor a Bede. There are the scanty records of Roman intervention, there are the canons of the innumerable councils, and that is

almost all. The picture we construct from such materials can hardly be complete. For whatever it is worth, it shows us a Church which is in many respects a department of the State. The kings named the bishops, and, in time of crisis, the bishops lent all their religious prestige to the kings. In this sense they were patriotic enough, though we are hardly in a position to decide whether they would not have done better for the Church and for Spain by throwing their influence against the continuance of the elective monarchy. The same evils afflicted the Spanish hierarchy that are to be noted in seventh-century Gaul -- personal loose living and, above all, simony. One result of the closer connection with the State -- the closest to obtain in any of those barbarian kingdoms -- was the almost complete failure of the bishops to act independently of the king, save occasionally in political matters. We find bishops who share in plots and rebellions: we find none who come to their death through an apostolic fearlessness that rebukes the royal sins to the sinner's face. Here the Spanish episcopate apparently falls below the standard of the bishops of Gaul. The bishops suffered as the whole of the Church suffered, and the nation too, from the country's isolation. There was never a Columbanus nor an Augustine to stimulate with the vitality of difference the sluggish evenness of national piety. Nor did the Benedictine rule penetrate into Spain, in all the two centuries that lay between St. Benedict and the Arab conquest. Nation and Church stagnated together, and as they had lived so they fell. To blame the Spanish Church for the national unpreparedness is to reverse the logic of facts, for the Spanish Church was very largely what the Spanish kings had made it. It was thanks to them that it had become part of the nation, dependent on the nation, and therefore powerless to renew its life. One thing alone could have saved Spanish Catholicism and through it the nation -- effective intervention from outside. By the end of the seventh century, with Spain, Europe and the Papacy as they were then organised, this was out of the question. And it is questionable whether Spain would have welcomed it. The significant fact remains, that the first of these barbarian Christianities to fall was the state-ridden Church of what had been the least barbarian of all the western provinces of the old empire.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 4: THE CHURCH AND THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE, 714-814

1. THE HERESY OF THE ICONOCLASTS

THE century that opened with the pontificate of St. Gregory closed very gloomily. The Lombards, for all that they were now Catholics, still menaced the security of Rome; the churches of the East were once again tamely acquiescing in the imperial defiance of the Roman supremacy; and if England and Ireland, the new provinces of Christ's kingdom, were thriving vigorously, morality and Christian order in the older church of Gaul were in worse condition even than in the time of St. Gregory. Finally, the new power which, sixty years before, had so dramatically conquered the lands whence Christianity had originally come, was once more moving; and it was capturing the West, now, as easily as it had then captured the East.

Carthage fell to the Mohammedans in 698 and in the next ten years they were masters of the whole of Roman Africa to the Atlantic. The internal quarrels of the aristocracy in Spain, and the assistance of the governor of Ceuta, the Byzantine Empire's last scrap of territory in the West, gave them their chance. They crossed the Strait of Gibraltar (711) in the imperial vessels-12,000 men in all, of whom but a poor 300 were Arabs. The chief and the army were Moors, Catholics only a few years earlier. The Visigothic army they routed in one decisive battle, and, victorious, spread like a flood over southern Spain. Cordova, Elvira, Merida, Toledo, were occupied in turn. In 718 Saragossa was taken and in 720 the Mohammedans crossed the Pyrenees. They took Narbonne, and though, in 721, they failed to take Toulouse the whole of the south-west was soon in their hands. Bordeaux, Nimes, Carcassonne were Mohammedan towns, and even Autun. In these same years other Arab-directed armies pressed with equal success to the conquest of the East. From Persia, a conquest since the first days of the new religion, they now overran Turkestan and central Asia, the valley of the Indus and the Punjab. Armenia and the Caucasus fell to them and, masters of an empire that stretched from the Atlantic to the Great Wall of China, they laid siege in 717 to Constantinople.

The rulers of what had been the Eastern division of the old Roman Empire, for all that they resisted stoutly, had been for many years powerless against this new force. Heraclius, upon whom the first disasters fell at the moment when he had barely completed his deliverance of the East from Persia, died in despair (642). Constans II (642-668) had the unhappy experience of a monotony of defeat. With his son Constantine IV (668-685) affairs mended somewhat. The new emperor was a more vigorous personality than his father and he held off for five years the boldest venture the Arabs had yet attempted -- the siege of Constantinople (673-678), defeating their fleet with terrible losses at Syllaeum, and their armies in Asia Minor. It was Islam's first real check and for twenty years there was peace.

The next emperor, Justinian II, was, alas, a fool, a half-crazed tyrant, thoroughly incompetent. A revolution drove him out and for sixteen years the empire was given over to anarchy. These were the years of the new Arab advance, of the loss to them of Africa and Spain, and of the Arab seige of Constantinople. The capital was threatened, this time, by the Bulgarians, barbarians lately settled between the Danube and the Balkan mountains. Its deliverer was the military commander of the province of Anatolia, Leo the Isaurian. He marched on the capital with his army and was proclaimed emperor as Leo III. He was to reign for twenty-three years (717-740) and in that time to re-establish order and security for centuries yet to come. Leo III is, with his son and successor, Constantine V (740-775), the creator of that Byzantine State which for another five hundred years effectively staved off the ever recurring assaults from the East.

Gradually the Arabs were driven out of Asia Minor, and Constantine V, taking the offensive, recaptured Cyprus and harried Armenia and Syria to the Euphrates. To these two princes, very largely, do we owe it that the nascent civilisation of the Catholic Middle Ages was not stifled by Islam while it was yet painfully learning to breathe. At the same time, they crippled the power which menaced from the west this one civilised Christian State-the half-civilised Bulgarians.

These warrior princes did the State equally valuable service as reformers. The process which, in the previous century,

recognising the facts of the case, had consciously worked to make of the Roman Empire of the East, a Greek-speaking, Oriental-mannered State, was pressed forward more and still more vigorously. A new reorganisation of the provinces, a new distribution of powers, a military code, a code of agricultural laws to arrest the development by which the wealthy landowner was growing more and more wealthy and the peasant becoming a slave, and above all a new code of civil law -- it is for this reconstruction of the State, as well as for the military genius which ensured that there should be a State to reconstruct, that the Isaurian emperors deserve their high place in the history of civilisation.

They have another, very different, title to fame as the agents of a new religious controversy which rent the empire for sixty years, embittered their relations with the pope, who by this was the sole surviving power in the West that remained loyal to the empire, and which gave to the Church hundreds of new martyrs. This was the celebrated controversy as to the lawfulness of the reverence paid to the images of the saints, a practice which these emperors began to forbid under extreme penalties. A quotation from the classic historian of the empire, Finlay, shows the connection of this apparent aberration with the general policy of the Isaurian emperors and it explains the bitterness with which, from the beginning, they attacked the practice and punished its adherents. " [The period 717-867] opens with the efforts by which Leo and the people of the empire saved Roman Law and the Christian religion from the conquering Saracens. It embraces a long and violent struggle between the government and the people, the emperors seeking to increase the central power by annihilating every local franchise, and even the right of private opinion among their subjects. The contest concerning image-worship. . . became the expression of this struggle. Its object was as much to consolidate the supremacy of the imperial authority, as to purify the practice of the Church. The emperors wished to constitute themselves the fountains of ecclesiastical as completely as of civil legislation." []

Images -- painted and sculptured representations of persons and mysteries, allegorical scenes, scenes from biblical history, or the liturgy, images even of definite historical personages, of Our Lord, His mother, and the saints, had been used by the Christian churches from at least the first century as testify, not

merely the reference to them in the early writers, but the numbers of such primitive images which still survive. It is less easy to be certain that a definite cult was paid, in the period before Constantine's conversion at least, to the actual image for the sake of its subject. With Constantine's conversion there is very definitely a cult of the Cross, and apparently, about the same time, the beginnings of a cult of other images, for already the practice has its critics, and the Council of Elvira in 305-306 definitely forbids the placing of pictures in the churches "lest what is worshipped and adored be painted on the walls." [] A little later, at the other extremity of the Christian world, Eusebius of Cesarea, the father of Church History, is explaining to Constantine's sister that he cannot send her the image of Christ for which she asks since the Scriptures forbid the making of images. He adds that, having recently found one of the faithful with what passed for pictures of Our Lord and St. Paul in her possession, he had confiscated them, lest the practice should spread, and Christians, like the idolaters, should come to think they could carry God round in a picture.

That such reasons should prevail in a time when idolatry had hardly ceased to be the State religion and when it was still fashionable, was only natural. Despite such critics -- Eusebius did not lack successors -- the use of images spread, however, and by the time of Justinian (527-565) it was generally established in the East at least, and along with it, but more slowly, the practice of paying a reverence to the image itself. Theologians noted carefully the precise import of such reverence. Thus Leontius, Bishop of Neopolis (c. 582-602), explains (in reply to a Jewish gibe that the Christians, too, are idolaters in their veneration of images and the cross) that the reverence is purely relative; the prostrations before them, the kisses lavished upon them, the place of honour given to them in the churches are directed to the personage they represent. The whole apologetic of Catholic practice in the matter appears here so fully developed that fifteen hundred years of further controversy have added nothing to it.

The practice of the Church in the West was, in this as in other matters, somewhat behind the practice in the East. One of the earliest traces of reverence to images of the saints in the West is the reference, in a poem of Fortunatus, written at the latest in 576, to the lamps that burn before the picture of S. . Martin of

Tours. Twenty years later than this we have a witness to the custom in no less a personage than St. Gregory. The pope writes to the Bishop of Marseilles who, fearing his people may make an idolatrous use of the statues, had had them broken up. He points out to the bishop that such pictures and images serve as books to the illiterate. Since it is for this purpose, and not for adoration, that the images are placed in the churches, the bishop does wrong in destroying them. Does he set himself against the universal practice of the Church? Does he claim a monopoly of sanctity and wisdom?

St. Gregory, in these texts, can hardly be claimed as urging the use of images for devotional purposes. [] Still less can he be said to oppose it, or condemn it. The practice continued to spread in the West, and within a century from the death of St. Gregory it was as general there as in the East. The criticism from outside the Church did not cease. Besides the Jews there were the Manichees of the type known as Paulicians. They refused to reverence the Cross because they regarded with horror all that it represented. The Monophysites, too, opposed the use, and even the making, of sacred images. Severus, Peter the Fuller, and other leaders of the party have all gone down to history as strenuous opponents of the practice. To make an image of Jesus Christ was to imply that He had a true human nature and since many of the Monophysites believed Him to be only partly human their objection to the picture or statue is understandable.

It is not easy to say exactly why the emperor Leo III suddenly showed himself in the role of iconoclast. It may have been associations of his youth, for he came from a province not far from the centre of the Paulician movement. It may have been from Monophysite associations, for again he came from a region where the sect had been strong and persecuted. Or again his opposition may be taken as an example of the anti-Hellenist side of that revival of the East which, in progress now for two hundred years, was about to reach its climax, the century of Mohammedan culture's apogee, of Asiatic emperors and Oriental popes. The cult of the beauty of the human form was one element of the domination of Hellenism to which not all the centuries had ever really converted the East. Now, in a variety of ways, the reaction against that cult was showing itself. One of its fruits, perhaps, was the revolutionary religious policy of Leo III.

There was nothing to shock or surprise contemporary opinion in the circumstance that the emperor should occupy himself with reform in religious matters. These were, and had been, his acknowledged province -- so far as the mass of the Eastern bishops were concerned -- almost from the days of Constantine himself. [] The semi-divine emperor of the pagan empire had never so abdicated his prerogative as to be no more than one of the faithful in the body of the Church. Gradually, in all that concerned its administration, he had come to be its head. He patronised orthodox or heretic as he chose, and whom he patronised prospered. He never, of course, pretended to exercise spiritual powers, to give sacraments for example, nor, if he were a Catholic, did he claim to alter the faith. On the other hand he certainly claimed the right to decide the expediency of issuing condemnations of heresy, and to choose the method of condemnation. He never denied the Church's infallibility, but he expected to control the movement of its exercise. He named the bishops of his empire, and when they crossed his path, as to their credit they frequently did, he deposed and exiled them without scruple. When Justinian came to give the imperial law its classic recasting, the Church law went into his code en bloc. "Nothing should escape the prince, to whom God has confided the care of all mankind," he said. Never did any State lay its hand on the Church so effectively; and when Leo III declared "I am priest no less than emperor," he was little more than a faithful echo to his predecessors.

It was in 726 that the first edict against religious images appeared. The text has long been lost, but apparently it provided for the removal of the images, and the attempt to take down the image of Our Lord which was placed above the gate of the imperial palace, provoked a riot at Constantinople. Throughout the European provinces, in Greece and in Southern Italy, there were similar demonstrations, and even an attempt to dethrone Leo. The Greek insurrection came to an end with the defeat of the pretender's fleet: in Italy the Iconoclasts were less fortunate. In 730 the emperor advanced his policy a step further. He summoned the Patriarch of Constantinople, Germanus I, to sign a decree condemning the veneration of images. Germanus refused, and was promptly deposed and imprisoned. Shortly afterwards he was put to death. A compliant successor was provided and soon the emperor had a substantial following in

the very episcopate. The pope, Gregory II (715- 731), one of the rare popes of this time who was not an Oriental, now intervened. He had had a long experience of the Byzantine tyranny in ecclesiastical affairs and, in the days when he was still no more than a deacon and the half-mad Justinian II was emperor, he had by his diplomacy extricated the reigning pope -- Constantine -- from a difficult situation (710). [] Later, as pope, he had been the chief means of preserving the empire's Italian territories for Leo III in the first difficult years of his reign. His letters to Constantinople [] dealing with the new crisis recall bluntly to the emperor the realities of the situation. The empire's hold on the pope is but a name, and he has at hand more powerful protectors, the new Barbarian princes: " If you send troops for the destruction of the images of St. Peter, look to it." The successor of St. Germanus was threatened with deposition unless he amended. This correspondence must have been one of the pope's last activities, for in 731 Gregory II died.

His successor, Gregory III (731-741), took up his policy. Five times at least he wrote to the emperor, begging him to return to the traditional practice, and then, summoning a council at Rome on November 1, 731, the pope condemned and excommunicated whoever condemned the veneration of images or destroyed them. The emperor, for reply, copied his predecessors. As Justinian I had arrested Vigilius in 545 and brought him to the capital, as Constans II in 654 had similarly outraged St. Martin I, as Justinian II had attempted to kidnap Sergius I in 695, and had forced the appearance in 710 of Constantine, so Leo III now sent off a fleet to arrest Gregory III. The fleet was, however, destroyed by storms as it crossed the Adriatic, and the emperor contented himself with the seizure of the papal estates in Sicily and Calabria -- the main part of that Patrimonium Sancti Petri from whose revenues the popes financed their administration of Rome and the relief of its poor.

Leo III aroused another adversary, in addition to the pope. This was the great scholar whom we know as St. John Damascene, in whose writings the theological genius of Greek-speaking Catholicism makes its last notable appearance.

To the iconoclast controversy St. John contributed, between 726 and 730, three essays. They defend the lawfulness of making images, and the Catholic practice of paying them honour. To

deny them honour because they are material things is Manicheism. As to the honour paid them it is never more than relative. The varied usefulness of images, as a means of instruction, as reminders of the love of God, and of the virtues of the saints, as stimulating devotion -- are all set forth. As to the recent legislation, the saint declares roundly that religious matters are outside the emperor's competence. "It is not for princes to give laws to the Church. . . . The princes' business is the State's political welfare. The state of the Church is a matter for bishops and theologians." Despite St. John's reasoning, and despite the papal decision, Leo III persevered in his policy, and when he died, in 741, the new regime was triumphant in the Asiatic provinces at least, and the Eastern church was once more out of communion with Rome after a peace of fifty years.

The new emperor Constantine V (741-775) was determined to reduce the European provinces as his father had reduced those of Asia Minor. He is the curiously violent and crude figure who has gone down to history as Copronymos -- a soubriquet not so impossible to translate as, translated, to print. The accident by which as a baby he soiled the font of his baptism, whence the name derived, was an unconscious foreshadowing of one distorted side of his later life. His accession gave the Iconoclast movement new life. Once the political troubles that followed his father's death were ended Constantine made a bid to capture for the movement the support of the whole Greek episcopate. At a council held at the palace of Hieria (February 10, 753) 338 bishops assented to a declaration that to make images, to honour them, to give them any veneration was sinful. Particularly was this so in the case of images of Our Lord, for such images claimed either to present merely His humanity -- separating the natures as Nestorius had done -- or, if they claimed more, they confused the two natures. To make images of the saints is, further, a sacrilegious attempt to prolong their earthly life. All images, then, are to be removed from the churches as things contrary to faith and abominable. Whoever contravenes this decree is excommunicated, and, if a priest or bishop, deposed. The emperor would have gone further and denied the belief in the saints' power of intercession, along with the doctrines which were that belief's foundation -- the doctrines, that is, of the resurrection of the body and of the eternity of hell and heaven. The bishops, however, held firm and their orthodoxy here prevailed.

The decrees of the council were the beginning of a general war on images and on all who venerated them. They were torn down in church after church and in their place were set, for decoration, landscapes and pictures of animals and birds. From the bishops and the generality of their clergy the emperor met with little opposition. They accepted the decrees without difficulty. But in the monks he met a resistance as determined and as prolonged as the Catholic emperors had met in the matter of Monophysitism. Many were exiled, and then the emperor turned to worse penalties. From 761 when the first monks were martyred to 775, when Constantine died, was a very real reign of terror. The monasteries were forbidden to receive novices, the monks were forcibly married, the cult of the saints was forbidden. It became criminal to pray to them, and the very term " saint " was declared unlawful.

With the death of Constantine V (September 14, 775) the persecution halted, for his son, Leo IV, though himself an Iconoclast, was by no means so violently attached to the movement as his father, who had been one of its creators. Moreover his wife, the Empress Irene, secretly favoured the Catholics. Leo IV's short reign prepared the way for the reaction which followed, for on his death (780) Irene took over the government as regent for his child successor Constantine VI.

The first move towards a restoration of the tradition was the resignation of the Patriarch of Constantinople, as an act of reparation for his former surrender. In his place the Secretary of State, Tarasius, was appointed, who immediately denounced the decision of the Council of 753 and appealed for a general council. The empress agreed and the pope too -- one of the great popes of the century, Adrian I (772-795). But the first attempt to hold the council failed. The army, largely recruited from the highlands of Isauria, had always been a centre of the Iconoclast movement and it was still attached to the innovations of the first two great Isaurians. The soldiery, then, drove out the council and threatened a revolution. Irene gave way and bided her time. The mutineers were gradually replaced by troops on whom she could rely and, a year later, on September 24, 787, the council met at Nicea beyond the Bosphorus where, three hundred years earlier, the first of all the general councils had assembled.

More than 300 bishops attended the council, the pope was represented by two legates and the Patriarch of Constantinople presided. There were in all eight sessions, the last of them on October 23, 787, just one month from the first. The Roman legates, as in preceding councils, [] were the bearers of a letter from the pope which set out the traditional belief. The pseudo-council of 753, he lays down, is to be anathematised in the presence of the papal legates since it was held without the Apostolic See and went against tradition. Thus will the words of Our Lord that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" and "Thou art Peter. . . " be fulfilled of that see whose tenure of the primacy shines throughout the world and which is set as head of all the churches of God. The papal letters were read and accepted; and, in successive sessions, with much citation of texts from early writers, it was declared to be part of the Church's faith and practice, that the saints should be invoked in prayer, that images and relics should be received and embraced with honour. The Council of 753, its acts detailed, was condemned; and, in a final decree, the kind of honour due to sacred images was defined-it is an adoration of honour, not the adoration of worship reserved to God as Divine. It is therefore lawful to light lamps before the pictures of the saints or to burn incense before them, since the honour paid to the image is really given to the personage it represents.

The Council of 787 should have ended the controversy for ever. Of the events that led to its reopening, and of the repercussions of the dispute in the distant western kingdom of the Franks we must, however, treat elsewhere.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



2. THE WORK OF ST. BONIFACE

While, on the Eastern frontiers of Christendom, the emperors were enforcing policies that threatened to weaken still further this remnant of the old world and to lose to the Church its last cultured people, a new movement of consolidation was, in the West, laying the foundation on which all the external activity of the Church for the next five hundred years was to be built. This was the alliance between the Papacy and the kingdom of the Franks. The agents of the work were the two Mayors of the Palace, Charles Martel and his son Pepin the Short, the Popes Zachary and Stephen II, the Lombard kings, Liutprand and Aistulf and the English missionary bishop St. Boniface.

Pepin of Heristal, in whom this family emerges as the real ruler of the Franks, died in 714. Charles Martel was one of his natural children -- then twenty-six years of age -- and, lest he should usurp the heritage, locked away in a fortress by his father's widow. He escaped, however, and, in the customary manner, made away with the heirs, his half-brothers, and seized the position his father had left. He showed himself, from the first, to be a mighty warrior, the greatest soldier Gaul had known since the last of the Roman generals. The Frisians, the Saxons, the Bavarians, the Alemanni -- all these hostile nations of the eastern frontier, felt his hand in turn. Aquitaine, Burgundy and the western Frankish kingdom too, he so thoroughly subdued that by the time of his death (741) all Gaul was once again, after three centuries, really united under one ruler.

Another enemy against whom his wars never ceased was Islam. In 732 the Mohammedan armies had penetrated as far as Poitiers. Here Charles met them, and in one of the really decisive battles of world history, he defeated them with tremendous slaughter. In 735 there was a new campaign, the Saracens having seized Arles and Avignon and penetrated even into Burgundy; and in 737 a further campaign in which, again with great slaughter of the defeated, Nimes and other strongholds in the south were restored to Christianity. By the end of his reign, Charles Martel had established himself as the natural political chief of Western Christendom. Against the Arabs he had repeated in the West the success of Leo III in the East; in his

own realm he had established a political leadership it had not known for centuries; and, unlike his great Eastern contemporary, he had not been so unfortunate as to involve himself in a quarrel with the Church. So far indeed was he from enmity that he has a place as one of the chief promoters of its missionary activities. "Were it not for the King of the Franks," said St. Boniface, "I could not rule the faithful, nor defend my priests and clerics, the monks and the servants of God. Nor would I be able, without the fear his commands inspire, to hinder the paganism and idolatry of Germany."

The King of the Franks was the mission's protector, but the missionary was the Englishman Boniface, and in him the apostolic Benedictine monachism, to which his own country owed so much, now returned to the continent, in the service of the Roman Church that had first sent it to England, to be now that Church's instrument for the conversion of Germany. St. Boniface -- Winfrid was his name until the pope changed it -- was born in Devonshire about the year 680. He was of noble birth and he had to fight with his family before he was allowed his heart's desire to become a monk at Exeter. From Exeter he went to Nursling, in Hampshire, and here he came, indirectly, under the influence of St. Aldhelm, Abbot of Malmesbury, and Bishop of Sherborne, a gifted, artistic spirit, poet and musician, whose school was, for the west, something of what Jarrow and the school of York were for the north. In all this culture St. Boniface was well versed. He became rector of the abbey school and the author of a Latin grammar. He was a scholar; as the time went, a savant; and he was an ascetic too. In 710 he was ordained priest, and then he began a second siege of authority to consent to his desires -- this time to go as a missionary into Germany. Not until 716 did his abbot yield, and in that year Boniface crossed over to Frisia.

Here a one-time monk of Iona had for many years been labouring. This was Willibrord, the founder of the see of Utrecht, to which, in 695, Pope Sergius I had consecrated him, and of the famous abbey of Echternach in what to-day is Luxembourg. Boniface's first essay was not successful and he returned to Nursling. The abbot died, and Boniface had the utmost difficulty in avoiding election as his successor. His heart was still in Germany, and in 718 he set out for Rome. From Rome he returned to Frisia, officially commissioned this time, and for

three years he worked with St. Willibrord.

In 722 the pope -- Gregory II -- recalled him, consecrated him bishop and once more despatched him to Germany, to work this time as the chief of an independent mission. One feature of this consecration has a great significance, for it reveals that desire of immediate control over its subordinates which characterised the policy of the Roman See since the peace of Constantine first set it free to organise its powers. The newly-consecrated bishop swore obedience to the pope in the same terms that the suffragan bishops of the Roman province had used from time immemorial. The consecration was a sign, also, that the new churches of Germany were to be the pope's own personal concern. The pope also gave Boniface letters for Charles Martel, and the Frankish king gave the missionary the sealed letter of safety which was to be, for thirty years, the human means of his protection.

For the next twenty years Boniface moved through Hesse and Thuringia preaching the simplicities of the Gospel, destroying the pagan sanctuaries and everywhere founding monasteries, for women no less than for men. Amoeneburg, Ohrdruff, Fritzlar, Bischoffsheim, Kitzingen, Ochsenfurt, all date from this time. He remained in constant communication with Rome, which the death of his patron Gregory II did not interrupt. The new pope, Gregory III, recalled him in 742 to give him the pallium, and declare him Archbishop, and to commission him to found other sees. In all there were eight of these -- Salzburg, Frisingen, Ratisbon, Passau, Buraburg, Erfurt, Wurzburg, and Eichstadt. Two years after his return from Rome he founded the most celebrated of all German abbeys at Fulda. In 753 it was made directly subject to the Roman See -- a rare distinction at that time -- and ten years later its monks numbered 400. There St. Boniface's body still rests, brought by the pious hands of his disciples after the martyrdom which came to him, in 755, in that Frisia where his missionary career had opened.

St. Boniface is the apostle of Germany, as St. Patrick is of Ireland, and through the co-operation of Frankish king and pope in support of his mission he is, in a way, a co-founder of the alliance between these two powers of western Europe. But his relations with the Frankish king, and with that alliance, were still more intimate. St. Boniface has a double career. He is a reformer

in Gaul as truly as he is a founder in Germany.

The religious revival of which the Irish foundation at Luxeuil was the centre had never received any steady support from the Frankish kings. Wherever the monks of St. Columbanus settled, works of piety flourished, morals and Christian life revived, the heathens were converted. But over the great mass of the territory ruled by the Franks the old disorders still went on unchecked, clerical illiteracy and immorality, simony, the brutality of the lay nobles degrading the sees and the monasteries they forcibly appropriated. Despite all the labours of a century of saints, Frankish Catholicism was in as bad a plight at the end of the seventh century as it had been at the beginning.

The accession of Charles Martel made matters worse. The ceaseless effort of defence against Mohammedans in the south and Saxons in the east which filled the twenty-seven years of his reign, entailed a kind of universal conscription in the national life. To the needs of the sovereign everything was ruthlessly subordinated, the Church no less than the rest. Its property, its prestige, its jurisdiction and revenues were chiefly valuable to him as a treasury from which to reward the faithful vassal and to secure the allegiance of the waverer. Men little better than brigands, ancestors of the robber-baron villains of the nursery tale, began to fill the sees. Some could not even read. The luckier among them held several sees at once. Other great sees were left for years without a bishop. How the spiritual life of the Church fared under such prelates, drunkards, murderers, debauchees, can be imagined. Recalling it in years to come, and recalling the man who was so largely responsible, St. Boniface could assure Pepin, Charles Martel's son, that his father was certainly in hell, and Pepin could believe it. Against thirty years of such a regime, crowning as it did a century of steady decline, nothing but occasional, isolated, individual piety was left to survive.

St. Boniface's career in Gaul really begins with the death of the terrible Charles Martel (741). The two sons who succeeded, Pepin the Short and Carloman, had received a monastic education at St. Denis, and it was in the kingdom of Carloman, soon to become a monk himself, that St. Boniface began his new career. As in his pioneer work in Germany, so now as reformer

in Gaul, he acted as agent of the Roman Church. Councils were held, the first for nearly a century, in the eastern kingdom in 741 and 744, in Pepin's kingdom at Soissons, also in 744; and, in 745, a general council met of the whole of the Frankish Church. Vacant sees were filled, new sees founded, the grouping of the sees round a metropolitan see restored. Councils were henceforth to meet annually, the metropolitan was to make the visitation of the bishops, the bishops of their clergy. The itinerant clergy were to be suppressed. The laws forbidding the clergy to marry, to carry arms, to hunt, and providing that they should wear the special clerical dress, were renewed. For delinquents appropriate sanctions were provided -- spiritual penalties and others too, imprisonment and floggings. In the monasteries the rule of St. Benedict was henceforth of obligation. Other canons dealt with the superstitious rites and survivals of paganism with which the popular Catholicism was interwoven. Sacrifices to trees and streams, the custom of honouring the pagan holy days, magical practices, witchcraft -- all these still flourished in places, and these councils provided for their extirpation.

A much less usual matter was the appearance of heretics. One of them, Adalbert, a Frank, gave himself out as a new prophet, to whom angels had brought relics of an invincible efficacy. He had new prayers, filled with mysterious names; forgave sins without confession; gave away his own hair and nails as relics; and in the course of years had gathered an immense following, and had even found two fools of bishops to consecrate him. The other heretic Clement, was an Irishman. His teaching was of a more intellectual kind -- a curious eclectic rearrangement of orthodoxy and heresy.

The reform council so earnestly desired by St. Gregory had at last been realised -- a hundred and forty years after his death. But the old obstacle to any real reform still survived. Pepin was no less attached to the royal hold on the Church than the Merovingians whom he had displaced. He was willing enough to see the disorders of clerical life corrected, and laws made to improve the quality of Frankish Christianity, but to the canons which, restoring the hierarchy, provided the only safeguard for the future, he turned a deaf ear. So long as he reigned none of the proposed metropolitan organisation passed into practice. Not even St. Boniface himself found recognition as archbishop

of a particular see, for all his reception of the pallium from Pope Zachary and his extensive authority as papal legate. For all his sanctity, and the merit of his mighty labours, he was never, for these princes, anything more than the bishop of the frontier never, apparently, a force in their councils, never a political power never personally intimate with any of them. This situation had its advantages, the greatest of which was the possibility of preaching Catholicism to the Saxons as a thing not necessarily associated with their detested Frankish conquerors. The main strength of the English saint lay not in Frankish sovereigns, for all the value of the protection they afforded him, but in his constant, uninterrupted relations with the popes. At every turn he lays before them his plans and his difficulties, and it is the popes who encourage and console him. These three popes -- Gregory II, Gregory III, and Zachary -- are very truly the sources of the new German church's vitality, as they are, also, of what new life came through Boniface to the Church in Gaul. Zachary died in 752 and the saint survived him a bare three years. Before the martyrdom came which crowned his long life of self-sacrificing exile, political affairs in the Frankish kingdom had taken a new turn. The new pope, Stephen II (752-757), had inaugurated, between the Roman See and the one Catholic power in the West, that alliance which was to be the pivot of papal history for the next five hundred years, and which was to do much, in the immediate future, to change the type of character elected as Bishop of Rome. In that revolution St. Boniface had little more than a place of honour. He was the greatest bishop of the Frankish empire, and the one in closest touch with Rome; but it was others whom Pepin chose as his agents when, in 751, he besought the papal sanction for the coup d'etat he meditated.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



3. THE ORIGIN OF THE PAPAL STATE

It was now more than a century since any of the descendants of Clovis had actually reigned. Since the death of Dagobert (638) the kings had merely succeeded. The power was entirely in the hands of their chief subjects, and since 687 in the hands of the family of Pepin. It was they, the Mayors of the Palace, who ruled, the Merovingian kings only appearing in public once or twice in the course of their reign. So real was the power of the Carolingians that, within half a century, of their first laying hold of it Charles Martel was able to leave the kingship vacant for thirteen years. Pepin, when he succeeded his father, filled it once more, but in 751, flushed with a series of new victories, and, since the retirement of Carloman his brother to an Italian monastery, sole ruler of the Franks like his father before him, he determined to end the anomaly once for all. The Merovingian should be deposed and himself, with the reality of power, have the title also. He set the problem before the pope as a case of conscience. The pope agreed to the abstract case that whoever really ruled should be called king, and Pepin, strong in this ratification, assumed the succession for himself and his family in a general assembly of the nation. The last of the Merovingians was tonsured, with his son, and Pepin was consecrated king by St. Boniface.

This consecration, a solemn anointing with holy oil, already in use among the Visigoths and the Anglo-Saxons, [] was a novelty in Gaul. It gave the new monarchy, from the beginning, something of a sacred character; and in the eyes of the new kings also, it may be, warranted that control in Church matters which they took over from the Merovingians and which they were to develop very strikingly in the next hundred years until it reached to the nomination of the popes themselves. Three years later the anointing was repeated with even greater solemnity. This time, in 754, it was the pope himself who conferred it, and on Pepin's sons as well -- Carloman and the future Charlemagne -- announcing, "It is the Lord who through our lowliness consecrates you as king."

It was not merely to ratify the act of Boniface that, in 753, Stephen II had made the long journey from Rome to Quierzy.

Between the first and second consecrations of Pepin a revolution in Italy had altered the whole temporal status of the papacy, and in that revolution the Frankish king's action had been the decisive factor. It has already been noted how, in the time of St. Gregory the Great, the Roman popes found themselves faced with the insoluble problem of being the loyal subjects of an emperor who would not come to terms with the Lombard invaders and who yet could not defeat them. As the seventh century wore on this problem grew even more acute. The Lombards increased their conquests until -- outside Calabria -- Aquileia, Venice, Rome, Naples, and their neighbouring countrysides were all that was left of Justinian's Italy. The Lombards, meanwhile, had abandoned their Arianism; they were now devout Catholics. The emperors, on the other hand, were the leaders and chief promoters of new heresies, of Monothelism in the seventh century, of Iconoclasm in the eighth. They showed themselves as ready to tyrannise in matters of religion, as willing to harry and even to murder the popes, as they were incompetent to defend their inheritance against the Lombards. Their representative at Ravenna lost his hold on all except the actual territory round that city; and while the duchies of Naples and Venice tended to become autonomous, the duchy of Rome, thanks to the popes, not only remained loyal but, more than once, helped by the circumstance that it was papal territory no less than imperial, it came to the assistance of the beleaguered exarch in Ravenna. It was a curious situation when the pope, whose properties the emperor had confiscated, whose arrest he had ordered, and against whom he had fitted out a great fleet, was the solitary defence in Italy of the emperor's representative.

But during the reigns of the popes who were the patrons of St. Boniface -- Gregory II, Gregory III and Zachary -- events occurred that brought this anomaly to an end. The Lombard chiefs were, by this time (c. 715), three in number; there was the king of the Lombards, whose capital was Pavia; there were the two dukes of Spoleto and Benevento, nominally his subjects, but actually more than half independent. The king contemporary with these three popes was Liutprand (712-744), the greatest of all the Lombard kings and, as events were to show, an excellent Catholic.

It was the new religious policy of the Emperor Leo III that

occasioned the beginnings of change. When Gregory II denounced the imperial laws that forbade the veneration of images and banished them from the churches, the creaking imperial machinery was set in motion to reduce him to submission, as it had been set in motion against his predecessors, Sergius I in 695 and St. Martin I in 654. As in 695, the Roman people and the Roman division of the imperial army stood by the pope. The Lombards too joined with them, and it was their army that halted the exarch as he marched from Ravenna to execute the imperial will against St. Gregory. The exarch retreated to his capital, his troops mutinied and in the riot he lost his life. His successor preferred the ways of negotiation and, as a preliminary to reducing the pope, was bidden to break the new, unheard-of, papal alliance with the Lombards. The involved diplomacy, in which the mutual rivalry of the Lombard king and dukes played its part, ended curiously enough in a three-cornered pact between pope, exarch, and the Lombard king. This was in 730. The next year Gregory II died.

His successor Gregory III, a Syrian, was just as resolute in his opposition to the Iconoclast emperor and in his defence of Leo's victims. The emperor confiscated the papal estates in Sicily and southern Italy. He cut the communications between the pope and the bishops of these provinces. But against the pope himself he was powerless, thanks to the growing autonomy of the duchies now separated from Ravenna by intervening Lombard territories, and thanks to the Lombard reduction of the exarch's power. The ten years of Gregory III's rule (731-741) were years of Lombard conquest, and the Romans were sufficiently ill-advised to assist the Duke of Spoleto against the king, and so to give Liutprand every excuse he needed to capture Rome itself. Rome the king did not indeed attack, but he had captured four towns in the north of the duchy when Gregory III died. The next pope, Zachary -- yet another oriental -- was more diplomatic. As Liutprand marched on Rome the papal policy changed. The cause of the rebel Duke of Spoleto was abandoned. The king promised to evacuate the Roman territory, and to restore the captured towns; and the Roman army joined with his to attack Spoleto. Two years later it was the turn of Ravenna to feel the weight of the Lombard power. Liutprand, master of Bologna, and of Cesena, had Ravenna in his hands when Zachary besought him to spare it. Once more the papal diplomacy, because it was papal, was successful.

In the following year (744) Liutprand died. The new king, Ratchis, was equally warlike, and equally docile to the voice of St. Peter. As Liutprand had abandoned his campaign against Ravenna, so Ratchis now gave up the siege of Perugia. He did more, for in 749 he abdicated, and buried himself in the monastery of Monte Cassino -- an ill event for the fortunes of the imperial rule. Aistulf who succeeded him was of quite another stamp. Before Pope Zachary died (March, 752) Aistulf had taken Ravenna and its duchy, bringing the imperial rule to an end once and for all. He then turned to the towns that lay between his new territories and Rome -- Perugia, Todi, Amelia -- and to the conquest of Rome itself. The new pope, Stephen II (752-757), set himself to negotiate, and secured a peace of forty years. That was in June, 752. By the autumn the treaty was in pieces, and Aistulf demanding tribute from the Romans as the price of his "protection." Once more the pope negotiated, but this time in vain-Aistulf was inflexible. The papal ambassadors were both of them his own subjects, and the king sent them back to their respective monasteries.

The winter passed with the Romans anxiously awaiting the descent of Aistulf's army with the first good days of spring From the emperor -- Constantine V -- all that came was an order to the pope to negotiate with Aistulf for the restoration of Ravenna. The Romans evidently must save themselves; the pope must somehow defeat the Lombards -- and he had no resources-or become their subject, losing the de facto independence he had enjoyed for half a century, and submitting to a barbarian master: unless he could find an ally who would deal effectively with the Lombards and disinterestedly with himself. The pope turned to the Franks, with whose princes, very largely because of St. Boniface, the papacy had been in close relation for thirty years and more.

That the Franks should be called in to defend Rome against the Lombards was in keeping with Roman political tradition. Its last appearance had been so recently as the time of Pope Stephen's own predecessor Gregory III, who had made a great appeal to Charles Martel in 739, but fruitlessly. The Frank was then the ally of Liutprand, and saw no good reason why he should make war on his friend to restore Byzantinism at Rome. Thirteen years later the situation was very different. Byzantinism was dead, in

Rome and even in Ravenna. Nor was the pope appealing now for its restoration. It was protection for St. Peter himself, his shrine, his people, his city that was the motive of the appeal. Charles Martel, too, was dead. In his place the pious Pepin reigned, and as recently as a matter of months ago Pepin had sought, and obtained, from St. Peter that ratification which consecrated as a religious act the coup d'état by which he and his family had succeeded to the heritage of Clovis.

The pope approached Pepin with the utmost secrecy, using a pilgrim as his agent. Pepin, in return, sent to Rome the Abbot of Jumieges. The reply which the abbot carried back to France was to the effect that the pope wished to treat personally of the important matter and besought Pepin to provide a suitable escort for his protection. Pepin agreed, and in the September of 753 the escort arrived in Rome.

It found the pope prepared for his momentous journey, and it found with him yet another ambassador from the emperor. In the very hour when the pope, determined to end at last the dangerous futility of his nominal dependence on Constantinople, was setting out to meet his new protector, Byzantinism had again intervened. The pope was ordered to seek out Aistulf and to induce him to restore Ravenna to the empire.

It was then a curiously mixed caravan, where the last of one age and the first of another met, that set out from Rome on October 14, 753, the pope, the imperial ambassador, the Franks. At Pavia they met the Lombard king. The pope made his appeal, the imperial ambassador supplemented it with his own eloquence and a letter from Constantine V. Aistulf, of course, remained unmoved. Whereupon the convoy split up. The Greeks returned to Constantinople; the pope, despite Aistulf's efforts to detain him, made his way to Aosta and the pass of the St. Bernard. At St. Moritz envoys from Pepin met him; at Langres, Pepin's son, the future Charlemagne. By the feast of the Epiphany 754 the pope had reached the royal palace at Ponthieu. Pepin with his court had gone out to meet him, had prostrated himself before the pope and in the procession walked beside him holding his stirrup.

The next day the fateful interview took place. The pope and his

court appeared before the Frankish king clad in sackcloth, ashes on their heads. They besought him to bring about a peaceful settlement of the cause of St. Peter and of the Roman State. Pepin consented, and pledged himself to restore the exarchate with all its rights and territories. Negotiations with Aistulf were opened forthwith. Pepin began by demanding a pledge that the Lombards, out of reverence for St. Peter and St. Paul, would for the future abstain from all hostilities against their city. Aistulf refused, and in two great assemblies of the Franks (at Braisne on March 1 and at Kiersy-sur-Oise on April 14, 754) it was agreed-not without opposition -- that the Lombards should be compelled by force of arms. Pepin marched his army across the Alps and laid siege to Pavia. Aistulf consented to treat. He agreed to surrender Ravenna and his other conquests and even Narni, a Roman town taken years before by Liutprand. In October, 754, the pope returned to Rome.

Aistulf made over Narni to Pepin's representatives, and waited until Pepin and his army were safely over the Alps. Then he went back on his word. He refused to complete the surrender, and returned to the war of raid and pillage against Rome which had driven Pope Stephen to call in the Franks. On January 1, 756, he laid siege to Rome itself. The pope had already urged Pepin to return and complete the work of his first campaign. Now he managed to send a further embassy from the beleaguered city. The envoys took with them, among other letters, one addressed to the whole Frankish nation, written in the name of St. Peter, "I, Peter the Apostle."

Pepin did not delay. As the Frankish army moved south Aistulf abandoned the siege of Rome and marched to meet it. He was defeated and locked himself up in Pavia. Pepin followed and as he prepared to lay siege to the town, once more the ghost of Byzantine Italy appeared. The same high official from Constantinople who had accompanied the pope in the mission of 753 now returned, to demand, of Pepin this time, that the disputed territories should, when he had reconquered them, be made over to the imperial government. Pepin refused. He had gone to war, he explained, for love of St. Peter, hoping by delivering the apostle to win pardon for his sins. The ambassador retired, this time finally. It was the old empire's definitive abandonment of its claim to the city whence it had sprung. Rome was to begin its history anew, independent of the

empire which still continued to bear its name.

The holy war continued. Aistulf was once more compelled to plead. This time the terms were more severe, and Pepin installed an army of occupation until they had been executed. Frankish officials went from town to town receiving the surrenders and the keys of the gates and then, making their way to Rome, they laid the collection before the tomb of the apostle. The pope was now, through the Frankish king's devotion to St. Peter, independent of any temporal ruler, was himself ruler, in name as in fact, of the city and State in which his see was fixed. A new and immense complication was thereby added to the development of Catholicism in the lands once ruled by the Roman Emperor of the West.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



4. THE FIRST YEARS OF THE PAPAL STATE

The history of the next twenty years showed how seriously the complication of the Papacy's new political importance could distract the popes from the task of their spiritual rulership. It showed, also, that if they had escaped subjection to the barbarian Lombards, they had by no means escaped the need to fight for their independence. Finally it introduced a new element into the ecclesiastical life of the greatest of sees. Worldly-minded clerics, ambitious for honours, had always been a possible source of trouble at Rome. Now that the Bishop of Rome was in every sense a sovereign prince, there was added the new danger that the office would be coveted by men who were not clerics at all. To the semi-brigand nobility of the little Papal State there was offered -- at the risk of a riot, a few murders, and the as yet but faintly possible intervention of the distant Franks -- a prize that might from the mere lordship of some petty rock-fortress, transform them into kings. That temptation endured, to be for the next three centuries a constant factor in papal history.

The temptation was nourished by the new hostility between the two bodies who made up the notabilities of the new State -- the clergy and the military aristocracy. In the last years of Byzantine rule the clergy, through their head the pope, had supplied the brains, and even the more material means, by which the Lombards had been warded off. Now they were in every sense rulers, and the military nobles -- no longer, even nominally, their fellow-subjects under the distant emperor -- were simply the officers and chiefs of the clergy's army. Had clergy and nobility alike been guided by nothing except the ideals of the religion they professed, humility, obedience, a passion for serving, the situation would have presented no danger. As it was, the new State, and eventually the Papacy itself, became a stage where presently a half-regenerate humanity strove and struggled in all its primitive unpleasantness.

There was, from the very beginning, in the very pope in whom the State was founded, Stephen II, the tendency and the desire to end, once and for all, the external menace to papal independence by making the pope master of all Italy. The event

showed that neither he nor his successor, his brother Paul (756-767), whom the same ambition drove, was strong enough to achieve it. It was evident that the new State could not even survive, unless protected by the Frankish power that had created it. The Lombard without, and the lay nobility within, were more than these first papal kings could cope with. Hence a continual appeal to the Franks, and finally a war in which, just twenty years after the first intervention of Pepin, Charlemagne, Pepin's son, destroyed the Lombard power for ever and made himself King of Lombardy. This victory made St. Peter's protector the near neighbour of St. Peter's successor, and the protector tended, by reason of the frequent appeals for his intervention, to become something of an adviser, of a judge, of a suzerain even. The problem that drove the popes to ally themselves with the Franks had by no means been solved: it had merely changed its form. In one form or another it continued to worry the popes through the next twelve hundred years, to 1870 and to 1929; it is a problem they can never neglect, and their preoccupation with it is bound, not infrequently, to distract their attention from more directly spiritual affairs.

The history of the Papal State between its foundation and Charlemagne's conquest of Lombardy (754-774) can be told very briefly. It is in miniature what, from one aspect, Papal History will tend to be for the next thousand years. Aistulf, in 756, had pledged himself to restore what he himself had captured. The spoil of earlier wars, Bologna, for example, Osimo, was left untouched by the settlement of that year. Aistulf's death, and the appearance of rivals to dispute the succession, one of them seeking aid at Rome, seemed an obvious occasion for the pope to extend his territory (757). A treaty was signed; the pope did his part; the candidate he favoured succeeded; and he made over something, but only something, of the extensive restoration he had promised.

Pope Stephen had died before he learnt how the Lombard had deceived him. It was left to his successor, Paul, to avenge it. The negotiations now opened with Pepin were complicated by the fact that the pope had lately intervened to secure Pepin's patronage for the Dukes of Spoleto and Benevento, who were the Lombard king's subjects. Pepin was far from enthusiastic. He refused the pope's offer of the protectorate and he refused also to support the pope's plans of territorial expansion.

Whereupon the Lombard king marched against his rebellious dukes, overcame them, and then turned to Rome. Pope Paul demanded the fulfilment of the promises made before his accession. The king promised a part, conditionally on the pope's securing from Pepin the return of the hostages taken in 754. Paul promised this and wrote to Pepin as the king desired. He also sent another letter, to explain that the first was mere formality. Would Pepin send an army and compel the Lombard to fulfil to the letter his first promises? Pepin sent, not an army, but two commissaries; the disputes were settled by a confirmation of existing arrangements, and the pope was advised to cultivate the friendship of the Lombard king.

This was all the more advisable in that the emperor, Constantine V, powerless to punish the pope directly for his share in the events that had made him politically free of the empire, master of Rome, and, what mattered more at Constantinople, of Ravenna too -- was now endeavouring to build up with the Lombard an anti-papal alliance. Nor was this the end of Byzantine diplomacy. It crossed the Alps and, on the basis of a common feeling in the matter of the devotional use of images, sought to draw Pepin, too, into an anti-papal combination. But Pepin refused; as he also refused to be moved, by the pope, from his friendly relations with the Lombards. So things remained for the rest of the pontificate of Paul I. He died in 767 (June 28) and his death was the occasion for the domestic dissensions in the new State to reveal themselves in all their vigour.

Paul I, thanks to Pepin, had enjoyed peace abroad; and, thanks to his own firm, not to say harsh, government, peace at home also. The dispossessed military aristocracy had in this pope a master whom they feared. The prisons were never empty; death sentences were by no means unknown; taxes were heavy. It only required the news of the pope's illness to set in motion a whole world of discontent. The nobles saw their chance to regain what they had lost. They did not propose to restore the emperor, nor dared they have planned to laicize the State. Pepin, St. Peter's protector, was still very much alive. It was simpler to force one of themselves upon the Church as Paul's successor. The leader in the conspiracy was the duke Toto, the pope-to-be was the duke's brother Constantine, a layman like himself. The conspirators first tried to make sure that the pope would not

recover and then, foiled in this, called in their retainers. By the time the pope died (June 28) the nobles held the city. They found their way into the Lateran and there proclaimed Constantine, who, in the course of the next few days, received in rapid succession the tonsure, minor and major orders, and consecration as Bishop of Rome.

All had gone according to plan. The opposition was mute save for one man. This was the primicerius Christopher. He had been the power behind the throne in the late reign, and in the reign of Stephen too. He it was, apparently, who had planned and carried through the diplomatic strategy which had established the papal State. More recently, he had foiled Toto's attempt to hasten the death of Paul I; and, on Toto's army entering the city, he had brought that warrior to promise solemnly not to interfere with the election. Now he refused to acknowledge Toto's tool and realising himself to be marked for destruction -- one of his supporters, the duke Gregory, had already been murdered -- he soon fled, with his children, to St. Peter's. There he remained until Constantine promised to spare their lives. In return they pledged themselves to enter a monastery by Easter, 768, and until then to remain quiet. Easter came, they chose their monastery-at Rieti, in the duchy of Spoleto -- and were set free. But once safely across the frontier it was to the Lombard king that they made their way. He was only too happy to use the opportunity; and presently (July, 768) the exiles were at the gates of Rome with a Lombard army in support. Friends within opened the gates and, after two centuries of vain effort, the Lombards were at last in possession of the city of St. Gregory. In the fight Toto was slain, stabbed from behind, and Constantine fled, to be discovered skulking in a corner of the Lateran.

Christopher himself had not yet arrived. In his absence the Lombard priest, Wildepest, who led the expedition, held an election and proclaimed as pope an aged priest, Philip. The feast that crowned the election was barely over, and the elect not yet consecrated, when, that same day (July 1), Christopher returned. Philip's election was quashed, and he was taken to his monastery by the hero who had murdered Toto. The following day an election took place in the customary form, Christopher presiding. The choice of the assembly clergy, nobles and people -- fell upon Stephen, a priest of holy life who, from Christopher's

point of view, had the further advantage that he was weak in character and utterly without experience of affairs. It only remained to punish, or to wreak vengeance on, the survivors of the election of 767 -- Constantine and his fellow-prisoners. Their eyes were poked out and they were thrust into prison, Constantine after a trial and sentence of deprivation. Along with these unfortunates, Wildepest, guilty of the election of Philip, was likewise blinded, and so roughly was the operation performed in his case that he died of it.

Pepin had died this same year (768) and it was to his successors, Charlemagne and Carloman, that Stephen III's envoys brought the news of the events which had resulted in his election. The envoys asked for a deputation of bishops to assist at a coming council where measures would be taken to guard against any repetition of the scandal of Constantine's election. Thirteen prelates were chosen, and at Easter, 769, the council opened in the Lateran. Constantine was cited, and the poor blind wretch, bidden defend himself, was treated with insults and blows and sentenced to life imprisonment in a monastery. The new pope and his electors then, on their knees, besought the pardon of the council for having during twelve months acknowledged Constantine as pope. Next, a witness to the growing barbarism of thought no less than of manners, all Constantine's ordinations were declared invalid -- a decree that went back on the teaching traditional at Rome since the beginning of things, and that repudiated the principle in whose name the pope of a bygone time had threatened to depose St. Cyprian. Finally it was enacted that, for the future, only cardinal-priests or cardinal-deacons should be eligible as candidates for the papacy, and that in the election none but clerics should take part. The laity's share was reduced to the opportunity of cheering the newly-elected pope and of signing the acta of the election in testimony of agreement.

Stephen III survived the council of 769 barely three years. He continued to rule as weakly as he had begun, and the only event of importance was the disgrace and the murder of the men who had made him pope, Christopher and his son Sergius. The pope, in fact, tired of his creators; and he found an ally in the Lombard king, offended mortally by Christopher's rejection in 768 of his candidate Philip, and by the murder of Wildepest. In 771 the Lombard marched on Rome. It was Lent and he came on his

soul's business. But Christopher filled the town with troops and locked the gates against him. The pope, however, went out to St. Peter's to meet the king, and Christopher and Sergius received orders to follow. Their supporters, seeing the tide begin to turn, forced them out and left them to the Lombards. They were dragged from the tomb of the Apostle and, at the bridge of St. Angelo, had their eyes torn out. Christopher died. Sergius, less lucky, survived for a year in the prisons of the Lateran and then, half strangled, was buried alive close by. Nor did the Lombard king keep his promises to the pope.

This tale of petty insurrection, treachery, outrage and murder is worth some detail in its recital, not only because it witnesses very graphically to the general advance of barbarism within Christianity since the days of St. Gregory and St. Leo, but because it marks the beginning of barbarism's conquest of their very see.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



5. CHARLEMAGNE, 768-814

Stephen III's short reign (768-772) ran out in shame and ignominy. The very worst might have been anticipated of the election which followed his death. That election, however, had a far different result. It set on the throne one of the most capable popes the Church had known since St. Gregory the Great. This was Adrian I. By birth he came of the military aristocracy; by all his life and training he was a cleric; at the moment one of the seven deacons. He was experienced, capable, honest, and in this Roman there re-appeared all the native genius for government and administration. He was to rule for twenty-three years, a length of days not equalled for another thousand years. [] His first act was to enquire into the scandals which had disgraced the last years of his predecessor, and to mete out appropriate punishment to the guilty. Next he turned to the Lombard king who, with his vassal of Spoleto, was harrying the papal State as of old. Negotiations had little effect, and the new pope appealed yet once again to the Franks. Meanwhile the Lombards marched on Rome. The Franks followed their usual policy. They strove to reconcile the Lombards with the pope, to induce them to abandon their conquests -- but in vain; and in the early summer of 773, led by their new king, Charles, the Franks invaded the Lombard kingdom. The usual rout followed, but this time the Frankish victory was definitive. The Lombard king was despatched to France, where he remained to the end of his life; the King of the Franks was, henceforth, King of the Lombards too.

While the siege of the Lombard capital, Pavia, was still in progress Charles (Easter, 774) made a solemn visit to Rome. He was received with the honours traditionally used for the emperor's representative, and he renewed with Adrian the pact sworn twenty years before between his father and Stephen II. According to this agreement Spoleto, Benevento, Tuscany, Venetia, Istria and Corsica were also promised to the pope. Had it ever been carried out, the popes would have been rulers of the greater part of central and northern Italy; the Lombard kingdom would have shrunk to a mere province. Commachio, Ferrara, Faenza, and Bologna were indeed made over once Pavia had fallen, but before the magnificent promise had been further

fulfilled Charlemagne's consciousness of his new role of King of the Lombards intervened. He turned a deaf ear now to the discreet papal reminders and when, in 780, he had his son, Pepin, consecrated by the pope as King of Italy, the act was a clear declaration that the Frankish kingdom of Lombardy would remain in extent pretty much what the Lombard kingdom had been. The prospect of territorial magnificence which had haunted the popes for thirty years was at an end. Occasional and important additions Charles did indeed make to the papal States, but from 780 the convention of 754 and 774 was a dead letter.

To the burden of this quite legitimate grievance, events soon added another, for Pope Adrian and his successors. This was the relation of their new State to the power which created it for them.

In the time of Pepin (754-768) the papal State had been certainly free from any Frankish interference, and of the title Patrician of the Romans, with which the grateful pope had decorated him, Pepin made no use at all. Nor did Charlemagne act differently until, after the victory of 774, he began to have permanent personal interests in Italy. Then, slowly, there began to gather round the distinction certain concrete attributes of lordship. The nobles whom, for one reason or another, the papal government deprived of rank or office, began to appeal against the pope to the Frankish king and, despite protests from Rome, the king listened to the appeals; occasionally he made recommendations thereupon to the pope. Adrian was a wise ruler, as tactful as he was strong, and in his time, for all that this new practice began slowly to establish itself, he so managed things that the papal independence did not suffer and that, on the other hand, the Frankish king remained a friend. Adrian died, however, in 795 and under his successor Leo III -- a very different type of personage indeed -- the difficulties began to show immediately.

It was a first innovation that the new pope officially notified the King of the Franks of his election, sending him, along with the keys of St. Peter's shrine, the standard of the city, and praying for a deputation of nobles to receive the Romans' oath of fidelity. Much had happened, evidently, since the last election twenty-three years before, to develop Charlemagne's importance in Roman affairs in the eyes of the Roman Church. Charles, too,

has a share in the loyalty of the Romans, since they now swear an oath to him, and he has therefore a very definite -- if not well defined -- right of government. Pope and king, in some way, are together the rulers of Rome. And in his letters to the pope the king recommended him to lead a good life, to govern wisely, to put down abuses, to show himself a good pope and ruler.

Four years later (799) an attempted revolution in Rome showed how far Charles' overlordship was admitted in practice. Leo III, for good or bad, was as unpopular as Paul I had been thirty years earlier. He was not himself a noble, and it was from the family of his predecessor that the leaders of the trouble came. Trouble of a very grave kind was already preparing in 798, and it came to a head in an attempt to murder the pope on St. Mark's Day, 799. He was set upon as he made his way to the station church for the litanies, beaten, his eyes half torn out and his tongue as well, and he was carried off to a monastery in one of the less frequented districts of the city. Thence he was rescued, and recovering, miraculously it is said, from his injuries, fled to the Frankish court. He found Charles at Paderborn and besought his protection.

From Paderborn towards the close of the year (November, 799) he returned, with a strong escort of nobles and bishops charged by the king to enquire into the business. The conspirators had no other resource than to try to turn the enquiry into a trial of the pope. The details of the proceedings are lost, but no definite findings were published and the matter dragged on until Charlemagne himself arrived in Rome a year later. On December 1, 800, there was a great assembly in St. Peter's. The king presided and spoke of his desire to end the scandal. Accusations had been made which no one could prove, and since the pope could not be tried he could not be acquitted. It was the dilemma of 501 all over again [] and Leo III took the same way out of it that Symmachus had chosen. He made a solemn declaration, on oath, that he was innocent, in a second assembly called for the purpose on December 23. It was perhaps hardly a satisfactory conclusion to the affair and the circumstances of the king's presence gave it quite possibly the appearance of being done at the bidding of the all powerful lord of the Western world. For that, by this time, Charles indeed was.

Two days later was Christmas Day, and as the king knelt before

the shrine of the Apostle at mass, the pope placed a crown on his head while the choir acclaimed him emperor of the Romans. The deed had been done which was to haunt the imagination of the next five hundred years; the pope, so it came to be considered, had made the King of the Franks into the Roman Emperor. This it was -- whatever the realities which, in the mind of Leo III and Charlemagne, underlay that astonishing gesture -- which never left the popular imagination, the pope creating the new power and bestowing it upon the Frankish kings, the all powerful king kneeling before the pope to receive it. That Charles was not well pleased at the manner in which there came to him whatever the ceremony was meant to convey, that he had already had it in mind to acquire it through marriage with the Empress Irene-in whom, at the moment, the line of Augustus and Constantine and Justinian was represented -- may well be. What was done was done and, from the very lack of definition in the doing, it acquired all the more easily the name of being what it appeared to be. Two questions suggest themselves. Whom was it that the pope crowned, and what affect had the ceremony on the relations between the Frankish kings and the papal monarchy which, already, were developing so rapidly in the direction of patronage and subordination.

Charlemagne was the greatest figure the West had seen since Julius Caesar himself. He is of the line of Alexander and Napoleon, and the memory of what he was and what he achieved never faded from the memory of the Middle Ages, but remained to be always, in some respects, its most powerful inspiration. He was, to begin with, the mightiest warrior of his warlike family. He completed his father's work in Aquitaine; and, beyond the Pyrenees, after years of fighting, made himself master of Spain as far as the Ebro. In Italy, to his conquests of 774 he added those of the southernmost Lombard duchy of Benevento and for a time Venice and Dalmatia too acknowledged his suzerainty. His most permanent work was, however, in Germany. Bavaria now lost its semi-independent status, and after several failures he finally penetrated into the heart of Hungary, breaking the power of the Avars, a savage Hun-like people, nomads and plunderers, who for centuries had been the terror of their western neighbours. Finally, after thirty years of endless war, he mastered once and for all the Saxons, a trouble to the Franks since early Merovingian times. For thirteen years (772-785) the history of the eastern frontier is a monotonous alternation of

Frankish conquest, with the establishment of churches and abbeys in its wake, and Saxon risings in which all the civilising work of Charlemagne goes up in flame while priests and monks are murdered. The Frank's revenge was as brutal as its provocation. On one occasion as many as four thousand Saxons were beheaded in a single execution while he looked on. In the end he was master, and within a generation the Saxons, dragooned into Catholicism, compelled by force to receive baptism, were a Catholic people. When Charlemagne died, in 814, the whole of Western Europe that was Christian was again united under a single ruler, save for the British Isles and the remnants of Byzantine Italy.

This vast domain was not a mere congeries of widely differing peoples. Charlemagne was not the mere brutal soldier Charles Martel had been. He was a political idealist, and his empire was an ordered attempt to realise his ideals. He was educated, and his personal enthusiasm for learning never slackened throughout his long life. One of his favourite books was St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, and the State Charlemagne created was a very real attempt to organise the City of God on earth. For the first time in its history the Church had found a political genius wholly devoted to the task of realising the ideals of the Gospel. The State was to be the means of gaining the world for Christ, Charlemagne the immediate successor of St. Boniface. Never before, and certainly never since, has Catholicism been so identified with a political regime, and this not in order to serve the political ends of the regime but to be its inspiration and to direct it. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that Charlemagne, in the last thirty years of his life, is the Catholic Church. He is the one human being on whose energy and goodwill and loyalty the well-being of all depends.

In 779 he reorganised the hierarchy and, reversing his father's policy, adopted the system of metropolitans planned years before by St. Boniface -- a conversion to ecclesiastical tradition due to Pope Adrian's gift of the collection of canons made by Denis the Short. The ancient sees were restored; and upon Mainz, and Salzburg, too, the pope now conferred metropolitan rights. The boundaries of the sees were strictly defined, and all monasteries subjected to the local bishop. At every turn the civil law came to the bishop's assistance, strengthening his hand for the correction of evildoers, whether clerics who lived unseemly

lives or hunted, or laity who ignored say, the laws of fasting or who neglected to receive the sacraments. The same law, however, admonished and corrected the bishop, also; and it was the king, source of the law, who continued to name, absolutely, bishops and metropolitans alike. For all that the State was at the service of the Gospel, the ministers of the Gospel were by no means independent in their mission. The ideal of St. Amhrose [] was, even now, only partly realised. The decisions of synods and ecclesiastical councils had indeed the force of law, but the emperor too, when he chose, would legislate in ecclesiastical matters. Fortunately, from the point of view of the entente between Charles and the two popes with whom he had to deal (Adrian I and Leo III) the ecclesiastical affairs of his day were almost entirely matters of administration. How Catholicism would have fared had some great dispute on doctrine flared, and had Charles determined to decide it in the fashion traditional at Constantinople, is matter for speculation, but no more. For centuries before his time, in all the lands he now governed, the different kings had laid hands on ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the protests of the Church had gone unheeded. Much might be forgiven to Charlemagne, continuing the practice, since Charlemagne's ideals were those of the best of bishops and since -- despite occasional bad failures in his own life -- he was so whole-hearted in his loyalty to his ideals.

The clergy now played a greater part than ever before in the civil life of the empire. They provided all the chief officials of the highly organised civil service and the imperial diplomacy. These clerical ministers and officials were by no means always priests, though benefices were liberally showered on them, nor were they necessarily clerical in their way of life. Thus one of the king's chief ministers, Angilbert, was the Abbot of St. Riquier. He did much for the abbey, extending its buildings, enriching its library. He was one of the band of the court's literary men, as celebrated for his poems as for his success in the diplomatic missions on which the emperor employed him. He was also the lover of Charles' daughter Bertha and had two children by her. But this made no difference to his position, nor even to his relations with the emperor, who knew all. So firmly rooted, still, were the abuses to combat which St. Boniface and St. Columbanus had given their lives. Charlemagne's own private life presented an equally grotesque combination, with its tangle of wives that needs skill to unravel, to say nothing of ladies who

were not even nominally wives.

Away from the court, there were, in all the chief towns of the empire, the local bishops. The civil law obliged them to live in their sees, to make regular visitations of the diocese, to hold annual synods. The bishop was obliged by law to see that all his clergy could explain the Pater Noster and the Creed, that they were conversant with the prescriptions of ecclesiastical law and the penitential codes, that they could administer the sacraments and preach. Preaching above all was, for Charlemagne, the most important duty of the priest, and his laws and admonitions to the bishops return to this subject time and again. To assist the priest whose own ability in this respect was small, Paul the Deacon, at the emperor's own command, compiled a book of sermons drawn from St. Augustine, St. Caesarius of Arles, St. Gregory and St. Bede, while St. Gregory's *Regula Pastoralis* was extensively circulated to serve as a general guide for the tasks of bishops and parochial clergy alike.

A further evidence of the emperor's concern for the promotion of virtue and learning in the clergy charged with the cure of souls, was his encouragement of the new way of life instituted by the Bishop of Metz, St. Chrodegang (767), one of the disciples of St. Boniface. St. Chrodegang had been, in his time, a high official of Charles Martel's chancery. As Bishop of Metz he had, later, been one of Pepin's envoys in the famous embassy of 754 to Pope Stephen II, through whose good offices he had, on the martyrdom of St. Boniface, succeeded to that saint's effectual primacy in Germany. He was one of the pioneers of liturgical reforms, introducing the Roman rite and the *Cantilena Romana* which later ages called the Gregorian Chant. But his most striking innovation was the establishment of the custom that, in the larger churches, which were served by a number of priests, the clergy should live a life in common under a rule. They gave up their private property, but retained the use of it personally. They kept also their hierarchical rank, priest, deacon, minor cleric. They assisted as a body at the daily church offices, were bound to receive Holy Communion on Sundays and feasts, to confess their sins twice annually. The rule made provision for systematic study, and it provided for a public correction of faults. the association took in all that vast personnel of clerics who made up the household of the Carolingian bishop, and also the boys and youths who were destined for the ecclesiastical

state. It provided for grammar schools, seminary and chapter. Such an institution could not but appeal to Charlemagne, and he did much to encourage other bishops to adopt it.

For monks as monks the emperor had less favour. What monks there were, he strove to unite into a single system and one of his laws imposes the Benedictine rule on all monasteries, the emperor, with characteristic care, sending in 787 to Monte Cassino for an authentic copy of the rule.

It was piety informed by doctrine that was the quality dearest to Charlemagne's heart in ecclesiastics; the emperor, inevitably, once more the patron and protector of the clergy who were its agents. From the beginning of his reign he realised the degree to which Frankish Gaul was intellectually barbarous, and setting himself to attract the best minds of the day to the work of educating his clergy he turned to the country whence St. Boniface had come. One of St. Bede's pupils, Egbert, promoted to be Archbishop of York, had founded there the school which, at the time of Charlemagne's accession, was the intellectual centre of Europe. It was Egbert's pupil Alcuin, head of the school of York and the greatest scholar of his time, whom Charlemagne now persuaded to settle in Gaul. From Italy he brought Peter of Pisa and Paul Warnefrid, the historian of the Lombards. Spain was represented by Theodulf, whom Charles made Bishop of Orleans, a poet whose memory has outlasted much else if only because of the place of one of his hymns, *Gloria laus et honor*, in the liturgy of Holy Week.

The first of the schools through which these carefully gathered men of letters worked upon the new Christendom, was the imperial court itself. Set lectures, conversation classes, intellectual games in which Charlemagne's own determined enthusiasm led unflinchingly, were some of the means. And wherever the emperor went, there, too, went the imperial school. Moreover, each see, each monastery, each parish was commanded to have its school. Of the monastic schools Tours, where Alcuin himself was abbot, was the greatest. It developed into a kind of training school, whence teachers went out to revive the intellectual life of other abbeys and sees. Fulda too, the foundation of St. Boniface, bore testimony in its new intellectual strength to the scholarship which was its own founder's first title to recognition, and to the zeal for learning

which he never lost and which the continual stream of missionary monks from England kept continuously alive in the heart of Germany. From Fulda came the leading intellectuals of the first quarter of the ninth century, Eginhard who was Charlemagne's biographer, Walafrid Strabo, and Rabanus Maurus.

Charles, as part of his great scheme of Christian restoration, gave force of law to all the reforms which St. Boniface had so desiderated. He showed himself equally the heir of the saint in his zeal to capture for the Gospel the still heathen tribes of the north and east. Under his patronage, protected by his power, the work of the mission went steadily forward. The Slavs then settled in central Germany, the Frisians at whose hands St. Boniface had met his death, the Saxons as far as the Elbe, the Slavs of Carinthia, and even the Avars, turn by turn submitted, often to the none too happy combination of Frankish political necessity and the disinterested zeal of the children of St. Boniface. By the time Charlemagne died, the frontier of the advance of Catholicism lay many miles ahead of the political frontier of his empire.

Against this policy which made loyalty to the empire and to Catholicism one thing, with its practical sequel of forcible baptism, all that was best in the life of the time protested. The Patriarch of Aquileia was able to induce the emperor's eldest son Pepin, the King of Italy, to put no compulsion of this sort upon the Avars whom he had recently conquered (796). They were, in the mass, ready to embrace Catholicism, and from the Danube to the Adriatic a vast campaign of instruction now opened in preparation for their baptism. Alcuin lent all his prestige to second the efforts of these frontier bishops in the delicate task of preserving the purity of faith from the taint of political policy. Tithes, he had heard, were destroying the faith of the Saxons. A bishop should not be chiefly famous for his severity in exacting such dues. And though baptism might be forcibly performed on the unwilling, faith was another matter. Such gifts of God came through prayer. Nor should the rigour of the Church's penitential code be applied to the letter, in the case of newly-converted peoples.

In what measure the spirit of Alcuin and Paulinus of Aquileia prevailed, in general, over the barbarian ruthlessness of Charles

it is not possible to say. The incidents serve to illustrate, yet once again, the mortal danger to the Faith whenever zeal for its propaganda is inspired by any spirit less pure than that of the Faith itself. It was not the only way in which the magnificent protectorship of Charles, and the incredible scale of his success, threatened the life of the Church. Like his grandfather before him, he treated all Church property as his own. The abbeys, which the policy of St. Boniface had tended to save from the terrible episcopate of his day by exempting them from the jurisdiction of the local bishop, Charlemagne riveted to that jurisdiction more closely than ever. Again, like his grandfather, he used abbatial nominations -- for the custom that the monks elected their abbot had disappeared entirely -- to reward faithful service to the State. Abbeys were given to clerics who were not monks, and even to laymen. The abbot -- and the bishop too -- had to bear his share of the imperial burden. St. Boniface had fought against the abuse that clerics bore arms. Now the emperor ordained the use of arms as a duty. In time of war the abbot or bishop was to join the army at the head of the fully equipped troop that was his quota to the forces. The abbeys of Charlemagne's time were no longer merely convents of monks, whose lives were given over to prayer and mortification. They were the great centres of national life, functioning in the social organism as the cities had functioned in the Roman Empire. Prayer there was undoubtedly, and much means of sanctification, but around the abbey, attracted thither by the abbey, was all the life of the immense domain which depended, ultimately, upon the monks for the intelligent direction which had first created its economic life and which, alone, maintained it in being. That in the abbey, by the side of church, school, farm, workshops and market, courts and prison there was also now the barracks, was a new development in no wise revolutionary.

Christendom and the Carolingian state were for a century practically coterminous, and for half of that time the Carolingian state was Charlemagne. Over the whole vast edifice he presided, as a tradition after his death, but in his life, as a very concrete reality, appointing the innumerable counts and bishops who were the permanent local agents of his policies and the missi who periodically issued forth from the centre of government to inspect the working of the machine and to correct abuses. He was in many respects the greatest political force the Church had

yet possessed. As his resources were so much less than those of the three great Christian emperors who preceded him -- Constantine, Theodosius and Justinian -- so does his use of them deservedly set him higher. He was an immediate social force of a magnitude they never equalled; and this by reason of his Catholicism and of his close unity with the popes, whom he dwarfed in every respect, who were very much his subjects, and yet to whose spiritual hegemony he was, in a matter-of-course way, always subordinate. How great his achievement -- in the matter of the extension and development of Catholicism, for example -- can readily be seen if the state of Catholicism, as he left it behind him at death, be compared with its state a hundred years earlier, at the accession of his grandfather, Charles Martel. Of that great restoration Charlemagne was not the principal agent. St. Boniface, and the multitude of disinterested monastic apostles whom he inspired and led, the Roman popes to whom at every turn St. Boniface looked, and not in vain, for guidance and support, hold here an unshakable primacy. Yet had it not been for Charlemagne, all that great work would never have survived to bear even its first fruits. The immense machine he set up was, however, for all its maker's sincerity, inspired by a spirit that had in it too little of St. Boniface, too little of the Gospel. Its successful working called, also, for a Charlemagne simultaneously present throughout its vast whole, and he strove to achieve this through his legates, the missi. Its permanence called for a succession of Charlemagne's through time -- and this, fortunately for the religion of the Church, no man could secure. Fortunately: for, with the creation in the West of yet such another system as that which, for now some centuries, had been slowly choking Catholicism to death in the Roman empire of the East, the ultimate fate of the Church must have been worse than even the terrible things which the next century held in store.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



CHAPTER 5: THE SIEGE OF CHRISTENDOM, 814-1046

1. THE BREAK-UP OF CHARLEMAGNE'S EMPIRE, 814-888

CHARLEMAGNE'S mighty administrative achievement was fated soon to perish. It could indeed hardly have been otherwise. In the very heart of the empire he established, forces violently hostile to the new political unity wrestled from the beginning. The social change by which the great landowners attracted to themselves the domains of their smaller neighbours, and with the domains their service and loyalty; the political change which, next, made these great men the lords of their dependants, and the system by which the domains of these lords were exempted from the authority of the king's officers; -- all these had continued to develop through the fifty years of Charlemagne's reign. They were now developed deliberately and systematically, as the natural and traditional way of government. The care and the expense of government was transferred from the central authority, king or emperor, to the local lord. The day was fast approaching when the king would have no subjects directly obedient to him but the handful of great men -- counts, bishops, abbots -- and in that day all would depend on the power of the king to compel these great men to obey.

Another tradition that lived on through Charlemagne's great reign was the idea of the kingdom as the king's personal possession something to be divided and bequeathed like any other estate. Charlemagne so divided the empire among his sons in 806; Louis the Pious, his surviving son and successor, did the same in 817, in 829 and in 835. From all these partitions flowed a series of bitter family feuds and civil wars.

The empire was artificial in another respect. Its peoples were too varied and too different and, as yet, too little catholicised -- despite the conversions and the work of the missionary monks -- to form a real unity. It is too early perhaps to speak of French and Germans and Italians, but the ancestors of these modern nations were, in Charlemagne's time, by no means a single

united people. The empire was a mosaic of a thousand motley pieces. One thing alone kept it together -- the genius of the first emperor.

The really violent troubles began in 829, when Louis the Pious, in order to give the son of his second marriage -- Charles, afterwards called the Bald -- a share in the empire, revised the partition of 817. There followed ten years of civil war. The sons of the first marriage revolted, and were crushed. They revolted a second time and, the great churchmen assisting them, who stood by the old unitary traditions of their master Charlemagne, Louis was defeated and forced to resign. A little later he came back; there were new partitions, new wars; and finally, in 840, he died, leaving the imperial title to his eldest son and the empire divided among all three.

The fighting still went on, this time between the brothers -- the new emperor, Lothair, showing himself weaker even than his father. Finally, in 843, the unity of the empire was once and for all definitely broken by the treaty of Verdun. One brother took the west -- roughly France; another the German lands east of the Rhine; and Lothair took Italy and the middle lands between France and Germany, from the North Sea to the Alps, called henceforth, from his name, Lotharingia (Lorraine). Twelve years later (855) Lothair died, prematurely; and Lotharingia was itself divided to make kingdoms for his three sons. By 870 two of these had died, and though the eldest brother, Louis II, managed to retain, with the title of emperor, the kingdom of Italy, the greater part of the lands of his brothers was seized by his uncles, the two surviving sons of Louis the Pious -- Louis the German and Charles the Bald. The Treaty of Mersen, made in that year between these three princes, marks the beginning of France and Germany as separate and consciously different kingdoms.

The main feature of the history of Charlemagne's family in the twenty years following this important treaty (870-888) is the rapid disappearance of all its leading members. By 885 three only were left of all the army of Carolingian princes: Charles the Fat (a son of Louis the German), Charles the Simple (a grandson of the same prince), and Arnulf, a third grandson who, but for his own illegitimacy should have been the heir, since he was the son of the eldest son, Carloman. When Charles the Fat died in

888, Charles the Simple was little more than a baby and chaos complete and entire descended on what remained of Charlemagne's tradition. It was just seventy-four years since his death.

During these seventy-four years the frontier wars which the Franks had waged for centuries went on unceasingly: with the Slavs, in furthest Germany, with the Avars and, in southern Gaul, with the Mohammedans from Spain. And this century of political dislocation brought with it new enemies, more ferocious and destructive than any western Europe had known since the Vandals. these were the pirates from the fiords of Norway and from Denmark. It was in the last years of Charlemagne's reign that the flotillas of their long, light boats, drawing little water. easily able to sail up the rivers, began to harry the coasts of the empire. The hope of plunder, animal lust, and elementary bloodthirstiness seem to have chiefly inspired these first descents. The Northmen were also savagely anti-Christian, the monasteries and churches the especial objects of their ferocity. In 793 they sacked Lindisfarne, and in 795 made their first raids on Ireland. Gradually their policy changed. They began to winter in fortified camps, off the coasts where they operated, or on islands in the rivers. Soon no river from the Elbe to the Guadalquivir was safe from these pests. England was especially their prey. They took possession of Sheppey in 835, they made themselves masters of East Anglia, destroying monasteries and massacring the monks. Amongst others they put to death for the faith was the King of East Anglia, St. Edmund. They next turned to Wessex, and they ravaged Mercia, and finally, by the Treaty of Wedmore (878), Alfred, the greatest of the English kings, was compelled to recognise them as the rulers of all the north and east of the island.

In the empire of the Franks the Northmen established three great centres: on the Scheldt, the Seine and the Loire. Antwerp, Utrecht, Tongres, Cologne, Mainz, Metz and even Aix itself, the capital, felt their power until, after fifty years of this reign of terror, Arnulf, the last fighting man of Charlemagne's family, destroyed their camp at Louvain in the great battle of 891. Just five years before this, the pirates of the Seine had met their great check at Paris, the siege of which they had been forced to abandon after a stubborn twelve months of fighting. The emperor essayed to buy them off with money and an annual

tribute, but vainly. As in Germany, town after town fell to them. The west of France suffered even more than the north. From their settlements at the mouth of the Loire, Nantes, Blois, Bordeaux, Toulouse, and as far as Tarbes, were burnt out time and again, the countrysides ravaged, and monasteries sacked until the country was little more than a desert. In Spain they had less success, thanks to the military organisation both of the tiny Catholic kingdoms and of the Arab States. But they penetrated and vexed the Mediterranean even as far as Pisa and Lucca.

A century of such savage destruction, added to the desolation of civil war and the absence of organised government, was enough to reduce Charlemagne's reign of order to a chaos such as Europe had never before known. Christendom was fast becoming a waste with, here and there, little islets where a handful of scared and terrified survivors strove to maintain the tradition of ordered life.

There remains to be noted yet a second external scourge which, in this same century, menaced the existence of what had once been the Roman Empire and was again to be European civilisation. This was the maritime empire of the Mohammedans of Africa. Here, towards the end of Charlemagne's reign, the internal rivalries which, for half a century, had occupied all the fierce energy of the State, yielded before the family of the Aghlabites. Soon the new order was visible in the appearance of a fleet, the conquest of Sicily and an endless harrying of the coasts of Italy and southern Gaul. Like the northern invaders, the Saracens made settlements and even, through their occupation of the passes of the Alps, they for years made communication between Italy and France a matter of the greatest difficulty and peril.

The century that followed Charlemagne's death was thus a century in which his empire -- Latin Catholicism -- was continuously besieged, and, under the stress of the siege, was steadily broken and wasted.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



2. CAROLINGIAN CATHOLICISM: PIETY, LEARNING, MISSIONS

For the first thirty years or so of the period, Carolingian Catholicism continued to advance: the reform of Catholic life, the activity of the missionaries, and the fundamentally important work of intellectual revival. Louis the Pious did not share his father's failure to understand the real importance of monasticism. For him the monasteries were not merely centres of civilisation and intellectual life: they were primarily settlements of monks, sanctuaries wherein the primitive ideals of the Gospel, the perfect following of Jesus Christ, the life of prayer, were cherished and the best of opportunity provided for their realisation. Louis was the friend as well as the patron of St. Benedict of Aniane, and seconded the efforts of that great monastic reformer, as also those of his successors Arnulf of Marmoutiers and Jonas of Orleans. An imperial decree of 817 made the rule of St. Benedict obligatory on all monasteries, and laid especial emphasis on the necessity of manual labour and ascetic practices. In the same year the emperor issued, also, a rule for the canons regular and one for the nuns.

Alcuin's work for liturgical uniformity was continued by his pupil Amalric, Bishop of Treves (811-850). It is from his antiphony, and the treatises which he wrote to explain and defend it -- a combination of the Roman antiphony and that of the church of Metz -- that the modern Roman rite largely derives. In the countrysides, the movement to establish parishes independent of those in the towns continued to make headway and, despite inevitable opposition, the movement to free these parishes from the power of the local lord. On the other hand the king, more than ever, kept the nomination of bishops in his own hands. and, for all his patronage of the monastic life, he continued, as the needs of policy dictated, to make over the abbeys to laymen.

Nor did the missionary movement die with Charlemagne. Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims, and foster brother of Louis the Pious, turned from his labours for the State to initiate the conversion of Denmark (822), whose king he baptised in 826. But the great name here is that of yet another Benedictine, Ansgar, a monk of Corbie. He was scarcely twenty-five when he went north to take

up Ebbo's work and for nearly seventy years he spent himself to do for Denmark and the north of Germany what Boniface had done for the centre, and the Irish monks for the south. Like St. Boniface he was the pope's legate; and in Hamburg he created a second Fulda, cathedral, monastery, library and school. The apostolate in Sweden was at the same time given to Ebbo's nephew, Gauzbert.

The intellectual life of this second generation of Carolingian Catholicism, the fruits of Alcuin's genius, was richer and more striking than that of the first. One of its leaders was the most famous of all Alcuin's pupils, Rabanus Maurus, Abbot of Fulda in 822 and Archbishop of Mainz from 847: no original thinker certainly, but a trained mind and a lover of learning of the type of Isidore of Seville, concerned to re-edit for his own generation, and to save for the future lest it should perish, the thought of the Christian past. He wrote Manuals of Grammar and Philosophy, commentaries on Holy Scripture, on the Canon Law, controversial writings on Predestination against Gottschalk, and an encyclopaedia that left no knowledge unexplored. As Abbot of Fulda, Rabanus Maurus formed Walafrid Strabo, the poet of the century and yet another commentator on Holy Scripture; and he formed Gottschalk too. Fulda, in his time, was the greatest of all the schools of the continent. Elsewhere, too, the work went on: lectures on the Bible, St. Augustine, Boethius, discussions of the old questions of Grace and Free Will, of the Infinite and the Finite, the existence and nature of Universals.

In the political struggles which filled this unhappy century, churchmen had as prominent a place as they had occupied in the routine administration of the previous generation. Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons, and Ebbo of Rheims were the chiefs of the party that fought against the partition policy of Louis the Pious. When this finally triumphed, the bishops again worked strongly to set up, in place of the now destroyed unity of the single emperor, a system of permanent alliances based on the Gospel principles of brotherly love. They were successful up to a point. The kings solemnly swore to keep inviolate the rights of charity and brotherhood, and their fraternal pacts were ratified as such by the assemblies of the notables. From the royal alliances, thus inspired by the teaching of the Gospel, the peace of Christ would descend to nobles and people alike. The City of God on earth seemed a long step nearer to realisation. St. Augustine,

the new age's greatest prophet, had come into his own.

The idea, and these practical policies that enshrined it, provoked a new interest in the morality of politics, and produced a whole new literature -- the De Institutione Regia of Jonas of Orleans, the Via Regia of Smaragdus, the De Rectoribus Christianis of Sedulius Scottus and, above all, the De Regis Persona of Hincmar, Ebbo's successor at Rheims after 845. Not since the days of St. Ambrose had the claim for the Church's moral supremacy in life been so insistently set forth, and never, even then, had the practical conclusions of the doctrine been proclaimed more bluntly. Political duties are moral duties; kings are as much bound to keep the moral law in their public life as ordinary men in their private lives; the Church is the divinely appointed guardian of morality, and thereby the chief power in the State. "Bishops, " said Hincmar, "are the equals of kings. More, they are superior to the king since it is they who consecrate him. As it is their privilege to anoint him, so it is their right to depose him. " So far had theory travelled since the introduction into Gaul, a hundred and twenty years earlier, of the practice of consecrating the ruler. In the Christendom of Charlemagne's successor, where Church and State continued to be one, the roles were now apparently to be reversed. The king might name the bishops, but they were to be the judges of his activities. The same ideas, but expressed with far greater force and related to the most powerful tradition in Christendom, are to be seen at work in the activities of the greatest of the contemporary popes, St. Nicholas I (858-867).

With the papacy of Nicholas I there reappears the explicit assertion of the Roman See's primitive claim to a universal primacy of jurisdiction over the Church as the consequence of Our Lord's promise to St. Peter. Thence derives Rome's unique power of summoning synods and of giving life and real value to their acts. The pope is the supreme judge of all ecclesiastical suits and the only judge in such greater causes as those to which a temporal sovereign is a party or those that concern the deposition of a bishop. In this last matter Nicholas I develops the earlier practice, according to which the popes, while reserving to themselves decisions that touched patriarchs, primates and metropolitans, left the deposition of bishops to their immediate superiors. A bishop may still be deposed by the provincial council, but the pope is insistent that the council's

decision, to be effective, must have his confirmation. Not on appeal alone, does the pope show himself the immediate superior of the local episcopate.

This restorer of the idea of the papal monarchy within the Church faced 110 less boldly the great contemporary difficulty of the relations of the Church with its defender: the consecrated, Church-created empire. In the fifty years that followed Charlemagne's death the Church slowly but steadily reacted against his implied relegation of the bishops -- and the pope -- to the sanctuary. The conception that the cleric's sole clerical duty was prayer and study, while the emperor would take on himself the actual management and direction of Church affairs, was increasingly challenged. In this reaction the local episcopate led the way. It was not until Nicholas I that the papacy began to dominate the reaction. Church and State for this pope are definitely not one thing, and he urges this insistently, against the ideas implicit in the actions of Carolingians in the west and of the Byzantine emperor in the east. In its own domain each of these powers is sovereign. The State, therefore, must not interfere in Church matters. It is, however, the State's duty to assist the Church -- a principle which in a few centuries will be developed as far as the theory that the State is an instrument in the Church's hands for the realisation of the Christian ideal. Nicholas I, however, does not go so far. Nevertheless, quoting frequently the forty-fourth psalm, "Thou hast set them princes over all the earth, " he is conscious of the pope's duty to correct even kings should they break God's law. They, too, are subject to the penalty that shuts them out of the divine society. But while excommunication remains for princes, too, a possible ultimate sanction, it is not an excommunication to which any temporal consequences are attached; there is no hint that the pope may, or must, depose the excommunicated prince; and, of course, none at all of the later idea of a holy war to drive him forth.

The question has been raised as to the sources of Nicholas I's doctrine and as to his own share in its formulation. The main ideas are, of course, not his own at all. They are the traditional policy of the Roman See and he could find the classic texts that express it in the collection of canons of Denis the Short, [] the decretals, that is to say, of the popes of the fourth and fifth centuries and the canons of the earlier councils. He had, too, in

the well-stocked armoury of the archives of his see the letters of later popes, among which the decisions of Pelagius I (556-561) and St. Gregory the Great had a special importance. Was the contemporary collection which we call the False Decretals, among the sources Nicholas I employed? The question has, apparently, never been settled absolutely. M. Fournier speaks of "un certain parfum isidorien" as discernible in his writings after 865. At the most these fabrications did no more than give new support to ideas already traditional and formed from other sources. No one, certainly, will ever again accuse the great pope of being, through his possible use of them, " a conscious liar. " The material was not, then, of the pope's own creation. But he so used it to meet the particular problem of the day, and he restated it in forms so precise and so useable that, through his letters, something of his personality passed into all the collections and thereby did much to form the mind of all the later Middle Ages.

There is a further aspect of the Carolingian attempt to restore the institutions of civilised government which must be noticed, namely the desire of the scholars who were the agents of Charlemagne and his son to relate their work to something more enduring than expediency, than the necessity of the moment or the convenience of the prince. The ultimate object of all their endeavours was the restoration of the rule of Law, and their first task, here, was to rediscover the Law. This was especially true of the movement to reform the Church, its clerics and laity alike. In the enthusiasm of these eighth- and ninth-century reformers, and in their desire to strengthen their case by the adducing of the best authority, are to be found the beginnings of the new science of ecclesiastical jurisprudence. These clerics are the ancestors of the systematised Canon Law of the later Middle Ages.

By the time of Charlemagne's accession (768) the confusion in the minds of ecclesiastics as to the detailed rights deriving from, what all accepted, the Church's universal commission to save men's souls, was complete and entire. Three hundred and fifty years of continuous war and civil disturbance -- of a general breakdown of civilisation in fact -- had done their work. To the question what powers did the Church claim to possess according to the canons, or what powers had the Church exercised in the past, no one, anywhere, could give a satisfactory reply.

Nearly three hundred years earlier, by the end of the fifth century, that is to say, in the time of Pope Gelasius I (492-496), there had been formed a carefully noted collection of all the canons of the councils so far, and of the decrees of the different popes deciding cases and enunciating thereby the principles by which future cases would be decided. Then came the complete break up of the old political unity. For the next two hundred and fifty years, Spain and Gaul went their own way. In Gaul this patrimony of the law was scattered, and in great part lost to sight. In Spain, on the other hand, where alone in these outlying lands the centralisation of the hierarchy round a single primatial see -- Toledo--survived, the collection continued to grow through the seventh century. But by 720 Spain, as an effective influence in Christendom, was dead, thanks to the Mohammedans; and Africa, the first real home of the collection of the canons, had, from the same cause, ceased to matter. The Church in Gaul was entering upon the most chaotic period of its history, and to the confusion from internal causes there was now added -- in this matter of the difficulty of knowing what was the Church's authentic tradition of law -- a new confusion from outside. This was the introduction into Gaul, through the monk-missionaries from Ireland and England, of the innumerable Penitentials -- privately compiled lists of offences and sins with arbitrarily decreed penances assigned to each.

Again, from the time of St. Boniface the movement had never flagged that aimed at a complete renovation of the discipline of Christian life, in both clergy and laity, a renovation based on a reorganisation of the hierarchy; from 742 councils began to be held once more, and frequently: whence innumerable new canons of discipline and, thanks to the caesaro-papism of the Frankish kings, innumerable royal capitularies to supplement them.

The confusion of laws was thus, ultimately, greater than ever. The idea still, however, persisted that the new laws were but attempts to restore the ancient discipline -- as the one means to restore the ancient world-unity -- and, in the minds of those who made these new laws, more important by far was the old law which lay preserved in some of the ancient collections. In these it was realised, lay salvation from the chaos. The practical problem was to decide which of the several collections of the

old law was to be taken as official.

It was under these circumstances that Charlemagne asked for, and received from, Pope Adrian I (772-795) the official collection used by the Roman Church itself. The book sent to Charlemagne -- which we call the Hadriana -- was made up of an early Roman collection, as arranged by Denis the Short for Pope Hormisdas (514-523), and the texts of the later African collection. It now spread rapidly through the empire, its prestige easily outdistancing that which any other collection could claim. The reformers had in it a code and precedents that put all lesser codes out of court. The Penitentials, for example, began to be condemned in one council after another. As the ninth century went by, the influence of the Hadriana, in conjunction and combination with the Spanish collection (the Hispana), grew steadily. But although much of the old confusion was thereby lessened, this ancient law was not sufficient to serve as a basis for the correction of later-day wrongs, nor to defend the Church against the new kinds of abuses which, in ninth-century Gaul, threatened its very nature. Particularly was the old law deficient in means to stem the development by which the Church's property was gradually passing into lay hands. Charles Martel, in the eighth century, had looted the Church to finance the State; his grandson, Charlemagne, in the ninth, had turned the abuse into a legalised form of government. Deriving from the scandals was a wholesale anarchy in nomination to abbeys and sees that was still more shocking. The most pressing problem, for the reformers of the time of Charlemagne's own grandchildren (for example Charles the Bald, 840-877), was how to defend the Church from the new danger of legalised secularisation.

In the first place the bishops protested, and as their motives were open to the imputation that they sought their own aggrandisement, they turned for support to the impersonal argument of Sacred Scripture. To the new growing law of the State the Church must, ultimately, oppose its own older law -- the law that must exist, since the Church's claim was just and, in this matter, the State a usurper. The law must be fully stated; it must not be mere generality but deal with particular cases; most important of all it must possess a prestige greater than anything that the Carolingian State and the Church in Gaul could create; to serve its purpose it must be Roman, decrees of the ancient popes dealing with these very abuses in times gone by and

expressing in legal form the Church's rights and claims.

Here we approach a most extraordinary happening -- extraordinary to us, but hardly so, to such a degree, in a time which had other literary habits. The collection desiderated by the Carolingian reformers did not exist. Whereupon some of them deliberately created it; they composed, that is to say, of set purpose -- probably in the diocese of Le Mans, about the year 850, and for the defence of the rights of that see -- a whole body of law, assigning each decree to a particular council or pope, going as far back as the second century in their desire to heighten the prestige of what they produced. These are the famous False Decretals, once -- when all that was known about them was that they were forgeries -- a powerful weapon in the quiver of the anti-Roman controversialist.

They served their purpose sufficiently for knowledge of them to spread. In an age that was enthusiastic for whatever bore the mark of the ancient Roman unity -- an age that knew not the science of criticism -- they were accepted for what they professed to be. Gradually they came into use at Rome too, and by the middle of the eleventh century were accepted there in their entirety.

The real importance of the False Decretals is the new detail they bring in support of the already existing acceptance of the Roman Primacy. They were devised to help Le Mans, and the best way in which Le Mans could be helped was by the invocation of Rome -- *magni nominis umbra*. The invention, of its own nature, turned ultimately to help Rome. It showed the Roman primacy in function in numerous detailed ways and it expressed the rights of the primacy so functioning in apt legal formulae; it undoubtedly assisted the development of systematic routine appeals to Rome in cases that involved the bishops; it developed a new system in which the importance of the metropolitan declined; it assisted the extension of the Church's privilege to try delinquent clerics in her own courts; and it did very much indeed to secure recognition of the sacred character of ecclesiastical property.

On the other hand, the general effect of the acceptance of the False Decretals, the effect of them as an agent to resolve the existing confusion of the law, was slight. The differences

continued: differences between the cited authorities, differences between the books which inspired the reformers in different parts of the empire. As the ninth century drew to its close the Carolingian empire disappeared, and in the dreadful anarchy that ensued, the chances of the effective functioning of a central authority in the Church seemed as hopeless as the chances of the imperial authority itself. With the eleventh century the work of restoration had to begin yet once again.

But this work of preserving the existing knowledge, the careful encyclopaedic surveys of Rabanus Maurus, the bold revival of St. Ambrose in Hincmar and St. Nicholas I, by no means exhaust the intellectual life of this renaissance doomed to disappear so soon. In the second half of the century, the years that saw the Northmen established on every frontier of the empire, and even in his own native country, there appeared in Gaul an Irishman of genius, the greatest speculative mind since Boethius three hundred years before. This was John Scotus Erigena.

Erigena's learning was in its origin not Carolingian but Irish. [] Of his early life we know nothing. He makes his first appearance at the court of Charles the Bald in 847, and for thirty years he is the chief figure of this last generation of Carolingian culture. Then, after 877, history loses all trace of him. He had the advantage over all his contemporaries of a superior understanding of Greek, and he was the Catholic West's one really constructive mind between Boethius and St. Anselm. His influence on the first development of medieval philosophy was very great indeed.

It is not hard to trace the intellectual pedigree of this Irish thinker: the two most philosophical of all the fathers, St. Augustine and St. Gregory of Nyssa -- Neoplatonists both -- St. Maximus the Confessor and, above all, the anonymous writer for so long called -- and thought to be -- Denis the Areopagite.

This writer, who now for the first time begins to be a power in Western thought, had long been known in the East. [] The literary device behind which he hid caused him to be identified with that Athenian whose conversion was almost the sole recorded fruit of St. Paul's famous visit. [] This identification -- whose truth the Middle Ages took for granted -- gave an immense prestige to the doctrines his works contained. Here

was a contemporary of the apostles, no less, using the philosophy of Plato to expound his new faith. It had almost the effect of an apostle himself philosophising. The reality was very different. The author of these various books -- pseudo-Denis so to call him -- was no Athenian but a Syrian, not a contemporary of the apostles but a monk of the late fifth century. Nor was he a Catholic, though a convert from Paganism, but a Monophysite. He was a contemporary of Proclus (411-485) and of the furious controversies that were the aftermath of the Council of Chalcedon. []

The first reference to his works that has come down is, in fact, from the arch-heretic Severus in his controversial writings against the Church in the early sixth century. Later the Catholic theologian Leontius of Byzantium also cites him and in the next century, thanks to the prestige resulting from his glorious pseudonym, he has passed into the corpus of Catholic writers, and is used extensively as a witness against heresy. He is known and used by St. Gregory the Great, St. Sophronius of Jerusalem and St. Maximus the Confessor. It was probably the last named saint whose use of pseudo-Denis gave to these writings the last needed touch of orthodox warrant. For the pope St. Martin I at the Lateran Synod of 649 he is " Denis of blessed memory. " Pope Agatho cites him, too, in his letter to the General Council of

680; and the next General Council (Nicea II in 787) quotes Denis against the Iconoclasts. It was through the Greek monks in Rome that a knowledge of these books first began to spread in the West. Pope Paul I (757-767) sent a copy of them to Pepin; and Hilduin, abbot of St. Denis and arch-chaplain to Louis the Pious, translated them into Latin. But it was the translation, annotated, of John Scotus Erigena that was the real beginning of their striking effect on medieval thought. []

To translate Denis into Latin was one of the greatest things Erigena ever did. His other great achievement was to provide the first generation of medieval thinkers with a completed system which explained Catholicism as a philosophical whole. The inspiration of all this work was Neoplatonic, and, except for his use of Aristotle's dialectic, Erigena was himself nothing if not a Neoplatonist. Medieval philosophy had made its great start, and had made it with the initial confusion that it was not to work out

of its system for centuries. The weakness and the strength were apparent in Erigena's own contribution to that philosophy, the *De Divisione Naturae* which appeared after his translation of Denis, somewhere about 867. In this book we are presented with the most ambitious effort of the Catholic mind since St. Augustine himself, a philosophical discussion of the whole vast subject of God and His universe. [] This elaborate attempt to explain the Catholic view of the universe through Neoplatonism was a rock of offence to Erigena's contemporaries, and to the orthodox of later generations. Its author's confidence in the power of reasoning to explain the date of Revelation is boundless. His own use of logic is as strong as it is subtle. But, too often, he is ruined by a love of paradox, by an artist's delight in phrase-making, and by an exuberance of language that, at times, does grave injustice to his thought. It is not difficult to understand how, for all his good intentions, he was criticised and condemned as a Pantheist. The universe, as Erigena conceives its origin, is not too easily distinguishable from its Creator. The well-worked-out scheme of the flux and reflux of creation from the Creator leaves no place for the fact of evil and its eternal consequences. His theory of human knowledge breaks under the criticism of facts, and his claim for reason as the all-availing expounder of mystery can again only lead to disaster. It is not to be wondered that Erigena was repeatedly condemned, at Valence and at Langres in his own lifetime and later, in 1050, with Berengarius whom to some extent he inspired.

Erigena, nevertheless, had not lived in vain. He had stated the problems that were to occupy all the thinkers of the next four hundred years, the relations of faith and reason, the rational exposition of the data of faith, of the universe and its relation to God. He had produced, in his unsuccessful attempt to solve the problem, the first ordered systematic work of this kind that Latin Catholicism had so far seen. []

The intellectual revival had, in the main, been a work of restoration. Alcuin and the lesser men had been chiefly concerned first to amass themselves, and then to transmit to their pupils, whatever could be found of the erudition of the ages before the barbarian invasions. Grammar, rhetoric, the rules of reasoning, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, music, medicine, the meaning of the Scriptures, the theological work of the

fathers, particularly of St. Augustine and St. Gregory -- of all that these had to offer they made themselves living encyclopaedias. They were essentially schoolmasters; facts rather than ideas were their chief interest, and their writings inevitably tended to be compilations and manuals for the instruction of those less learned than themselves. The revival, in its first generation, could hardly do more. And before, in the next generation, scholars could, from this erudition, develop an interest in ideas, in intellectual speculation and the beginnings of a philosophical revival, the new invasions and the collapse of Charlemagne's political system had brought the whole movement to an end.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



3. EASTERN CATHOLICISM: THE END OF ICONOCLASM: THE SCHISM OF PHOTIUS: 813-925

The General Council of 787, though it marked a definite victory of tradition over the Iconoclasts, hardly weakened the party's hold in those sections of the national life where for nearly a century now it had been all powerful. One stronghold of the party was the army; and the army's attachment to the religious fashions of the great military heroes of the century was possibly strengthened when the sovereigns of the Catholic restoration showed themselves, through twenty years and more, weak and incompetent rulers. The successful military revolution of 813 brought with it a vigorous Iconoclast reaction in the religious world.

The emperor who then came to the throne, Leo V, was a soldier, an Armenian by birth. He began by commissioning the publication of a catena of texts from Holy Scripture and the Fathers which, apparently, favoured the practice of his sect. The next stage in the plan was that the Patriarch of Constantinople-Nicephorus I (806-815) -- should give the book an official approbation. But the patriarch remained true to the faith, and instead of approving what was, in effect, an Iconoclastic manifesto he summoned a council of 270 bishops and abbots in which the decisions of the General Council of 787 were renewed. The emperor bided his time and a few months later (March, 815) Nicephorus was sent into exile and a more tractable personage installed in his see. Almost immediately the new patriarch, in his turn, called a council. This time it was the Council of 753 that was re-enacted, and the canons of Nicea II were declared null and void. But the bishops were by no means unanimous in their support of this attempt to revive the heresy. They showed a much better spirit than their predecessors of sixty years before, and to subdue them the old edicts of persecution were put in force anew. The number of victims soon exceeded those of the persecution under Constantine V. Monasteries were sacked yet once again, the religious expelled and turned adrift. Many of the abbots were imprisoned and flogged, others sewn up in sacks and flung into the sea. So for five years the new reign of terror lasted, until Leo V died, assassinated, on Christmas night, 820.

His successor, Michael II, and his successor's son, Theophilus, maintained the Iconoclast tradition and were also, in their measure, persecutors. Theophilus, towards the end of his reign (834-842), showed himself the most cruel of all. When he died (January 20, 842) the government of the empire, for the second time in sixty years, fell to a woman, for the new emperor was a baby two years old. Like her predecessor Irene, the new empress-mother, Theodora, was a Catholic, and the persecution ceased immediately. But, as in 784, while this was easy to accomplish, it was quite another matter to reverse the anti-Catholic development of the last thirty years and restore Catholicism officially.

The position of the Empress Theodora was all the more difficult in that the patriarch was fanatically Iconoclast. However, within little more than a year she had negotiated the chief obstacles. The patriarch was removed and the abbot Methodius installed in his place. Methodius -- St. Methodius -- was the character for whom the circumstances called. He was a saint, he was a man of learning, firm in his principles and charitable in application of them. He gradually replaced the Iconoclast bishops, and while he made matters easy for those who abjured the heresy, he sternly repressed the tendencies towards an extravagant reaction favoured by one section of the Catholic party.

So ended, after more than a hundred years of trouble and persecution, the movement to abolish the cult of images. It was just five hundred and twenty years since Constantine's victory over Licinius had delivered the churches of the East from the last of their pagan persecutors. For a great part of that time those churches had been racked by heresy. Arians, Nestorians, Monophysites, Monothelites and Iconoclasts -- each century had added to the list of these disturbers of ecclesiastical peace and unity. Eastern Catholicism, spared the material destruction which in the West was part of the social and political transformation of the fifth and sixth centuries, had been tested in a far more fundamental way. In no case had the trial of heresy gone by unaggravated by the action of the omnipotent emperor. Sometimes, as in the Arian troubles, the emperor was himself a heretic and strove to impose on the Church the errors it had solemnly condemned. At other times, for all that he adhered to the traditional belief, the emperor did his utmost to reunite Catholic and heretic by means of vague formulae that sacrificed

the truth defined. Whence again, inevitably, a breach of communion with Rome. From one cause or another, and always, ultimately, from the emperor's hold on Eastern ecclesiastical life, the churches of the East had, out of those five hundred and twenty years, spent some two hundred and three years in schism. The reign of the emperor, Michael III, that opened with the final defeat of the Iconoclasts was to close with the beginning of the most serious breach of all.

The occasion of this schism was, it is true, less important than any of the earlier occasions, and the schism lasted only a matter of ten years. But thanks to the fact that its leader, Photius, was a personality of the first rank, and thanks to his formulation of a definite case against the papal primacy, this breach in the ninth century left wounds that have never healed. The schism was indeed patched up; but during the time it lasted, a new mentality had begun to develop. The militant and aggressive anti-Roman spirit, already in evidence at the Council in Trullo a hundred and seventy years before, [] crystallised now into unforgettable formulae; it allied itself with the congenial principle of Byzantine superiority over the barbarised Latin West. During the century and a half that followed the final disappearance of Photius there was an apparent restoration of normal relations between Rome and the East. But below the surface the events of 858-869 had effected a permanent change, and it needed only the appearance of a second, able and ambitious personality to create anew the anti-Roman schism of Photius, in a bitter offensive, at a time when no shade of dissentient teaching troubled any of the churches in East or West.

The patriarch of the restoration of the images, St. Methodius, died ill 846. His successor, Ignatius, was the youngest son of the Emperor Michael I, forced to become a monk when Leo V deposed his father in 813. Ignatius was a good man but autocratic, something of a martinet indeed, and presently his zeal to cleanse God's house began to make enemies for him in more than one quarter. There was already a strong anti-Ignatian party at Constantinople when, in the tenth year of his occupation of the patriarchal see, Ignatius came into conflict with the court. That party was led by Gregory Asbestos, an archbishop whom Ignatius had deposed, but whose deposition Rome had refused to confirm -- despite the patriarch's demand -- until it had heard both sides of the case. To the repeated requests from Rome to

state his case, Ignatius, even so late as 858, had returned no answer.

The empress-mother, Theodora, had by this time retired; the emperor, Michael III, was still only in his teens, and it was Theodora's brother, Bardas, who acted as regent with the title of Caesar -- a man of great ability, cultivated, but a loose liver. Michael III has gone down to history as Michael the Drunkard, and the Caesar, his wife turned out, was in 856 living with his daughter-in-law Eudokia. The circumstance is not, of course, unique in the history of courts, but Ignatius was not the man to let scandal go unrebuked simply because to rebuke it was to affront the man who had power of life and death over him.

Remonstrances, however, were in vain; and on the feast of the Epiphany, 858, Bardas crowned all by presenting himself for Holy Communion at the patriarch's mass. Ignatius refused to administer to him. The emperor protested that this was an insult to his uncle, but Ignatius held firm. Later in that same year the emperor and the Caesar planned to rid themselves of Theodora by locking her up in some convent. But Ignatius refused to be a party to the scheme. The thing could not be decently done without his co-operation and now, weary of his continual interference, it was arranged that he should go. He was suddenly arrested, November 23, 858, and deported to the island of Terebinthos.

The patriarchal see was declared vacant, and Bardas looked around for a likely man to fill it. Photius, upon whom his choice fell, was a candidate in every way unexceptional. He came of a great family which had suffered much for orthodoxy in the time of the Iconoclast emperors -- he was, in fact, a kinsman of the great patriarch Tarasios who had been the chief agent in the restoration of 787. Moreover, Photius had a distinguished record in the imperial service as counsellor and secretary; and he gave every sign, already at thirty, of what he was later to become--one of the most learned men who have ever lived. He was unmarried and his life was religious and beyond reproach. Had the see been really vacant Photius could hardly have been bettered as a candidate for it: save for the fact that he was a layman. But vacant it was for Bardas -- Ignatius having signed some kind of abdication, whether absolute or conditional is not clear -- and Photius accepted the nomination. On Christmas Day, 858, he

was consecrated by Gregory Asbestos.

Throughout the empire, however, a considerable party of bishops stood loyally by Ignatius. Whence there began a campaign to unite the episcopate in support of Photius. The Ignatian bishops met, declared the election of Photius null and void, and excommunicated him. Photius, in reply, held a council (spring of 859) which declared Ignatius and his partisans deposed. Next the government intervened, to carry out the sentences of Photius' synod. Soon the supporters of Ignatius were, like him, locked up in prisons, where they were maltreated and tortured.

Rome, so far, had not come into the matter at all; but in 859, with the hope that the Roman prestige would reduce the opposition, both Photius and the emperor approached the pope-Nicholas I. They explained that Ignatius, broken by age and ill-health, had resigned; Photius, with extreme reluctance, had accepted the promotion in his place; there were still remnants of Iconoclasm in the capital, and Ignatius, in his retirement, had entangled himself in political matters; he had, also, been guilty of transgressing several papal decrees. For this reason Photius had been compelled to excommunicate him.

Nicholas I was determined not to recognise Photius until he had gathered independent information about the whole affair. He decided that an enquiry was called for and sent to Constantinople as his legates the Bishops of Porto and Anagni. They were sent to enquire into the circumstances in which Ignatius had ceased to be patriarch -- to report and not to judge. But, exceeding their commission, they went into the history of Ignatius' own election fourteen years before, and into the history of his treatment of the Roman requests in the matter of Gregory Asbestos. Then, in May 861, they presided at a synod where Ignatius was again deposed -- because his own election was irregular, and because of his illegal procedure with Gregory. Ignatius, thereupon, appealed to the pope.

The affair dragged on very slowly. First of all the legates returned with their official report, and with more lying letters from Photius and the court. In March, 862, at a synod in Rome the whole matter was examined. The blundering of the legates was made clear: the pope disavowed them and ordered their

punishment; as to Photius, he refused to recognise him as a bishop, holding Ignatius to be the holder of the see until the case against him should be established. Then, at last, there arrived in Rome the appeal of Ignatius against the synod of 861 and the legates, telling, for the first time, the story of the share of the palace in his original deposition. In a new synod (April 863) the pope, with the statements of all parties before him, now definitely decided for Ignatius; the legates were deposed; Photius was excommunicated, should he not surrender the place he had usurped; Ignatius and his supporters were solemnly restored. To the emperor the pope wrote "advising and commanding" him to restore Ignatius; while to the other patriarchs he gave the reasons for his case against Photius and the imperial court: they had condemned Ignatius without a fair trial; they had installed a successor before his case was canonically terminated; at the trial, when this did take place, Ignatius was judged by his own subjects; and finally Photius, a layman, had been consecrated patriarch without observance of the necessary canonical intervals between his receiving the successive orders of deacon, priest and bishop.

The emperor replied in a letter which the pope described as "filled with insult and blasphemy". He utterly refused to accept the Roman decision, and threatened to send an army to bring the pope to his senses. Photius struck the pope's name out of the mass -- an action tantamount to excommunication. To all of which Nicholas replied in a famous letter, (September 28, 865) as long as a treatise, [] in which, while he reminds the Easterners again and again that the primatial rights of the Roman Church are of divine institution, he offers, if it will satisfy them, to have the whole case tried anew.

The next two years saw no change in the situation save an additional aggravation due to the mission in Bulgaria. The Bulgarians had first made appeal for missionaries to Constantinople about the time when Photius had been intruded into the see. He had sent missionaries as they asked, and Michael III had stood sponsor to their king, Boris, at his baptism (864). But the mission had not been too successful. Boris wanted a hierarchy of bishops that would be independent of Constantinople. Photius made difficulties. And so, in 866, the Bulgarian king, influenced partly at any rate by political considerations, turned to Rome; and in answer Nicholas I sent

two Latin bishops, one of them destined, in time, himself to be pope. This was Formosus, then Bishop of Porto, successor to the bishop deposed by the synod of 863.

At the same time the pope sent legates to Constantinople to explain and defend his sending a mission into Bulgaria. They carried despatches of an even more violent tone than the letter of 865, the emperor being now bidden to burn publicly the "blasphemous" letter of 863. But the legates were turned back at the frontier, and Photius made the Latin "aggression" in Bulgaria the occasion for the most effective thing he ever did. This was a long and violent anti-Roman manifesto, set forth in an encyclical letter to the other patriarchs. It was destined to be, and it still remains, the charter of the separate status of Constantinople and its dependent churches. The Latin "invasion" of the Greek missionary territory is described, and the danger to the faith of the neophyte from the Latin ignorance and errors. These are listed: the Latins fast on Saturdays; they eat milk foods in the three days between Quinquagesima Sunday and Ash Wednesday; they look down on married clergy; they reject the Confirmation given by a priest; and they have corrupted the Creed by adding the words "and from the Son" to the clause which, speaking of the Holy Ghost, says "Who proceeds from the Father". For which reasons Photius summons all the bishops of his patriarchate to a council which shall discuss and condemn these errors. Of that council we know little, save that it met and declared Nicholas I deposed, and that it deposed, too, all who supported him, "forerunners of apostasy, servants of Antichrist. . . liars and fighters against God" as the encyclical proclaimed them to be. Also, it is to be noted, Photius endeavoured to win over the emperor in the West, Louis II.

There is nothing new in Photius' refusal to accept the Roman sentence after invoking Rome's authority. What is new, and unprecedented, in a Patriarch of Constantinople, is his attack on the papacy as such, and on its hitherto universally recognised right.

It was, apparently, in the summer of 867 that these last events took place, and it is hard to say if Nicholas I ever knew of them. His health was failing all through that year and on November 13 he died, making efforts to the very end to mobilise the

scholarship of the West in opposition to an opponent whom he recognised to be a man supremely learned. By the time the pope died, and before he could have known of it, that able and learned, but shifty adversary had, however, himself been removed. But not by death. One of the imperial equerries, Basil the Macedonian, had been gradually creeping nearer to the throne. In 866 he had had Bardas murdered, and had succeeded to his place. On September 23, 867, it was the turn of Michael III; and Basil was proclaimed emperor. A wholesale reversal of his predecessor's acts followed. Among the favourites who fell was Photius, a long-standing rival of Basil at the court; and on November 23 Ignatius was solemnly restored to the patriarchal throne. Photius was sent into exile.

Between these events and the General Council of Constantinople which solemnly accepted the Roman judgement about them, there is the long interval of nearly two years -- an interval which is not merely practical testimony to the very real obstacle of geographical distance that now separated the two great centres of Christian life, but which also symbolises the distance which separated the Roman idea of the task before the council from what the new emperor, and his patriarch, had envisaged when they proposed it to the pope. Once more the meeting of a general council in the East was to be the occasion of new serious difficulties between pope and emperor, and, as on so many previous occasions, it was to leave behind memories whence would spring new, lasting troubles.

For the new emperor, Basil I, the thing that really mattered, in these years 867-870, was the very urgent problem of reconciling the two factions of ecclesiastics and their followers into which the churches of his empire had been, for ten years now, divided-"Ignatians and Photians". If the pope would consent to judge between them, on the basis of the events of 858, and if both parties would appear before him to plead their case, such a Roman decision might very well end the troubles. And what the pope decided in Rome it would be well that a council, meeting at Constantinople, should ratify.

But for the pope, these domestic troubles of the church of Constantinople were only one element of the affair. Since the original mischief arising out of the substitution of Photius for Ignatius in 858, there had occurred two events of the utmost

gravity, and of far greater importance than the question, even, which of the two men was the lawful Patriarch of Constantinople. Photius, in his capacity as patriarch, had, in fact, denied the papacy's right as the divinely instituted primate of the Church of Christ; he had done this in the most solemn way, in a great council. And a host of Eastern bishops had supported his action. That Rome should, and would, forgive the now repentant bishops was very desirable and all to the good, but the pope in this reconciliation, could not, without betraying his primacy, ignore an event of such magnitude as the recent wholesale denial of its existence.

When then, in June 869, the pope -- Adrian II -- considered with his council the letters sent by the emperor and Ignatius, the main question that occupied his mind was the Photian council of 867 and the patriarch's encyclical letter that had preceded it. This was the main subject of the Roman deliberations, and while an amnesty was offered to the Eastern bishops who repented their share in the event, the council of 867 was condemned and Photius again excommunicated, with the severe proviso that, even should he repent, he was not, ever again, to enjoy more than a layman's status in the Church. The emperor had asked the pope to take part in the council planned to assemble at Constantinople, and Adrian II agreed. The three legates he sent to preside in his name carried with them letters for the emperor and for Ignatius. The pope made it clear in his instructions to the legates -- and the legates faithfully obeyed his instructions -- that the council was not to reopen the questions he had already decided at Rome, but to accept his decisions, and give them a solemn public promulgation.

The council reckoned as the Eighth General Council -- opened on October 5869. Besides the legates, and the patriarchs and their representatives, there were barely a dozen bishops present. Nor did the numbers greatly increase as the weeks went by. There were 21 bishops at the fifth session, at which Photius made his first appearance; 38 at the eighth, on November 8; 65 at the ninth and, for the solemn session which closed the council, February 28, 870, 103 -- of whom 37 were metropolitans.

There was no difficulty about the condemnation of Photius, who maintained a haughty silence before his judges. But when it came to the trial of his supporters among the bishops, and to

the testimony of those who professed repentance, there were occasional scenes. Adrian II's instructions were that all were to sign the famous formula drawn up three hundred years before by Pope Hormisdas (514-523), [] and used by him as a test of orthodoxy in the reconciliation which ended the schism of Acacius. "The first condition of salvation" the formula declared "is to keep the rule of the true faith and in no way to deviate from the laws of the Fathers. And because the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ: 'Thou art Peter and upon this Rock I will build My Church, etc., ' cannot be passed over. What things were thus said are proved by the resulting events, [] because in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been kept free from blemish. We then, wishing to be by no means parted from that hope and faith. . . anathematise all heresies. . . . And therefore I hope that I may deserve to be with you in that one Communion, which the Apostolic see teaches, in which [Communion] is the whole, real and perfect solidity of the Christian religion. And I promise that in future I will not say in the holy Mysteries the names of those who are banished from the Communion of the Catholic Church, that is who do not accord with the Apostolic See. " []

One bishop began to argue that this Roman assertion of an indefectible faith was not historically true, and the emperor showed signs of wanting the point argued. But the legates insisted. The bishop must sign or be condemned. Nor was this the only dissension. Basil, as though to forestall any action by the legates which might endanger his own plan, namely not so to antagonise the party of Photius that it would be impossible to reconcile them with Ignatius, had sent one of the high officials of the court to control the debates, and between this personage and the legates there was more than one lively incident. Finally there was the mysterious "suspension" of the council which, suddenly, did not meet at all for two whole months [] -- part of which period, according to one account, was spent by the chief of the legates, Marinus, under arrest, for resisting the emperor's wishes.

But whatever the differences and difficulties the papal will was finally carried out, as the series of twenty-seven canons shows, promulgated at the final session February 28, 870. In these the Iconoclasts were again condemned. The interference of the State in episcopal elections was condemned too; elections

where the State has interfered are to be held null and void: those so elected are to be deposed, even if consecrated. Synods, it is declared, do not need the presence of the emperor or his legate for the validity of their acts. No one is to presume to depose any of the patriarchs; and especially no one is to do what Photius has done of late, and what Dioscoros did of old, [] that is to say write and put into circulation calumnies against the pope. Should anyone so presume he is to be punished with the punishment meted out to them. Any prince who attempts to coerce the freedom of the pope, or of any of the patriarchs, is anathema. Should any doubt or controversy touching the Holy Roman Church come before a general council the matter is to be examined with becoming reverence. In no case is sentence to be defiantly given against the Supreme Pontiffs of the elder Rome. [] In this last session the emperor, too, intervened: with a speech urging the Church's right freely to manage its own affairs.

Nevertheless, the tension in which the council had done its work continued to the end, and survived its close. In the last few days the legates had to complain of the theft from their baggage of the retractations signed by the bishops of Photius' party. And, a much more serious matter, in those same last days there arrived at Constantinople a mission from the Bulgarian king. He was finally determined not to link himself with Rome, since the pope resolutely refused to let him have Formosus as bishop. Once more, then, Boris besought the Patriarch of Constantinople to provide him with bishops and priests. The Roman legates protested vigorously; and there was a tense period when a new schism, with Ignatius as the papal adversary, seemed not unlikely. It ended by the legates formally forbidding Ignatius, in the pope's name, to send missionaries to Bulgaria, and in Ignatius making a dutiful, but very general, declaration of submission to the pope. Then the legates departed -- but by the time they had reached Rome the patriarch had equipped the Bulgarian Church with a complete hierarchy, an archbishop and twelve bishops.

The legates were a long time on their way home. They left Constantinople in the spring of 870, but did not reach Rome until some time in June 871. The news of the council's proceedings, and of the legates' difficulties, had preceded them; and Adrian II, instead of any formal ratification of the decrees, sent, along with

a complimentary letter to the emperor, a strongly worded complaint to the patriarch about his new activities in Bulgaria, threatening him with excommunication, and actually laying the sentence upon those now usurping in Bulgaria the episcopal jurisdiction.

The situation had not at all improved when, twelve months later, Adrian II died. His successor, John VIII, was a man of like views, but stronger and more vigorous in action. He had been archdeacon of the Roman Church for many years, and was thoroughly conversant with the complications of the problems before him. From the beginning of his reign this new pope took a strong line about the Byzantine "invasion" of Bulgaria. "If the treacherous Greeks do not depart, " he wrote to King Boris, "we are determined to depose Ignatius. " And, Ignatius proving obstinate, John VIII, in April 878, sent legates to offer him the choice between the faithful carrying out of his promises and deposition. But when the legates reached Constantinople they found that Ignatius was dead -- that he had died, indeed, six months before they set out. A new patriarch reigned in his place: it was Photius.

The appointment was natural enough from the emperor's point of view. The main problem in the religious life of the day was still the division, now twenty years old, that had begun with Michael III's deposition of Ignatius in 858. Photius, at the time of this second nomination as patriarch, had himself long been reconciled with Ignatius, and had been set at liberty. His diplomatic gifts had erased from the emperor's mind the memory of their old rivalry, and he had been appointed tutor to Basil's heir, the future emperor, Leo the Philosopher. There was every hope that the appointment of Photius as successor to Ignatius would finally rally all but the most fanatical of the dissidents. But what about the pope? Upon Photius there still lay the terrific sentences of the council of 869 and, above all, the pope's decision that henceforth he was to be no more than a layman in the Church.

The legates had no competence to deal with any element of this new problem. But they did not return to Rome. Instead they wrote to John VIII, telling him of the great event and, it would seem, endeavouring to win him to sympathise with the emperor's solution. The emperor also wrote, and so did Photius.

And the pope showed himself very favourable.

It needs to be said that John VIII had other worries, very practical questions of life and death, which at this moment inclined him to take an easy view of the latest events at Constantinople. The Carolingian empire was now in the last stages of disintegration. It was only with difficulty that the pope could persuade one of the great family to take upon him the name of emperor: and this at a moment when the Saracens threatened to be masters, not only in southern Italy, but even in Rome itself! If the emperor at Constantinople could not be persuaded to defend the pope against the Saracens, Rome's case was desperate indeed. This political anxiety was, indeed, one of the matters with which the legates despatched to correct Ignatius in 878 had originally been charged; and in their letters reporting the re-appearance of Photius they were able to tell the pope of the emperor's sympathetic dispositions towards the problem of the safety of Rome.

It was, then, in the happiest mood towards the emperor, and Photius, that John VIII, in the spring of 879, summoned his Roman council to consider the new aspect of the patriarch's career. He determined to recognise Photius as lawful patriarch and he cancelled and quashed all the sentences of the council of 869-870, and forbade anyone, ever again, to cite them against Photius. But Photius was to give some sign of repentance for his actions in the bad days of 867, and he was to pledge himself to withdraw the missionaries sent to Bulgaria.

Once again the Roman decisions were to be given the publicity of acceptance and promulgation in a council at Constantinople and this took place the following winter, November, 879-March 880. Photius was now all that any pope could desire. He made all the prescribed promises, even about the Bulgarian mission, and the legates solemnly granted him acknowledgement, and robed him in the handsome vestments sent by the pope as a special mark of affection.

There was, however, less agreement about the Roman demand that laymen were not to be promoted to the episcopate without the usual intervals between the various sacred orders received. And, according to one account, there was a tense moment when the question of the Filioque clause in the Creed was raised. This

crisis, however, was resolved by the diplomacy of Photius -- so this same account -- and all the more easily since, so far, the popes too had refused to insert the words -- even Leo III when asked by Charlemagne. John VIII confirmed all that the council had done and for the short remainder of his reign -- he died, murdered in 882 -- the peace between Rome and Constantinople continued undisturbed.

When Pope John VIII recognised Photius in 879 as the lawful patriarch of Constantinople, it was, however, an unfortunate by-product of his action that the party traditionally associated with the cause of the dead patriarch, Ignatius, the pro-Roman party of the crises of 858 and 867, now became the party whose policy was schism "on principle". The great council of 879 was to them an abomination; and their account of it, wholly misrepresenting what took place -- stating, indeed, the very contradictory of the fact -- not only served their party needs in the next generation, but continued to mislead all the Western historians until our own time. [] According to that false account, the pope repudiated the council of 879 and from this there resulted a renewal of the schism on the part of Photius.

Behind the screen of the falsehood and the forgeries there lies this much of the truth, namely that John VIII's action did not have the universal approval of the high officials of the Roman Curia. Among those who, at Rome, still eyed Photius askance was the one-time legate to the council of 869, Marinus; and it was Marinus who succeeded John VIII as pope in 882. Stephen V, too, in whose time Photius was deposed by the emperor Leo VI (886), was of the same mind; as was also the next pope, Formosus, a strong personality seemingly, and a strong opponent of all John VIII's policies. There followed, then, upon the pro-Photius decision of 879, a period when it might seem that the anti-Photius party at Constantinople could still look to Rome for support. The imperial deposition of Photius, in 886, was an opportunity for the party to invoke it.

But the popes were too wary to act on the first scanty statements of the events that came to them. Before granting recognition to the new patriarch Stephen -- a boy of sixteen, the emperor's own younger brother -- they asked for more information about the circumstances in which Photius had ceased to reign. In the end, it would seem, Stephen V granted

the recognition. Then his successor, Formosus, intervened -- sending legates to state the Roman view about the validity of the orders conferred by Photius. This intervention, it is held, probably contented neither of the rival parties. It was not until the stormy reigns of Formosus (891-896) and his next five short-lived successors (896-898) were over that John IX, in a rare interval of peaceful papal possession of Rome, brought about a reconciliation between "Ignatians" and "Photians", and between the patriarchate and the Holy See (899).

The peace lasted just eight years. What broke it up was a furious controversy about the legitimacy of the fourth marriage of the emperor -- Leo VI. His first wife had died in 893, and his second in 896. In 899 he had married a third time, and in 900 this wife too had died. None of these wives had brought him an heir and Leo, not venturing upon a fourth alliance -- so strong was the tradition in the Eastern churches against re-marriage-was living in notorious concubinage when, in 905, a son was born to him. He now approached the patriarch, anxious for some means to be found whereby this child should be recognised as his heir. The patriarch was Nicholas, called Mystikos, one of the major personalities of his line, who by his ability and his learning and his early career in the imperial service -- as well as by kinship -- was another Photius. Nicholas proposed that he should baptise the child with all the ceremonial appropriate to the emperor's heir, but that the emperor should separate from his mistress, Zoe. To this Leo agreed. But, the baptism over, he not only brought back Zoe, but himself crowned her as empress (906) and persuaded a priest to bless their marriage.

And now, while the patriarch buried himself in his study to think out a canonical solution for the problem, the emperor bethought himself to consult, and to beg a dispensation from, the other three patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch and Jerusalem, and from the pope. Upon this Nicholas hardened his heart. The quasi-independence of his administration seemed threatened, and when the Roman legates arrived from Sergius III with what he knew would be a reply favourable to the emperor, Nicholas refused to receive them; and he organised his own metropolitans to swear to die rather than agree that a fourth marriage could be lawful (906).

In February, 907 Nicholas was suddenly arrested, an obedient

synod declared him deposed, and some kind of acceptance of his fate was obtained from him. The synod chose in his place one of the great ascetics of the day, the monk Euthymos, and it granted the emperor the permission he sought; the priest who had actually married Leo and Zoe was however deposed, for having done this without authorisation. Finally, when the emperor proposed to legalise fourth marriages the synod declared that not only fourth marriages but third marriages too were unlawful; and the new patriarch steadfastly refused to crown the empress, or to allow her to be publicly prayed for as empress. The emperor's personal problem was solved, but no more than this; and there were now new divisions throughout the East, between the partisans of Nicholas, and those who recognised Euthymos.

Five years after these events when Leo the Philosopher died (912), there was a "palace revolution"; Nicholas was brought back and Euthymos deposed. In the general "revenge" Nicholas did not forget his score against Rome; and he sent the pope, Anastasius III, an ultimatum demanding that the decision given in 906 be reversed and the legates who bore it punished; otherwise he would strike the pope's name out of the mass. The Roman reply has not survived, but presently the threat was carried out. Once again the church of Constantinople was in schism, while in the capital the patriarch and the empress-mother Zoe fought for supremacy in a maze of palace intrigues. These came to an end when, in 919, the grand-admiral, Romanus Lecapenus, forced his way to the throne, marrying the boy emperor, Constantine VII, to his daughter and compelling recognition of himself as joint-emperor. In a great council at Constantinople in 920 Romanus forced upon the various religious factions a skilfully arranged compromise; and three years later the quarrel with Rome was also healed. No details of the reconciliation have come down to us. We know of two letters from Nicholas to the pope, John X, and that the legates he asked for were sent to Constantinople. We also possess the account which Nicholas gave of the affair to the King of the Bulgarians, Simeon. It is a curious document, and ominous for the future. The patriarch, who is sending with it a letter from the pope designed to lessen the Bulgarian king's hostility to the emperor, warns Simeon that "to despise the authority of the pope is to insult the prince of the apostles". And then he tells, in his own fashion, the story of the conflict about the lawfulness of fourth

marriages, of the great scandal, and of how the Roman See has finally ratified all the condemnations issued by Nicholas. " Like Photius in 880, Nicholas came out of the fight with all the honours of war. " [] If there was a surrender anywhere, it was -- according to his version -- on the part of Rome. The letter is, by implication, yet another assertion of Constantinople's claim to autonomy, to a jurisdiction practically sovereign. And herein lies, no doubt, the main importance in history of this long-drawn-out, and not too well-known, Byzantine aggression.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



4. THE ROMAN SEE AND THE DISSOLUTION OF THE EMPIRE, 814-900

The genius of Catholicism continued, then, to transcend the weaknesses of its members even in this dying world. The weaknesses were as evident as in the days of St. Boniface -- ignorant clergy, worldly lords and successful brigands masquerading as prelates, a greedy laity taking every occasion the times offered to lay hands on ecclesiastical property and jurisdiction for their own profit. Nowhere is the struggle that shook the whole Church better seen than in the history of its primatial see, in the story of the development of the Frankish protectorate during the eighty or ninety years that followed Charlemagne's death. It is the story of the ever-increasing hold of the emperor on the papacy, and of the gradual disappearance of the principle of free election. The idea grows that the papacy, a thing eminently profitable, is worth much violence to secure, and at Rome there are soon rival factions traditionally hostile, to whom every vacancy presents an opportunity for fraud, violence, and sacrilege. These factions outlive the empire, and once the strong hand of the emperor has gone the papacy is at their mercy.

Charlemagne was scarcely dead when the faction which, in 799, had tried to murder Leo III, seized its opportunity. But now the plot was discovered in time, and arrests and executions were the order of the day. Protests went to the emperor. The death penalty, the punishment of the Roman Law for the outrage on the Roman maiestas, seemed to the Franks unnecessarily harsh. And, since the emperor was emperor of the Romans, should he not have been consulted? So Louis the Pious sent a commission to Rome to enquire, and the pope explained himself. The plots continued and the next year, 816, an insurrection broke out. It was suppressed by the Franks -- just in time to save the pope. Then, in June 816, Leo III died.

The election was made, in conformity with the decree of 769, by the clergy alone. They elected the deacon Stephen, who, like Leo's predecessor Adrian I, was a noble and therefore qualified to unite the contending parties. He reigned only six months, but in that short time he recalled the exiles of 799 and 814, saw to it

that all his people swore allegiance to the emperor, and, in October, 816, solemnly crowned Louis at Rheims.

With the unexpected death of Stephen IV (January 25, 817) the forces that had ruled during the twenty-one years of Leo III's reign returned to power, in the person of the new pope, Pascal I. The reign was as troubled as that of Leo III. It began with the now customary announcement to the emperor of the pope's election and with a confirmation of the pact of amity between the two powers. The text of the pact of 816 is the earliest that has survived. The emperor guarantees the pope's sovereignty over the Italian territories, which are specified in detail, and he guarantees also that the papal election shall be free and unhindered. On the other hand, he reserves the right to receive appeals from the pope's subjects. In 822 there was a notable instance of the exercise of this right when Louis' son, Lothair -- whom Louis had himself crowned King of Italy, as he himself had been crowned by Charlemagne -- decided an appeal of the nobility against the pope. The next year there were more serious troubles. Some of the appellants of 822 were murdered, and the pope was accused of being privy to the deed. He protested his innocence and, following the precedent of Leo III, solemnly purged himself by oath.

Twelve months later the unhappy pope was dead, and the internal dissensions precipitated in a double election. Thanks to the influence of the monk Wala who was Lothair's chief adviser, and who chanced to be in Rome, one party gave way and the archpriest Eugene was unanimously acknowledged -- the candidate of the nobility. The emperor, weary of the endless scandals that resulted from the Roman factions, determined to end them by a careful, systematic and official delimitation of powers. A mission was sent to Rome under the nominal presidency of the young king, Lothair, after whom the pact in which it issued was called the Constitution of Lothair. On the whole the balance of the new arrangement was unfavourable to the pope. The pope, henceforth, must not put to death anyone who enjoyed the emperor's protection, nobles that is to say and dignitaries. Romans accused of serious crimes were to have a choice by which law they would be judged, Roman or Frank or Lombard. The magistrates were to be nominated by the emperor, who was now to be represented at Rome by two permanent commissioners, one of them nominated by the pope. They were

to make an annual report to the emperor on the papal government, and to receive appeals against its action. Should the pope refuse to do justice to such appeals the commissioners were to send them on to the emperor. Finally, the Constitution regulated the papal election. None but Romans were to take part in the election, and -- a notable reversal of existing law -- the laity were to have a share in it. And the newly-elect was to swear an oath to the emperor in the presence of the commissioners and the people. The history of the next few elections interprets the new arrangement. The emperor is very definitely the overlord of Rome, and the pope is not consecrated until the emperor's representative is satisfied that the election has been made in accordance with the prescribed form.

Eugene II accepted the Constitution, and in a council of the bishops of the Roman province he promulgated the new regulations for the election of the pope. Then, only a few months later, in August, 827, he too died. His successor, Valentine, lived for a few weeks only. The next effective pope was Gregory IV, elected in October, 827, but not consecrated until after the imperial commissioners, six months later, had come to Rome and confirmed the election. The new system was an established fact, and the nobility had been given a new hold on the papacy, a hold which tended, from the first, so to increase that the clergy's part in elections was, often enough, to be by comparison a very secondary affair indeed.

Gregory IV was an exceptionally long-lived pope. His sixteen years' pontificate saw the beginning of the disastrous civil wars between Louis the Pious and his sons, in which the pope in the interests of unity and peace opposed the emperor's schemes of partition. It saw, too, the establishment of the Mohammedans in Sicily and the beginning of their attacks on Italy itself. The duchy of Benevento was at this time disputed between rival claimants, both of whom called in bands of Saracens as auxiliaries. In every new event the end of the Carolingian peace was already beginning to be proclaimed when, in the beginning of 844, Gregory died.

The election of his successor showed once more the reality of the new imperial suzerainty. As in 824, there was a double election. The candidate of the nobility, Sergius, managed to expel his rival from the Lateran and was himself, thereupon,

consecrated and enthroned. The emperor, Lothair, had not been consulted, and to maintain his right, now sent his son, the future emperor, Louis II, with an army, to examine into the election. There was an enquiry, much questioning of all who took part, and finally Sergius was recognised as pope. He proceeded, thereupon, to consecrate the young king and to swear fidelity to the emperor his father. Furthermore, it was again carefully stipulated that no one was to be consecrated pope without the sanction of the emperor or his representative.

Sergius II was elderly, gouty, and lacking entirely in the gift of ruling. His one title to consideration was his noble birth, that he came from the family that had given Eugene II to the Church, and was later to give Adrian II too. The pope's brother, Benedict, a nobleman of shifty ways and dissolute life, was soon installed as Bishop of Albano and his chief adviser. Soon it was known that the one thing necessary under the regime was money. Offices, benefices, appointments and favours of every sort, were on sale; and to supplement where these means fell short, the pope and his brother set themselves to pillage the monasteries. Then, a divinely appointed chastisement, men said, for the election of so worthless a pope, on August 23, 846, the Mohammedans landed at Ostia and making their way along the Tiber sacked and pillaged the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul. Against Rome itself they were powerless; the old walls were an obstacle such an expedition could not hope to force. But the whole of the Christian West shivered at the sacrilege, and the emperor was moved by the general indignation to raise funds to fortify the basilica of St. Peter, and to organise an expedition and drive the Saracens from Italy. The miserable old pope did not long survive the indignity He died in January, 847.

In his place the Romans elected Leo, the priest of the church of the Four Crowned Martyrs. With the money which the imperial tax brought him, with offerings from all over Christendom, and with taxes on his own domains he fortified the district round St. Peter's -- the district called ever since, in memory of him, the Leonine City. It was no luxury of building, for the Mohammedans continued to molest the coast and the districts at the mouth of the Tiber during all the rest of the reign. Leo IV's relations with the emperor never attained to cordiality. He had been consecrated without the emperor's permission -- though this had been put right by a declaration that the pope in no way

denied the emperor's rights -- and when, in 850, the young Louis II, associated now with his father as emperor, came to live in Italy as its king the delicacy of the situation was greatly increased. The pope complained of the emperor's representative at Rome and the emperor seems to have supported discontented papal functionaries against the pope. Leo IV, from the point of view of imperial policy, fell very short indeed of perfection as pope. The emperor began to make plans for the future. A new departure was at hand. The emperor, at the next vacancy, would have his own candidate and, an imperialist pope elected, harmony would reign between the two powers.

The priest Anastasius on whom, for this dubiously honourable promotion, Louis II cast his eyes was a man of no small distinction. He was the son of the Bishop of Orte, [] a strong imperialist, whom the emperor had more or less compelled the pope to choose as the papal member of the commission of superintendence. Anastasius was unusually well educated. In addition to a wide knowledge of ecclesiastical literature, for example, he had a good command of Greek. Now he suddenly disappeared from Rome and the next news was that he was living in the neighbourhood of the imperial court. The pope, suspecting an understanding with the emperor, and fearing perhaps a schism, ordered him to return. He refused, and thereupon, after a succession of warnings, the pope excommunicated him and specifically deprived him of any right to be elected pope in the future, laying an excommunication on whoever should presume to vote for him. The relations of pope and emperor were in this state when, July 17, 855, Leo IV died.

The sequel to the emperor's plans was curious. Anastasius was of course still absent from Rome, and unanimously the Romans elected Benedict, the priest of St. Cecilia. This election the emperor refused to ratify. His commissioners appeared at Rome with an escort and with them came Anastasius, the emperor's candidate. The number of their partisans increased as they journeyed, Benedict was arrested, and Anastasius took possession of the papal palace. But the clergy held firm. Anastasius lay under sentence of deposition and by Church Law no deposed ecclesiastic could receive promotion. The commissioners had to yield; and in a solemn assembly at St. Mary Major's, Benedict, released now, was re-elected and the election confirmed.

The sentences against Anastasius were renewed. He was reduced to the lay state and made Abbot of Sta. Maria in Trastevere. There, in studious retirement, he remained, preparing himself for the next office to which the emperor destined him, that of permanent imperial commissioner at Rome charged to keep watch on the pope. His father still held office as the papal nominee on the Commission, and so Anastasius would triumph, despite Pope Benedict's re-election ! But before the scheme matured Benedict III died (April 17, 858). This time the emperor himself assisted at the election. He did not repeat the mistake of 855 and suggest an ineligible candidate, but proposed, and succeeded in carrying, the election of a very distinguished man indeed. This was St. Nicholas I, the greatest pope between St. Gregory and Hildebrand, one of the three popes whom alone of the two hundred and sixty posterity has agreed to call "the Great. " He owed his election, none the less, to Louis II, for the Roman clergy had had another in view.

The new pope managed to keep on good terms with the emperor. Anastasius he disarmed by making him, to use a modern term, his secretary of state, in which capacity the forthcoming schism of Photius and the struggle with Hincmar of Rheims, soon gave him ample scope to show himself one of the great defenders of papal rights. When Louis II demanded the reinstatement of the Archbishop of Ravenna, excommunicated for his misgovernment, the pope held firm despite the emperor's personal intervention; and, carrying the war into the other camp, he renewed the decree of 769 forbidding non- Romans -- the emperor's envoys for example -- to interfere in papal elections. Nicholas was no mere statesman, but a man of saintly life, and his natural courage was reinforced by the invincible prestige of personal holiness. The emperor withdrew his support from the excommunicated prelate, while the pope descended on Ravenna and saw personally to the restoration of order. Finally the archbishop submitted.

This dispute was but a preliminary skirmish. In 863 a battle royal developed between pope and emperor. The cause was the annulment of the marriage of the emperor's brother, Lothair II of Lorraine, and his re-marriage. The bishops of Lorraine had sanctioned the re-marriage twice in synod. It was once more sanctioned in a great council at Metz, presided over by the

pope's legates and then, in the October of the same year, the pope quashed the decisions of the councils, and since both the law and the facts were so evident that no honest man could be in doubt, deposed the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves for their share in the scandal and recalled his legates to take their trial. The decision was a signal for all the discontented to combine: the King of Lorraine of course, the emperor, still sore over the Ravenna defeat, the Archbishop of Ravenna, -- even the schismatic Photius, in distant Constantinople, was approached. Presently a great army, led by the brother sovereigns, moved on Rome. The pope gave himself to prayer. Processions filled the streets, the people prayed and fasted. For two whole days the pope prayed before the tomb of St. Peter. Then the tide began to turn. The emperor fell ill. He asked nothing better than a reconciliation. The great combination broke up and the affair ended with the pope stronger than ever.

Nicholas I died, all too soon, after a reign of only nine years (858-867). His successor, Adrian II, elected without difficulty, was again not consecrated until Louis II had approved. He was soon involved in serious difficulties with the family of Anastasius. Adrian, to begin with, without reversing the decisions of his predecessor, tended towards a policy of leniency to some of the malcontents of the late reign. Anastasius persisted in the contrary sense, and in the end had his way. Between the son, who thus dominated the spiritual administration, and his father the aged Arsenius who controlled the temporal, the papacy, with a weak pope, was very much what this family chose to make it. And behind them was the emperor. A new manoeuvre which would have extended their power still further failed however. It ended in a fearful crime - - symptomatic of the more sinister tendencies of the time and prophetic of the future -- and this ruined all. Adrian II, while as yet in minor orders, had married and his wife and daughter were still alive at the time of his election. Arsenius now planned a marriage between the pope's daughter and his own younger son Eleutherius. But the pope had other views. As in other states, so in the papal state, a matrimonial alliance could be of high political importance. This new, and unecclesiastical, novelty, had shown itself already when Adrian's two predecessors, Benedict III and Nicholas I, had been careful to marry off their nieces to important members of the local nobility as a means to secure their loyalty. Adrian had made similar plans for his daughter. Eleutherius, however,

would take no denial, and finally kidnapped both mother and daughter.

The pope appealed to the emperor and presently the imperial officers were hot in pursuit. Eleutherius, surrounded, murdered both the girl and her mother. He was taken and himself put to death. Meanwhile the pope denounced Anastasius as the author of the plot and, in his anger, renewed against him all the old sentences of twenty years before and deprived him of the post of librarian (868). Later he managed to prove his innocence and Adrian reinstated him. The incident is yet another instance of the speed with which the papacy was being forced along the road of secularisation, and of what it had to fear from the brutal Roman nobility against whom the emperor was its sole defence.

On April 12, 875, the emperor Louis II died, the last effective ruler to hold undisputed sway in Italy. Adrian II had predeceased him by three years. In his stead ruled yet a fourth nominee of Louis II. This was John VIII, and to him there now fell the delicate task of deciding, since Louis II had no male heirs, to which of his uncles, Charles the Bald of France or Louis the German of Germany, the imperial title should now descend. For the first time there was a France and a Germany between which the papal diplomacy must needs choose. For the first time it depended on the pope whether a King of France or a King of Germany should be the dominant force in Italian politics. The emperor, for the last fifty years, had chosen the popes. Now it was for the pope to choose the emperor. Whichever prince he chose, the empire of Charlemagne was beyond all possibility of salvation. The imperial title, already, was become a mere decoration.

The pope chose the King of France -- the weaker of the two brothers, but the ruler of the more civilised kingdom, an intellectual, and a prince devoted to the fortunes of the Church. The choice was the signal for his rival to put all possible obstacles in his way; Louis the German and his three sons took the field. Charles, partly by arms, partly by diplomacy, circumvented them, and on Christmas Day, 875, just three-quarters of a century after the first coronation that had founded the empire in his grandfather, he too was crowned at St. Peter's. Then, disregarding the pope's appeal for aid in the holy war against the Mohammedans, he hurried back to defend his own

realm against his brother and nephews.

While, beyond the Alps, the new civil war continued -- the death of Louis the German in 876 only providing an occasion for new quarrels -- the pope was occupied once more with the problem of the Mohammedans, and with the chronic discontent of his own factious subjects. From Bari and Tarentum the Saracens had been lately expelled by the fleet of the eastern emperor -- the beginning of a Byzantine restoration in southern Italy that was to last for another two hundred years -- but they now found new employ in the service of the rival petty princes. Soon there was a Mohammedan garrison at Naples, another at Gaeta. The Campagna was never free from their raids and Rome itself was menaced now from the land. The pope, a man of unusual vigour and invincible spirit, organised a fleet in addition to his army. He turned admiral, and successfully: defeating the Saracens several times, destroying a fleet, and liberating hundreds of Christian captives. Also he fortified St. Paul's as Leo IV had fortified St. Peter's.

In Rome itself there was a strong faction which viewed the policies of John VIII with deep misgiving -- the high officials whom the influence of the late emperor had forced upon the popes of the last twenty years. With the death of Louis II the opportunity had come to the pope to be rid of them. They preferred flight to the risk of what possibly awaited them, in that time where the unsuccessful politician so frequently ended his career blinded and lacking a tongue. Whereupon the pope, after in vain exhorting them to return, solemnly condemned them. Among these eminent fugitives one at least, Formosus, the Bishop of Porto, was a man of real distinction and great austerity of life. Nicholas I had employed him on a mission to Bulgaria, and the Bulgarians had wished to keep him as their primate. This the pope -- Adrian II, by this time -- refused, whereupon the disgusted Bulgarians had turned to Constantinople. As Adrian neared his end there was talk of Formosus as his successor. But another school of thought had prevailed, and the distinguished Bishop of Porto could hardly hope for favours from the candidate it succeeded in electing -- John VIII.

At this juncture, while the exiles, returning with an army, invested Rome, Charles the Bald suddenly died (October 6, 877)

and the pope, for the second time in two years, had to choose an emperor and a protector. While he hesitated, his enemies took the Leonine City and held him prisoner for thirty days, using all possible pressure to induce him to name Carloman, the senior prince of the German branch of the family. But the pope held his ground, refusing to make a decision, and finally they made off.

Next, in despair, the pope made peace with the Mohammedans and sought to arrange a league of perpetual peace between the warring Carolingians. But nothing came of his great scheme; the dislocation of the ancient empire went on apace; each of the princes had more than he could successfully accomplish in the task of keeping order within the kingdom nominally subject to him; and the pope's final decision to crown as emperor Charles the Fat, the senior surviving member of the German branch of the imperial house [] (February 12, 881), did nothing to strengthen his own position in Rome. There his enemies were finally too much for him and on December 15, 882, they made away with him, battering him to death when the poison acted too slowly. John VIII is the first pope whom history records to have been murdered. In the next eighty years he was to have, in the manner of his death, not a few successors. The event was yet another proof how speedily the Carolingian civilisation was falling back into barbarism, proof too of what the Roman nobility were capable.

John VIII's successors -- the short lived Marinus (882-884) and Adrian III (884-885) -- recalled the exiles, and with them Formosus, absolved now from the censures laid on him and from the oath he had sworn never to return to Rome. With Stephen V (885-891) the political problem of the empire returned for, in X87, Charles the Fat was deposed, to die a few months later. Three candidates disputed the succession to his title of emperor-Arnulf the Carolingian King of Germany; Berengar, another Carolingian who ruled Italy; and Guy, the powerful anti-imperialist Duke of Spoleto in whom the old anti-Roman, anti-papal tradition of the Lombards came to life again. Guy defeated Berengar, and Stephen V, without the safeguard of any treaty, without any guarantees for the future of the papal State, had perforce to crown him emperor (891).

The papacy's real hopes centered in Arnulf, a safer protector because more distant; and for the next five years all the Roman

diplomacy was directed to induce Arnulf to invade Italy and dispossess Guy. It was a dangerous game, but one that Stephen's successor, too, continued to play. This was no other than Formosus himself (891-896). Arnulf, however, was kept in the north by the problem of Germany. Not until 896 did he come, and on February 22 of that year he was solemnly crowned emperor by Formosus, who had already crowned his rival Guy and, on Guy's death in 894, Lambert his son. It only remained for Arnulf to conquer Lambert and then, the papacy freed from the new political slavery, to retire to Germany. The campaign had hardly opened however when paralysis struck down Arnulf, as it had stricken his father Carloman. The papacy was once more at the mercy of an emperor from whose inevitable vindictiveness no mercy could be hoped. The shock of the news was too much for Formosus and, just seven weeks after his coronation of Arnulf, he died (April 4, 896).

While Arnulf was slowly carried into Germany, Lambert marched to his triumph. By the end of the year he had taken i Rome. Formosus was no longer alive, but there yet remained ways to inflict exemplary punishment. The new pope -- Stephen VI -- was bidden to try the dead pope for the alleged ecclesiastical, irregularities of his election, and, that the ceremony might lack nothing, the corpse of Formosus was disinterred and, vested in the pontifical robes, set before the assembled bishops. He was condemned, and according to the ritual the body was stripped of all its insignia. Underneath the splendour they found a hair shirt. Finally they threw the remains into a disused grave, whence the mob next took them to tip them into the Tiber.

Stephen had himself been consecrated bishop by Formosus, the most serious irregularity urged against whom had been his own previous occupancy of the see of Porto. As the law then stood, no bishop could pass from one see to another. Stephen VI, then, suffered from the same irregularity as the man he now condemned. He solved the difficulty by declaring that the ordinations performed by Formosus were all null and void--including therefore his own -- since Formosus was not pope but a usurper.

Stephen VI, too, had his enemies, or perhaps his share in the frightful horror of the recent trial pointed him out as the most appropriate scapegoat once the city had come back to its

senses. Be that as it may, an insurrection soon dispossessed him. In his turn he, too, was degraded and thrown into prison where, in a short time, he was strangled. Romanus, who followed him in the chair of St. Peter, lasted for four months only; Theodore II, who came next, for only twenty days. Formosus, or rather his remains, no-v reappeared, thrown up by the river. Theodore, with all possible ceremony, restored them to their original resting place in St. Peter's; and, so it is said, as the body was borne in, the images of the saints placed there by the dead pope bent in reverence before him. Theodore also restored all the clerics whom Stephen had deposed.

But if Theodore made amends for the sacrileges of his predecessor, he did not live anything like long enough to lay the old spirit of faction. When he died there was once more a double election. The party of Formosus elected John IX, their opponents Sergius III. The emperor intervened in favour of the first and Sergius, for the moment, retired.

John IX (898-900) was a reformer. The acts of Stephen VI were once more annulled. It was decreed that never, for the future, were corpses to be dug up for trial, and, a kind of recognition of the apparent truth that without the emperor there was small chance of order, the imperial rights in the matter of papal elections were again solemnly confirmed. How the new alliance would have worked it is impossible to say, but within two years Lambert had died without heirs and John IX was dead too.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



5. THE ROMAN SEE AND THE ANARCHY, 900-1046

So far as the Papal State was concerned, the death of John IX was the end, for nearly a century, of even the elementary decencies of life. Berengar, who claimed now to be emperor, was wholly taken up with the war against his rival Louis the Blind, of Provence. The empire had at last ceased to matter anywhere at all. The huge state of Charlemagne was now everywhere at the mercy of the local great man -- bishop, abbot or count -- all, or almost all, jealously disputing jurisdictions and territory, endeavouring in the general chaos to annex rights long coveted and to extend their existing possessions. The plague of the Scandinavian invasions had indeed for the moment been broken, but in their place there appeared a new horde of ferocious nomads from the steppes of Asia -- the Hungarians. Arnulf had used them as auxiliaries in his wars, but in 895 the whole nation, a million in all, was streaming into central Europe. For the next sixty years, almost unhindered, their disciplined cavalry swept over central and southern Europe, Italy, Provence, Lorraine and, especially, Germany, the most terrible affliction that even these centuries had seen.

These years between the disappearance of the empire and the emergence of the German King Otto I (936-973) are, except in England, perhaps the darkest in all known European history. Nowhere are they darker than in Rome, where, for sixty years a single noble family dominated, making and unmaking popes at its pleasure. The details of this story are so grotesque that they lose all relation to reality. They have scarcely any power to shock, so great is their incredibility. The head of this family was the nobleman charged with the government of Ravenna, who was also something like the commander-in-chief of the army, Theophylact. In the reign of John IX's short-lived successor, Benedict IV (900-903), another reforming pope, Theophylact plays no part. To Benedict there succeeded Leo V, whom after a few months another priest, Christopher, managed to overthrow. Christopher was in turn deposed (904) by the disappointed candidate of the election of 898, Sergius III, and sent to the prison that still held Leo V. A few weeks later the two ex-popes were murdered "out of pity" ! Sergius, a blackguardly ignoramus, was now supreme. Theophylact's hour had come.

Sergius renewed all the censures against Formosus, and honoured the tomb of the vile Stephen VI with an epitaph that exalted the infamous trial in words that defy translation. Next, annulling all the ordinations made by Formosus and the "Formosan" popes, John IX and Benedict IV, he threw the whole of Italy into indescribable confusion. Theophylact, through his wife, Theodora, slipped into the new post whence he came to control the whole papal administration, while his daughter, Marozia, there is reason to believe, became the pope's mistress. Of Anastasius III, and of Lando, who succeeded Sergius and, together, reigned for little more than two years (911-914)] we know hardly anything save that the principate of Theophylact was in no way interrupted. Next came John X (914-928) alleged to be the lover, not of Marozia, but of her mother. He, too, was of the party of Stephen VI and Sergius III, but he showed himself a strong ruler and a capable soldier, organising a league of princes against the Saracens, defeating them in a great battle in 916 and routing them from their stronghold on the Garigliano. John X was long-lived, but towards the end of his reign he broke with the Theophylact clan. Its chief was now Marozia. She had married, in 915, one of the heroes of the war with the Saracens. Her husband soon died and it was her two sons, Alberic and John, who were, for the next few years, to play the leading parts in political life. Civil war broke out in the Papal State, between John X and Marozia. The pope called in the Hungarians, but before long a riot in Rome brought his reign to an end and in 928 he died in prison, smothered, it is said, at Marozia's orders. The next three popes were nominated by Marozia -- Leo VI, who lasted six months, Stephen VII for two years, and finally, in 931, her own son, John XI, a young pope, certainly, since his mother was scarcely forty!

Marozia's supremacy was fated soon to disappear. She now married, as her third husband, Hugh, the King of Italy. Her son, the pope, officiated at the marriage and all seemed well. But Marozia's elder son, Alberic, aspired to the mastery of Rome. Between him and Hugh, who hoped for the same prize through a revival of the empire in his favour, there could be nothing but enmity. The troubles soon came to a head; Hugh was driven back to Pavia, Marozia imprisoned, and Alberic was master as Theophylact, his grandfather, had been. During the next twenty years he was all powerful, the real ruler of the Papal State and the decisive factor in what passed for papal elections. His

brother, John XI, died in 935: the next four popes [] were all Alberic's nominees.

A double aim inspired Alberic's policy as ruler of the Papal State (931-954). He desired to render permanent the family hold on the State, and to prevent any revival of the empire; for, whoever was crowned as emperor, this family ambition would find in him, inevitably, an opponent; the official protector of the Holy See could not allow any other master of the Roman See but himself. The danger of such revival came in the first place from Alberic's father-in-law, King Hugh. He made a series of attempts to capture Rome -- an event which would of course have been followed by his coronation as emperor -- in 933, in 936 and in 941. Each time Alberic was too strong for him and Hugh died his ambition unachieved. His son and heir, Lothair, did not live long enough to be a danger to Alberic; but a more serious competitor by far was the King of Germany, Otto I, whom Lothair's widow, Adelaide, now called in to deliver her from Berengar of Ivrea who had usurped her rights.

So, in 951, the German king descended on Italy. He took Pavia, liberated Adelaide, and married her. Then he turned towards Rome. But Alberic, once more, successfully warded off the Charlemagne-to-be; and Otto made his way back to Germany.

As ruler of Rome, Alberic was at least satisfactory. The four popes of his choice were men of good life, and the period was one of religious restoration, thanks very largely to the influence of St. Odo of Cluny. It came to an end all too soon, in the most singular departure from tradition that the century produced. Alberic's health failed prematurely. He was scarcely forty when, in 954, death claimed him, while his heir Octavian was still in his teens. Octavian, despite his age, succeeded peacefully to his father's power, and to the hope of something more, for before Alberic died he had extracted a promise on oath from the electors that, when the pope died, they would choose Octavian. So it fell out. Octavian succeeded his father in the temporal sovereignty of Rome, with its new tradition of naming the pope, and a few months later he also succeeded the pope, Agapitus 11 (956). He was then sixteen years of age.

There was this to be said for the scheme that it ended, for once, the rivalry of nobility and clergy, of the temporal and spiritual

interests, since John XII -- Octavian's new style -- combined them, eminently, in his person. The pope was once more supreme in his State, and supreme because, before he was pope, he happened to be, like his father before him. "prince and senator of all the Romans. "

It was already a serious disadvantage that the person in whom these offices were combined was so young; it was another that he did not in the least realise the obligations which his spiritual rank entailed. The most serious thing of all was that the older he grew the less he seemed to care. He was master as no pope had been master since the Papal State began. How he used his power is most decently told in the spare and reticent lines of Mgr. Duchesne. []

" We know, too, in what other fashion his youthful spirits overflowed, and how Rome was soon the witness of truly appalling scandals. The young pope took little pleasure in the ritual ceremonies of the Church. Matins scarcely ever saw him present. His nights, no less than his days, were spent in the company of women and young men, in hunting and in banqueting. His sacrilegious love affairs were flaunted unashamedly. Here no barrier restrained him, neither the rank of the women for whom he lusted nor even his kinship with them. The Lateran was become a bad house. No decent woman was safe in Rome. This debauchery was paid for from the Church's treasury, a treasury filled by a simony utterly regardless of the character of those who paid. We hear of a boy of ten consecrated bishop, of a deacon ordained in a stable, of high dignitaries deprived of their eyes or castrated. Cruelty crowned the debauchery. That nothing might finally be lacking, impiety, too, was given its place, and men told how, in the feasting at the Lateran, the pope used to drink to the health of the devil. "

None the less the administrative machine continued to work. What occasion the almost universal breakdown of communications left to these popes for the exercise of their primacy was not neglected. Even John XII could regulate the lives of the monks of Subiaco recently restored by his father.

The regime went on for six years. Then, driven by dire necessity, for the young pope had none of his father's political gifts, an appeal was sent to the German king. Otto, barred from Rome in

951 by Alberic, needed no second invitation from Alberic's son. As in 951, he met with little resistance in the Italian kingdom. He entered Rome, and on the Feast of the Purification, 962, John set the imperial crown on his head. This time the pope himself had knotted the rope that was to hang him.

The emperor swore to defend the pope and the pope swore to be loyal to the emperor. Once more the imperial rights in papal elections were carefully set out. In practice the only difference was to be that a German prince would now choose the pope where, for the last sixty years, he had been chosen by an Italian.

The emperor was soon called upon to exercise his privilege. Scarcely had he left Rome (February, 963) than John XII began to plan an anti-imperialist league with the defeated King of Italy. Otto returned. A hastily gathered council listened to the numerous complaints of the pope's scandalous life. He was summoned to appear and then, after a month's delay, solemnly deposed (December 4, 963). In his place, with the emperor's consent, they elected one of the lay officers of the State -- Leo VIII. The new pope lasted just as long as Otto remained in Rome. When the emperor left, John XII reappeared with his partisans and Leo fled. A new council now pronounced Leo's election invalid, since no council was competent to pass sentence on the pope and since Leo, at the moment of his election, was a layman. A few months later John XII died, in circumstances as scandalous as those in which most of his life had passed. In his place, ignoring Otto's pope, the Romans elected Benedict V (May 22). But Otto returned and, a month later to the day, Leo VIII was reinstated while Benedict was transported to Hamburg to live there as the prisoner of the archbishop.

The ascendancy of the house of Theophylact was ended. Henceforth they had a powerful rival, in their schemes to dominate the papacy. But this powerful rival, none the less, was not all-powerful and to the regime of 904-963 there succeeded a period of confusion where the emperor or the great Roman family chose the pope, according to the opportunity of the moment. It was Otto I who appointed John XIII (965-972) -- a relative of John XII, for he was the son of Marozia's younger sister -- and then, on John XIII's death, Benedict VI. The next year (973) the Roman family came once more to the fore, in the person of Crescentius, brother to the dead pope John XIII.

Benedict VI was now deposed; and, through the influence of Crescentius, Boniface VII was elected in his place. At his orders Benedict was, apparently, strangled Boniface was now (June 974) driven out in his turn by the imperial commissioners, who chose as pope Benedict VII. This pope -- a reformer who, as Bishop of Sutri, had been a friend to the new monastic reform of Cluny -- reigned for nine years. When he died the emperor, Otto II, [] chose for pope his own chancellor, who took the name of John XIV (983). Then, prematurely, a few weeks later, Otto II died, leaving for successor a baby three years old. It was the opportunity for Boniface VII -- murderer of Benedict VI -- to return from Constantinople where, since 974, he had found shelter. John XIV was overthrown, and imprisoned in St. Angelo; where he died miserably a few months later (August 20, 984).

Boniface thenceforth reigned peaceably until his sudden death, eleven months later. His patron, Crescentius, had predeceased him. It was, then, this man's son who "managed" the new pope, John XV. When, in 996, this pope died, Otto III, now of age, was himself in Italy. Crescentius "II" dared not ignore the emperor;. and, on the Roman petition for a new pope, Otto named one of his own cousins, Bruno of Carinthia, who took the name of Gregory V: he was the first German pope. [] The emperor had no sooner left Rome than, as before in 963, the pope imperially imposed was expelled; and Crescentius installed a pope of his own -- John XVI. Otto however returned in the spring of 998. Crescentius was beheaded; and John XVI, his ears and nose slit, his eyes and tongue torn out, was solemnly deposed.

Gregory V did not long survive his restoration. In February, 999, he died -- poisoned, it is likely, by some henchman of the rival faction. The emperor, since the victory over Crescentius, had made Rome his residence -- the only detail he was destined to realise of his dream of really restoring the empire of Augustus. He now appointed to succeed his cousin his old tutor Gerbert, Archbishop successively of Rheims and Ravenna -- the first French pope, in immediate succession to the first German. This new pope, Silvester II, was the most distinguished scholar of the time. But the learning which made him almost a legend even to his own contemporaries, could not supply for the weakness of the young emperor; nor could it exorcise the brutal determination of the factions to regain their century-old supremacy in Rome. Otto III was driven out, two years after

Silvester's succession, to die a wanderer at the foot of Soracte in January, 1002. Nor were his followers, nor the pope, strong enough to secure the burial in Rome of this last emperor to dream of making the ancient city once more the capital of the world.

Otto, twenty years of age, was not yet married. The succession passed to his kinsman Henry, Duke of Bavaria. In Rome another Crescentius had appeared -- the son of the victim of Otto's justice. It was he who, in Rome, was Otto's effective successor. The rivalry for supremacy, and for what went with this -- the power of naming the pope -- between the house of Theophylact and the foreign kings seemed ended. It was just a hundred years since the first Theophylact had arisen to power through Sergius III; and his family still maintained their hold. But it was to last only a few years longer. A rival clan was to wrest it from them; and then, after scandals that recalled John XII, a king from Germany was again to interfere. For yet another fifty years the Holy See was to remain enslaved to one lay master or another.

Silvester II died peaceably, at Rome, in 1003. John XVII who followed him reigned only for six months. Next came John XVIII (1003-1009) and Sergius IV (1009-1012). All these were the choice of the third Crescentius, and good men. Crescentius "III" predeceased his last nominee by a matter of months, and when Sergius IV died (May 12, 1012) there was a double election. The faction of Crescentius elected Gregory; while another and equally powerful band of the same old family, represented by the Count of Tusculum, supported Theophylact, one of the count's own younger sons. It was Theophylact who was finally installed -- under the style of Benedict VIII -- and Gregory carried his case, as usual, outside Italy to the German king, Henry II. Henry, however, decided for Benedict, and in 1014 received from him in St. Peter's the imperial crown.

Once again the empire of Charlemagne had been revived to honour the king of the Germans. But this time it was no mere forced compliment on the part of the pope. Benedict VIII was a strong pope who set himself to the task of repairing the damage wrought by the upheavals of the past century and a half. The invasions had finally ended. Missionaries were at work converting the Northmen in the country coming to be called Normandy and the Magyars in Hungary. At a great council at

Pavia the pope opened the campaign for a religious restoration by an attack on the most serious of the novelties that had developed during the chaos -- clerical marriage. To the end of his reign he remained on the best of terms with the emperor, who, indeed asked nothing better-himself a man of saintly life [] -- than to co-operate in the revival.

Another powerful auxiliary was the pope's brother, Romanus, who was in practice the ruler of the State -- much as Alberic had been, eighty years before, in the time when his brother, John XI, was pope. When Benedict died, in 1024, Romanus, for all that he was a layman, took his place. He called himself John XIX, and, alas, continuing to be the secular noble, revived the worst traditions of his tenth-century predecessors. St. Henry II also had died in 1024. The new emperor, Conrad II (1024-1039), was too interested in his chances of making money out of abuses to regret the appearance of a pope in whom abuses found the highest of sanctions.

John XIX was sufficiently scandalous. His successor outdid even the scandals of John XII. John XIX died in 1032. He had still a third brother living, Alberic. This man had two sons, Gregory and Theophylact. Gregory was made ruler of the Papal State, with the title of Consul, and Theophylact became pope as Benedict IX. The emperor, Conrad II, found the arrangement excellent. The new pope was treacherous and dissolute, but he lent himself easily to the emperor's schemes. He lasted twelve years, until, in 1044, the Romans rose and drove him out, possibly with the aid of the Crescentius faction; and then, lavishly. thereto, they elected as pope the Bishop of Sabina, Silvester III (January 1045). Benedict's party, however, speedily restored him, and Silvester returned to his old see (March 10). On May 5 Benedict suddenly resigned in favour of his godfather, the archpriest of St. John-before-the-Latin-Gate. The new pope took the title of Gregory VI, and all that was healthy in Italy hailed his accession with relief. St. Peter Damian wrote to congratulate him and, from a Benedictine monastery on the Aventine, Gregory called one of the monks to be his secretary, Hildebrand. It was the entry into the history of the Church and of Europe of a man so great that it is hard to characterise him. But it was not yet his hour. There remained the Crescentius' pope, Silvester III; there remained Benedict IX, soon to return, and backed by his powerful clan; there remained, too, the question

of Gregory VI's own election. [] In all these stirring events of the past year all parties had ignored the emperor. It was obvious, given the tradition since Charlemagne's time, that the ultimate decision between the three claimants would lie with him; and Benedict IX stood for a family always strongly imperialistic. What would the emperor -- Henry III -- do?

Throughout what was the empire of Charlemagne the same causes produced, during this century, the same effects: ecclesiastical discipline in decay, simony rife and clerical marriage the rule, nobles appointing their own kin to abbeys and sees in order the more easily to plunder them. Richard I, Duke of Normandy, gives Rouen to his son, Bayeux and Avranches to nephews, Lisieux to his grandson. Richard II continues the tradition. It is the same in the south of France where sees become a family possession, passing from uncle to nephew, and the same is frequently the case in Burgundy too. Where the lord has no rights in the election the vacancy is often the occasion for his illegal intervention, bribery and violence making the election a nullity. As one lord's son becomes pope at sixteen years old, so for another boy of ten his father buys the Archbishopric of Narbonne, and for the rest of his long episcopate this curious archbishop is put to selling lands, castles, privileges, and even ordinations, in order to pay off the debt of his initial expenses, endeavouring to sell at a profit in detail what he had bought in bulk! Sees were still, for the princes, an easy means of rewarding service; their revenues were even made over to women, as witness the French queen whose security for her creditors was her expectation of a see! In the abbeys which passed into the hands of such strange abbots the most extraordinary developments are recorded. We learn of abbots married and living in the abbeys with their families and, less credible still, that their monks followed their example, such abbeys apparently being transformed into the equivalent of a vast country club. The matter of the monastic vows was, in such places, a joke, and the abbot who tried to introduce reforms there did so at the risk of his life. Thus Erluin, who strove to restore the religious life of the great abbey of Lobbes lost his eyes and his tongue and was left for dead by the indignant monks. Between these brigands installed in cloisters, or in sees, private wars raged as furiously as between the other robber-barons. In England, too, the same kind of disorders appeared, and at one time Pope Formosus had it in mind to

excommunicate the whole English hierarchy.

It was the most serious feature of all that men grew used to the sight of these abuses, and that the usurpations seemed well on the way to acquire force of law. The prince, nominating and deposing bishops now for centuries, comes to regard such nominations as appertaining to his prerogative. The see has become his property as truly as the other lordships recommended to his protection by their owners and received back from him as from their lord. Where such a development has taken place -- that is to say in the generality of abbeys and sees -- election means no more than the lord's right to appoint. That right -- and the right to exploit the monastic properties -- he disposes of as he disposes of any other property. He divides it; he bequeaths it, he sells it; he gives it as a dowry. In southern France it was more common for such rights to be owned collectively. In the north the lord generally tended to keep it whole in the hands of his family. Germany, more than anywhere, these rights remained with the king -- the emperor to be. As the Romans approached the emperor when the see was vacant, asking him to name the new pope, so did the chapters of such sees petition the lord who owned the right to name the new bishop.

Such "rights" once established there were not wanting lords to exploit them financially. The lord of Narbonne received 100,000 pieces of gold from Guifred of Cerdagne when he appointed the latter's son, the boy of ten, as archbishop. Sometimes the right to elect was sold for a single occasion, the owner being careful to arrange for a commission. It is one of the glories of William the Conqueror, set out by his biographer with all the praise it deserves, that he never sold a single ecclesiastical dignity. Systematic simony, and the other contemporary practice of clerical marriage, combined to produce the beginnings of a third abuse. The married bishop and priest had but one thought -- how best to transmit his benefice to his own family. The clergy, if such practices spread, would become a hereditary caste, and the property originally given to the churches for the support of charity be the rich endowment of the privileged few. We meet such married bishops in Normandy and in Brittany, at Rouen, Le Mans, Seez, Quimper and Nantes, at Gascogne and at Agen, all of them leaving their sees to their sons, and, in one case at least, securing the succession by associating the son with the

power while the bishop himself was still alive, as the princes were beginning to have their heirs crowned in their own lifetime. The old law, that forbade the ordination of the sons of a priest born after their father's ordination, had fallen into oblivion.

With such abuses in the hierarchy, and in the monasteries, it is not surprising that the religious life of the parochial clergy suffered to the point of disappearance. The best elements of the time sought to protect themselves by enlistment in some abbey of good repute. Despite the immense losses through the long-endured royal supremacy, such abbeys still existed, and in no small number. It was now that the practice became general that the monk should be a priest, and as priests -- and not merely as preachers -- the monks began to serve the countrysides about their abbeys. Between such abbeys, loth to submit to the destructive authority of the local bishop -- and therefore often exempted from it by the Holy See -- and the bishops there was sometimes a feud that developed into war.

A final consequence of the confusion of the time was the reflected confusion in theological thought. The horror inspired by the sight of wicked bishops bred the relieving thought that such wickedness must destroy their spiritual power. The blessings, masses, ordinations of such prelates were, then, mere ritual gestures, void of real effect -- an old and often condemned heresy had reappeared, and it was to take hold of a strong party among the coming reformers. In this era of chaos it escaped condemnation, and it possibly drew support from the condemnations and re-condemnations of their predecessors' ordinations made by so many of the popes of this time.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



6. CATHOLIC LIFE DURING THE ANARCHY: ABUSES, REFORMERS, MISSIONARY CONQUESTS

That preaching ceased, that the sacraments were neglected, that superstition only too often did duty for faith, that the traditional Catholic piety suffered indescribably needs but to be stated. And the old poison of Manichee doctrine began to run again, a thin stream indeed but virulent, through the arteries of Christendom. A few more years and what trace would there anywhere be left in the lives of Catholics of the life and teaching of Christ?

Catholicism was, nevertheless, on the eve of a restoration so speedy in its realisation and so magnificent in its scale that, even yet, no one has adequately described it as a whole. The chief figure in that restoration was the monk Hildebrand whom Gregory VI, in 1045, took from his monastery to be his secretary. But the foundations on which Hildebrand built, the materials with which he worked, were not of his creation. Like himself they were part of the tradition of Catholic thought and practice which not all the devastation of two centuries of dissolution and barbarism had destroyed. The fact of that destruction and some of its worst effects have been noted. Something must be said of what escaped. Even in this darkest age there was light. The universal "dark ages" never existed, unless in the minds of those who had no means of reading their history.

To begin with, in no country at any time during these years of desolation were there lacking saints, men in whose lives the gospel ideals were realised through the practice of virtue that was no less than heroic. In Italy there were priests such as Bernard of Menthon whose pastoral zeal made him the apostle of the Alps, monks like St. John of Parma, St. Nil and the two founders of new orders, St. Romuald and St. John Gualbert. In every part of France, too, saints are to be met, Gerard of Aurillac, Thibaut of Champagne, Fulbert of Chartres, Abbo of Fleury and Gerard of Broigne who led a great revival of the ideals of St. Benedict's rule. Throughout Flanders, and in the lands between the Meuse and the Moselle, new foundations sprang up. Bishops like St. Gerard of Toul assisted the revival. The spirit was already active -- and nowhere so evident as at

Cluny -- which will produce Carthusians, Cistercians, and the great order of Premontre.

In Germany, where, despite a more barbarous way of life, the Church had less to suffer in essentials than in Italy and Gaul, the missionary labours inaugurated by St. Ansgar, and so long interrupted, were now resumed. New sees were created in the Danish peninsula (948), the king was baptised (965) and, after a brief anti-Catholic reaction Sweyn, too, his successor. Sweyn's son Canute, King of England as well as of Denmark, was a most pious prince, multiplying monasteries and, in his devotion, even reviving the old English tradition of the royal pilgrimage to Rome. In Norway the mission prospered as in Denmark. By the time of St. Olaf (king 1014-1030) the new faith was everywhere victorious. As in Denmark, it was the kings who had been the most powerful and earnest of propagandists. Iceland and Greenland had been won over at the turn of the century (c. 1000) and in 1050 the episcopal see of Gardar in Greenland was founded. Sweden was more obstinately pagan. King Olaf was indeed baptised in 1002, but a pagan reaction drove out his Catholic successors. Sweden remained a stronghold of paganism until well into the twelfth century. One centre of this mission to Scandinavia was Hamburg but Englishmen, too, had a very large share in it.

Other missionaries, from central Germany, were engaged, in the last half of the tenth century, in a work equally arduous -- the conversion of the Slavs. Here again it was in part a work of restoration. In Scandinavia the hardy zeal of these monastic apostles endeavoured to convert peoples never as yet in relation with the empire: in eastern Germany, however, the mission had accompanied the victories of the German kings. Otto I's conquest of the Wends and Adobrites had been followed (946-949) by the foundation of sees at Havelburg, Brandenburg and Stargard. Twenty years later Merseburg, Meissen and Zeitz were founded, dependent on the new metropolitan see of Magdeburg which, in the emperor's plan, was to be the centre of all this missionary activity. As everywhere else, the speedy conquest was followed by a pagan reaction. As late as the year of the Norman Conquest, the pagans inflicted a bloody defeat on this attempt to form a Catholic kingdom of the Wends (Battle of Lenzen 1066); Mecklenburg was ravaged, Hamburg once again destroyed, and in thanksgiving to the gods priests were burnt

alive in solemn sacrifice.

The movement to convert the Slavs -- not unwilling to listen to the teaching of Christ -- was also complicated by national hatreds. They suspected the German missionaries, allies doubtless of the German bishops who fought in the armies of the German king, much as the pagan ancestors of these same Germans had, in the days of St. Boniface, suspected the missionaries who were Franks. The appearance of the English monks had delivered the Faith from this impasse in the eighth century. In the ninth it was from the east that deliverance came to the Slavs of Moravia, when the Emperor Michael III sent to them two priests from Salonika, the brothers Cyril and Methodius (863). They were men of culture and wealth, sprung from distinguished families and had, both of them, abandoned brilliant careers in the service of the State to follow the monastic life. At the moment when the emperor's summons came to them their energies were employed in a mission to convert the Khazars. The success of their new mission to the Slavs naturally did not please the German bishops. They were denounced to Rome for such novelties as the use of the Slavonic tongue in the liturgy, and, Constantinople at the moment being in schism and the centre of a violent and instructed anti-Roman propaganda, the pope, St. Nicholas I was alarmed and summoned the brothers to Rome to explain themselves (867). By the time they arrived Nicholas I was dead. It was Adrian II who heard their case. Far from condemning their activities, he raised them both to the episcopate and sanctioned their liturgical innovation. Henceforth the pope was to be to them what his eighth-century predecessors had been to St. Boniface. Cyril died in Rome (869) but his brother returned to the difficult mission, to meet again the hostility of the German king and his bishops, to be imprisoned and repeatedly denounced to Rome. Adrian's successor, John VIII, as repeatedly protected him, but Methodius died (885) with his work not yet completed. Then came the Hungarian invasion, from which Moravia suffered more than most places, and the hope of a Slav Catholicism evangelised in direct dependence on Rome was destroyed for ever.

Not Moravia but Bohemia, where St. Cyril and Methodius had never been able to penetrate, was to be the centre whence would come the conversion of the Slavs of the north. Of the first

apostles of the Czechs little enough is known. As early as 845 fifteen of their chiefs received baptism at Ratisbon, and from 894 all their dukes were Catholic, the most famous of them the martyr St. Wenceslaus I (925-935). These were, all of them, supporters of the mission, and the see of Prague was founded in 973. Nevertheless the work was so slow, the relapses so frequent, that the greatest of the early bishops, St. Adalbert, lost heart and left Bohemia to preach to the still more barbarian Prussians. There in 997 he met a martyr's death. It was another fifty years before the Czechs were really converted.

Nevertheless, long before that time, there were Czechs who were missionaries, and these were already busy beyond the frontiers of Bohemia with the conversion of the Poles. A grand-daughter of St. Wenceslaus had married the Duke Miecislav and in 966 he was baptised. Two years later the see of Poznan was founded, dependent at first on Magdeburg, and in the year 1000 the second see of Gniezno, in the place where St. Adalbert had met his death. New sees at Cracow, Kolberg and Breslau were made subject to it. The first of these Catholic dukes had recommended his realm to St. Peter, receiving it back as St. Peter's vassal and thus inaugurating that close attachment to Rome which has ever since been so characteristic of Polish Catholicism. In Poland, too, there was, however, to be a pagan reaction, and it was not until the time of St. Casimir, king from 1041-1058, that paganism was finally destroyed.

One of the chief hindrances to the conversion of the Slavs had been the Hungarian invasions that filled the first fifty years of the tenth century. They thrust like a wedge between the northern and southern Slavs, and they destroyed utterly the nascent Catholicism of the Moravians. Here, too, the reign of Otto I marks a turning point. At a great battle on the Lech (955) he destroyed the military power of the Magyars for ever. They ceased to be a race of wandering plunderers, and, settling down as tillers of the soil, they willingly received the missionaries who now began to pour in. The first to organise this new activity was Frederic Archbishop of Salzburg, appointed papal legate for the purpose by Benedict VI. From Ratisbon and Freising, too, came assistance, but the great hero of the work was Pilgrim, appointed Bishop of Passau by Frederic of Salzburg. The mission was his personal occupation, and one fruit of his zeal was that the next king of this newly converted people was not

merely Catholic but a saint. This was St. Stephen, crowned by the pope in the year 1000, king from 997-1038? whose long reign saw new sees established, monasteries built, and a Church organised independent of the Church in Germany, under the Archbishop of Gran, his capital city.

Further still to the east, beyond the Hungarians and Poles, lay Russia, and the tenth century saw the beginnings of Russian Catholicism too, evangelised, however, directly from Constantinople, Byzantine from its very beginnings. Byzantine also was to be the Catholicism of the Bulgarians, for all that their first teachers had been Latins. The greatest of these was the austere Formosus, and when Adrian II (870) refused to give him to them as their bishop -- since he was already Bishop of Porto, and the Latin tradition frowned on episcopal translations -- the Bulgarians turned to Constantinople. John VIII made more than one attempt to regain the immediate Roman hold on this distant nation, but in vain. The more loosely organised Catholicism of their powerful neighbour the Byzantine emperor, and possibly its greater political pliancy, made a stronger appeal. Bulgaria henceforth, like Russia, would follow Constantinople

While then, in the tenth century, the Church in its older provinces suffered, almost to death, from the general chaos of civilisation, it produced for its new conquests a host of obscure heroic souls who very slowly, but continuously, with immense toil, laboured to carry the good news that the kingdom of God is at hand to thousands of souls as obscure as themselves, in lands until now veiled from the knowledge of civilisation. The eternal, divine love of God for man had by no means failed to find a faithful reflection in the Church of Christ.

Nor was it entirely dead in the older provinces of the West. In more than one place, as the invasions ceased, as the invaders were beaten back, or converted, new signs of life were evident. In England the reigns of the first conqueror of the Danes, Alfred the Great (871-901), of his son, Edward the Elder (901-924), and his grandson, Athelstan (924-940), were a time of vigorous restoration, economic, intellectual and spiritual, the very centre of which was the restoration of religious life. It was now that St. Dunstan was formed, to be another St. Boniface for his native country, scholar, musician, monastic reformer, reforming bishop, and as Archbishop of Canterbury the first of the great

ecclesiastical statesmen of the English Middle Ages. In Gaul too -- which by the tenth century we may begin to speak of as France -- the intellectual and religious renaissance went hand in hand, at Rheims and Chartres, at Angers, Laon, Orleans and Paris where, around he restored cathedrals, the episcopal schools began to be founded whence were to come the scholastic philosophy and the first universities.

Most striking sign of all, new orders of religious appear. The first, and the most important, of these was the Benedictine renaissance whose centre was the abbey of Cluny in Burgundy, founded in 910 by William the Pious, Duke of Aquitaine. From its beginnings Cluny was freed from the jurisdiction of the local bishop and directly subject to the Holy See. It was Benedictine, but with a difference. Corporal austerities were added to the rule, and it acquired a regimental rigour that testified to a view of human goodwill less optimistic than that of St. Benedict. The new venture was uniquely blessed in that, for a hundred years and more, it was directed by an unbroken succession of great saints -- Berno (910-927), Odo (927- 942), Maieul (942-994), Odilo (994-1048) -- all of them personalities of the first order. The popes -- the amazing popes of the tenth century -- encouraged them. authorised them to reform the other monasteries, lavished privileges on their work. It was, for example, John XI -- Marozia's son, John XII's uncle -- who set St. Odo to his work of reform in Burgundy and central France. The same saint restored Subiaco and Monte Cassino, and he founded at Rome the monastery that was to form Hildebrand. Under St. Odilo the movement spread to the tiny Catholic kingdoms of Spain. The number of houses dependent on Cluny rose from 37 to 65, and there was now established the practice which gave to the work of Cluny its peculiar strength. The old Benedictine principle that each abbey was completely autonomous was abandoned. the houses reformed by Cluny formed a kind of religious order, whose members all owed obedience to the Abbot of Cluny. The superiors of the dependent houses, the priors -- for the Cluniacs know only one abbot, the Abbot of Cluny -- were not elected by their monks but nominated from Cluny. The Abbot of Cluny was no hermit. He had the duty of visiting the dependencies, and the charge of maintaining good order throughout his immense family. Periodically all the priors met at Cluny in a general chapter. In that age of general dislocation, when unity of any kind seemed but an impossible dream, and when alone the

monasteries retained a semblance of stability, the importance of the new departure that bound up in one huge federation all these cells of new religious life, can hardly be exaggerated. It was the most powerful arm for the restoration of good living, and for the preservation of the ideals of a good life, yet given to the Church. It was to the centuries which saw it rise what the Capuchins and Jesuits were to be for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The first Abbots of Cluny were inevitably great travellers Spain, France, Italy and Rome saw them continually. They advised the popes; kings called them in to arbitrate. Such all abbot as St. Odo or St. Odilo was perhaps the greatest figure in the Church in his time. Assuredly faith and charity were far from extinct in the tenth century despite the undoubted losses, the indescribable scandals.

Not that these were hidden, nor that men shrank from facing the problem they presented to the loyalty of practising Catholics. At a council of French bishops and notables in 991, [] for example it was proposed that the Archbishop of Rheims, Arnoul, should be deposed. His guilt -- treason to the first of the Capetian kings -- was admitted. But the pope alone could depose a bishop, and though the king's advocates set out in detail the atrocities of the contemporary pontifical life as an argument to dispense with the pope's jurisdiction in the matter, and though the bishops elected a new archbishop, the popes quashed the judgement and in the end prevailed. the new archbishop -- Gerbert, afterwards Pope Silvester II -- resigned and Arnoul was restored. Throughout the councils of the time evidence is not lacking that Catholics still held, in the words of the Abbot of Fleury at this very council of 991, that "the Roman Church, like the key-bearer of the heavenly kingdom who was the chief of the apostolic college, has the privilege of giving life to all the churches, which dispersed throughout the world, arc, as it were, its limbs. Whoever resists the Roman Church separates himself from among its members and becomes a member of the body of Christ's enemy. " The one source of metropolitan jurisdiction is Rome, and its sign is the pallium of lamb's wool blessed by the pope and conferred by him alone. As for the scandals, they must be borne until the providence of God removes them. "Although the yoke imposed by the Holy See can scarce be borne, " said a council of the time, " nevertheless let us bear it and endure. " [] Not the least sign that the divine life still continues in the Church is this faith

of its members in the divine institution of the primacy, despite the degradation with which men have for centuries covered it. That faith was soon to be rewarded, for it was from the papacy that there was to come, what could not come otherwise, whether from individual saints or from such a corporation of saints as Cluny aspired to be, a general restoration of Catholic life and a new spiritual age.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 6: THE RESTORATION OF SPIRITUAL INDEPENDENCE, 1046-1123

1. THE MOVEMENT OF REFORM AND ST. GREGORY VII, 1046-1123

If there was any province of Christendom which had suffered less than another from the debacle of the tenth century it was Germany. Its conversion might as yet be incomplete, but Catholicism was too powerful a factor in the hold of the Carolingian kings on their conquest for them to be wholly indifferent to its quality. It was a newer thing there than in France. It had come in with the conqueror from the West -- and very largely owing to his protection. In Germany, too, the political organisation had never been sufficiently settled for the country to suffer from the disintegration of the central government as Italy, and France especially, were suffering. The Carolingians, who survived in a weak fashion to delay the recovery of France for yet another seventy years, disappeared from Germany in the first years of the tenth century. The German kings who took their place had all the freshness, and some of the strength, and even the genius, of Charlemagne himself. From 918 to 983, under Henry I, Otto I and Otto II, the Church in Germany had all the advantages, rare in that century, that come of a strong, purposeful government. Scandals were by no means lacking, but there never came upon religion that chaos which paralysed its action in other places.

The chief feature which, in this comparatively united German Catholicism, gave cause for real anxiety was its integration in the new political unity, and the contentment of so many churchmen that it should be thus integrated. It was the monarchy that had brought the Faith to Germany, and the Church tended to be, more completely than elsewhere, an instrument in the hands of the kings. They appointed and dismissed bishops and abbots at their will; they employed them in the great affairs of State; they named mere statesmen to the sees; all the abuses and usurpation systematised by Charlemagne continued to flourish in tenth-century Germany, part of the systematic royal protection and promotion of the interests of religion.

The general contentment Or even good churchmen with this state of things, the fact that they tended only to complain when, under a bad ruler, it was used to nominate unworthy prelates, is striking evidence how far abuse had passed into a system. It was indeed, as a system, a very important part of the whole social order. In the bishopric (or abbacy -- for both were affected by the development, entities wholly different in kind, the spiritual function, the territory over which the prelate had spiritual jurisdiction, the temporal principality and the mass of property attached to this -- the lands, the buildings, the serfs, the various kinds of tenants, the rights, the privileges, the jurisdictions, the social and political obligations -- all these had for a long time now (that is by the opening years of the eleventh century) become, in the general view, a single, indissoluble whole. Like the countship, the bishopric was, in feudal language, an honor, a beneficium granted by the king. The cleric who received it became thereby the man, the vassal, of the prince who gave it; and he became, at the same time, the lord of other men. In the national scheme of things the system of bishoprics was parallel to, and counterbalanced, the system of countships, as a means whereby the country was governed; it balanced the system of countships in this important respect, that the countships had become hereditary, so that -- and this was especially true of Germany -- the royal interest in nominations to sees and abbeys was, fundamentally, a real concern that one of the main checks on the tendency of the feudal nobility to nullify the royal power should really function.

When the bishop died (or was translated to another see) the honor was in the position of that of a lord who had died without heirs -- it reverted, de plein droit, to the lord who had given it. And, like every other honor, the ecclesiastical beneficium was conveyed to the recipient through a ceremony -- this was the Investiture, about which the famous controversy was now about to begin. The Investiture was not a mere ceremony, but an act which really and actually transferred the honor, from the lord to the man on whom he meant to confer it; and the act consisted in the presentation by the lord of an object that symbolised what was conferred. From about the year 899 the custom grew, first in Provence and then in the Empire, that kings granted bishoprics by handing to the cleric the crozier or pastoral staff. This practice began to appear in France about a century later; and

then, in Germany, the emperor Henry III (1039-1056) added the ceremony of placing a ring on the cleric's finger. To these new developments to this use by the lay lord of ceremonials already used in the religious rite called the consecration of a bishop, no objection ever seems to have been raised for the first hundred and fifty years.

What was it now considered that such Investiture by the lord conferred upon the cleric? Nothing else than that one juridical whole the episcopatus, in which spiritual and temporal were, for this mid-eleventh century, indissolubly conjoined -- not, of course, the sacramental powers conferred through the act of consecration, [] but everything else, including as well- the cura pastoralis.

So universal was this view of the indissoluble character of that socio-religious complex the bishopric, that all the first generations of reformers held it too. [] But while the kings, looking first to the social role of the bishops, based upon this idea of the episcopatus as a unity their claim to a final say who should be bishops, the new clerical reformers drew from the fact of the unity a very different conclusion. The bishop was primarily a spiritual personage -- therefore the layman could not lawfully appoint him to the episcopatus and must not invest him with it, using those symbols (acts and words) by the handing over of which the bishopric was considered conferred. The two views were diametrically opposed; and in the first, hot, fifty years of the conflict the aim of each of the parties was, necessarily, the unconditional surrender of the other. None, as yet, saw the distinction, which existed in fact, between the bishop as the spiritual ruler of men's consciences and the bishop as a kind of count who happened also to be a cleric. Only as the war continued, and as the theorists began to study the institution historically, did the reality of this distinction emerge, and with it the possibility of a lawful compromise between Church and State based upon it.

The great name in the history of this development is that of St. Ives, Bishop of Chartres, [] one of the founders of the new scientific Canon Law; the country where a solution on these lines was first attempted was England, and its ecclesiastical patron was the Archbishop of Canterbury, St. Anselm. []

The danger is evident how easily a confusion might arise in an ordinary man's mind between the prince's right to transfer his own temporal authority over his subjects and, what belongs to quite another order of reality, the right to confer on a man spiritual authority over other men. But this danger was far from evident to the generations that saw the system of such investiture slowly develop and expand. Once the danger began to be evident to ecclesiastics, revolt was inevitable; and before such a revolt became general there was bound to be a transition period when ecclesiastics who were no less pious than the reformers continued to stand by the old system because they were not clear headed enough to see how dangerous the confusion was which it always implied and was now producing. For many years the reform party was therefore divided. About such evils as simony, and clerical incontinence, and clerical marriage, it was indeed always united. But it was not until the pontificate of Nicholas II (1059-1061) that the war on lay investiture as the main source of all these evils, began really to be waged by the popes, on a principle, and with any consistency. From the time of St. Gregory VII (1073-1085) this is the main object with all the party. The vision of how a good prince might use such authority in church appointments to repress clerical abuses, the memory of what, in the past, good princes had in fact accomplished -- these seem ever to have haunted many minds among the reformers. The boldness of St. Gregory VII, bent on extirpating a custom now well nigh universal, and established for the best part of two centuries was, to such men, something of a scandal.

The situation of the Church under this regime, now about to be attacked and destroyed, is seen at its best in the reign of Henry II (king from 1002, emperor in 1012, died 1024). In his own life he was a model of evangelical virtue, given to prayer and mortification, a generous almsgiver and a promoter of good works. [] He was, none the less, the effective administrative head of the Church in Germany, reforming monasteries, enforcing Catholic tradition against divorce -- always a difficult matter with these half-converted Barbarians -- deposing unworthy bishops, creating new sees, convoking synods and presiding at them: even, on one occasion, forbidding a bishop to say mass until he had cleared himself of an accusation. His use of the powers he usurped was admirable; and the new and growing tradition of which he is the best example finds its way

into the writings of one of the earliest of the canon lawyers, Burchard, Bishop of Worms, who during this reign began to compile his famous collection.

The pope who crowned St. Henry, Benedict VIII, died, in 1024, to be succeeded by his deplorable brother, John XIX. How St. Henry would have dealt with such a pope may perhaps be inferred from the way in which Otto I had dealt with John XII. The contingency did not now arise, however, for, in that same year, 1024, St. Henry also died. He left no heir and the kingship, with the empire, passed to Conrad, the Duke of Franconia.

Conrad II was an emperor whom the new regime at Rome suited sufficiently well. For all his personal generosity to the churches he favoured, he was never hampered in his dealings with them by any interest in reform. The old abuses of simony and the marriage of clerics began to creep back. The reform movement, where it continued, did so thanks to the zeal of individuals, notably to the three bishops of Liege, Utrecht and Cambrai. Nor did the reformers find any difficulty in accepting this, by now, customary hold of the emperor on the administration of the Church.

Conrad II reigned for fifteen years. His son, Henry III, who succeeded him in 1039, was a personage of a very different order. A strong ruler, studious, reserved in manner, correct where his father had been a loose-liver, he halted the growing decadence of German Catholicism. The Church was too valuable an instrument in the work of uniting Germany for him to suffer the weakness and the wickedness of its subjects to harm it. So, while the canon law was strictly enforced that barred the sons of priests from an ecclesiastical career, and the whole force of the Church enlisted to enforce the " Truce of God," [] the king, more than ever, kept his hold on the nomination of bishops and abbots, investing them, on appointment, with the symbols of their spiritual authority. How such a man would deal with the Roman scandal no one could doubt. The opportunity for his intervention was the fall of the wretched Benedict IX, whose family owed the papacy very largely to the patronage of the German kings. It was, in some sense, to revenge an outrage on his crown that, in the autumn of 1046, Henry III crossed the Alps with an army.

Everything went according to the traditional programme. The emperor met Gregory VI and, with the threat of deposition, persuaded him to abdicate. [] This was effectuated at the Council of Sutri (December 20, 1046). Silvester III was deposed and, making no opposition, retired to a monastery. On Christmas Eve, in the inevitable fashion of these German protectors of the Church, like Otto I in 963, and Otto III in 996, Henry III named his pope. It was, of course, one of his own German bishops: Suidger, the experienced reformer who for six years had ruled the see of Bamberg created by Henry II. He took the name of Clement II, and on Christmas Day crowned his sovereign Emperor. The coup d'etat ended, as always for now two centuries, with a renewed acknowledgement of the emperor's rights in the matter of papal elections; it was set out, this time, in the clearest possible terms.

Clement II, whatever his title to be pope, was a good man and promised an era of better things. But the foundation on which his power rested was the emperor. When the emperor withdrew, the Roman nobility, from whose hands he had rapt the papacy, emerged once more; Clement died, after a nine-months' reign, apparently poisoned (October 10, 1047) and Benedict IX reappeared. Benedict survived for another eight months. On Christmas Day, 1047, the emperor named yet another of his German bishops, Poppo of Brixen, who took the name of Damasus II. This pope's reign was shorter even than that of Clement II; it was not until July 17, 1048, that he came to Rome and was installed, and twenty-three days later he too was dead. It was another six months before the emperor filled the vacancy and meanwhile, to the easing of this complicated problem of legitimacy, Benedict IX finally disappeared. At Christmas, 1048, the emperor named his third pope, Bruno, Bishop of Toul. He took the name of Leo IX, and with his accession the leadership of the reform passed to the Holy See.

Leo IX was, at this time, forty-seven years of age. He was of mixed blood, partly Alsatian, partly Burgundian and French, and a near relative of Henry III. He had begun his career in the imperial service under Conrad II and, although in holy orders, he commanded a troop of horse in that emperor's Italian expedition of 1027. The accident that, on his return, the see of Toul was vacant, changed his whole life. After much hesitation Bruno consented to be its bishop; and thenceforward, for twenty years,

he gave himself to the work of reform. The evils of the Roman situation he knew well, for, since his consecration, he had often visited the city as a pilgrim. But, unlike his two immediate German predecessors, this third choice of Henry III did not—the thing seems certain -- consider that the emperor's nomination alone sufficed to make him pope. There still remained the all-important matter of the consent of the Roman Church; and it was as the Bishop of Toul, and in a pilgrim's dress, that he arrived in Rome. [] He was enthroned on the first Sunday of Lent, 1049 (February 12).

The new pope took with him from Lorraine a number of experienced reformers destined, in the next ten years, to make the new tendencies the one stable feature of the papal policy. Humbert, Abbot of Moyenmoutier, one of the monasteries which Bruno had reformed, a learned and able controversialist, was the chief of them; Frederick of Lorraine (brother to the Duke of Lorraine, Godfrey) was another; Hugh the White, Abbot of Remiremont, was a third; and Halimard, the monk who had recently been made Archbishop of Lyons, a fourth. Finally there was Hildebrand, the secretary of the recently deceased expope Gregory VI, who now returned to the city whence he was one day to organise and direct the whole great movement. He was as yet, however, only one, and that the youngest, [] of this band of able counsellors, the picked instruments through whom Leo IX proposed to rule.

Leo IX was himself a man of great learning -- in the last month of his life, while the prisoner of the Normans, he set himself to acquire a knowledge of Greek -- and he was a saint. He had lost none of his old military skill, and his short reign was a well-planned and well-executed campaign that took him through every one of the diseased and sickly provinces of Christendom. Everywhere he went the pope presided personally at the council summoned to examine local conditions, deposing unworthy prelates, restoring the practice of elections, forbidding lay interference, and particularly the practice of selling the rights of nomination, forbidding the clergy to make war, restoring the old discipline of celibacy and enacting the most stringent penalties against simony. The list of these councils is imposing. They took the pope to the very confines of settled Christianity. They began with one at Rome in 1049; then, in the same year, the pope is at Pavia, Rheims and Mainz. In 1050 he is at Rome again,

tours southern Italy and crosses the Alps to Langres. Treves is visited in 1051, Pressburg and Ratisbon in 1052, Augsburg and Mantua in 1053. By the time the pope died, the whole of the Church knew that reform was now the papacy's own concern, and its main concern. The Roman Church had been brought into direct touch with the dependent bishops in so striking a way that none could now be unaware of this.

These apostolic journeyings were the foundation upon which all the later effort of the Church as a united whole was built. The new condemnations of lay control over appointments may not yet have sounded with all the needed clearness. They were lost perhaps, for the moment, in the condemnation of more striking and more openly scandalous anomalies such as clerical marriage, clerical brigandage and simony. But already Leo IX had singled out the root cause of all the disorder. He had set in motion a force which, since the lay hold was universal, must ultimately shake all Christendom, and which must, assuredly, strain the new relations between pope and emperor. So far, and for St. Leo, too, the imperial control of papal nominations was an undiscussed feature of ordinary procedure -- the very means, indeed, by which the papacy had been transferred from the control of blackguards to men of goodwill. St. Leo was himself its creation. His own relations with the emperor were excellent, and the question did not arise.

The pontificate ended, for all that, in storm. In 1040 the Normans had invaded southern Italy, from that kingdom of Sicily which ten years earlier they had wrested from the Arabs. For all that they were Catholics, the new conquerors speedily showed themselves as great a scourge as earlier invaders. Church lands were ravaged with the rest, and in the course of his reform campaign in the summer of 1052 the pope was brought up against the Norman atrocities. There ensued a series of events that was to be of very great importance in the future development of the papacy's relation to the empire. The pope gathered an army--the German contingent for which the emperor, at the last moment, refused to let go, thanks to the Bishop of Eichstadt -- and in the summer of 1053 the campaign opened. It ended abruptly in the rout of the papal army at Civitate (June 18, 1053). The pope was captured, the Normans besought absolution for their crimes, swore fidelity and were absolved. But they held the pope prisoner for another nine months none

the less. A few days after his release he died (April 19, 1054).

The first result of the short war was a strong reaction against St. Leo and his policies. The leading Italian reformer, St. Peter Damian, denounced in unmeasured language the pope's recourse to arms. The battles necessary for the Church should be fought by the emperor. The only sword a priest should know is the sword of the word of God. At the imperial court, too, there was a reaction and when, finally, after an interregnum of almost twelve months, the emperor prevailed on a German bishop to take up the unattractive responsibilities of the papacy, it was that Bishop of Eichstadt who had opposed St. Leo that he appointed. The circumstances of the "election" are curious. St. Leo's "cabinet" was scattered at the moment of his death; Humbert and Frederic of Lorraine were at Constantinople, [] Hildebrand in France. In September (1054) a delegation from the Roman clergy and people met the emperor at Mainz and agreed to accept his candidate. It was not until the following March that the Bishop of Eichstadt accepted, and he made it a condition that the emperor should assist him against the Normans; he styled himself Victor II.

As well as the Normans another problem called the emperor into Italy. Godfrey of Lorraine, already a troublesome and rebellious vassal, had recently, without the emperor's leave married the widow of the Marquis of Tuscany [] and become thereby lord of a territory of immense strategical importance that stretched across the Apennines and was a formidable obstacle to communications between Germany and Rome.

Henry III came down into Italy, to find that Duke Godfrey had managed to escape. His wife was arrested; and his brother, Frederic, chancellor now of the Roman Church and just returned from his mission to Constantinople, also judged it more prudent to take to flight. The Norman troubles continued to be the subject of negotiations without any decision being arrived at, and the proposed expedition that was to destroy them was abandoned; revolts in Germany had called the emperor home. The pope, after acting for some months as Henry's lieutenant in Italy combining the work of reform with that of policing the imperial vassals, followed him in September, 1056. A month later he was assisting at Henry III's deathbed (October 5, 1056) and securing the recognition of his heir [] from the great lords and

bishops. Then, shortly after his return to Rome, Victor II died too, at Arezzo (July 28, 1057), reconciled in the last months of his reign with Godfrey and with his brother Frederic, now, thanks largely to the pope, Abbot of Monte Cassino (May 18, 1057) and a cardinal (June 3).

Victor II was to be the last of the imperially nominated popes. This time the vacancy was of short duration. The news of the death of Victor II no sooner reached Rome than, on August 2, the clergy elected Frederic of Monte Cassino who was consecrated and installed as Stephen IX. For the first time for centuries the Church had a pope whom neither the emperor nor the local aristocracy had appointed. An embassy was, it is true, sent to ask the consent of the empress regent, but sent only when the new pope had been consecrated and was already acting as pope. All the pacts conveying to the emperor rights, privileges, and powers of veto had been ignored; the policy of Leo IX was carried to its logical conclusion. Meanwhile the reforms continued. Then, only eight months after his election, the new pope died (March 29, 1058) after laying a command on the Roman clergy not to elect his successor until the return of Hildebrand, then away at the imperial court. How little progress, in one direction at least, all the labours of the three last popes had as yet accomplished was shown immediately when, without waiting for Hildebrand, the Counts of Tusculum elected their first pope for nearly thirty years -- the Cardinal-Bishop of Velletri, John Mimicius, who took the ominous name of Benedict X (April 5, 1058). The Roman clergy, led by Humbert, refused him recognition, and so too-influenced no doubt by Hildebrand -- did the empress regent. The court fixed on Gerard, the Bishop of Florence; [] Hildebrand won him over to consent; Godfrey of Lorraine was commissioned to see to the expulsion of the anti-pope; and, in December, 1058, Gerard was proclaimed as Nicholas II. It was a return to the procedure which had produced Victor II.

With a mixed army, in which the forces of Godfrey of Lorraine were conspicuous, the new pope marched on Rome. Hildebrand's diplomacy had won over one of the factions, after a little street fighting Benedict X fled, and, on January 24, 1059 -- ten months after the death of Stephen IX -- Nicholas was solemnly enthroned. He was the sixth pope in twelve years, and destined to reign for little more than the average of his recent

predecessors, for he died at Florence in July, 1061. His reign is, nevertheless, immensely important. For Nicholas II is the author of the law governing papal elections that is still in force; and to secure the freedom of the election from those out of whose hands the new law took it -- the Roman nobility and the emperor -- this pope made an alliance with the Normans. This was indeed a departure, for the Normans were little better than a pirate state, nowhere recognised as anything else. Here Nicholas II's adviser was, probably, the new Abbot of Monte Cassino, Didier, lately created cardinal and one day to be pope himself as Victor III.

The new electoral law was promulgated in the decree of a council held in the Lateran in April, 1059. A hundred and thirteen bishops took part in it, and after the usual condemnation of simony, of clerical marriage -- it was now forbidden to hear mass said by a priest who was not celibate -- and of lay investiture, [] a decree was passed making the rule of life of the canons-regular obligatory on all clerics bound to celibacy. The decree on the papal election laid down that, henceforth, the only electors were the cardinal bishops and the cardinal clergy of Rome; they are to elect, by preference, a cleric of the Roman Church; the emperor is not accorded any rights, but whatever is done is to be done "with due regard and honour to our son Henry the present king. . . in accordance with the concession we have made, and likewise to those of his successors who personally shall have received the like right from the apostolic see."

The decree [] fixed the law for all future times, giving to the chiefs of the Roman clergy, the cardinal bishops, priests and deacons, a new importance and practically founding their corporate existence as the College of Cardinals. It was by no means anti-imperialist in intention. The enemy against which it was directed was the anarchical influence of the Roman aristocracy, responsible for two centuries of scandal and sacrilege, and still powerful enough to force the election of their man. The emperor, nevertheless, was removed from the centre of the action. His honour was to be secured, but the decree does not confirm any one of the innumerable acts by which the consecration of the pope was made to depend on the emperor's consent to the election; a whole collection of imperial rights that had developed since Charlemagne was silently set aside. The court, naturally, was displeased. The legates who came from the

council with the official communication of its decrees, were refused a hearing, and a council of German bishops condemned the pope and declared his laws null and void. Nor was the new alliance between pope and Normans to the imperial liking. Their duke, Robert Guiscard, swore fidelity to the Church, swore to assist the pope to recover his rights, made over his lands to St. Peter and received them back as St. Peter's vassal, pledging himself to pay an annual tribute in acknowledgement of suzerainty. The new, independent papacy was provided with a strong ally, should either of its ancient masters seek to re-establish his hold.

While Nicholas II lived all was well. The anti-pope, Benedict X, submitted. The German court remained passively hostile. But with the pope's death (July 27, 1061) the various hostilities fused. It remained to be seen whether the court, the defeated Roman aristocracy, and the innumerable opponents of the new reforms from among the dignitaries of the Church in northern Italy, could be united and unite on a pope. Nicholas II was at Florence when he died. When the news reached Rome there was a small-scale insurrection, and presently two missions were on their way to the court, one from the Roman aristocracy, the other from the unreformed bishops of Lombardy. There seemed small chance of the statute of 1059 being carried into effect on this the first occasion that called for its application.

It was Hildebrand who saved the situation. He was now archdeacon of the Roman Church, the first dignitary after the pope himself; and the pope's death left him in full charge. He had his candidate ready, persuaded him to allow his name to go forward, and brought him to Rome. This was Anselm of Baggio, Bishop of Lucca, who had in recent years made a name for himself as the militant leader of the reform party in Lombardy. He was a Lombard himself, a friend of St. Peter Damian and well known at the court where he had served in recent years as ambassador. He was by no means an intransigent, and represented a school of reform less drastic in its procedure than that which had bred Nicholas II. []

Meanwhile Hildebrand had also won over one of the Roman factions, and had called in the Normans [] who were, by this, camped outside the gates of the city. On October 1, 1061 Anselm was installed as Alexander II.

Four weeks later the court declared itself, and at Basel, in the presence of the boy emperor, Henry IV, an assembly of German and Lombard bishops chose as pope the Bishop of Parma, the candidate favoured by the Roman nobility; he called himself Honorius II. The emperor ratified the election and, with an army, the imperialist pope descended on Italy. On April 14, 1062, he defeated the troops of Alexander II in the fields by the castle of St. Angelo, took possession of Trastevere and St. Peter's. Two things saved Alexander: the arrival of Godfrey of Lorraine Marquis of Tuscany -- actually a check on Honorius rather than an aid to Alexander, for Godfrey recommended both to retire to their former sees and submit their claims to a council -- and, secondly a palace revolution in Germany. The new regent, Anno, Archbishop of Cologne was a zealous reformer. He was however too much of an imperialist to acknowledge Alexander immediately and he, too, was possessed with the idea that both Alexander and Honorius should submit their claims to a council. As regent he summoned a diet to discuss the question at Augsburg.

To this diet Alexander sent as his advocate St. Peter Damian, who, zealous reformer though he was, now gave away the principle of all that the last two popes had accomplished for the freedom of religion when, confident of Alexander's legitimacy, he declared that it was for the emperor and his bishops to decide which of the rivals was really pope. [] The German nobles and bishops voted for an enquiry into the case against Alexander. The pope made no protest against this and, when the diet recognised him as pope, he returned to Rome, in the spring of 1063.

And now St. Peter Damian, from France, whither he had gone as legate, once again threw the pope's case into grave confusion. For, ignorant of the Augsburg act of recognition, he wrote to Anno demanding that the regent summon a general council. Alexander II was still too insecure to make the kind of reply to Anno that Nicholas II might have sent; and when the council met, at Mantua, (Pentecost 1063) the pope, although his demand that he should preside had been bluntly refused, [] consented to appear before it and to make a solemn protestation that his election was not simoniacal, and was according to the ancient form. As to the Norman alliance, concerning which he had to

submit to a lecture from Anno of Cologne, that was his own affair. The council ended by acknowledging Alexander and it condemned Honorius. The schism was ended. Alexander had triumphed, but not without the emperor. The principle that the laity have no rights in papal elections -- to which Nicholas II had lately given so much importance -- had suffered something of an eclipse.

Alexander II had, however, by no means waited for the council's decision before beginning to rule the Church. The explanation which he made to the council at Mantua was a simple act of policy to end the schism. Ever since his election he had, in fact, continued the work of his predecessors, by synods, despatch of legates, and correspondence, working the reforms into every corner of Christendom. The direct influence of the Roman Church was beginning to be felt throughout the universal Church more continuously than ever before in its history. Southern and central Italy were now comparatively well in hand. In France the new Capetian rulers, still hardly more than nominal kings, oscillated; but legates from Rome toured the country unceasingly, preaching the new principles, and, in synods and councils, insisting on the punishment of those who contravened them. Spain, too, felt the new vigour. In Germany the chief interest, during these years, was the gradual revelation of the young emperor as another Conrad II. Like his grandfather before him Henry IV continued to traffic in sees, and he showed every sign of resentment against the new limitations on his power. He was not yet crowned as emperor, and the fear that the pope would refuse to crown him acted, for the moment, as a restraint. Nevertheless, despite the growing difficulty of Henry's hostility, the reform continued to penetrate Germany too. Alexander was even able to compel such chiefs of the German episcopate as the Archbishops of Cologne and Mainz and the Bishop of Bamberg to come to Rome and stand their trial.

One of the chief interests of this reign is that it saw the introduction of the reform into England. William of Normandy who, two years after the end of the schism, had conquered England, was a prince who had always enjoyed the confidence of the popes of the reform. He was himself the more enthusiastic for the reform in his new kingdom, since he found it a means of strengthening his own authority. When, on the death of St. Edward the Confessor (January 5, 1066), Harold succeeded to

the English throne, William sent off a mission to Rome denouncing Harold as a perjurer, and the Archbishop of Canterbury who had crowned him, as schismatic -- Stigand having received his pallium from Benedict X, and having never since made his submission to the lawful pope. Alexander blessed the expedition, despite opposition from some of his cardinals, and sent William a consecrated banner as a pledge of support. Hildebrand was the main mover in this policy, and after the Conquest he reaped his reward. In 1070 two papal legates presided over a great council at Winchester. Stigand and several other bishops were deposed; Lanfranc, now abbot of Bec, was appointed archbishop, and the Church in England, too, was opened to the full tide of the new vigorous life.

When, in 1073, Alexander II -- not the least of whose merits was that he survived to rule for more years than his six predecessors put together -- came to die, the reform movement had been, for a quarter of a century, the primary occupation of the popes. They had gradually organised it throughout the whole Church, and where, in the beginning, it had depended for its success on the lucky chance that the reigning emperor was himself a good man and interested, it had now for sixteen years been independent of any temporal authority, captained by the pope himself. The imperial suzerainty over the Church, accepted without reflection, by good men no less than bad, as one of the ordinary facts of life, had been set aside. For a short sixteen years the papacy, for the first time in five centuries, had been politically free. There was now to begin the desperate fight to maintain that freedom, a fight that was begun with the freedom barely gained and the gain in no way consolidated.

The Emperor Henry IV was now twenty-three -- intelligent, cultured, an artist, but selfish and sensual. To anyone who knew his character, and the history of the popes' successful attack on the privileges which his line had so long enjoyed, conflict must have seemed inevitable. Rather than surrender to the new idea, that lay control of ecclesiastical appointments was the main cause of all the ills that afflicted religion, the emperor would throw in his lot with the anti-reform forces. The pope, just as inevitably, would, in defence of what had been won, increase the growing centralisation, tightening the links that bound bishops to the metropolitans, and metropolitans to the Roman Church. The time for compromise and half measures was gone. The

moment had come when to attack abuses yet more violently was a very necessity of life. The time called for a pope who should be perfectly informed of every element in the complicated game, who should possess a will of iron, political subtlety, unshakable courage, and also, if these were not to damage himself and his cause once the spirit breathed life into the terrifying combination, a pope who should possess the heroic disinterestedness that comes of supernatural charity. It was the ultimate secret of Hildebrand's lasting success -- for he it was upon whom the burden fell -- that he remained the monk first as last, the ascetic and the man of prayer.

As in 1061, the vacancy found Hildebrand in charge. The decree of 1059 was to be applied for the second time, and in circumstances more menacing than before. Hildebrand ordered a three days' fast in preparation for the election, and proceeded with the dead pope's funeral. There was only one possible candidate, and at the very funeral, apparently, he was spontaneously, tumultuously, hailed as pope, clergy and people shouting together and bearing down his unwillingness. A month later he was ordained priest, and on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul consecrated bishop.

Hildebrand -- St. Gregory VII -- was at the time of his election a man in the middle fifties. [] His youth had known the Rome of the last of the popes of the House of Theophylact. He had been the secretary of the first of the reformers, and in the days of Gregory VI's exile he had come into close contact with the leaders of the reform movement in Burgundy and Lorraine. He had perhaps known Cluny, [] and he had certainly known Liege, the one centre, [] at that time, of a reform movement which was also anti-imperialistic. The Bishop of Liege it was who, alone had protested when Henry III had disposed of the popes at Sutri, who alone had ventured to oppose to the emperor the tradition that the pope has no judge on this earth. [] From the north St. Leo IX brought Hildebrand back to Rome, ordained him to be one of the sub-deacons of the Roman Church and set him in charge of its finances. Later he had served as legate in France at the time of the great controversy on the Holy Eucharist, and under Victor II he had returned to France, again as legate and reformer, presiding at great councils, such as that of Lyons and that of Chalons, where simoniacal bishops were deposed. He had gone as legate to the imperial court and, under Nicholas II,

with Anselm of Lucca to the place where the conflict raged most violently between the reform and the old regime -- Milan. When Anselm succeeded as Alexander II, he remained at Rome to be that pope's alter ego. By the time of his own election, in 1073, he knew by personal experience every phase of the vast movement, knew, too, every personality engaged in it. Few popes have come to their task so well prepared.

The principle that gives unity to the whole of Gregory VII's varied activity, is his ever present realisation that he is responsible to God for all the souls entrusted to him. Political activity may be a necessary means, but the end in view is always wholly supernatural. The pope must answer to God for the souls of kings no less than for those of priests and peasants; for kings too must keep God's law, or find themselves in hell for all eternity. And to William the Conqueror Gregory VII wrote this explicitly, "If then, on that day of terrible judgement it is I who must represent you before the just judge whom no lies deceive and who is the creator of all creatures, your wisdom will itself understand how I must most attentively watch over your salvation, and how you, in turn, because of your salvation and that you may come to the land of the living, must and ought to obey me without delay." There is nothing new in this: it is but a particular application of the general principle that the shepherd is charged to guide the whole flock which Gelasius I, for example, had stated no less explicitly to the emperor Anastasius six hundred years before St. Gregory VII. [] Nor, despite the ingenuity of later, anti-papal, historians -- was this meant as a thinly-disguised means of bringing about a political system in which the pope should rule all the affairs of the Christian world. Nowhere in the pope's own declarations is there any hint that he hoped for such a position, nor in the multitudinous writings of his supporters, whether publicists or canonists, that argue for the rights he did claim; nor is there any sign that the emperor believed this to be Gregory's aim, or any of the emperor's men. To none of the pope's contemporaries, to none of those who were at the heart of the struggle, did it ever occur, even to allege, that what Gregory VII was aiming at was to be the emperor of a Christian world state. []

Henry IV, too, had his problems, and chief among them that of recovering what the crown had lost during his own long minority. [] Appointments to sees, and the accompanying

simony, were at the moment important political expedients. This return to the evil ways of his grandfather had already, in the last years of Alexander II, led to difficulties between Henry and the Holy See; and the candidate to whom the king had sold the see of Constance was, thanks to the pope, denied consecration. Despite the king, a council, presided over by papal legates, was held at Mainz (1071) and the bishop-elect of Constance was compelled to resign. In another dispute, which divided the bishops and abbots of Thuringia -- where the allocation of tithes was in question -- the king had intervened to prevent an appeal to Rome. It was already more than evident that, in Henry IV, the reform movement faced the most serious opponent who had so far arisen. In Germany itself his determination to dominate the great feudatories could only end in war, and in 1073 a general revolt broke out which came near to sweeping him away altogether. In his despair Henry appealed to the pope, acknowledging his simony and his many usurpations in the matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, asking for aid and humbly promising amendment of his life. Gregory VII had already planned his policy with regard to the German king. He was not by nature an intransigent. [] He would do his best, by kindly warnings, to turn Henry from an opponent into an ally of the reform. Only when he proved obdurate did the pope return to the drastic remedies of Cardinal Humbert and Nicholas II in order to secure the freedom of religion. Already, in September, 1073, he had forbidden the new Bishop of Lucca to receive investiture from the king, and now came the king's submission and appeal.

The pope's reply was to despatch two legates, to reconcile Henry and his subjects and to settle the details of the dispute between king and pope still hanging over from the last pontificate. By May, 1074, the war seemed practically over, and the pope and king were reconciled. The pope resumed his activities on behalf of reform in the great German sees. It was, very largely, to these great bishops, of Cologne, Mainz, Augsburg, and Hamburg, that the ruling of Germany during the minority had fallen. The accession of Gregory VII found them as little subordinate to the pope as they were to the king. It was only with the greatest difficulty that the pope's legates were able to bring together the council he desired, and strong protests came from the German clergy against the new discipline and especially against the newly enforced clerical celibacy. There was not too much hope that, in any conflict between Rome and

Henry IV, the churches of Germany would make common cause with the pope.

That conflict was not long in coming. Gregory VII had begun by renewing the decrees against simony and clerical ill-living (Roman Council of March, 1074). By the Lent of 1075 it was evident to him that, almost nowhere, had the legates despatched to enforce these decrees, met with any general support from the bishops. The pope now determined to strike at the two chief causes of this failure on the part of the bishops. The abuse that appointments to sees had everywhere fallen into the hands of the lay lord, Gregory met by a solemn renewal of Nicholas II's decree of 1059, which had never been enforced. No prelate must, henceforth, receive an abbey or a see from any lay lord; no lay lord must, for the future, make such grants. And in the Dictatus Papae the pope reminded disobedient bishops that his authority was of divine institution, and that it extended to a power of deposing bishops and, if need be, of the emperor too.

This decree of February, 1075, against lay investiture was not intended, the thing seems certain, as an aggressive move against the princes -- still less was it an act which especially envisaged Henry IV; the pope was in no hurry to promulgate the decree to princes generally, and his policy in applying the law varied greatly. In the English kingdom of William the Conqueror, for example, where simony had no place in the royal appointments, and where king and bishops were at one with the pope in the work of reform, Gregory VII never raised the question at all. The new law was, indeed, " a preventive weapon designed to assist the struggle against simony". [] In a country where simony on the part of the king was systematic, and the king hardened in his resolve to maintain the system, conflict -- speedy conflict -- was inevitable; and such was the case with Henry IV. And, as the decree was a challenge to Henry IV so too were the blunt declarations of the Dictatus Papae a challenge to the feudalised ecclesiastical princes who occupied the sees of Germany. In these twenty-seven terse propositions king and bishops were warned that the pope's laws against simony, clerical ill-living, and the usurpation of rights to appoint were no dead letter, and that none, whatever his rank, would escape the sanctions enacted against those who broke these laws. []

The war in Germany, that still dragged on despite the papal

intervention of 1074, came to an end in September, 1075, with Henry IV completely victorious. Master, at last, in his own house, the king was now to show his hand against the papacy. The troubles of the see of Milan gave the king his opportunity. In March, 1075 the party of reform had suffered there a great defeat and their leader had lost his life. Whereupon their rivals had begged King Henry to appoint a new archbishop -- despite his recent acknowledgement of the archbishop, Atto, whom the pope had recognised at the council of 1074. The German king consented and nominated Tedaldo, a deacon of the Milanese church. And it was with this incident that the great struggle began between the sacerdotium and the imperium that was to be a main feature of European history for the next two hundred and fifty years.

Gregory VII answered the challenge with a solemn warning, December 8, 1075, that the decrees of the last council bound the king no less than the rest of the Church, and with a private message that if Henry persisted he should himself be excommunicated and deposed. Henry's reply was to organise against the pope all the discontented ecclesiastics of Germany and Lombardy; with them there rose, also, the anti-papal Roman aristocracy. It was not yet thirty years since Henry's father had despatched three popes in as many weeks.

It was the Romans who moved first, and as the pope sang the Midnight Mass of Christmas in St. Mary Major's he was attacked and carried off by one of the leading Roman nobles, Cencius, to be delivered however, after a few hours. Next, in January, 1076, a council of German bishops at Worms -- twenty-seven in all -- denounced the pope as a usurper, elected without the king's authorisation, a mischief maker who for two years had sown dissension and trouble throughout the Church. The king added to their official decree letters of his own, inviting the Romans to expel the pope and bidding Gregory VII himself, "no pope but a false monk," abandon the see he had dishonoured. "Come down then, leave the see thou hast usurped, that another may take the place of blessed Peter. I, Henry, king by the grace of God, and all the bishops, we say to thee 'Come down, come down, thou whom all the ages will condemn.'" []

The envoys from the German council halted on their way to Rome, to hold a council at Piacenza, where the Lombard

bishops swore to refuse obedience to the pope. At Rome the pope gave the envoys a hearing -- and proceeded to excommunicate the Archbishops of Mainz and Cologne, the presidents of the German council, and with them the king himself (February 14, 1076). This last decree was promulgated in terms of unusual solemnity, which reveal the new development given by the reformers to Our Lord's promises to St. Peter. "Hearken, O Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, to the prayer of thy servant, whom thou hast nourished since infancy, whom, to this day, thou hast protected from the power of the wicked. Thou art my witness, and Our Lady, God's mother, and thy brother the blessed Paul, that it was thine own holy Roman Church which set me, for all my unwillingness, at the helm. . . By thy favour it is, and not by any works of mine, that the Christian people obey my ruling. . .

In thy place, and by thy favour, God has given me authority to bind and to loose upon earth. Wherefore, filled with this confidence, for the honour and defence of thy Church, in the name of God Almighty, by thy power and thy authority, I deprive Henry the king, son of Henry the emperor, who with unheard-of pride has risen against thy Church, of all authority in the kingdom of the Teutons and in Italy. I release all Christians from their oaths of fidelity sworn to him or that they shall swear to him. I forbid any person to do him any of the service due to kings. . . . I bind him with the chain of anathema so that the whole world may know 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."

This act of unprecedented boldness, the culmination of the efforts of the reformers since 1049, was the culmination, too, of Gregory's reign, a focal point indeed of all the long history of the relation of the Catholic Church and the Catholic kings, towards which much previous history tended, to which all later history looks back. Gregory VII was to meet disaster upon disaster, to die with the Church divided, with the reformers defeated and scattered. But, because of the setting he gave it, this first papal excommunication and deposition of a king never left the Catholic memory. It fixed for all time, upon all subsequent popes and bishops, the elementary nature of their duty to secure the rights of religion and in securing them to make no distinction of persons. *Imperator intra ecclesiam non supra ecclesiam est*, so

St. Ambrose had admonished Valentinian II seven hundred years earlier. St. Gregory VII's excommunication of the German king stamped that truth so deeply into Catholic practice that, henceforth, it ceased to be matter for discussion.

At first all went well and a great victory for the reformed papacy seemed assured. Around the papal decision all the recently quelled rebellion rose again. The great feudatories gladly renewed, under the new papal sanction, their old war on Henry. As the summer of 1076 came on his bishops, too, left him for the pope. At an assembly at Tribur (October 16, 1076) his deposition was proposed and it was agreed that this should be left to the pope who should come, in the following February, and hold a great council at Augsburg. Henry, apparently, was irrecoverably lost.

As in 1073, he resolved to save himself by submission. The pope had already left Rome for Germany when, with a few attendants, Henry crossed the Alps. He met the pope at Canossa, a fortress belonging to the pope's ally the powerful Countess Matilda, ruler since her father's death of the important marquisate of Tuscany. The pope, convinced most unwillingly that Henry's repentance was sincere, could not refuse him the absolution he sought (January 28, 1077). The king might stand, for three days, as he has ever been painted, clad only in his shirt, barefoot in the snow, beseeching the inflexible pope. It was he, nevertheless, who triumphed, staving off disaster at the last moment of the last hour, and breaking the entente between the pope and the German opposition before it had had time to take diplomatic shape. []

In Germany, meanwhile, the opposition had elected another king, Rudolf of Swabia, Henry's brother-in-law (March 13, 1077). As between the two rivals the pope declared himself neutral, offering to arbitrate and judge between them. Both kings accepted, at least so far as to send ambassadors to plead their case before a great council of a hundred bishops which the pope assembled at the Lateran in the April of 1078. Once again, however, for lack of convincing evidence, the pope refused to decide. contenting himself with sending to Germany a commission of investigation. When it was clearly shown where the right lay, he would condemn the usurper.

The mission achieved very little. The war went on despite the endeavours of the legates, and presently Henry, disregarding the explicit oaths he had sworn at Canossa, was once more disposing of abbeys and sees in the old fashion. When, in the first weeks of 1080, he demanded that Gregory should excommunicate Rudolf, he merely applied the last stimulus to force the punishment that had been accumulating. At a council summoned in March of that year the pope recalled the previous decrees and renewed the excommunications of the disobedient and rebellious prelates. The rules for episcopal elections were again set forth, and finally the question of the German kings was dealt with. Henry, his bad faith since Canossa set forth in detail, was once more excommunicated and deposed, Rudolf acknowledged as lawful king.

Henry, however, was in a strong position. His nobles stood by him, his bishops too. Except in the far north he was master everywhere. The bishops of Germany, first at Bamberg (April 12, 1080) and then at Mainz, (May 31) the bishops of Lombardy at Brixen, (June 25) renewed the denunciations of the earlier council at Worms. The pope was a magician, a sorcerer, the protector of heretics, a poisoner who had made away with his four predecessors; his deposition was decreed, and in his place was "elected" the Archbishop of Ravenna who for ten years had led the anti-papal movement in Italy. He styled himself Clement III.

In October, Rudolf was slain in battle and Henry, master now in Germany, was free to invade Italy, execute the sentence of his bishops, and enthrone "Clement III." The independent papacy had endured just twenty-three years. The king was now in a position to regain what his father had held in 1046, Otto III in 996, Otto I in 963.

Before the new danger the pope was helpless. Although the Countess Matilda was as loyal as before, her energies were wholly absorbed in defending herself against her own vassals and against the towns which resented her claims; the invasion would be the signal for a general revolt throughout her territories. The Normans again had, in recent years, shown themselves so eager to raid the pontifical territory that it was extremely doubtful if they would now defend it. But finally, through the diplomacy of the Abbot of Monte Cassino, their two

chiefs, Richard of Capua and Robert Guiscard, were reconciled to the pope. Further treaties were made with the petty barons of the Campagna.

Early in 1081 Henry began his march. Verona, Milan, Pavia, Ravenna, opened their gates to him in turn. Everywhere the local discontent rallied to him. On May 21 he appeared before Rome. His forces were, however, too slight to take the city, and the summer heat soon put an end to his attempted blockade. In the spring of 1082 the king made a second appearance before the walls -- but with no better fortune. In June 1083 he was, however, able to occupy the Leonine city and the pope agreed to call a general council on the condition that Henry would guarantee the safety of the bishops coming and going. This plan failed; and then, in 1084, upon a fourth military demonstration, the king was successful -- with the help of the funds sent by the emperor at Constantinople for an expedition against the Normans, and the connivance of war-weary traitors within the city. Thirteen of the very cardinals had, in fact, deserted Gregory VII when, on March 21, Rome fell to Henry. Three days later his anti-pope was enthroned at the Lateran, and on March 31, Easter Sunday, "Clement III" crowned Henry IV as emperor in St. Peter's, saluting him as Patrician of the Romans, while the old oaths were sworn anew that guaranteed the emperor's rights in the election of the popes. The old regime had been restored: the German king was once more master of the Roman Church.

His triumph was of short duration. The pope, still besieged in St. Angelo, managed to get a message through to the Normans and soon Robert Guiscard, with a huge army, was marching north to relieve him. The emperor did not await his coming but fled (May 21, 1084). Six days later the Normans arrived, and, treating the Romans as rebels, put the city to the sack. The pope was released, to become little else but the prisoner of his ferocious allies. Without them his life was not safe; when they retired with their booty he had no choice but to accompany them, to Monte Cassino, to Benevento, and finally to Salerno.

As the Normans retired, the imperialists recovered their hold "Clement III" once more reigned in the Lateran, while Gregory; protected by the Normans, passed the last three months of his life at Salerno. Isolated in southern Italy, cut off from all effective communication with the rest of Christendom, he launched a last

appeal for help to all who believed "that the blessed Peter is the father of all Christians, their first shepherd after Christ, that the holy Roman Church is the mother and the mistress of all churches." The pope was broken, and in a short few months he died (May 25, 1085). []

For the moment it seemed as though his work must die with him. It was a year before the cardinals could come to an agreement as to his successor, and another year before that successor would take the decisive step and seal his acceptance by receiving episcopal consecration. It was a curious choice that the sacred college had made, for the new pope -- Victor III -- was no other than the Abbot of Monte Cassino, the patron of the Normans, the negotiator of their peace with Gregory VII, and also, in the last days of St. Gregory, threatened with excommunication for his dealings with Henry IV. Victor III [] reigned for a matter of weeks only. On September 16, 1087, he died, and confusion descended once more on the followers of Gregory VII. Finally, on March 12, 1088. the cardinals elected Odo, the Bishop of Ostia. After three years of leaderless chaos the work of St. Gregory was to go forward once more.

The new pope was French by birth. He had made a name for himself at the school of Rheims, and had risen to be archdeacon of that see. Then he had gone to Cluny, and once again his gifts had raised him. He was prior of Cluny when, in the early days of Gregory VII, he accompanied his abbot -- Hugh -- to Rome. The pope kept him there, creating him cardinal and making him Bishop of Ostia. Thenceforward he was one of the most active of the pope's lieutenants in the work of reform. When Gregory VII, in the last days of his life, was asked whom he would prefer to succeed him, the Cardinal Odo was one of those whom he named. Odo by no means approved of Victor III, though he did not -- like some of the party -- refuse to acknowledge him as pope, and in the end he was so far reconciled to him that Victor III even recommended him as his successor.

It is the glory of Urban II -- for so the new pope styled himself -- that in the ten years he reigned he made good the immense damage which the cause of reform had suffered since the excommunication of 1080. He did more; for, as devoted as Gregory VII and as determined, he supervised personally the progress of the movement as Leo IX had supervised its

beginnings. [] The history of his pontificate divides easily. During the first five years the anti-pope and the imperialists continued to hold Rome and northern Italy: Urban II had no choice but to live under the protection of the Normans in the south. In 1090 the emperor himself again descended on the country, and for six years more the struggle went on between his forces and those of the Countess Matilda, aided now by the league of Lombard towns. But gradually the imperialists were forced out; Henry's son, Conrad, joined the rebels, was accepted by them as king, and went over to Urban II; in Germany itself, thanks to Urban's legate the Bishop of Constance, the reform party was slowly reunited. The monastery of Hirschau -- a German Cluny -- began to be a new source of strength, and even in the episcopate (now for fifteen years filled with Henry's nominees) bishops began to desert "Clement III" for the successor of Gregory VII. Urban's own personal tact, his diplomatic combination of inflexibility in principle with the traditional mildness of the Roman Church to repentant schismatics, did much to hasten these reconciliations. After 1093 he was able to live safely in Rome, where, so far, he had spent but an occasional, hazardous few weeks. .

The years of his "exile" among the Normans Urban II had - devoted to the reorganisation of that much tried land, where for the best part of a century Norman, Byzantine and Saracen had fought for the mastery. Now he turned his attention to the north. In March, 1095, he presided over an immense assembly at Piacenza, an international congress to which the loyal supporters of the policies of Gregory VII came in from all over western Europe, bishops from Germany, France and Spain, ambassadors, too, from the old empire of the East, clerics to the number of 4,000 and, it was estimated, 30,000 laity. This unprecedented success marked very definitely the end of the crisis in which the work of Hildebrand seemed fated to perish. The council also marks a definite change in the tone of Urban II's government of the Church. The pope is, once more, free of political anxieties; the canons of the council are a declaration to the world that the reform of Christian life is, once again, the sole task that occupies his mind. And from now on Urban II shows himself more and more of a rigorist in his attitude to lay investiture.

From Piacenza the pope moved slowly through Lombardy to his

native France. Here many matters awaited his decision. The Church in France had, in fact, suffered cruelly from lack of leadership since Gregory VII's death, now ten years ago. There were controversies over jurisdiction between different bishops, disputes between metropolitans as to precedence and, finally, there was the scandal of the repudiation of his wife by the king, Philip I (1060-1106), and his subsequent remarriage.

Philip I was another, but less able, Henry IV. He had already incurred the wrath of Gregory VII for his crimes against the Church and his cruel oppression of his subjects. The same pope had also chastised the French bishops for the servility which kept them from protecting the weak against the king's tyranny. Now the king had turned his wife out, married another, and the Bishop of Senlis had blessed the second marriage. The Archbishop of Rheims and the other suffragans had approved, and the Bishop of Chartres, the famous canonist St. Ives, who alone had protested. was thrown into prison. For all this, Philip had recently (October 16, 1094) been excommunicated by the Archbishop of Lyons acting as papal legate.

The pope reached France in July, 1095, and for four months he moved about the valley of the Rhone, occupied in a general mission of restoring peace and unity, everywhere deciding, with authority, the disputes and controversies which, for lack of decision, had degenerated into feuds. On August 15, he was at Le Puy, to discuss the coming crusade with its bishop, Adhemar, who was something of an authority on affairs in the Holy Land. A fortnight later, at St. Gilles, Urban was in consultation with the count, Raymond, whose experience of the wars against the Saracens in Spain suggested him as the leader of the expedition which Urban had in mind. In October he consecrated the new abbey church at Cluny, where twenty years before he had ruled as prior, and in November he moved to Clermont to preside over the council summoned in the previous August.

This Council of Clermont (November 18-28, 1095) was an even greater success than that of Piacenza. Once more, although it was summoned as a council of French bishops, prelates, monks and laity came in from all parts. Accounts speak of between three and four hundred bishops and abbots. The total number of those whom the council drew to the town may have reached

100,00 () It was a second stupendous testimony, within a few months, to the hold of the papacy on the mind of Christendom, and, necessarily, an immense aid in the struggle still going on in Germany. The usual decrees on reform recently renewed at Piacenza, were explained and published once more; new decrees emphasised the cleric's independence of the lay lord and protected church property against lay usurpation; the Bishop of Cambrai was deposed for simony and for receiving investiture from the emperor, the King of France was solemnly excommunicated, and the Truce of God was officially adopted as of obligation universally throughout the Church. Finally, Urban II, on his own initiative, launched the scheme for the first Crusade.

In 1096 the pope returned to Italy. He held yet another council at Rome in 1097, one at Bari in southern Italy in 1098 and, a few months before his death, a last council in Rome, to which a hundred and fifty bishops came.

On July 29, 1099, Urban II died. The long fight for independence was by no means won, but, by comparison with the situation in 1088, victory and release might seem, were there no set-back, to be no more than a matter of time. Set-backs, however, there were to be, and the chief of them was the personality of the new pope -- Pascal II (elected August 13, 1099). His loyalty to the reform was beyond all doubt. It was Gregory VII who had made him a cardinal, and he had stood by the cause through its darkest days. Like Urban II he was a monk, an Italian, and a man whose life was a model of austerity. He was, however, of that large number of whom, sorrowfully, their friends can but regret *capax nisi imperasset*. A good counsellor, he showed himself as a ruler uncertain and vacillating, and he afflicted the Church for eighteen years.

The first years of his reign, however, saw one obstacle after another disappear. " Clement III " died in 1100, and left no effective successor. Philip of France made his submission in 1104. The investiture struggle which St. Anselm of Canterbury had waged in England with William II and Henry I was settled. in 1107, by a pact which recognised the Church's freedom of election. [] Finally, in 1105, Henry IV, defeated and crushed, was compelled to abdicate in favour of his son, the leader since 1100 of the party in opposition. And to all this series of important

gains must be added the new prestige accruing to the papacy from the Crusader' capture of Jerusalem (July, 1099). The pope's position when the young Henry V, his succession secured, broke through his promise and renewed his father's policies, was already stronger than that of any pope for centuries.

Henry, inevitably, was excommunicated. He replied by invading Italy (1110). As he approached Rome Pascal II, possibly through fear that the capture of the city would entail the creation of another anti-pope and the renewal of the schism, prepared to treat. He offered, if Henry solemnly undertook to abandon the practice of investiture, to renounce all the Church's feudal rights within the empire, to make over to the king the whole vast amount, lands, privileges, temporal jurisdiction. Had it been possible to carry out, the treaty would have revolutionised the social structure of half Europe. To the king it would have conveyed immediately an immense increase of wealth and power. The Church -- bishops, abbots, schools, hospitals, pious foundations, the whole vast movement before which still lay the task of Christianising the Germans and converting the heathen -- would just as suddenly be stripped of all its material equipment and its public status while there still lay upon it the burden of maintaining all the life it had called into being in the course of seven centuries; and it would once more, inevitably, have fallen into the lay lords' power. []

If the pope showed a dove's simplicity in making such an offer his bishops and abbots lacked none of the wisdom that should be its complement. When, in the presence of the emperor-to-be, on February 12, 1111, the proposals were announced in St. Peter's, there were violent scenes and presently a wild riot. The king thereupon arrested the pope, sixteen of the cardinals, and a number of the Roman nobility. When they were released it was announced that Pascal II had surrendered. All that Gregory VII had fought for was abandoned. Henry was to be crowned as emperor, and the pope had made over to him all the rights of investiture he claimed. "What I would not have done to save my life," said the lamentable pope, "I have done for the peace of the Church."

The hard toil of the last sixty years, the labours and sacrifices of his predecessors, saved Pascal II. They had created such a spirit in the Church that he was powerless before it. The personal

activity of the papacy, felt in every see of Christendom for the last two generations, the innumerable councils, the continual tours of the papal legates, the constant intervention of the popes in the local crises of so many sees, those journeys which had familiarised so many of the faithful with their very presence, all had contributed to build up an enthusiasm that would not tolerate such a surrender. Soon from all sides, and nowhere more strongly than from France, protests began to pour in. The Abbot of Monte Cassino, ordered personally to surrender his rights, refused. "I love you," he wrote, "as my lord and as my father, and I have no desire for another as pope. But the Lord has said 'Whoever loves father and mother more than me is not worthy of me.' . . . As for this outrageous treaty, wrung from you by violence and treachery, how can I praise it? Or indeed how can you? . . . Your own laws have condemned and excommunicated the cleric who submits to investiture. . . ."

Another sturdy prelate the Archbishop of Lyons, urged the pope in still stronger terms. "Detestable pilot that you are, in times of peace a bully and before the storm a coward." The Archbishop of Vienne, Pascal's own legate in France, called a council, declared lay investiture to be heretical, and excommunicated the emperor. He, too, wrote to the pope, begging him to confirm the council's sentence and to break with Henry. "If you hearken to our prayer and break with King Henry we shall be your faithful and devoted sons. If you remain union with him, we pray God be merciful to us for we shall withdraw ourselves from your obedience." Cluny took the same line; and another abbot wrote bluntly to Pascal that he was a heretic. In Germany the bishops of the great sees who had so far fought the emperor -- Cologne, Mainz, Halberstadt, Magdeburg and Salzburg -- took up arms once more. The war was on again and the pope, after a temporary retirement, in which he even thought of abdicating, yielded. To the legate in France he wrote that he had withdrawn the concession, and in a great council at Rome (March, 1112), acknowledging that it was contrary to justice, he annulled the grant and confirmed once more the legislation of Gregory VII and Urban II. Four years later, in the council of 1116, Pascal was more explicitly repentant. "I confess that I failed," he said, "and I ask you to pray God to pardon me. As for the cursed privilege. . . I condemn it with an everlasting anathema, and I will that its memory be for ever hateful." []

In February, 1115, Henry was badly defeated at Welfesholze, and

though he attempted to renew the schism -- setting up the Archbishop of Braga as "Gregory VIII" and even, master of Rome again, having a second coronation -- the days of his power were numbered. Pascal II died in 1118, his successor, Gelasius II, lived only a year; and then (March 1, 1119) the cardinals elected as pope the Archbishop of Vienne who had, in 1111, led the Catholic movement against Pascal's concessions. He it was who now, as Calixtus II, was to arrange the treaty which ended the long struggle.

In a council at Worms (September 23, 1122) they were finally arranged. Henry conceded, once and for all, the Church's right freely to elect and consecrate its bishops, and he forswore the investiture with ring and crozier, the act by which he had created his bishops. The pope, for his part, conceded that the elections should take place in the king's presence so long as they were free and without any simony. The bishop-elect was to receive investiture of the temporalities of the see by the touch of the king's sceptre.

The Concordant of Worms was a compromise, [] hut a compromise which registered the victory of the principle for which the popes, during eighty years of controversy, had contended, namely that bishops should not, as of right, owe their promotion to the lay sovereign. It was more than six hundred years since, with the first of the Barbarian kings who was a Catholic, the disastrous custom had first taken root. Now, thanks to the unremitting warfare of three generations of popes, bishops, monks and faithful people, the ancient principle was re-established, to he in practice often enough ignored, but never again to he denied by churchmen or treated as non-existent. []

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



2. THE SCHISM OF CERULARIUS

The century that follows the reconciliation of Rome and Constantinople when Nicholas Mystikos was patriarch, is one of the greatest in all the long history of the East Roman Empire; and yet it is a time whose ecclesiastical history has gone unrecorded. Great soldiers now rule, like Nicephorus Phocas (963-969) and Basil II (963-1025), who reform the State, throw back the Bulgarians and the Saracens, and regain the ancient hold on southern Italy too. It is now that the Byzantine conversion of Russia begins, and wherever the imperial arms are victorious the prestige and jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople also gain. But of the relations between the ten patriarchs who, in these hundred years, successively rule the see and the twenty-one popes who were their contemporaries, we know very little. For the Greek chronicles of this time, the West hardly exists. So far as the Byzantine literature is concerned the East has already broken away, in this century of Marozia and John XII, of Otto I and Otto III -- himself the son of a Byzantine princess -- and of the first French and German popes.

There is, indeed, record of an embassy from Constantinople in 933 begging the support of the pope John XI for the newly-named patriarch Theophylact, a boy of sixteen, son of the emperor Romanus Lecapenus; he was to rule for twenty-three years, and to prove himself a Byzantine John XII. In the next generation there are the long negotiations for the marriage of Otto II to Theophano, a sister of the boy emperor Basil II -- negotiations rendered all the more arduous by a tactless letter from the pope, John XIII, which speaks of the German king as the Roman Emperor? and treats the princes of Constantinople as mere "emperors of the Greeks". Not only were the negotiations now broken off, but the Greeks spoke of abolishing the Latin rite in Byzantine Italy, and of annexing all these sees to the jurisdiction of the patriarch at Constantinople. It was Nicephorus Phocas who made this stand, and it was doubtless only the revolution in 969 which staved off a new schism. In that year Nicephorus was murdered, and his assassin, John Zimisces, took his place as emperor-regent for the boy emperors Basil II and Constantine VIII. Zimisces managed to Will some kind of consecration from the patriarch, and he re- opened the

conversations with Otto. On Low Sunday, 971, the future king Otto II and the Byzantine princess were married in St. Peter's by the pope, John XIII.

Three years later Zimisces was offering hospitality to one of John's successors -- though that is hardly a correct description of the ruffian Franco who, in June 974, brought about the murder of Pope Benedict VI and for a few short weeks reigned in his place as Boniface VII. It was the power of the German king that brought about Franco's expulsion, and since the Germans were still the main obstacle to the Byzantine re-conquest of Italy, "Boniface VII" was made much of in Constantinople, where the lawful popes Benedict VII (974-983) and John XIV were not recognised.

Otto II died, all too soon, at the age of twenty-eight, in the first weeks of this last pope's reign, leaving a child of three to succeed him, and the mutually hostile Byzantine empress-mother Theophano, and the Burgundian grandmother, Adelaide, to share the reality of power. It was a great opportunity for Theophano's brother Basil II, now come to man's estate and about to begin his great career, and it was an opportunity for "Boniface VII", who, with Byzantine assistance, appeared in Rome again, to add the murder of a second pope to his crimes and to reign himself for a brief fifteen months (April 984-July 985).

Towards the end of the long reign of Basil II the Eastern empire and the popes were once more in contact, and in conflict, and although the facts are far from certain the troubles seem to have been wholly political. Once again the pope had reason to fear the growing Byzantine power to the south of the papal State, and once again he strove to protect himself by an alliance with the German king. Benedict VIII (1012-1024) and Henry II (1002-1024) were now allied, as John XIII and Otto the Great had been allied forty years earlier. In those forty years the heel and toe of Italy -- Apulia and Calabria -- had been conquered by Basil, and much other territory too, until now he menaced the Campagna. From the first years of the new century, however, there had been a series of revolts against the new Byzantine ruler, and Benedict VIII had given them what support he could. He had also made use of the chance presence, in the country between Rome and Naples, of a band of Normans returning from a pilgrimage to the

Holy Land. The new papal-imperial alliance against Byzantium did not however achieve very much; it was the death of Basil II, in 1025, and the utter incapacity of his successors, which really saved the situation for the popes.

But the crisis had given new motives to the separatist tendencies at Constantinople, and, bringing in the Normans, it had produced the force that would not henceforth rest until the Byzantine power in Italy was wholly destroyed. That destruction the Normans were to accomplish, in part, as allies of the popes. The old scorn of the Byzantines for the Latin barbarians was, from now on, reinforced by a new hatred of the victorious Normans, and, as the empire grew ever weaker, by a new, very real fear. When Michael Cerularius, the patriarch of the new schism -- the schism which still endures -- began his attack in 1052, thirty years nearly after the last encounter between Basil II and the pope, the Greeks had a host of natural, political, and cultural reasons for wishing well to whoever proposed finally to defy and repudiate the religious supremacy of the Roman See.

Those thirty years are a lamentable chapter in Byzantine history. Basil II was succeeded by his seventy-year-old brother Constantine VIII (1025-1028), and Constantine by his daughter Zoe, a pale, and wholly incompetent version of Catherine the Great. It is around the disreputable history of this elderly lady's successive husbands, the series of marriages and murders and re-marriages, that most of the story turns. When Cerularius appears, in 1043, he tells immediately as the strongest man in public life for almost a generation. And by this time all contact with Rome -- the fact seems certain -- had ceased. The patriarchs no longer advised the popes of their election; the pope's name had ceased to figure in the list of personages officially prayed for at mass. If there was not actually a state of war between the two sees there was, at any rate, a rupture of diplomatic relations. Very possibly it went back to the days of the political troubles between Basil II and Benedict VIII. It was the achievement of Cerularius that, intent on maintaining this quasi-independence of the papacy which he found on his accession, he transformed it into the reality of formal schism.

Cerularius, like Photius, had come into the ecclesiastical world as it were by accident. Following the tradition of his family he had built up a career in the imperial court. Then, about 1040, he

was involved in a conspiracy to depose the emperor, Michael IV, Zoe's second husband. Had the plot succeeded, Cerularius might himself have become emperor. When it failed, Michael IV, in order to safeguard himself against further danger from Cerularius, endeavoured, in the traditional Byzantine fashion, to make a monk of him. Cerularius, however, resisted; and then the suicide of his brother wrought a change: of his own will he entered a monastery. Three years later, Constantine IX became emperor -- as Zoe's third husband. He was an old friend of Cerularius who, once more, became a power at court. When, in 1043, the patriarch, Alexis, died, Constantine nominated Cerularius to succeed him. He was now the second personage in the empire and, since the emperor was a paralytic, there seemed no limit to what his powerful personality might achieve.

What first moved Cerularius to action was a remarkable change in the political situation in Italy which, so he was afraid, might weaken the position of his see. The feats of the Normans were now bringing pope and emperor together, where, a generation earlier, they had been a main cause of their antagonism. The Normans had, in fact, been too successful in Italy for the popes' liking. They were now, indeed, as great a menace as the Byzantines had once been; and when the chief Byzantine official in Italy, Argyros, approached the pope St. Leo IX, somewhere about 1050, with a project of alliance against the Normans, he found the pope more than agreeable to it. His own sovereign, still Constantine IX, was no less willing, and to make the alliance complete the pope went in person to Germany to win over the emperor Henry III (1052). How St. Leo's diplomacy succeeded, and what the fortunes of his army in the campaign that followed, has been already described. At the battle of Civitate (June 18, 1053) the Normans defeated the pope, decisively, and took him prisoner.

Now to all this policy of alliance with the pope Cerularius offered strong opposition. He feared that, with the closer and more friendly relations between pope and emperor which the new political necessity had bred, the papacy would re-appear as an active element in the ecclesiastical life of the empire, to the great detriment of the new autocephaly of his see. He fought Argyros in the imperial council and, when he failed to win over Constantine IX, revenged himself by excommunicating Argyros. Henceforth the patriarch and the general were desperately

hostile-and the fact was soon to affect very seriously the relations of Constantinople and Rome. Next the patriarch made an attack on the Latins who lived within his immediate jurisdiction. He closed their churches, forbade all use of the Latin rite in them, and, alleging that the consecration of unleavened bread was no consecration at all, he had the Blessed Sacrament thrown out of the Latin pyxes and systematically trodden underfoot.

This took place, seemingly, in the year 1052, and some months later, in the spring of 1053, Cerularius, through the agency of one of his own clerics from Constantinople whom he had set to preside over the chief Bulgarian see -- Achrida -- despatched what was, in intention, a summons to the pope to remodel Latin ways according to the pattern of Constantinople. This letter -- of Leo of Achrida to John, Bishop of Trani [] -- is not a mere statement of grievances, or a declaration of independence, but an ultimatum, a monition as from a superior, a correction as from the only true believer to others who have fallen away from truth and corrupted the faith. It is another important feature of this letter that it speaks as though the union with Rome had already, and since a long time, ceased to be. Leo of Achrida, in fact, purports to set out for the Latin bishop's consideration the customs which the Latins must give up if East and West are to come together again: such are, for example, the Latin use of unleavened bread in the mass, the eating of flesh meat not killed in the Eastern manner, fasting on Saturdays, the suppression of the Alleluia in Lent. []

The Bishop of Trani sent the letter on to the pope. The reply of St. Leo IX was drafted by his chief adviser, the Cardinal Humbert, that abbot of Moyenmoutier whom we have seen as a reformer of ecclesiastical life famous for his vigour, the leader indeed of the most radical of all the reforming groups, whom the Alsatian pope had brought with him to Rome in 1049. Humbert was a man of rare learning, one of the few skilled in Greek as in Latin, and a personality, therefore, whose influence on the approaching crisis was to be all but decisive; he was, in all things, active, combative, impetuous, a man without subtlety, inclined to favour drastic decisions as the way to lasting solutions.

The long letter which Humbert now sent, in the pope's name, to

Cerularius is a theologian's reminder of the facts about the Roman primacy over the Church of Christ, about the divine origin of this primacy, and the indefectibility of the faith of the Roman see. It reminds Cerularius, also, that the pope has no judge in this world, and that by the very fact of judging the pope he has himself incurred a sentence of anathema which all the ancient councils would confirm. Whether Cerularius ever received this letter is doubtful. [] And now the disaster to the papal arms seemed likely, for the moment, to change even the patriarch's hostility. The news of Civitate was brought to the capital by John of Trani himself, sent by Argyros. Its effect was to convince the emperor, even more strongly, that it was his first political interest to develop the new friendship with the pope. He wrote to Leo promising help, and declaring his resolve to re-establish peaceful relations with the Holy See. And Cerularius also wrote, a very moderate letter, in which he stated his own wish to see peace restored with Rome. The only really ominous phrase in this letter is the patriarch's insistence -- seemingly exaggerated -- on the length of time the two sees have been in separation, as though hinting that separation was the normal state of things. He promises, however, to put back the pope's name into the mass, St. Leo -- so he presumes -- reciprocating this gesture of reconciliation.

These two letters came to the pope at Benevento, where he was still a prisoner of the Normans, about the turn of the year, 1053-1054. He decided to send an embassy to Constantinople, and chose as his legates Humbert, another cardinal, Frederick of Lorraine, [] and Peter the Archbishop of Amalfi. [] Also he sent a reply to the two letters. Again it was Humbert who wrote for the pope, and once again the temperament of the Burgundian cardinal was only too evident in what he wrote. The tone of the letters was not only fatal to a mission of reconciliation, but Humbert fell into a serious historical blunder, and, in fact, from the beginning he played into the hands of his much more subtle adversary. The emperor was told that the recent acts of Cerularius made the pope fearful for the chances of future peace, and nowhere, in this letter, was Michael styled "patriarch": he was "the archbishop" only; the only patriarchs the letter spoke of were those of Alexandria and Antioch, and the letter counted as a blame against "the archbishop" his usurpation of their jurisdiction. This was to ignore (or to be ignorant of) a state of things which the earlier popes had

recognised for centuries; it was to repeat the errors with which, in the days of Photius, the learned but not omniscient Anastasius the Librarian had misled Adrian II. The same errors appeared in the letter to Cerularius himself; and not only was his sacrilegious violation of the Blessed Sacrament rebuked but the validity of his own possession of his see was questioned: he was told he was no archbishop because when he was elected to the see he was only a layman, a repetition of the charge made against Photius but in no way true of Cerularius. As for Michael's offer to restore the pope's name to the diptychs, this was noted as his simple duty in the matter: the only alternative to such recognition of the papal supremacy was to be joined with the heretics and the synagogue of Satan.

These letters would, of themselves, it may be thought, have sufficed to endanger the success of the mission. When the legates took in Apulia, en route for Constantinople, and there took counsel with Argyros, they settled its fate once and for all. It was this consultation which determined the legates to deal first with the emperor, and not to negotiate at all with the patriarch but to present him with an ultimatum; and the consultation gave Cerularius his opportunity to deny absolutely the papal character of the mission, and to assert that it was a mere trick on the part of the excommunicated Argyros. The situation was worsened by the calamitous fact that barely had the legates reached Constantinople when St. Leo IX died (April 19, 1054), and the Holy See was effectively vacant for twelve months.

At Constantinople, then, the legates found the old emperor as favourable to their mission as they had hoped. The patriarch ignored them and, as yet, they ignored him. Then a violent controversy developed between Humbert and a learned monk of the Studion monastery, Nicholas Stethatos, which turned upon a pamphlet written six months earlier by Humbert. [] Nicholas had written, in reply, an attack upon the Latin practice of using unleavened bread, the Saturday fast and the celibacy of the clergy. Humbert now took the opportunity to make a violent assault on Nicholas. The controversy raged for some time, and it ended, so far as Nicholas was concerned, in a debate in the emperor's presence, at which the Latins were victorious, whereupon Nicholas submitted.

This was at the end of June, 1054. The patriarch still held aloof from the whole affair, steadily refusing the emperor's pleas to meet the legates. Very evidently the mission had come to the end of its usefulness. It might as well, now, return to Rome. But the legates, before they departed, resolved to excommunicate the patriarch. They prepared the bull and, on Saturday, July 16, during the sacred liturgy, they laid it on the altar at St. Sophia. Once again, alas, the maladroit pen of the Burgundian cardinal spoiled somewhat his excellent case. In the bull the traditional primacy of the Roman See is indeed re-affirmed, and the rights of the legates thence deriving; and the rectitude and orthodoxy of the emperor and his people are recognised. The one obstacle to peace is Michael, who styles himself patriarch, and his supporters. Their innumerable heresies are listed: there is in him, and them-it is declared -- something of the Simonists, the Donatists, the Arians and the Manichees; and they have corrupted the creed by suppressing the Filioque clause. [] Michael has refused to abjure and repent. He has refused audience to the legates; he has forbidden them to say mass; he has excommunicated the pope. Wherefore the legates pronounce against him the sentence already provided by St. Leo should he not submit.

The legates left for Rome two days later. But they were speedily recalled, by the emperor who, perhaps, still had hopes of reconciling Cerularius. On Wednesday, July 20, Humbert and his fellows were back in the capital. But before nightfall they were once more on the road to Rome, smuggled out of the city with great difficulty by Constantine, barely escaping with their lives. For the patriarch had not been inactive, since their first departure. He had made the bull of excommunication public, and "organised" the mob against this Latin insult. As a measure of appeasement the emperor had the bull ignominiously burned. and, now, while the legates made their slow way back to Italy the patriarch called a synod which condemned all that they had done -- not indeed as legates of the pope, for the synod denied that they were such, as it denied that the bull was the act of the Holy See. Cerularius next sent an official account of all this to the other Eastern patriarchs, and he also drew up a lengthy manifesto which set out the Eastern case against Rome. It is not now the Cardinal Humbert alone who is attacked, but all the Latins for the ways in which their practice differs from the East But, even so, there is no denial of the Roman claim to a primacy

over the whole Church of Christ. The manifesto however -- and this is the most serious thing about it, much more serious than the list of liturgical "errors" put in accusation -- is penetrated with the idea already noted in Cerularius' earlier attack, namely that the East has gone its own independent way for centuries now, and that reconciliation with Rome is in no way desirable or necessary. The Latins are a conventicle of heretics -- what has the orthodox church of the Greeks to do with such? Here, at Constantinople, under the protection of the patriarch and the emperor, is the sole authentic religion of Jesus Christ.

The Patriarch of Antioch endeavoured, even so, to bring back Cerularius to a more amenable frame of mind. He admitted the barbarism of the Latin ways, but urged that these were details that did not matter essentially. As for the faith of the Latins, every pilgrim who visited the churches of the East was testimony that it was identical with that of the Greeks. Patience where there were differences, and peaceful discussion, was the only way out of the tangle, so he thought; and he besought Cerularius to reflect whether the long tale of disasters that had befallen the empire was not the penalty for the long misunderstanding and separation from the Apostolic See. At any rate Cerularius ought to wait until the new pope was elected, and then approach him in a spirit of gentleness and charity.

Cerularius, however, kept to his way. He made no move whatever towards Rome. Life within his jurisdiction would once more go on as in the years before the problem of the Normans brought St. Leo IX and Constantine IX together. And Peter of Antioch did not insert the new pope's name in the mass.

Six months after the excommunication, Constantine IX died (January, 1055). Until August, 1056, his aged sister-in-law Theodora, the daughter of Basil II, ruled, at least in name. Michael VI, whom she named as her successor, lasted barely a year. It was Cerularius who engineered [he revolution that threw him out, and who "created" the new emperor, Isaac Comnenus (August, 1057). But Isaac, once securely placed, refused to be the patriarch's tool. Soon he began to plan his removal. Just before Christmas, 1058, he had Cerularius arrested and ordered his trial. But, worn out by the crisis and the shock, the patriarch suddenly died. Whereupon the popular voice spontaneously hailed him as a saint. The emperor was compelled to bring back

his body with great pomp, and himself to venerate it as that of a martyr. It was the beginning of a new career for Cerularius, of his influence as saint and martyr in the spiritual life of the Byzantine church and, above all, as a hero in the epic of its struggle with the tyrannical and heretical Latin barbarians. There was now a Byzantine myth about the events of 1054, as there was, in the Western chronicles, a Latin myth too. Upon these myths the animosity of the two races was largely to feed, and, in the next three centuries, to wax exceeding strong.

The bull of 1054 was no more than a personal excommunication of Cerularius, and, of course, of whoever adhered to him. It did not in any way condemn the Eastern churches nor their own local customs. But the whole of the Eastern churches now slid slowly into schism. Greek scorn of Latin ignorance and barbarity, [] national pride, a certain disgust at the scandals which for too long had disgraced Latin Catholicism, scandal at the developments which made the Latin bishop a civil prince and often, even, a general in the field -- all these helped to feed the fire. Within forty years of the excommunication came the Crusades, and the conflict of Greek and Latin interests and ambitions in the East. The treachery of the one, and the bloodthirstiness and rapine of the other, achieved the evil work. Never again, save for brief moments and under the stress of political necessity, were the Greeks to submit to that divine primacy which, whatever the occasional mistakes of the men in whom it was manifested, had been, for the Greeks too, the one bulwark against heresy and which had desired to be their defender also against the encroaching Christian State.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



3. . THE OFFENSIVE AGAINST ISLAM: SICILY, SPAIN, THE EAST. 106-1099

The solemn imperial assent, given at Worms, to the principle that the Church is spiritually autonomous, marks the end of the hardy papal offensive on a usurpation consecrated by centuries. It is one of several signs that the Church, and the civilisation of which it is the main force, has left behind it for ever one very definite phase of growth. Another such contemporary sign is the new successful Catholic offensive against Islam, an offensive undertaken in Spain, and also in those Eastern lands whence Islam had first issued forth to destroy a whole Christian empire. The popes who, in the West, have successfully challenged the hold of the civil power over spiritual things are the popes who organise and promote the first crusade.

The land where Our Lord was born and died had had a powerful attraction for the West from the time of the first Christian emperors. With Constantine's restoration of Jerusalem, with the discoveries of the holy places and of the true cross, Palestine became the goal of innumerable pious travellers. The pilgrimage was born; and a whole organisation of hospices and related services sprang up to meet its innumerable requirements. Nor did the later political chaos which wore down the empire in the West really lessen, either the attraction of the East, or the determination of thousands to make their way thither. Commercial relations between the East and the West went on uninterrupted; in every Western town of any importance " Syrian" merchants were to be found and Paris, even, at the end of the sixth century, had a Syrian for its bishop.

When, half-way through the seventh century, the armies of the new Arab religion destroyed the Christian power in the East, the difficulties of the long voyage were of course greatly increased. Nevertheless the pilgrimages persisted, and the systematic almsgiving organised for their support since the time of St. Gregory the Great. With Charlemagne there came the first attempt to win for the pilgrims a defined measure of security, through diplomatic action at the court of the caliphs. Harun-al-Raschid, in 807, gave the emperor a kind of recognition as the protector of all these Latin Christians, and the churches and

monasteries began to be restored. For the next two hundred years the pilgrims to Palestine enjoyed a kind of regulated security. Then came the half mad caliph, Hakim (1009-1020), who inaugurated a violent persecution of Jews and Christians alike, and destroyed the churches. The storm ended as abruptly as it had begun. Peace was restored, but under an entirely new regime. The protector henceforward was the Roman Emperor at Constantinople. It was under Byzantine influences that the new restoration took place and that the Christian quarter of Jerusalem was now fortified.

This change of protector was to be of immense importance in the near future, for it was barely made when, in 1054, the schism of Cerularius came to separate Constantinople from the West for ever. The pilgrimages, however, continued, organised henceforth on a scale that made them miniature invasions. In 1027, for example, a pilgrimage left Normandy that counted 700 members under the protection of the Duke. In 1035 the Duke himself led a great band. But the greatest of all was the pilgrimage of 1065, 12,000 strong, led by the Bishop of Bamberg -- a real military expedition which, more than once, had to fight for its life. Despite the new Greek prestige, the enthusiasm for these spiritual expeditions grew with every year, and the Latin churches and monasteries began to be rebuilt.

Then, in the last half of this same eleventh century, a new virile force appeared, to dominate the Mohammedan world in the East and to threaten, not merely the security of the pilgrimages, but the existence of Eastern Christianity itself. This force was the empire of the Seljuk Turks. At first the auxiliaries, and then the masters, of the Caliphs of Baghdad they began, from 1064, to conquer Asia Minor and the islands in the Aegean Sea from the Roman Empire in the East, and to menace Constantinople itself. At the same time, they attacked the hold of the Fatimite Caliphs of Cairo on Syria, and in the very year of their great victory at Manzikert over the emperor, Romanus IV, (1071) they took Jerusalem from the Fatimites. Thereupon the chivalrous idea began to develop in the West of a holy war to recover the East from the Turks.

To liberate Christians by force of arms -- for what other way was there? -- from the yoke of their Mohammedan conquerors had already, for some years, been an integral part of the papal

programme of religious restoration. And the papal interest in this had naturally shown itself first of all where the Mohammedan conquests were nearest to the popes, in Sicily and in Spain. The accident that the establishment of the Normans in the south of Italy coincided with a civil war in Sicily where three Mohammedan princes contended, made the Christian task here all the more easy. It was in 1060 that Robert Guiscard crossed the straits of Messina, and he fought the long war which followed as the sworn vassal of St. Peter, and under the banner blessed for him by Alexander II.

In Spain -- where the Mohammedans were still, after three hundred and fifty years, masters from Gibraltar to within less than a hundred miles of the Pyrenees -- there were also, midway through this same century, serious feuds among the Mohammedan rulers; while in the little kingdom of Castile there appeared in 1072 a great leader in the king Alphonso VI (1072-1109). Eight years before his accession the neighbouring King of Aragon, Sancho I (1063-1094) had led an army into the valley of the Ebro and had taken Barbastro -- an expedition significant in two ways of what was soon to come, for the king had the assistance of many French knights, and their presence in his army was due in part to the pope. It was Alexander II who was the real inspirer of what was, in effect, the first of the crusades. Not only, as in Sicily, did this army fight in Spain against the Moors under the pope's banner, but, anticipating the great act of Urban II thirty years later, the pope raised the character of the military activity by granting to all those who fought what we should call a plenary indulgence.

The expedition of 1063 ended, indeed, in failure. But Alexander II was preparing a renewal of it when, in 1173, he died. St. Gregory VII, who followed him, had been a main power in this as in Alexander's other policies. and for him too it remained one of the duties before the Holy See to provide for the liberation of Spain. But from now on and for some years, there were serious obstacles to check the good will of Gregory VII. The chief of these, of course, was the struggle with Henry IV of Germany that began Within three years of the pope's election and which, from thence on, more and more absorbed his whole attention. But there were serious difficulties also from within the little Christian kingdoms of the peninsula, Leon, Castile, Navarre, Aragon and the county of Barcelona. Here too there was urgent need of a

religious reformation, and the Church suffered from the same trio of evils that tried it elsewhere: clerical ill-living, simony, the lay control of ecclesiastical appointments. To root out these abuses the popes employed in Spain the services they found useful in Italy and France -- local councils over which papal legates presided, and the subjection of the local episcopate to more or less permanent resident legates. And here they came into conflict not only with Alphonso VI of Castile [] but with the great ecclesiastical system of Cluny also, nowhere better organised, more fruitful in good results or more powerful than in these frontier territories. When the war of reconquest began again, in 1079, the papacy had no share in it, and none therefore in Alphonso's great feat, the capture of Toledo in 1085, which had a sensational effect throughout all Europe.

After the spectacular capture of Toledo there was a strong Moorish reaction, and the early years of Urban II's pontificate are chiefly remarkable for the reconciliation which this Clunisian pope brought about between the Cluniacs in Spain and the papal legates. No pope could, through his antecedents, have been more interested personally in Spain than this one-time prior of Cluny and Urban has the great merit, too, that he brought to an end the animosity which had kept Castile and the papacy at arm's length for so many precious years. Finally, in the Spanish expeditions of 1089-1092, a great French soldier had emerged, Raymond, the Count of St. Gilles.

The papacy had, then, already quite an amount of practical experience of the hazards and difficulties of war against Mohammedans -- as well as a conviction of its real importance for the future of religion -- and Urban II himself was peculiarly well-placed to appreciate new projects when, at the council of Piacenza in March, 1095, envoys came to him from the Byzantine emperor Alexis I, begging for aid against the new enemy, the Seljuk Turks.

This was, of course, no appeal from a legendary land and a half-forgotten race. The papacy had never lost touch with Constantinople, despite the events of 1054; and to direct the Holy War to the East, as well as to the West, had very definitely been in the plans of St. Gregory VII at the outset of his reign. There was a friendly exchange of letters between this pope and the emperor Michael VII, in 1073, and a papal embassy was sent

to Constantinople. In 1074 the pope made an attempt, which failed entirely, to organise an army for the defence of the Byzantine empire. In language characteristic of Gregory's generous spirit the religious case for the crusade is set out here once and for all, "These pagans have made a vigorous onslaught on the Christian empire; they have pillaged and laid waste the whole land with unheard of cruelties up to the very gates of Constantinople. They have occupied these countries with tyrannical violence and massacred thousands and thousands of Christians like beasts. If, therefore, we have any love for God, if we are truly Christian people, the unhappy fate of this great empire and the deaths of so many Christians must be for us all a great anxiety. Our Lord's own example, who redeemed us, and the duty of Christian charity, bid us not only to lament these misfortunes, but also, if it be necessary, to give ourselves in sacrifice for our brethren." []

To this appeal not a single prince made any reply, and very soon came the long war with the German king to absorb all the pope's attention. But what Gregory VII had failed to do in 1074, his disciple and alter ego Urban II did achieve twenty years later.

Urban II's interest in Eastern affairs began in the first year of his reign, while the pope, still exiled from Rome, was busy in Sicily with the reorganisation of the Church in this newly-liberated land. He was, at this same time, in communication with the Byzantine emperor, tentatively suggesting a reconciliation between Rome and the Eastern Churches. It was from the pope that the first move had come; nothing less, indeed, than a complaint to the emperor that, without any synodal action to justify it, his name was no longer recited in the Holy Liturgy. From this unexpected, and somewhat embarrassing, communication, there rapidly developed, at Constantinople, an important controversy; and soon the whole case for and against the achievement of Cerularius was revived. The emperor, Alexis I, was favourable to a rapprochement with Rome; the bishops, generally, were against it. The emperor's reasons were political -- and so too were those of Urban II, anxious to ward off the menace of an understanding between Alexis, Henry IV and the anti-pope "Clement III".

A council at Constantinople decided finally for the emperor's point of view. The pope's name was restored to the diptychs and

he was invited to a council where the outstanding differences that kept East and West apart would be discussed. Our information about this episode goes no further, but relations between Urban II and Alexis I continued to be friendly, and it was wholly in keeping with this new spirit and with the events of the previous seven years that, in 1095, the emperor sent his appeal to the Council of Piacenza. []

In the months that intervened between that council and the one which followed at Clermont the pope had time to frame his policy, and to consult such experienced advisors as the Bishop of Le Puy and the Count of St. Gilles. When, in November, the council brought in to the ancient capital of Auvergne such an unprecedented host of lay enthusiasts, the pope was given the ideal setting for the publication of the new ideal. No doubt the circumstances fired him to make one of the great speeches of history. There were present at the council two hundred and sixty-four bishops, four hundred abbots, thousands of the lower clergy, and a vast multitude -- a hundred thousand it is said -- of nobles, knights and lesser folk. It was on November 27 that the pope made his famous speech. The text of it has not survived, but we know it was an appeal to the immense host before him to give themselves generously to deliver the Christians of the East from the new perils that beset them. The immediate result was an enthusiasm without limits and to the cry "God wills it" clerics, nobles, knights, and men of the people pressed forward to vow their lives, and to take as their badge that cross of red cloth from which came the name of Crusade.

It remained for the pope to organise this unprecedented enthusiasm into a definite fighting machine. To all who took the cross -- that is to say, to those who vowed to go to the Holy Land and fight for the deliverance of the holy places -- the pope granted plenary indulgence; whatever penances lay on them for past sins were remitted. The vow, once taken, was irrevocable; excommunication fell upon those who broke it. During the crusader's absence his property was under the Church's special protection and precautions were taken to save the would-be crusader from vowing himself without due premeditation. Monks were not to go without their abbot's permission. The faithful were bidder to take the advice of their clergy before enrolling themselves Young people were forbidden to go at all, and so, too, were married women. The Bishop of Le Puy was named as

the pope, legate to preside over the whole vast affair. Constantinople was appointed as the rendezvous; the feast of the Assumption 1096 as the time. Letters were sent to all the bishops of Christendom to enlist their help, a succession of councils was held throughout France and Italy, and finally preachers were appointed to stir up enthusiasm and enlist recruits even in the smallest towns and most remote villages. Never had Europe known, in any cause such a vast campaign of propaganda. []

The preaching of the crusade produced a result wholly unexpected by Urban II. In the pope's mind, the movement he had called into being was to be transformed into a disciplined military expedition led by the nobles of Christendom. [] But long before this organised force was ready, enormous hordes of simple peasants, raised to a pitch of extraordinary fervour by the extravagance of wandering preachers, confounding often enough the heavenly Jerusalem with that the pope designed to free, victim of all manner of apocalyptic fantasies, set out for the East. Poor men, weary of the endless oppression of their masters, broken by the strain of bad harvests, driven desperate by the hopelessness of a hard life, they readily listened to what seemed the offer of an easy way to the millennium, and, a vast, unorganised rabble, with their wives, children, and old people, all their movables stowed on the farm waggon, their oxen shod and harnessed to it, by thousands and by tens of thousands, they slowly made their way through southern Germany and Hungary. Necessity made them lawless; they pillaged and looted as they went. A misguided piety led them, more than once, to wholesale slaughter of such Jews as they encountered. Long before they reached the Byzantine frontier their acts of brigandage had roused whole populations against them. The march through Hungary was a series of massacres and fights. In Constantinople itself, what of the horde survived gave itself to plunder, even stripping the churches of their lead. When, finally, they crossed the Bosphorus into infidel territory the Turks speedily made an end of the most of them. It was a very small band indeed that survived with Peter the Hermit to welcome, at Constantinople, the arrival of the real official crusaders six months later.

The military expedition was made up of four great divisions- Lorrainers, Germans, and northern French under Godfrey of

Bouillon; Normans and other Frenchmen from the north under Robert of Normandy, William the Conqueror's eldest son. Provencaux under Raymond of Provence (whom the legate accompanied); and the Normans of southern Italy under the command of Robert Guiscard's eldest son, Bohemond. After varying adventures and disasters, the last of these armies arrived before Constantinople in May, 1097 -- nine months later than the appointed date. All was now ready for the Christian attempt to roll back Islam after its four hundred years, occupation of Christian lands.

It must be borne in mind that the condition of the Mohammedan world in 1096 was eminently favourable to the crusaders. Asia Minor, and Syria, too, were but recent conquests of the Turks. The populations were hostile to them, and the immediate military problem was that of disposing of the occasional Turkish garrisons scattered among their new, still hostile subjects. Moreover, since 1092, the Seljuks had lost their military unity. Where, until then, one powerful figure had dominated their world, four of his generals now disputed the succession. Asia Minor and Syria were each of them practically independent states. Syria especially, torn by a civil war between rival emirs, was in poor condition to resist the new invasion. The Mohammedan State in Egypt, by no means resigned to its defeat by the Turks twenty years earlier, was making from the south efforts to regain its ancient hold; and the very year that saw the crusade victorious at Antioch also saw the Turks defeated by the Egyptians at Jerusalem which, in 1098, reverted to Egypt after twenty-seven years.

Given competent leadership, it could only be a matter of time before the enormous crusading army defeated the weakened force of Islam. But to defeat the Mohammedans, it was already beginning to be apparent, was only half the problem. How much of the piety that had sent the crusaders into battle would remain to inspire their handling of the fruits of victory? The motives of Urban II and of the thousands who, at his appeal, took the cross were nothing but religious. So far the crusade was a gigantic, universal act of faith. Around this core of spirituality elements of more mixed quality soon gathered. There were merchants of one kind or another to whom the huge expedition offered undreamed-of opportunities of sudden commercial expansion; there were the adventurers and speculators whom every age has known

and knows; and there were the ambitions and rival interests of the different princes and states to whom the actual conduct of operations was necessarily entrusted. Three princes especially, even before the expedition crossed into Asia, had already made their plans. Bohemond aimed at a kingdom with Antioch for its centre. Baldwin of Flanders -- brother to Godfrey of Bouillon -- who detested Bohemond, would check him and establish a rival state at Edessa. Raymond of Provence, equally suspicious of Bohemond, would counteract his influence by his principality of Tripoli. The Italian merchant states, Genoa, Pisa and Venice, supplying much of the shipping and serving the armies with trading supplies, also looked to their compensating profits, to concessions and trading privileges in the new states. The conduct of the crusade must, in the nature of things, be entrusted to these states and princelings. The possibility, if not the certainty, was already present that they would use the great opportunity, and all that the faith of thousands had to offer, for their own personal aggrandisement, Christians still being not wholly Christian in their detachment.

And already, too, another cloud darkened the prospects of the future -- the attitude towards the crusade of the emperor at Constantinople. It is true that, more than once, he had made appeals for help to the West. But that help, for all that it had now arrived, had not come in the way he had planned. He had looked for reinforcements, to be at his orders, in the reconquest of the lost provinces. What had happened was the arrival of huge independent armies capable of conquering not only the Turks but also, perhaps, what the Turks had left unconquered of the imperial domain. The emperor's plans and the aim of the crusade -- to say nothing of the personal ambitions of the different princes -- were at variance. There could never be anything but mutual suspicion and continual conflict, the emperor striving always by diplomatic shifts to neutralise the crusaders' superior force, and the exasperation of the crusaders steadily growing though a hundred years until, finally, they made themselves masters of Constantinople too.

In May, 1097, the Catholic army crossed into Asia, and after a fortnight's siege the first of the Turkish strongholds fell to it -- Nicea. A fortnight later, at Dorylaeum, they routed the field army of the local sultan. The way through Asia Minor now lay open to them, and by October they were before the walls of Antioch. It

was eight months before they reduced the city, and scarcely had they done so, slaughtering the garrison, when the victors were themselves besieged by a relieving Turkish army. They were utterly unprepared. In a few days plague and famine carried off a hundred thousand of their men. Many of the leaders made their way out of the apparently doomed city, and then the miraculous discovery of the Holy Lance that had pierced the side of Our Lord, revived the crusaders' confidence. Heartened by what all took as an evident sign of divine guidance, a bold sally planned by Bohemond put the besiegers to flight (June 28, 1098).

Nothing remained but to march on Jerusalem. It was, however, a good nine months before that march began, and the main cause of the delay was the quarrel between Bohemond and Raymond of Provence over the possession of Antioch. The legate, who might have been allowed to settle the matter, had died. Raymond, seeing the prize escape, began the first treacherous negotiations with the Byzantines, preferring to see them masters rather than his rival. Finally Bohemond was left in possession and in April, 1099, the crusade -- its rank and file weary of the costly sacrifice to the vanity of its leaders -- set out on the last stage of the journey.

Negotiations had been opened, a year before this, with the Egyptians, and it had been agreed that the crusaders were to have Jerusalem. But since that promise the Egyptians had themselves regained it (August, 1098) and when on June 6, 1099, after three years of marching and fighting, the Catholic army came before the Holy City there lay before it yet another siege. It was a siege of short duration. After another, alleged, vision in which the deceased legate appeared to one of the Provencal army, and after a great penitential procession, when the army, barefoot, made the circuit of the walls, while the enemy jeered and derided from the battlements, the assault was begun (July 14). The next day the crusaders were in, the defence forced at various points. It was the signal for one of the most frightful massacres of history. The victors killed all they met, soldiers and inhabitants, men, women and children, and their horses splashed through streets that ran in blood. After four hundred and sixty years of Mohammedan rule Jerusalem was once more in Christian hands. Urban II died just a fortnight later, before he had learnt of this final triumph.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



4. THE MONASTIC RENAISSANCE: CHARTREUSE, CITEAUX, PREMONTRE

Throughout the last years of the century the movement of monastic revival continued to go forward. One of its most notable fruits was the foundation of the order of hermits we know as the Carthusians. They were the outcome of the holy life of one of the great scholars of the eleventh century, Bruno of Cologne. He came of a noble family and was educated in the schools of Rheims and Paris. At Cologne, in 1055, he was ordained priest and returning to Rheims, became head of the school of theology there and a famous preacher. Among his students was the future Urban II. In 1067 Rheims received as its archbishop a prelate who had bought his appointment. Bruno, now chancellor, was in the end compelled to denounce openly the scandals of the regime and a struggle began that only ended with the archbishop's deposition in 1082. Bruno was the obvious man to succeed him, but for years Bruno's secret desire had been a life of solitude and penance. He now took the opportunity to end his academic career. He resigned his offices and his benefices and retired to the strict Benedictine abbey of Molesmes -- whence, sixteen years later, the Cistercian order was to develop. Molesmes, however, did not meet Bruno's needs and his quest next led him to the frightful solitude of the Chartreuse in the diocese of Grenoble. Here in 1084 he began the way of life around which the new order grew up. The election of his old pupil as pope, in 1088, interrupted his solitude for a time for Urban II called him to Italy and the Curia. After four years he was, however, allowed to resume his religious life, and he founded a second Chartreuse in Sicily. Here in 1101 he died.

St. Bruno left behind him a collection of sermons and, fruits of his scriptural studies, commentaries on the Psalms and on St. Paul's epistles. He did not leave a rule. It was not until half-way through the next century that Gigue, his fourth successor as prior of the Chartreuse, set down in writing the customs and way of life of St. Bruno and his disciples. The new monasticism was an ingenious combination of the hermit life and that of the cloister. All the monks lived within the monastery, but each monk had for himself his own separate hermitage where he lived, worked, prayed and slept. They only met in common for

the daily solemnities of the divine office and for an occasional meal. It was -- and it remains -- a life of unremitting penance and severe austerity, the monks having no contact of any kind with the outside world.

The order took root slowly. Not until 1115 was the first new foundation made. By 1140 there were eleven in all, by the end of the century another twenty-five, and by the end of the thirteenth century a total of seventy-three. For a time each monastery was autonomous, and under the control of the local bishop. Gradually the principle of association took root. In 1142, when the first general chapter was held, five only of the charterhouses were exempt from the bishop's jurisdiction. Alexander III did much to assist the movement. During his pontificate all the houses obtained exemption, and in 1177 he gave the general chapter jurisdiction over all of them.

More immediately important in the public life of the time, than this new order of hermits, was a contemporary reform in the ancient order of monks who followed the rule of St. Benedict which, from the Latin name of the first monastery where it was adopted -- Citeaux -- we know as the Cistercian rule.

For two centuries now the great influence of Cluny had dominated Western monastic life, and gradually the influence of time had introduced new developments. The monks were no longer laymen. Most of them were priests. Study, and still more the performance of the sacred liturgy, were their chief occupation. Manual work had shrunk before the demands of these more important tasks. The hours in the monk's day which it once had filled were now taken up with the solemn ritual of public prayer. The offices were lengthened and multiplied. Scarcely half an hour intervened after one finished before the next began. By the end of the eleventh century the Cluniac monk lived most of his life in the abbey church. This concentration of effort on the liturgy was the source from which flowed a whole renaissance of ritual, music and art. The Cluniac church was richly decorated, the mass and offices sung with stately pomp, the vestments and church furnishings were costly and elaborate. Public prayer took on a splendour it had never known before.

But in some respects Cluny's development had, perhaps, been

too richly bought. The great confederation of priories over which the Abbot of Cluny ruled supreme, a kind of monastic pope, had, inevitably, grown in wealth as it grew in influence. The collective work, through centuries, of individuals vowed to live poorly, must end in the accumulation of wealth. On the other hand the possession of wealth by persons vowed to be poor -- even though it be but collective wealth and in no way enrich the life of the individual -- is always something of a stumbling block for certain people. No matter how lawful the origin of the wealth, no matter how well it is used, its possession will always, with these, militate against the spiritual usefulness of its owners. And, of course, this monastic wealth was not always well used. Though Cluny remained substantially faithful to its ideals, there were houses of the federation where fidelity to the rule left much to be desired. Cluny had, moreover, liberally adapted to northern conditions the provisions of the rule regarding the monks, dress and food-an adaptation for which St. Benedict himself had provided.

In every association there are to be found critics who long to restore the primitive observance, souls for whom modification spells relaxation, and for whom a return to the literal following of the first rule seems the only way of correcting what is wrong, and of safeguarding the future of their common ideal. Hence, as the eleventh century drew to its close, a variety of movements began within the Benedictine world, reacting against the development associated with Cluny, and all aiming at a greater simplicity of life. The movement of Citeaux was merely one of these -- and for a long time it was not the most successful. But Citeaux, proposing merely to restore the life planned by St. Benedict, ended by producing a new religious order -- the first religious order founded as such.

The pioneer of the new reform was Robert, Abbot of Molesmes. St. Robert had been all his life an enthusiast for the strict observance of the Benedictine rule. Molesmes itself had been founded-as recently as 1075 and St. Robert was its first abbot -- as a house of strict discipline. But gradually the mitigations which contemporary monasteries found necessary were introduced here too, and by 1090, although not a lax community, it was indistinguishable from its neighbours. Whence the beginnings of discontent among the surviving founders, and a period of restlessness, which the abbot determined to end by

leaving, with such of the monks as preferred the harder life, to found -- with the sanction of the papal legate -- a new house at Citeaux, a dreary solitude in Burgundy. This was on St. Benedict's day -- March 21, 1098.

For a short twelve months there was peace, until the monks at Molesmes, their reputation lost by the rumours that they had driven out the saints of the community, besought the abbot to return and, to make certain his consent, the monks brought pressure to bear from the pope. In July, 1099, then, Robert went back to Molesmes, succeeded at Citeaux -- still a mere collection of cabins -- by the monk who had been his prior at Citeaux and, before that, at Molesmes. This was St. Alberic, and to him the reform owed its first set regulations and its habit which, in striking contrast to tradition, was white.

Alberic ruled for ten years and then there succeeded the onetime sub-prior of Molesmes, the Englishman, Stephen Harding, the real founder of the order to be. It was under St. Stephen that silk and gold were banished from the ecclesiastical life of Citeaux; vestments henceforward were of linen, chalices at best of silver, candlesticks and thuribles of iron, the crosses of wood; the church was bare of pictures or painted glass. The monk's dress was just as St. Benedict -- legislating six hundred years earlier -- had prescribed in his own gentler climate. The warmer underclothing, the furs, the extra garments with which Cluny had adapted the primitive austerity, were abolished. From the dietary meat, fish, eggs, cheese, butter and white bread were banished entirely. Vegetables only and coarse bread, with oil and salt as condiments, and water for sole drink were all the Cistercian allowed himself. The offices were deliberately shortened, and the time gained was given to manual labour -- the labour of reclaiming the barren waste and swamps where the monastery lay, seven hours a day from October to Easter, six hours during the summer. For sleep six hours in all was allowed, on a rude bed, clad in the habit, and this short spell was broken by the night office. For spiritual reading two hours daily was allowed, in summer three. Recreation, even in the monastic sense, there was none. Except when necessity called for it the Cistercian never spoke. Since the days when the last of the Irish monasteries adopted the rule of St. Benedict, nothing so austere had been proposed as the ordinary life of a monastic community.

But the new monks differed, in one very important respect, from those earlier ascetics. Citeaux was not a centre of intellectual life: it was an association of penitents; and for all that the chief influence in its foundation, St. Stephen, was a man of quite unusual learning, the prosecution of learning formed no part of the Cistercian vocation. Nor did the apostolate. The Cistercians became apostles, as they reclaimed the barren lands -- accidentally. They were founded to pray and to make amends for their sins. Their monasteries were to be planted in desolate solitudes, away from mankind; nor were they to possess more property than what was needed for the monks' penitential labour and their scanty support. The property would never, it was hoped, become such a distraction to the monastic life as in the great houses of Cluny which, often enough, were the centres of all life, social and economic, no less than religious, for the district in which they were placed. Another, most important, innovation was the institution of lay brothers to whom might be committed the care of the monasteries' inevitable contacts with the secular world, lest the monks in time might come to lose their primitive fervour. It is not surprising to read that, as this regime developed, the new foundations ceased to attract vocations. Less than fifteen years after the flight from Molesmes, Citeaux seemed fated to perish. Its history would have been that of yet another heroic effort that had ended with the pioneers who promoted it, but in 1113 there came to the abbey, demanding admission as novices, a band of thirty young men drawn from the noblest families of Burgundy, at their head Bernard, a young man of twenty-three. This spate of recruits was the turning point of Citeaux's fortunes, and in Bernard it received the saint whose genius was to dominate all Catholic life for the next forty years.

Immediately new foundations began to be made, La Ferte in 1113, Pontigny in 1114, Clairvaux and Morimond in 1115. The Carta Caritatis, the constitution regulating the relation of the new houses to Citeaux, was published four years later, and the rule of life. Thenceforward the order grew as no order before had grown. From the four first foundations others were made in swift succession. There were nineteen houses in 1122, seventy by the time St. Stephen died (1134) -- fifty-five of them in France -- 350 nineteen years later at the death of St. Bernard, of which sixty-eight were due to St. Bernard himself, and 530 houses in all by

the end of the century; the speed of the development was such as to alarm the very founders. Not all of these houses were new foundations. Often an abbey of Benedictines or a college of Canons Regular passed over in a body to the new life.

It remains to say something of the feature which marked the Cistercian movement as little less than revolutionary in the history of monasticism. St. Stephen Harding's plan for a congregation of monasteries was not new. To omit other examples, Cluny against which Citeaux may be said to have reacted, is an obvious instance. But though Cluny had first developed the idea of submitting all the monasteries to a common power, it had not, in so doing, retained that autonomy of the individual monastery which is the very heart of Benedictine monasticism. In Cluny's system each monk did indeed remain subject to his abbot, but there was only one abbot, the Abbot of Cluny. St. Stephen devised the happy compromise that the Cistercian abbot, for all his subordination, was the real head of his own autonomous monastery. Nor was the Abbot of Citeaux the personage that the Abbot of Cluny had been and still remained. The real power in the new foundation was the general chapter of all the abbots which was to meet annually at Citeaux. [] The supervision of the abbots, the task of visitation to enquire into the observance of what the chapters decreed, was left to the four abbots of the first four foundations, each for the houses that derived from his own. The Abbot of Citeaux was supervised by these four acting jointly. When an abbot died his successor was not appointed from Citeaux, but elected by the monks of the abbey concerned, together with the abbots of its daughter houses and the abbot visitor. Such is the striking innovation of the great English Cistercian, destined, in time, to affect, in some degree, every other religious order. Between Citeaux and its innumerable daughter houses there was no other link but that of charity. There were no taxes, no tributes, nor dues of any kind. The order was a federation of monasteries all accepting, and bound to, the customs, uses and liturgy of Citeaux, to the rule of St. Benedict as Citeaux had re-proclaimed it and as the Chapters-General interpreted it. A new force of immense magnitude had entered Christendom.

Side by side with the new monasticism of Citeaux, there developed the order of the Canons Regular of Premontre, whose founder, Norbert of Gennepe, was in his later life closely

associated with St. Bernard.

St. Norbert, born in 1080, was German and, although a cleric and canon of the collegiate church of Xanten, in the lower Rhineland, he lived the life of a worldly noble at the imperial court. It was not in fact until his thirty-fifth year that a miracle halted his career of dissipation, and turned him from a worldling to a penitent and a reformer. He now received holy orders, and after a vain attempt to persuade his colleagues at Xanten to embrace a more regular observance, he withdrew from the world for three years to prepare himself in solitude for the life of preaching to which he had resolved to give himself.

This novitiate over he began to tour the villages of the Rhineland, preaching ceaselessly penance for sin and amendment of life, healing feuds and reconciling enemies. Inevitably he met with opposition, and the Council of Fritzlar, in 1118. condemned him for preaching without proper authorisation. Whereupon Norbert, giving his property to the poor, left Germany for France and the pope, Gelasius II, who, at St. Gilles in Languedoc, sanctioned his way of life and gave him licence to preach. From this moment the saint's real vocation was determined, a life of poverty and austerity while he moved from place to place preaching ceaselessly, not Latin sermons to monks but exhortations in the vernacular to the laity.

Disciples gradually came to him and, in 1119, he was at Rheims begging the new pope -- Calixtus II -- to renew the permission given by his predecessor. The pope, willing enough to bless the good work, showed himself none too enthusiastic as to the chances of the survival of this organisation of itinerant preaching ascetics. It was in the pope's cousin, Bartholomew of St. Vir, Bishop of Laon, that the little group found its first really influential patron. He did much to win the pope round to a more active support, and he insisted that Norbert should make some kind of foundation in his diocese and help in the great work of clerical reform. The first settlement, in the church of St. Martin at Laon, did not succeed. As at Xanten, the chapter had no desire to embrace a better life. Finally Norbert fixed on the desolate solitude of Premontre, not far from Laon, where, in circumstances that recall the first days of Citeaux, the settlement of the new institute took shape.

St. Norbert was a canon and, in so far as he is a reformer of clerical living, he is directly a reformer of chapters. Premontre and the numerous houses which in imitation of it now began to be founded, were not monasteries: they were houses where lived in common observance the canons who served the churches attached to them. The canon was, by definition, a cleric who, if not already a priest, was in process of becoming a priest. The church he served was not merely the rendezvous for the general spiritual exercises of a community vowed to penance, but a centre of active pastoral work. Canons were parochial clergy, and the effect of the movement that began at Premontre was to introduce into the lives of such clergy something of the systematic asceticism which, from the beginning, had been of the very essence of monasticism. The canons of Premontre lived as severely as did the monks of Citeaux. For the first fifty years of the order every day was a fast day; even after the mitigation then introduced, they fasted daily from Holy Cross [] to Easter. They never ate meat. They lived in perpetual silence. But while the Cistercian's life ended with his monastery the Premonstratensian, by institution and not by development merely, must have ever in view the life of the mission.

The candidate who offered himself at Citeaux need not even be able to read, but in the first statutes of the canons of Premontre it is laid down that, first of all, the newcomer's knowledge is to be tested. Again a knowledge of Grammar and Latin is required before he can be clothed, and progress in knowledge is made a condition of ordination. Study is part of the canon's day -- a prescription of the rule directly traceable to the rule of St. Victor at Paris; each house has its librarian and, from the beginning, there are instituted definite courses of study.

St. Norbert's personal share in all this organisation is not too clear. The foundation at Premontre did not, by any means, bring to an end his active itinerant apostolate. The foundation, it has been said, was a place that saw him only at intervals. Then, in 1126, he was forced into high office as Archbishop of Magdeburg, and for the last eight years of his life he was inevitably caught up in the movement of ecclesiastical politics. He played in Germany much the same role that St. Bernard played in France, securing to the cause of Innocent II the support of the emperor Lothair, and checking the same emperor

when he showed a disposition to reopen the questions settled at Worms. With Norbert there went to Magdeburg his own Premonstratensians, and the city once more became a centre of missionary work for the conversion of the obstinately pagan peoples of the countrysides beyond the Elbe. Further Germany, Poland, and Scandinavia were to be strongholds of the new order down to the Reformation. With the Cistercians, and in these lands even more than the Cistercians, they must be counted one of the main forces of social development too, and civilisation.

So long as St. Norbert lived, [] his personal influence and example sufficed for a rule. But once the episcopate claimed him, and even more once he was dead, the order began to develop somewhat away from his plan. Here we must be cautious in assertion, for the rule now drawn up by Norbert's successor, Hugh of Fosses, was the work of the saint's most intimate friend. It seems beyond doubt, however, that the itinerant preaching now disappeared. The statutes nowhere make any mention of it. Also the canons do not merely serve the particular church attached to their house -- the monastery church so to call it -- but they serve, singly and in groups, the parishes founded by the abbey on its domain or on the adjacent domains. The development has begun that makes the Premonstratensian abbey the first seminary for the training of a parochial clergy. The success of the organised institution was equal to that of the contemporary Cistercians. It answered to a practical need of the day. In the time of Hugh of Fosses alone, two hundred abbeys were founded, and by the end of the century there were thousands of these white canons serving parishes on all the marches of Christendom.

The rule of the order was eclectic. Its basis was the so-called rule of St. Augustine. It borrowed from St. Benedict, and it borrowed from St. Victor at Paris. In its organisation the order had much in common with Citeaux. Each house was ruled by an abbot whom the canons of the house -- those engaged in work outside together with the actual community -- elected, under the supervision of the abbot of the house whence the electing house was first founded. The abbot's powers were very wide, but he was subject to visitation from the Abbot of Premontre or his deputy -- one appointed for each province -- and subject also to the General Chapter. It was the abbot who named all the officials

of his abbey, the Prior, Sub-Prior and, a particular invention of Premontre, the Circator -- an official charged to watch over the general observance of the rule. In the order the Abbot of Premontre, Dominus Praemonstratensis, was a great figure. He was a kind of primate but his primacy was modelled on Citeaux, rather than on Cluny. His rule of his own abbey was controlled by visitation from the first three daughter houses of Premontre and in his rule of the order he was subject to the General Chapter.

From the beginning there were also Premonstratensian nuns, and for a time some of the abbeys were dual -- an abbey of canons and an abbey of nuns sharing a common church. From the beginning, too, there were lay brothers, homines illiterati, to whom was committed the exploitation of the domain and the necessary material cares of the abbey, and for whom, on that account, there was a milder rule of fast and abstinence.

One last point merits special notice. The chief scene of St. Norbert's labours in the years that followed the great foundation of 1120 was northern France and Belgium, then infected with heresy of a virulently anti-sacramental type. Antwerp in particular was notorious for it, and for a long time the whole city was under the dominion of such a heretic, Tanchelm or Tanchelin, an anticlerical visionary of a semi-religious, semi-social type. One of the doctrines Tanchelm most strenuously opposed was that of the real presence of Our Lord in the Holy Eucharist. St. Norbert's sermons against Tanchelm on this point give him a place among the very first of the saints who built their spiritual teaching around the Blessed Sacrament, and his special devotion to the Mass finds many traces in the early rule and practices of the order.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



5. THE RENAISSANCE OF CATHOLIC THOUGHT

The century which followed the disappearance of Erigena was intellectually, the most sterile of all the long transitional period. Of any writers in the first half of it (c. 880-930) literally no record at all has survived. The life of the second half is perhaps best seen in Gerbert, head of the school at Rheims, Abbot of Bobbio (982) Archbishop of Rheims (991), of Ravenna (996), and pope, as Silvester II, from 998 to 1003. Gerbert was, like Alcuin and Rabanus Maurus, a man of encyclopaedic knowledge. He had studied in Spain, and was a famous mathematician, but he is chiefly important as a teacher. One of his pupils, Fulbert, became Bishop of Chartres and under his rule the school of Chartres became the first great nursery of the revival of intellectual life.

The school first attained a more than local fame through Fulbert's own pupil, Berengarius (999-1089), whose philosophising led him into a controversy, about the nature of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, which lasted for thirty years and more. The controversy had a more general importance in that it raised, for the first time for centuries, the bitterly disputed question as to whether it was lawful to use the secular science of dialectic to scrutinise and explain the teachings of faith. Berengarius was typical of the passionate enthusiasm of this first generation to learn again the rules of logic. Its formal rules were, indeed, almost all that was known of the Aristotelian philosophy to the men of this time. This new instrument they must apply universally, and Berengarius turned to examine with it the traditional faith of the Church that Jesus Christ is really present in the Holy Eucharist. Berengarius -- for whom the conclusions of his dialectic were the ultimate source of truth, and to whose mind no accident could exist in separation from its proper substance -- from the fact that in the Holy Eucharist the appearances of bread and wine continue after the consecration, deduced that the bread and wine still continued to exist. Jesus Christ was really present, he thought. but in the bread and wine.

His great opponent was Lanfranc of Pavia (1005-1089), Prior of Bec in Normandy and later (1070) Archbishop of Canterbury. For years the discussions continued, Berengarius condemned

repeatedly in different councils, yielding each time, signing the required retractions and then publishing explanations of his retractions that emptied them of all meaning. Into the controversy two of the great figures of the reform movement were drawn -- Gregory VII and St. Peter Damian. It was Gregory VII, as the legate Hildebrand, who presided over the stormy council of Sens in 1054 at which Berengarius was heard and from which he was cited to Rome, and who, as pope, in 1079, accepting as sincere his latest profession of faith, took the old theologian into his special protection So far as the Holy See was concerned this ended the controversy; but in France the discussion as to the sincerity of Berengarius continued as long as he lived.

St. Peter Damian's intervention in this confused affair was of quite another kind. Berengarius, thanks to a certain mastery of the arts of grammar and logic, had thrown doubts on the traditional belief about the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist. What else could be expected if men presumed to examine and discuss what the very angels could only adore? The first grammarian obviously was the devil, teaching the first man and woman to decline "God" in the plural; [] and to apply the profane sciences to the things of God was an outrage whence serious troubles were bound to follow.

There was evidently urgent need for the nature and office of reason to be made clear; and for its relations to belief to be set forth in such a way that the mischief of the confused hostility to intellectual activity, to which St. Peter Damian, among others, bore witness, might be arrested. In this useful task, which was to occupy all the efforts of all the thinkers from now on until St. Thomas, one of the pioneers was Lanfranc, with his careful insistence that a distinction must be made between the art of logic and its misuse. Between that art and the teaching of faith there is no opposition and, rightly used, the art assists belief and confirms it.

The controversy that centred round Berengarius was a kind of preliminary skirmish in which the parties who were to fight the long triangular battle of the next two hundred years made their first appearance; the philosophers, using an imperfect knowledge of what reason is, and reasoning, to criticise the traditional doctrine; the theologians denying the lawfulness of

any application of philosophical methods to explain the traditional doctrine; and the middle party whom the conflict between the traditional doctrine and the results of the re-discovered dialectic urges to an ever deeper study Or the dialectic and, ultimately, to a truer understanding of what the human reason is, what its province, and what its limitations.

The first great name in the development of the middle party was also a contemporary of Berengarius, St. Anselm. Like Lanfranc he was from the north of Italy, born in 1033 at Aosta, and, again like Lanfranc, a monk of Bec, where, indeed, in 1063 he had succeeded Lanfranc as prior. Thirty years later he succeeded his old master in a still more distinguished post when he was named Archbishop of Canterbury by William II. For the remaining sixteen years of his life (he died in 1109) he is perhaps the chief figure of English history, leading in England that fight for reform and for the emancipation of religion from State control the story of which, in continental Europe, has already occupied us. []

St. Anselm, in whom something of the spirit of St. Augustine comes to life again, wrote his first book -- the Monologium -- to satisfy the monks of Bec who asked for a treatise on God in which all the proofs should be from reasoning and, as far as possible not based on the authority of Sacred Scripture. From the beginning then the author is led to propound a theory of the relation between reason and belief, and to set forth their respective roles The teachings of the Faith are for him data beyond all discussion, facts and realities which reason must understand and interpret. Belief in them is the necessary preliminary to understanding their content. But such belief is not the end of man's concern with the mysteries of the Faith. There is a duty of using the reason -and therefore the art of dialectic -- to explore ever more deeply the meaning and implications of what is believed. It is not enough to say that the Fathers have already explained as much as is necessary. Had they lived longer they would have explained more. Much still awaits explanation, nor does God ever cease to enlighten the Church. How far can reason go in this matter of explaining revelation? Can it, ultimately, be expected to explain everything? Here St. Anselm shows himself optimistic. His confidence in the power of reasoning knows no limits. Even the mysteries of the Incarnation and the Trinity are proper fields for the operation of

this explanatory dialectic which is not unable to prove the existence of both. This exaggeration of the role of reason, due to an imperfect understanding of what reason is and of the nature of rational proof, is a serious weakness in St. Anselm's work. But the distinction between reason and belief and the delimitation of their respective domains -- a distinction between philosophy and theology as sciences -- is an immense advance in methodology on their identification by Erigena, the last constructive thinker to appear before St. Anselm

The chief contribution of St. Anselm to the philosophical revival is his carefully worked out system of Natural Theology, rational proofs of the existence of God and deductions thence as to God's attributes, His relation to the universe in general and to man in particular. The saint's proofs of the existence of God, the famous proof based on the possibility of our conceiving the idea of God as the Being than whom nothing is greater, brought him into controversy with another monk, Gaunilo of Marmoutier.

Another contemporary thinker against whom St. Anselm wrote was Roscelin, and with this controversy begins the history of the medieval contribution to a problem related to that of the relations between reason and belief, the problem, namely, of the value of general judgements or universals. How can we -- since all our experience is of the individual, the particular -- justify our formulation of judgements which are universal? Such general judgements are the basis of all scientific knowledge. Can they really be said to be true? and in what sense? Do universals really exist? This immensely important question had come to the medieval thinkers through the translation by Boethius of Porphyry's introduction (Isagoge) to one of Aristotle's treatises on Logic, the Categories.

Porphyry stated the problem but, since it was not a purely logical problem (and not a matter for beginners in logic) offered no solution. Boethius summarised the solutions of both the Platonist and the Aristotelian schools. The solution indeed, whatever it was, would have far-reaching effects. Ultimately-although, as is often the case, those who first attempted a solution did not suspect these ramifications -- the solution must involve the whole philosophical position, reaching speedily from logic to metaphysics. For thinkers who were Catholics their solution would also determine the character of their whole

philosophical exposition and defence of revelation. On the solution they adopted was to depend, ultimately, the future of Catholic Theology. More immediately, what was involved was the prestige of Platonism as the Catholic philosopher's instrument in explaining scientifically the data of faith. According to the Platonic philosophy, universals really existed as such, in another world. The individuals which exist in this, our own, world, and of which alone we have experience, reflect the natures of these elsewhere-existent universals. It was this opinion of the nature of universals which had so far prevailed. It was, for example, adopted by Erigena.

Now, in the last half of the eleventh century, thanks to Roscelin, a new explanation began to compete with it. Roscelin (born in 1050) was a pupil of John the Physician who was himself, like Berengarius, a pupil of Fulbert of Chartres. It is apparently not easy to define exactly Roscelin's contribution to the discussion since all we know of his thought we know from the writings of his opponents. But this much is certain that, for him, it is the individual alone who possesses reality: universals are merely words. Men exist: mankind is merely a name, a mental construction devised to assist thought. Roscelin next proceeded to apply his theory to the mystery of the Trinity, much as Berengarius had attempted to philosophise about the Holy Eucharist. The result was an explanation of the mystery that was indistinguishable from a theory that the three persons are three Gods, the one divine nature of the three persons being a universal, and therefore only a name, the reality being the three divine persons. Roscelin was condemned at Soissons in 1092, and at Rheims two years later. He retracted, apparently, his theories on the Trinity, but, unmolested by authority, continued to teach his nominalistic logic until his death.

This opening of the controversy on universals at the close of the eleventh century is the first great event of the new intellectual life. [] The appearance of Peter Abelard among the masters is a second. Abelard was born in Brittany in 1079. He studied at Paris under William of Champeaux, at Laon under Anselm of Laon, and at Compiègne under Roscelin. It is hard to exaggerate the ascendancy so speedily gained by this bright and gifted spirit over the student world of his time. A passion for hard work, a mastery of dialectic that made him an invincible adversary imagination and the artist's temperament all

combined to make Abelard's genius a brightly coloured legend even in his own lifetime. His education was hardly finished before his debating skill routed one after another of the great men of the day. Wherever he opened a school students deserted the official school to enrol themselves as his pupils. He was little more than thirty when he succeeded his recent victim, William of Champeaux, as the chief of the school at Paris. Then came the great tragedy, his falling in love with his pupil, Heloise, the birth of their child, the secret marriage, his mutilation at the hands of her guardian. Abelard resigned his post, became a monk at St. Denis and, after a few more turbulent years of success and failure, went into retirement (I 125).

Abelard was not a profoundly original thinker like St. Anselm, nor a great organiser of knowledge like Erigena. But he had an understanding of Aristotle's theory of knowledge that surpassed anything hitherto known, and he was one of the greatest teachers of all time. His influence here far exceeded what his books alone might have effected. A worker, and a master who produced other workers, he was responsible for the greatest impetus so far given to the work of the logical reconstruction of Theology.

Of all his books the *Sic et Non* is, from this point of view, the most important, for with it there appears for the first time the methodology which comes to perfection in the *Summa* of St. Thomas. It consists in setting side by side judgements from the Fathers, or from Sacred Scripture, that are apparently contradictory. Authority being at variance with itself the student can only solve the problem by reasoning. Abelard, in this, is an early precursor of St. Thomas. His theory of the role of reason in matters of faith is that of St. Anselm. Not philosophy, but the traditional faith is the all-important thing. "I have no desire to be a philosopher in contradiction with St. Paul," he wrote to Heloise, "nor an Aristotle separated from Christ, for there is no other name under heaven in which I can be saved. The rock on which I have built my knowledge is that on which Christ has built his Church." A second innovation in method is his combining-in the *Introductio ad Theologiam* -- the dialectical exposition of doctrine with that based on the writings of the Fathers, a combination of philosophy with the historical method that sounds singularly modern. He wrote also a treatise on morals -- *Scito Teipsum* (Know Thyself) -- which is a scientific

analysis of actions good and bad, and of the all-important intention from which derives their moral quality.

But, along with the Sic et Non, Abelard's greatest service is his destructive criticism of the Platonic theory of universals as so far held by practically all Catholic philosophers. It was on this point that he routed his master, William of Champeaux, and drove him into retirement. His own solution it is not easy to ascertain, for he fought Roscelin as successfully as he fought William. Though his language hesitates, there seems little doubt that he placed the reality of the universal primarily in the concept, while at the same time it has for him a source in the individual things themselves. The intelligence acquires its knowledge of universals by consideration of the common resemblance of the individual members of the class, and an activity of abstraction.

Like the great majority of the pioneers of this new movement to apply reason to the teaching of revelation, Abelard came into conflict with authority. His errors were many, on the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Redemption and Original Sin. His book on the Trinity was condemned to be burnt at Soissons in 1121, and he was obliged to declare publicly his acceptance of the Athanasian creed. How far personal considerations entered into this movement to prosecute the philosopher, and influenced the atmosphere in which the legal proceedings took place, it is not easy to say. There is no doubt that good men were divided and that some of them showed hearty vindictiveness wherever there was question of Abelard -- as there is no doubt that Abelard's rapid and easy rise to fame, his brilliance, and the arrogance with which he conducted himself, had made him as many foes as admirers. Nor were his troubles to end with his retirement to Brittany in 1125. []

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



6. THE FIRST GENERAL COUNCIL IN THE WEST

The Concordat of Worms marked a very definite stage in the long effort of the Roman Church to reform itself and the churches it governed. One of the chief instruments it had employed, in order to correct abuses and to introduce the new discipline, was the council of local prelates presided over by the pope or by a legate representing him. It was only fitting that a greater council than any hitherto seen in the West, the first general council to be held in the West, should seal the treaty which promised the beginnings of a new age. This was the council announced as early as June, 1122, and summoned to meet in the Lateran basilica of Rome for the first Sunday of Lent, 1123.

The official record of the council's proceedings has perished; but its canons survive, and there are accounts of the proceedings in contemporary chronicles. Apparently some five hundred bishops took part in it, and Calixtus II himself presided. There were two, perhaps three, public sessions at which the decrees were published. the first on March 18, the last on March 28. Of the machinery by which the decrees were prepared, of the discussions which preceded their introduction in the public sessions, we know nothing. The texts of the Concordat of Worms were read out and solemnly approved, and six of the council's canons form a kind of supplement to the pact. Laymen are forbidden to dispose of Church property; no bishop is to be consecrated who has not been canonically elected; the ordinations of the different anti-popes are declared null and void, as are all alienations of Church property made by them, except where these have been done with the consent of all the clergy of the churches concerned. In its preoccupation with the practical problems of church discipline and the extirpation of abuses, in its concern for the general social well being, the council only reflected the close relation of the two societies, civil and religious; and it set the pattern for all the other six councils of the Middle Ages. Of its twenty-two canons, five repeat previous legislation. [] Of the remaining seventeen, the most important is the twenty- first, which by making the reception of Holy Orders a diriment impediment to marriage completes at once the long Western development of clerical celibacy and the

restorative legislation of the previous seventy-four years. Until now the cleric in major orders who, in contravention of the existing canons, contracted marriage, had been regarded as the equal of the cleric who kept a concubine: he must choose between his clerical career and the woman with whom he lived, whether she be his wife or not. Under the new legislation it is taken out of the cleric's power to contract a marriage at all, once he has received Holy Orders.

The whole body of the Church had been roused to recognise in the layman's hold on ecclesiastical appointments the root of all the troubles that had for too long degraded it, and to see in a married clergy, not merely a dangerous innovation in discipline that made graver clerical abuses easier still, but one of the layman's most powerful aids in maintaining that hold. The council of 1123 marked the end of the long campaign of propaganda and the victory of the ancient tradition. Free of two, at least, of the chains that hampered its freedom the Church should go forward more easily in its mission of supernaturalising the life of mankind.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 7: THE AGE OF ST. BERNARD, 1123-1181

1. ST. BERNARD

ABOVE the richly crowded pageant that filled the thirty years after the triumphant council of 1123, popes, emperors, crusaders, philosophers and theologians, one figure stands in solitary grandeur -- St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux. Nothing of importance passed in those years without his active, and often decisive, intervention. For a lifetime he dominated the whole Christian scene, and after seven hundred and fifty years his influence is still active wherever Christian men, even outside the Catholic Church, use in their relations with God the phrases of loving informal devotion. The first foundation of the power he exercised over his own time was the completeness of his own surrender to God, made through the austere dedication of the new order of Citeaux. Sense he so disciplined, that it might no longer disturb his soul's converse with God, that for years he moved among men like a being from another world. He was known to all his contemporaries as the finest flower of a fine supernatural asceticism.

The material thus perfected by the supernatural was in itself singularly rich. The natural man had all the fiery ardour of the French nobles of the First Crusade, and it burnt a hundredfold more brightly in the setting of his religious humility. He had the passionate heart of the poet, and, in addition to the poet's gift, a natural eloquence which made of him such an orator as the Church had not known since St. Ambrose. The vast amount of his writing that has come down shows the astonishing variety of his appeal. There are ascetical treatises for his monks, admonitions to popes, hundreds of the most marvellously moving sermons, often as effective to-day as when he delivered them, polemical works in which his poetic genius forges a terrible invective against the apparent enemies of the faith, stern denunciations of clerical negligence and avarice that still burn white-hot, and a vast correspondence that shows him the willing servant and counsellor of clients in every rank of the life of his time.

He took the great congregation of Cluny to task for the degree in which, so it appeared to him, Cluny had developed away from St. Benedict's ideal. The disappearance of manual labour, the rich ceremonial, the studies, the dress, the food, all these are the subjects of a final devastating criticism. The papacy itself was not too high for his courage to admonish and warn it, particularly when that highest of dignities fell to one who, for a time, had been a monk of his own abbey of Clairvaux. It was then that he wrote, for the disciple's guidance in that high place where so easily a man might lose his soul, the *De Consideratione ad Eugenium papam*. It is a lengthy examination of conscience in which the pope is invited to consider how, almost necessarily, the new centralisation affords occasion for injustice and sin, with its legates, its reception of appeals, its exemptions. Eugene is to be pope, but never to cease to be, first, a father. One famous passage clamours for quotation, verbatim, for the light it throws, not only on St. Bernard's personal hardiness, but on the fierce directness that marks all the medieval saints when brought up against whatever may tarnish the beauty of God's Church.

"*Scio ubi habitas; increduli et subversores sunt tecum. Lupi non oves sunt: talium tamen tu es pastor. Utilis consideratio, qua forte inveneris, quomodo, si fieri possit, convertas eos, ne ipsi subvertant te. . . . Hic, hic, non parco tibi, ut parcat Deus. Pastorem te populo huic certe aut nega aut exhibe. Non negabis: ne cuius sedem tenes, te neget haeredem. Petrus hic est, qui nescitur processisse aliquando vel gemmis ornatus, vel sericis; non tectus auro, non vectus equo albo, nec stipatus milite, nec circumstrepentibus septus ministris. Absque his tamen credit satis posse implere salutare mandatum: Si amas me, pasce oves meas. In his successisti non Petro, sed Constantino.*" []

The sources of St. Bernard's prayer and theological exposition are not numerous. First of all there is the Bible, which indeed he must have known by heart, and especially -- besides the Gospels -- the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms. Of the earlier Catholic writers he uses very frequently St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, the latter very frequently indeed. Of the Greeks Origen only, and Origen simply for his exegesis.

As a theologian St. Bernard is content to state the doctrine in the terms in which he finds it, or rather -- to express his mind

here more adequately -- he criticises unsparingly the attempts of private enterprise further to explore the meaning of the traditional faith. Thus, to try and explain how the teaching that in God there are three Persons is not contrary to reason is an impiety that courts disaster. It is enough to know, on the authority of the infallible Church, that it is so. For the rest, man spends his time more profitably in veneration before the mystery than in trying to analyse its meaning

But it is through the commentaries on Sacred Scripture and, above all, through the sermons that St. Bernard's originality, his undoubted genius, shows itself. In a new way that marks him as the founder of a new spirituality, he gives a place to the humanity of the human element in the mysteries of the life of Our Lord, of His mother and the saints. The considerations which are, if the word may be used, the commonplaces of the ordinary man's spirituality, and which have been so for centuries, the hardships of Mary and Joseph as, in the last hours before the Divine Child was born, they sought for a home, the mixed anguish and joy of the first Christmas, or the sorrows and agonies of the Passion, of Mary at the foot of the Cross and of Jesus looking down upon her suffering innocence -- these and a thousand like moving considerations, which, moving the will through an overwhelming stirring of the emotions, must be permanently effective when they are the means by which a whole-hearted devotion conveys itself from the preacher -- all this spirituality has in St. Bernard its first great founder. Inevitably he has been, above all others, the prayer writer of later generations, more quoted, ever since his time, than any other devotional writer, with the solitary exception of St. Augustine. He stands at the head of the particular tradition of sacred eloquence which, even to-day, is perhaps the most effective of all, and his apparently inexhaustible riches continue to be a source of spiritual life to millions.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



2. THE PROGRESS OF CATHOLIC THOUGHT: ABELARD -- GILBERT OF LA PORREE -- HUGH OF ST. VICTOR -- PETER LOMBARD -- GRATIAN -- ROLAND BANDINELLI

How, amid this general revival of Catholic spirituality, did the movement fare which strove to construct a reasoned exposition of Catholicism? At first, it seemed fated to decline. From the moment when this tendency to satisfy rationally the interest of the human intelligence in the truths revealed through the Church first began to show itself, it had met with opposition; and especially with opposition from ascetics. Studies of this kind were, they declared roundly, a menace to the faith of those who engaged in them. What the Church taught should suffice; and where this presented difficulties to human understanding, man should be content to bow his head and humbly accept the difficulties without seeking further to resolve them. Such had been the attitude of St. Peter Damian in the time of Lanfranc and Berengarius; such was now the attitude of St. Bernard. The eleventh century opponent of these studies had been largely influenced by the spectacle of the new difficulties into which the none too competent logicians had tumbled. The like catastrophes were not lacking in St. Bernard's time, also, to serve as a powerful argument against the new attempt to satisfy the never-old, innate desire to know.

With Abelard, for instance, the three Persons in God appeared simply as God's power, His wisdom and His love; Original Sin was an impossibility; the fall made no difference to man's ability to do good; Jesus Christ is united to God by a union that is no more than moral, and the supreme value of His life lies in its appeal to love and in its example. The tendencies of the masters at Chartres -- still the chief centre of philosophical studies -- were not more reassuring. Here Neoplatonism was influential, and the Neoplatonist inclination to Pantheism is evident in more than one of the works that issued from Chartres. God is the essential form of all things; His presence in created things is their whole being; apart from that they are nothing, cannot exist. Such was the teaching of Thierry, head of the school from 1141 to 1150.

His predecessor, Gilbert of la Porree, Bishop of Poitiers from

1142 to 1154, [] was Aristotelian rather, possibly because of his devotion to Boethius, who was indeed his favourite author and upon whose work he wrote more than one commentary. Gilbert adapted the theory of knowledge propounded by his master Bernard -- Thierry's elder brother. There are three kinds of being God, matter and ideas. Ideas are the eternal types of all individual things. They exist eternally in the mind of God. From them come, in some way unknown, the copies which, being united to matter, give rise to individual things. It is in the identity of characteristics among the individuals of a class, and in their common resemblance to the ideas in the divine mind, that the fact of universality exists. So far Gilbert shows himself pupil of the Platonists. When he proceeds to relate this theory to the mode of human knowledge we recognise the commentator of Boethius and the author of one of the earliest Western works on Aristotle's Logic. [] We acquire our knowledge of the universal by abstracting, as we study the individual, this copy of the idea that exists in the divine mind, dissociating the form from the matter, comparing the dissociated forms and noting their resemblance. From the knowledge of the copy thus acquired, we proceed to the knowledge of the idea itself. Gilbert, apparently, used this theory of the dissociation of the universal from the individual, as a method of explaining the doctrine of the Trinity. He was accused of dissociating the divinity from the Persons, and of teaching that in God, too, in the divine nature as well as in each Person, there is matter and form. Gilbert more than once came into controversy with Abelard, but he was Abelard's ally in the general battle against the opponents of the application of dialectic to theology. []

St. Bernard, then, had ample material to hand to support his case against the new theologians; and to destroy their influence was, for a good ten years, one of the main concerns of his busy life. The battle opened with an assault on Abelard, provoked by that, alas, incurably bellicose person himself.

Abelard had resumed his lectures at Paris in 1136, and soon the old complaints, that had brought about his condemnation in 1121, began to be heard once more. A Cistercian abbot, William of St. Thierry, begged St. Bernard to intervene and the saint approached Abelard. The logician, apparently, was so far persuaded that he promised for the future to use more discretion in his theological expositions. But temperament was

too much for him and, with a return of his old arrogance, he challenged St. Bernard to debate at the coming Council of Sens. Very reluctantly the Cistercian consented, but when the council met (1140) it resolved itself rather into a judicial examination of Abelard's orthodoxy than into the scholastic tournament he had planned. St. Bernard had prepared a list of extracts from Abelard's works in which all could read how far from the traditional faith his use of dialectic had taken him. These theses Abelard was now asked to deny or to abjure. He did neither but, appealing to Rome walked out of the assembly.

In his absence the council continued the discussion, and the theses extracted by St. Bernard were sent to the pope, to be condemned, resoundingly if somewhat vaguely, and to earn their author a sentence of perpetual imprisonment in a monastery.

The condemnation of the theses was inevitable. They destroyed the very foundations of historic Christianity. For all Abelard's good intentions, his immense influence was steadily undermining the Faith. Nevertheless, good his intentions certainly were. He was never in any sense a freethinker, and he now showed that it was not merely for the look of the thing that he had given authority, and the Church, a place in his system. Whereas the humiliation of Sens had momentarily brought out some of the worst in his character, the sympathy and kindness of the Abbot of Cluny, Peter the Venerable, worked a general reconciliation. Abelard made his submission, was reconciled to the pope and even to St. Bernard. For the short remainder of his life he lived under Peter's protection, and in one of the abbey properties he died (1142).

Four years after Abelard's death the battle was renewed and this time it was the work of Chartres, or rather of Chartres's greatest luminary, Gilbert of la Porree, that was in question.

Gilbert had been consecrated Bishop of Poitiers in the year Abelard died, and it was his exposition, as a bishop, of the theories he had been teaching for years that brought him up against St. Bernard. An address to his diocesan synod in 1146 provoked a strong protest from his archdeacons who, furthermore, denounced the bishop to Rome. The pope -- Eugene III (1145-1153) -- referred the matter for examination to a

council which met at Paris the next year. But the prosecution, so to call it, mismanaged the case. They had no definite texts to allege against Gilbert, and in the debate Gilbert skilfully brought out their own mutual contradictions. The pope thereupon put off the examination. It came up a second time at a council in Rheims in 1148.

What accounts of this council survive differ in their details. It seems certain, however, that a party of the French bishops were strong enough to draw up a profession of faith and that some of the cardinals present prevented its acceptance, since they saw in the action a movement on the part of St. Bernard and the bishops to dictate to Rome. The profession was, however, published at Rheims after the council and, later, it was approved by Eugene III. It is certain, too, that Gilbert submitted. As the four propositions [] were read out in which his alleged errors were contained he declared to the pope, after each one of them, ' If you believe otherwise, I believe as you believe. ' Finally, it was forbidden to read or to make copies of Gilbert's commentary on Boethius until he had corrected it in accordance with his submission

Gilbert, to the end of his life, believed he had been misunderstood. He rewrote the prologue to his book and he changed the expressions which had caused the trouble. But he refused to discuss the matter with St. Bernard, inviting the saint, as a necessary preliminary, to take some lessons in the elements of logic. Six years after the council he died (September 4, 1154), still Bishop of Poitiers, undisturbed since the condemnation of Rheims, and for many years an object of great veneration.

Gilbert, not equal to Abelard in power of personality, was one of the first schoolmen to show a knowledge of Aristotle that goes beyond the logical treatises. So far Aristotle stood for logic and for little more. With Gilbert -- who evidently knew the fourth book of the Physics and the De Coelo et Mundo -- the revolution to be consummated in St. Thomas makes an important advance. Of Gilbert's later influence it is not easy to say much. His Liber Sex Principiorum did indeed win him the rare distinction of being cited, with Aristotle, as an "authority" in the schools. It was one of the classical texts upon which all the thinkers of the next centuries commented. But, this apart, he had little influence, and

as a theologian none except on the Calabrian Cistercian, Joachim of Flora, in whose mystico-prophetical writings Gilbert's exposition of the mystery of the Trinity becomes the basis of a real distinction between the roles of the Three Persons in the history of the world. But on the work of those who, in Gilbert's own time, laid the foundation upon which all subsequent theological study in the Church has been built, Gilbert's own theories had, seemingly, no effect at all.

Three of these contemporaries must be noticed. They are Hugh of St. Victor, the greatest theologian of the century; Peter Lombard, whose *Book of Sentences* [] (*Liber Sententiarum*) fixed for many centuries the mould in which the theological teaching of beginners was cast; and Roland Bandinelli, canonist as well as theologian, and later on, as Alexander III, the first of the great lawyer popes.

Although the chief centres of this intellectual revival lay in the north of France, the leaders were of very varied origin; Abelard, for example, was a Breton, Lanfranc and St. Anselm Italians. With Hugh of St. Victor it was the German mind that made it appearance in philosophy. [] He was perhaps twenty years of age when in 1116 he entered the abbey of St. Victor at Paris to become an Augustinian canon, just ten years after William of Champeaux -- since then Bishop of Chalons -- had founded its school of theology on his own retirement thither after his defeat by Abelard. Of that school Hugh was to be the most distinguished product. His most important work was done in a very short time, between his entry in 1116 and his election as prior in 1133. Eight years later and he was dead, cut off prematurely at forty-five.

Hugh wrote voluminously, commentaries on Sacred Scripture, treatises on mythology, on theology, ascetical guides, discussions of mysticism and its phenomena, works of pure literature, a history, some philosophy. His most important work is the *De Sacramentis Christianae Fidei*, a compendium of the whole of the Church's teaching. There exists, too, a still shorter compendium, the *Summa Sententiarum*, often attributed to Hugh, but about whose authorship authorities are by no means agreed. The *Eruditio Didascalica* deals with methods of study and the interrelation of the different sciences, while the *De Institutione Novitiorum* and the *Expositio in regulam beati*

Augustini contain the essence of his teaching on mysticism. []

Hugh never confounds the natural processes of knowledge with the supernatural, and this careful distinction, consistently preserved through all his work, is one of the chief sources of its value. We can know God by reasoning, and we can know God by believing God's revelation of Himself. This revelation is, in turn, made known to us normally by external teaching presented to our minds, but, sometimes, by an internal illumination. Thus Hugh escapes entirely the cloudy legacy of the Neoplatonic doctrine of divine illumination as the source of natural knowledge which, coming into Catholic thought through St. Augustine and the self-styled Areopagite, had done so much to confuse its development. As a theologian he makes the consequent clear distinction between the knowledge of God we can have through reasoning about revealed truths -- the proper office of Theology--and that which comes through processes above the natural, through contemplation (to use his own terminology). For all knowledge of truths which are supernatural, Faith is essential. Faith as an instrument of knowledge is superior to reason, since the object to which it can reach is superior. But reason can work on the truths obtained for it by Faith, examining their content and showing the reasonableness of belief.

Like his predecessors, Abelard and St. Anselm, Hugh made the mistake of over-estimating the extent of the field in which reason isolated from faith can work. The full understanding of the nature of the reasoning process, of the meaning of rational certitude and proof, escaped him. Like those predecessors, and like others after him, he set reason tasks for which, by its nature, it is not apt, as, for instance, when he set it to discover that in God there are three Persons.

As a writer on mysticism, to use in its technical sense that much abused word, he makes a careful analysis of those special divine interventions which, without initiative on the part of those whom they favour, raise such souls to a knowledge and love of God altogether beyond the normal. He describes this mystical ascent, in which man is made passive by the divine action, and attempts to analyse its nature. In his mystical theology he is not a Neoplatonist, for all his reading of the Neoplatonic authors.

Hugh of St. Victor is no mere compiler, but a highly original thinker, influenced, of course, by his sources, but influenced chiefly to think out the problems anew in their spirit. Aristotle he knew so far as Boethius could make him know; Plato and Plotinus through St. Augustine. Of all the Fathers it is St. Augustine, of course, who most affects him, although here too, like St. Anselm, Hugh is a new thinker after St. Augustine's pattern, rather than a restorer. Abelard, his somewhat older contemporary, influenced him immensely. From the *Introductio ad Theologiam* and the *Sic et Non* came the new severity of dialectic which characterises Hugh's work, and its fusion of patristic evidence with argument from reasoning. Thence also there came the idea of condensing into a single orderly synthesis the vast whole of Catholic teaching. Hugh, in his turn, repaid his magnificent creditor, for it was largely due to his use of Abelard that, after the master's condemnation, Abelard's valuable spirit and technique were preserved, to be safely used by the most orthodox.

Hugh of St. Victor died prematurely, and his name was soon to be overshadowed by that of Peter Lombard, for Peter Lombard wrote the first and the most celebrated of all theological textbooks. But through Peter Lombard it is Hugh of St. Victor who still, very often, is speaking. Peter's own manuscript has its margins filled with references to Hugh. Idea, expression, text, even whole pages from the *De Sacramentis* and the *Summa*, reappear in the *Liber Sententiarum*. Another pupil of Hugh was Peter of Poitiers, master of the canonist who became Pope Innocent III. A third pupil was Gandulph of Bologna, through whom Hugh's thought influenced all that great school, too. In the next great century Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure, and St. Thomas himself, were to speak of Hugh with singular veneration. The famous bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII, in defining the relations between the spiritual and the temporal power, made use of Hugh's very words; and another passage of his sacramental teaching passed through St. Thomas to find its final official sanction in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*. Hugh of St. Victor stands out as the one really great theologian of his century, the first to effect a real reconciliation between the new scholastic method and orthodoxy. []

Hugh of St. Victor was a thinker, Peter Lombard a compiler only; but he was a compiler of genius, and his famous book brought it

about that the right of the intelligence to use all possible means in its appreciation of revealed truth was, henceforward, accepted universally wherever theology was studied.

Of Peter Lombard's early life we know nothing, save that he came from Novara. The year 1139 found him studying at Paris, where St. Bernard was his first patron. In 1142 he wrote his commentaries on St. Paul, and six years later his reputation was already such that he took part in the Council of Rheims as an opponent of Gilbert of la Porree, and was one of those whom Eugene III consulted in that thorny business. He had completed his great work, *The Sentences*, by 1152 and, St. Bernard again intervening, the pope rewarded him with a canonry at Beauvais. In 1159 he was consecrated Bishop of Paris, and within a year he had died.

The *Liber Sententiarum* is a student's manual of theology. Its author does not attempt, like St. Anselm, to show, independently of Scripture and Tradition, the reasonableness of belief. The work lacks the originality of Hugh, as it lacks the subtlety of Abelard. Its philosophical data are scanty; hardly anywhere is there a trace of metaphysics. Peter hesitates often to declare himself, and at times the hesitation is willed. In all this the book marks a falling back from the achievement of contemporaries.

It had, however, two great merits. It was impersonal, concerned, that is to say, not to instruct the student as to Peter's theories, but to set before him all available opinions. Next, it was rigorously orthodox in its spirit. It provided the student with a vast ordered collection of authorities, texts from Sacred Scripture and from the Fathers; it neglected none of the contemporary thinkers; it was clear, brief, not encumbered with digression; and while it made good use of the fashionable dialectic, it did so with extreme moderation, chiefly to harmonise conflicting authorities, to discuss contemporary opinion, and only rarely for personal speculation. Peter had no sympathy for the victims of logical extravagance—*garruli ratiocinatores*, he styles them -- and his studied moderation may be fairly attributed in part to his association with St. Bernard, and with the great abbot's campaign. It is another merit of his book that it is entirely free from the spirit of controversy, although not one of the conflicting opinions of the day fails to find a mention in it. But Peter's one aim is to expound the traditional doctrine, and

the principal part of the book is not its dialectic -- for all the immense importance. historically, of the appearance of systematic dialectic in the work -- but in the multitude of its citations. So complete, indeed, is the Sentences in this respect that henceforward it was a rare scholar indeed -- St. Thomas Aquinas, for example -- who did more than read his texts in Peter Lombard. "Egregius collector," as a none too friendly contemporary described him, Peter borrowed often, and as literally as he borrowed liberally. To his great contemporaries, Abelard. Gratian, Hugh of St. Victor and the author of the Summa Sententiarum, he is especially indebted, but to Abelard, whom he never names, most of all. It is Abelard's principles that guide his interpretation of conflicting texts, and Abelard's Sic et Non supplied him with most of his patristic erudition. What the extent of Peter Lombard's own reading was, it is hard to say. A good nine-tenths of his texts are from St. Augustine, from whom there are a thousand citations, while from the next best used -- St. Hilary he takes but eighty. Denis the Areopagite is only twice cited, and no one of the Greek Fathers more than once, except St. John Damascene, referred to thirty times.

Peter Lombard's success, for all the merits of his work, was hardly won. Opposition to the method of his book showed itself immediately, and opposition also to some of his teaching. The first weak point which hostile critics seized was the defective theory, which he had inherited from Abelard, to explain how Jesus Christ Our Lord is both divine and human. This theory taught, in accordance with the tradition, that He is perfect man and truly God, but it failed to understand all that is meant by the truth that that union is hypostatic, that the Humanity with the Divinity is one person. Concerned to avoid the Nestorian error, that makes the humanity itself a person, the Abelardian theory denied that the humanity is a substantial reality. The Word's man is not, according to this theory, a new reality. It has merely received a new mode of being, the full and perfect humanity being the instrument of the full and perfect divinity.

The question, eagerly debated in the rising schools for thirty years, was raised at the Council of Tours in 1163. A hundred and twenty-seven bishops were present and the pope himself, Alexander III, presided, who, in his own works, written while a master in the schools, had shown himself also a defender of the new theory. It was in connection with this controversy that the

first attempt was made to bring about the condemnation of the *Liber Sententiarum*. It failed, however, as did the related endeavour to secure a decision on the dogmatic question. At a second great council, held at Sens in the following year, the pope contented himself with a strong prohibition of idle and useless discussions. But six years later, owing perhaps to the writings of John of Cornwall, the pope reopened the matter. A letter of May 28, 1170, renewed a command, already given, to the Archbishop of Sens charging him to see that "the erroneous opinion of Peter Lombard, one-time Bishop of Paris" is abandoned, the opinion namely that Christ according to His humanity is not a substantial reality. [] The masters are, on the contrary, to teach that as Christ is perfect God, so is He perfect man and truly man formed of body and soul. [] A further letter, of June 2 of the same year, repeated this instruction; and finally a third, dated February 2, 1177, ended the controversy, establishing sanctions to enforce the teaching.

The history of this so-called Adoptionist controversy is interesting for many reasons. It affords the spectacle of a pope condemning as pope the theories he had taught years before as a private individual, and, more important by far, it witnesses to a considerable theological progress since the comparatively crude controversies that centered around Berengarius.

The decree of 1177 was, of course, for the enemies of Peter Lombard's work an opportunity not to be lost. They took advantage of the change in Alexander III to attempt yet once again, at the General Council of 1179, what they had failed to secure in 1163. The story of the manoeuvre is extremely obscure. Walter of St. Victor, here our one source, represents the pope as willing to condemn the master of the Sentences, and only deterred by the wholesale opposition of his cardinals. Walter was, at any rate, one of the most bitter of Peter's critics, as his pamphlet--provoked by Peter of Poitiers, great commentary on the Lombard, the first of hundreds -- shows. It is called *Against the Four Labyrinths of France*, and attacks with a violence that knows no limits, Abelard, Gilbert of la Porree, Peter Lombard and Peter of Poitiers. Another, equally violent, critic was Joachim of Flora his exaggerations led him into manifest heresy and, after his death, to the resounding condemnation of the General Council of 1215. This marked the end of the manoeuvres to condemn the Sentences, for not only did this

council condemn the latest of Peter's foes, but it paid Peter the greatest compliment any Catholic writer has ever known, of associating him by name with the decree on the Faith, "We, the sacred and universal council approving believe and confess, with Peter Lombard. . . ."

The propositions censured by Alexander III were quietly set aside, and in the course of time others went to join them. They were listed, a score of them, at the beginning or the end of the manuscripts and a simple, "Here the Master is not followed" marked that, without any solemn condemnation on these points Peter's opinions had been abandoned. By 1220 he was established in the position he was to hold until, nearly three hundred years later, St. Thomas displaced him, as the inevitable, universal text on which the teaching of theology was built; and in all the new colleges the "Bachelor of the Sentences" was as permanent an institution as the "Bachelor of Sacred Scripture."

The history of the False Decretals has shown how great an influence in the development of church law, as a branch of learning, were the necessities of the ruling authority. But for all the energy of these primitive ninth-century bishops and scholars, the difficulties against which they strove persisted, still hampering the ecclesiastical reformer and the movement to re-establish the old order of Christian life. The confusion in knowledge as to what the law was, due largely to the presence of so many divergent collections, still continued. Authorities -- the collections of canons, that is, which were cited as such -- differed, and even the collections to which the reformers appealed were by no means always in agreement. Anarchy ever menaced this age of institutions half-created, that so lacked any acknowledged central lay authority, that was so frequently lacking in practical respect for the acknowledged central spiritual authority.

Realisation of the ever present trouble produced various attempts to remedy it; the new collection of ancient decrees made by Burchard, Bishop of Worms about 1020, for example, and the Collection in Five Books made about the same time in Italy. But even these collections, compiled as they were in order to guard against the faults of the earlier collections, still contained too many doubtful texts. Nor did either of them successfully establish the great desideratum whence alone an

effective unity of law could;. issue -- the active supremacy within the church of a single, strong, central, legislative and executive power.

But from about the middle of that same eleventh century the tide began to turn. The movement of papally-directed reformation that began with St. Leo IX and St. Gregory VII had its inevitable effect on the development of legal studies. Thanks to St. Gregory VII especially, systematic researches were undertaken in all the libraries of Italy, always in the hope of finding precedents to justify the new, revolutionary use he was making of the papacy's traditional supremacy. Towards the end of that century a wholly new kind of collection began to appear. of which that made by Anselm of Lucca -- nephew of Pope Alexander II -- is one of the best examples. Doubtful texts are now eliminated. New authentic texts, fruit of the recent researches, are inserted and along with these the new legislation which promulgates the reform principles as laws to be obeyed universally. All these new collections emphasise the rights of the Holy See, its effective primacy throughout the Church, its infallibility. They also bring texts to solve the eagerly debated contemporary question whether the sacraments administered by ecclesiastics who had themselves bought their consecration are valid. Anselm of Lucca, in particular, had a great share in translating into the facts of everyday Catholic life throughout the Church the traditional belief in the primacy of Rome. []

The new collections, scientifically considered, were an immense advance on all that had gone before. Nevertheless the old faulty collections did not, even yet, disappear. They were still used and extensively, partly for the simple reason that they were old, partly because of the frequent, local repugnance to the new strict centralisation that flowed from the new texts as their inevitable practical sequel.

The first effect of the spread of the "Hildebrandine" collections was, then, the appearance of yet more of the hybrid books where the old-world influence and the new appeared side by side-- Burchard for example with "Hildebrandine," texts -- and even of new apocrypha. St. Ives of Chartres, the most distinguished canonist of the generation that followed St. Gregory VII, is an instance in point. His Decretum is interesting, too, for the vast

amount of space theology occupies in it -- fruit of the Berengarian controversies on the Holy Eucharist. In this new fashion of setting together theological texts and decisions of law, yet another hindrance appeared to the development of Canon Law as an independent science, and therefore to the establishment of a universal reign of law within the Church as part of the Church's daily life. The first quarter of the twelfth century is then, in these respects, a period where, so far as concerns law, the progress of Catholic thought comes to a halt.

The need for a homogeneous code was, however, greater than ever. With a reform party active in every kingdom and diocese, new conflicts were continually arising which no texts clearly solved. The whole spirit of the time was towards greater certainty, greater clearness, a simplifying and a unifying of all religious knowledge. The spirit of St. Anselm and of Abelard could not but affect the canonists too. Then, from the end of the eleventh century, the Digest of Justinian began to be studied again, after being lost to Western sight for centuries. It offered the nascent Canon Law the stimulus of the conception of Law as a body of thought, the example of a scientific system of jurisprudence, with a proper and adequate classification and a system of interpretation. The time was at hand, and nothing now could delay it much longer, when, from laws, there would at last be produced the Canon Law.

The first moving force, in this last stage, was Urban II. No one of St. Gregory VII's disciples was more loyal to the cause of the reform, but it was one of the great merits of Urban II that he saw the possibility, and the need, of compromise within the limits of the essential Hildebrandine principles. The necessities of the situation as it had developed since, in 1084, the Normans drove out the emperor and rescued the pope, left Urban II no choice but to endeavour to harmonise this conflict by a careful interpretation of the laws; compelled him, for example, to distinguish between the necessary and the contingent. This initiative was developed in the next few years by St. Ives of Chartres and Bernold of Constance, who may be fairly considered the founders of critical jurisprudence within the Church. They did for the Church's law something of what Abelard, in his *Sic et Non*, did for the Church's theology. [] What they did well another man, born during their own lifetime, was to do with genius. This was Gratian.

Of Gratian's life we know almost nothing, except that he was monk of the order of Camaldoli, that he taught at the school of Bologna and that he wrote the great work which is the foundation of the science of ecclesiastical jurisprudence. We do not, know when he was born nor when he died, but the book which D gives him his unique place in history was written, apparently, by 1142. That book is commonly called, was universally called, Gratian's Decretum. Its author's own title -- Concordantia Discordantium Canonum, that is, A Harmony of Conflicting Canons-expresses best what it is, a vast collection of decrees of popes and councils with texts from the Fathers too, arranged systematically according to their subject matter and so treated as to make, of the vast miscellany, a single, ordered whole. It is a book to teach not merely laws but law, in which there is everywhere at work the practical desire to adapt the texts, intelligently, to all the actual needs of the Church. By his application, throughout the whole vast field of ecclesiastical legislation, of Abelard's critical principles for the interpretation of warring authorities, Gratian did much more than add to existing collections a newer, and best, collection of all. He produced a book of a new kind altogether, a private work indeed, but one which had the distinction not only of serving as the basis of all subsequent teaching in Canon Law, but also as the exemplar of all subsequent ecclesiastical legislation.

With Gratian the science of ecclesiastical jurisprudence is born, and thence begins the series of great lawyer popes thanks to whom the Roman Church's newly organised supremacy is, in the end, triply armed, with the great Corpus Iuris Canonici, wherein the subordination of each member to the whole Church -- realised as so essential an element of the religion of the Church since the days of St. Paul himself -- is ordered in as careful a detail as each member's faith, too, is beginning to be ordered. All earlier collections had had in view some particular practical end; they were, for example, handbooks of useful information for whoever had charge of a see, and the selection of texts they contained was influenced, very largely, by local needs and by recent local history. Gratian's achievement is fundamental. His sole aim is the law itself. From now on, the canonist ceases to occupy himself with theology, and the collections of canons discard the purely theological decrees and texts. While, until Gratian, the pioneers of the nascent

theological science had quarried in the collections of the canonists, henceforward the process is reversed and the canonist, free of theology, will use the theologians as material out of which to develop his scientific law. Gratian's separation of Canon Law from theology is not the least part of his fundamental service to the development of thought.

Gratian, it has been said, made use of Abelard's critical legacy. But, much more than in Gratian, Abelard's influence is evident in one of Gratian's pupils, his first great commentator, the Bolognese professor, Roland Bandinelli, whose personality was to dominate the second half of the twelfth century as St. Bernard's had dominated the first.

The early life of Roland Bandinelli is wrapt in the same tantalising uncertainty that obscures Gratian, his master, and Peter Lombard, his contemporary. He was born -- when we know not -- at Siena. He came to teach at Bologna, then the chief centre of intellectual life in Italy, somewhere in the thirties of the twelfth century and he won the name of being the foremost professor of Sacred Scripture and Canon Law of his generation. He was rewarded with a canonry at Pisa and, in 1147, with a like appointment in the Lateran. In 1150 Eugene III made him one of the cardinal-deacons, and the next year cardinal-priest. In 1153 he became Chancellor of the Roman Church and thereby the most influential person in the Curia after the pope. Six years later he was himself elected pope, Alexander III.

Of the works of the Cardinal Roland Bandinelli two survive, to justify the immense reputation he enjoyed among his contemporaries as a scholar. The first is his *Stroma*, an abridgment of the second part of Gratian's book made for the use of students. It is remarkable for its order and for the singular clarity of the exposition. The second work, the *Sententiae*, is a theological summa. in which the influence of Abelard is evident throughout, in the method of exposition and in the scientific spirit which inspires it. Roland Bandinelli is, however, no mere compiler, and many of the master's errors are corrected in his work, the Abelardian theory of original sin, for example, the teaching on the Trinity and on the nature of faith. But other errors of Abelard he took over; that, for example, on the nature of the union in Jesus Christ of the divine and the human, which many years later he was, as pope, to condemn.

The errors into which Abelard and Gilbert had fallen, and their spectacular defeat at the hands of St. Bernard did not, then, by any manner of means, ruin the movement towards a more scientific theology which they led. The spirit which had inspired them inspired in Peter Lombard and Roland Bandinelli the two most influential minds of the next generation also. It was to meet the opposition of those who claimed to be St. Bernard's disciples but who lacked his genius as they lacked his sanctity. Then, after a sharp crisis, it was finally to establish itself, as the official tradition of theological exposition.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



3. THE ROMAN SEE IN THE GENERATION AFTER THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS, 1123-1153

The strong French pope, whose diplomacy had brought to a victorious end the fifty years' controversy with the emperor, did not long survive his triumph. He died in the year which followed the Lateran Council, on December 13 or 14, 1124. His successor, Honorius II -- the cardinal Lambert -- had a long experience in the central government of the Church, that went back to the days of Urban II. Pascal II had made him a cardinal; he had been the companion of Gelasius II in that pope's flight and exile; he had been a power in the conclave that elected Calixtus II and had been, throughout the reign, that pope's most trusted adviser; as such he had played an influential part in the negotiations that preceded the Concordat of Worms, and his known conciliatory temper had won him the goodwill of the Roman nobility; it had been a career to which election as pope came as a very natural crown. Yet the election was made unwillingly, and in circumstances that might easily have led to schism, and which did, six years later, actually lead to schism.

The Roman nobility, whose interest in the frequent changes in their temporal ruler had been from the first beginnings of the Papal State, and could hardly fail to be, one of the major permanent anxieties of the popes, were still as willing as ever, at the death of Calixtus II, to attempt to renew their ancient hold on the papacy. In place of the Crescentii, the Theophylacts, the Cencii of previous centuries there were now the Pierleoni and the Frangepani. Each faction had its candidate, and the Pierleoni now triumphed, electing the cardinal Tommaso Buccapecci who took the name of Celestine II. But while the Te Deum was still in progress, the Frangepani leader broke in, tore from the shoulders of the newly-elected the papal mantle and bade him resign. The which, apparently very willingly, he did; and the terrified cardinals then elected Lambert, who took the name of Honorius II. For a few days the party of Celestine held out. But by St. Thomas's Day December 21, they had followed their leader; and then Honorius, too, resigned, to be immediately re-elected in more canonical fashion.

Almost immediately he had to face a serious crisis, for in 1125

his old adversary, the emperor Henry V, died leaving no direct heir. For a century now the imperial crown had passed from father to son, and it was as important for the popes, as for the imperial feudatories, to take full advantage of the opportunity now offered to safeguard the principle of its electoral character against any claims of family. It was no less important to secure that the new emperor should be a prince sympathetic to the settlement of 1122, and that there should be no risk of a renewal of the controversy about Investiture. To election therefore, Honorius sent his legates, and in combination with the archbishops and bishops of Germany they secured the choice of Lothair of Supplimburg. When Lothair besought the pope's confirmation of his election the principles of St. Gregory VII were given an ideal recognition, and the emperor showed that the petition was no merely formal act of goodwill by an important modification of the Concordat. Elections of bishops and abbots were henceforward to be absolutely free, "neither extorted by fear of the king nor influenced by his presence as the use has been, nor restricted by any convention." [] It is to the bishop thus freely elected and canonically consecrated that investiture of the temporalities is to be conferred by the touch of the sceptre.

In his relations with France Honorius was equally happy, although his tactful handling of Louis VI, in a quarrel that involved the French king and the bishops, brought him a stiff letter of reproof from the young St. Bernard.

Italian affairs were more troublesome. Much against his will the pope was forced, by losses in the field, to acknowledge the Norman hold on Apulia; and the Roman faction-fighting in which his reign was born continued through all its six years. It raged even around his very death-bed, for the Frangepani, who had so nearly lost in 1124, were determined to maintain their hold. They gathered in the palace where the pope lay dying, set it about with guards, and, the pope no sooner dead, all the cardinals present elected as his successor, the cardinal Gregory, who took the name of Innocent II (February 14, 1130). Unhappily the electors, for all their unanimity, were but a minority of the electoral college, and a few hours later their colleagues, outraged at the unseemliness of the uncanonical proceeding, elected-without any reference to Innocent's election -- the cardinal Peter Pierleoni. He called himself Anacletus II.

The Church had a practical problem without a precedent since the new system of papal elections introduced in 1059. Which of the two was really pope? The first elected? or the elect of the majority? That neither was pope, since both were the elect of fragments only -- greater or less -- of the electoral college, is a view no one seems to have taken. The law of the papal election did not as yet specify any particular majority of the votes as necessary for validity. Nor was there any machinery to decide between the rivals. Anacletus had Rome in his support, and maintained himself there until his death (1138). Innocent meanwhile, driven from Rome, followed the well-worn track of persecuted popes over the Alps to France, to win, ultimately, recognition from the majority of the Catholic bishops and princes.

The chief factor in that general recognition was the recognition accorded by Louis VI of France and the French bishops, and what determined their decision was the immense influence of St. Bernard at the Synod of Etampes. What principle, it may be asked, guided St. Bernard? Apparently the very simple one that, of the two rivals, Innocent was the better man, "une espece de divination de sa conscience." [] Pierleoni was the chief of the faction that had brought about his own election, an ecclesiastical politician primarily. Innocent, although the choice, perhaps even -- in the election -- the tool, of a faction, was at any rate not its leader. His election had not about it that air of self-election which, in his rival's case, was so sinister a reminder of the worst days of the last century. And Innocent had played a distinguished part in the struggle against Henry V. He must now have been advanced in years, for the earliest thing recorded of his clerical career is his service with the rival of St. Gregory VII, the anti-pope Clement III dead now these thirty years. Pascal II had made him a cardinal in 1116, he had shared the exile of the next pope, and then, in the time of Calixtus II, he had been the colleague of the cardinal Lambert -- the future Honorius II -- in the negotiation of the Concordat of Worms.

What the influence of St. Bernard did in France, that of St. Norbert did in Germany. By the end of the year 1131 Innocent was recognised everywhere, except in Rome and southern Italy where Roger of Sicily remained true to Anacletus.

It was inevitably a troubled pontificate, and even after 1138, when the death of Anacletus brought Innocent II universal recognition, some shadow of its origins continued to darken it. The emperor, Lothair, for all his exemplary action at his election in 1125, and despite his several expeditions against Anacletus, threatened to reopen the Investiture struggle, and only the influence of St. Bernard and St. Norbert kept him loyal to the Concordat. The French king, too, was not always satisfactory and his interference in the freedom of episcopal elections drew down on France an interdict. For Innocent II, despite his misfortunes, was no weakling. St. Bernard championed a spirit fashioned like his own. The work of reform went forward, the pope maintaining the tradition of local councils where he himself presided, correcting abuses and devising guarantees to prevent their repetition. The culmination of these, and the pope's greatest achievement, was the General Council of April, 1139, held in the Lateran, that marked the restored unity of Christendom after the death of Anacletus.

The history of this great council, at which some five or six hundred bishops and abbots assisted, is curiously obscure. Its canons indeed survive, but no record of the council has come down written by anyone who was even in Rome at the time. Its canons, for the most part, [] repeat the legislation of earlier reforming councils. Of the new canons one regulates the dress of clerics, three are concerned with nuns -- they are formally deprived of the power to contract a valid marriage, they are not to sing the Divine Office in company with the monks, and spurious nuns who live privately at home are to be suppressed. Two new canons reflect the Church's care for religion as a social force, one against usurers and the other against the use of catapults and bows in wars against Christians. Finally the ordinations of Anacletus are declared null and void. Two older canons are re-enacted, one against incendiaries and another against violators of the Truce of God.

The council has, too, a certain doctrinal importance, not so much perhaps for its condemnation of Arnold of Brescia -- who as yet had not developed all his latent possibilities -- as for its condemnation (Canon 23) of the new, Manichee tendencies which were, seventy years later, to menace the very existence of Catholicism in southern France. For the first time for many years there is no canon touching the matter of investiture. On the

other hand three canons deal once more with the question of clerical celibacy, and, in even stronger terms than in 1123, declare null and void marriages contracted by clerics in major orders.

The principal work before the council was to remove the last traces of the late schism. Following the precedent of 1123, of Urban II in 1095 and of St. Gregory VII before that, the ordinations of the late anti-pope were annulled -- a proceeding that, in the mind of its chief historian, raises the greatest difficulty which the whole history of re-ordination presents. Innocent II was not content with this, nor with the submission of those who had followed his rival. There were numerous deprivations, and the altars these bishops had consecrated were destroyed. One victim, especially, of the pope's revengeful spirit was the Cardinal Peter of Pisa, who had indeed been one of the anti-pope's chief supporters, but whom St. Bernard had won over to make his submission even before the anti-pope's death. He had been a most valuable recruit to Innocent, who had received him gladly and confirmed him in his dignities. In the movement to secure the submission of the party of Anacletus, Peter had played a great part, but Innocent, now secure, thought only of the past and deprived him. Nor, despite all St. Bernard's pleading, did he ever restore him.

For all its circumstance, the council was destined to very slight success. The pope's rigour made too unhappy an impression, he was soon involved in the disastrous war with Sicily, and there began twenty years of domestic political anxiety in Rome which effectively slowed down the papacy's European activity.

Innocent II had triumphed, but to the end things continued to go badly in Rome and the south. The King of Sicily was excommunicated at the Lateran Council, and the pope himself prepared to carry out the sentence and depose him. But Roger was the better general. He captured the pope and compelled him not only to lift the excommunication but also, once more, to recognise the Norman claims to the Italian mainland. The Romans were angered by the pope's refusal to sanction the destruction of the rival Latin town of Tivoli. The new spirit of the Commune that now evidently possessed Rome as it did the whole north of Italy, showed itself in another way when Innocent was compelled to make a grant of local self-government. This

developed, and a republic was proclaimed. In the midst of these new troubles the unhappy pope died, September 24, 1143.

He was succeeded by the short-lived Celestine II (September, 1143-March, 1144) who had been one of Abelard's pupils and, when Cardinal Legate in France presiding at the condemnation of Arnold of Brescia -- of whom more immediately -- had been rebuked by St. Bernard for his neglect to use that disturber of the peace more severely. As pope he reigned long enough to revoke Innocent II's concessions to the King of Sicily, thus leaving to his own successor, Lucius II, an additional worry to embarrass his endeavours to suppress the new republic.

Lucius II had been one of the legates thinks to whom Lothair III was elected emperor in 1125. The next pope had made him Chancellor of the Roman Church, and upon his election (March 12, 1144) he turned all his diplomacy to extricate the papacy from the domestic chaos in which its temporal affairs were rapidly submerging. He arranged a truce with Sicily. He allied himself with the Frangepani -- the more easily because the Pierleoni supported the Republic -- and with their aid proceeded to military measures. While besieging the Capitol he was however killed by a chance shot, after a reign of less than a year.

In his place, that same day (February 15, 1145), the cardinals elected the abbot of SS. Vincent and Anastasius. He was

Cistercian, won to the monastic life fifteen years before by St. Bernard, and after some years spent at Clairvaux, under the saint's direction, he had gone into Italy to undertake, at the request of Innocent II, the reform of the great abbey of Farfa. The election over, pope and cardinals fled from the hostile city, and it was in the abbey church of Farfa that, as Eugene III, its one-time abbot was consecrated. Rome meanwhile was given up to anarchy and pillage and then, in reaction against the horrors the pope was invited to return. But his stay was of short duration. The arch-disturber of his age now appeared there, the mystical revolutionary Arnold of Brescia, and in the January of 1146 Eugene III was once more an exile, destined not again to see Rome until a few months before his death in 1153.

Arnold of Brescia, the ruler of Rome henceforward for a good

nine years, is as typical a figure of the time as the popes he opposed, as Abelard, or as St. Bernard himself, who knew him well and whom in many respects he greatly resembled. He was much the same age as St. Bernard, born at Brescia in the last years of the eleventh century. He was ordained priest, became a canon-regular and even prior of his monastery. Like St. Bernard he was a man of amazing austerities. He was a famous speaker and gifted with a singularly charming personality. In Brescia he rapidly acquired fame as an eloquent critic of contemporary abuses, and, like many another clerical critic of clerical habits, he passed easily into a denial of the good of that he saw abused. The Church, for example, had no right to own property. Pope and bishops, by owning, were guilty of mortal sin; the Church was contaminated by the presence of such men; it ceased to be the Church; the pope was no longer pope; people should, therefore, refuse to receive the sacraments such men offered; better far, indeed, to confess to each other. Finally, he invited the attention of the emperor, to the miserable state of matters ecclesiastical. "It is in your power," he wrote to the emperor, "to arrange that for the future no pope shall be elected without your good pleasure.,'

Arnold speedily came into conflict with his own bishop, for his share in making the commune of Brescia independent of the bishop. He was denounced at the Lateran Council of 1139 and deposed from his monastic office and banished from Italy, not to return without the pope's permission. France was his place of refuge, and 1141 found him at Abelard's side at the Council of Sens. With Abelard he was sentenced by Innocent II to lifelong confinement in a monastery. The sentence was never carried into execution, and Arnold passed to Paris where, like an anti-clerical St. Bernard, he denounced in his lectures the wealth and vices of the clergy.

St. Bernard's influence with Louis VII brought about his expulsion from France. He wandered into Switzerland, he spent some time in Bohemia in the company of the papal legate there, and then, in 1145, at Viterbo, he made a complete abjuration to Eugene III. Before the year was out he was the head and centre of the new revolt that drove the pope forth, and for the next nine years the object of rich reprobation as the most subversive enemy of the whole social order.

The chief event, however, of Eugene III's reign (1145-1153) was the Second Crusade.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



4. THE LATIN EAST, 1100-1151

The success of the crusading armies in 1098-1099 was, in no small measure, due to the fact that they delivered their assault at a moment when the Moslem world was rent with bitter internal strife. The subsequent history of the Catholic hold on Syria and Palestine was to be the history of a long defensive war against the dispossessed Mohammedan, with the defenders even less united than had been the Moslem in the hour when they overcame him. To understand the quasi-inevitableness of the Mohammedan recovery it is essential to know something of the way in which the Crusaders organised their conquest.

The war had been a holy war at whose origin the Church had officially presided. The motive was the delivery of Christians from infidel tyranny, and the spirit in which this was achieved was, in theory, that of sinners working out satisfaction for their misdeeds by an heroic act of fraternal charity. The logic of the situation would have placed what conquests were made at the discretion of the Church. More even than over his own city of Rome, might the pope expect to preside over the destinies of the lands which the faithful, at his bidding and with his blessing, had wrested, for the love of God, from the infidel. The result was, however, far different.

Bohemond retained his hold on Antioch, Raymund of Provence on Tripoli, Baldwin of Flanders on Edessa; and an assembly of the nobles in August, 1099 elected Godfrey de Bouillon to be ruler of Jerusalem. His humility forbade him to call himself king. He would be simply the Defender of the Holy Sepulchre. But his brother Baldwin of Edessa, who succeeded him a year later, had no such scruples and was crowned first King of Jerusalem on Christmas Day, 1100, in the basilica at Bethlehem.

The new states were a curious transplantation of Western feudalism to an Eastern soil. They were very French, and they were necessarily, from the beginning, in very close contact with the papacy, to which at every crisis they must turn as the source through which assistance would chiefly, would indeed wholly, come. Politically the founders of the new states -- which soon came to be related, the rest to Jerusalem, as vassals to their

suzerain -- were the nobles. It was the nobles who elected the King of Jerusalem and the king's actions were wholly controlled by them. He was little more than a *primus inter pares*. The kingdom was doomed from its beginnings, and it needed only the shock of a united foe to bring it down. From an ecclesiastical point of view, too, the result of the Crusade was a transplantation of the West to the East. The victors continued to be Latin in their Catholicism. A Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem was set up, with four metropolitans and seven suffragan bishops depending from it. This Church was well endowed and became exceedingly wealthy, the greatest of all the landed proprietors. The patriarch was almost the king's equal, and the occasional struggles between kings and patriarchs were one of the many hindrances- to the growth of real unity.

The weakness of the State was reflected in its military organisation. As in every other feudally-organised State, the army was made up of the contingents brought in by the different nobles, and the contingent's first loyalty was, often, to its own immediate leader. Each castle was in some sense a little state, perpetually striving to escape the control of the king. Again, many of the fighting men were Armenian and Syrian mercenaries. The loyalty of this cosmopolitan feudal army to the ideals of 1095 could not but be uncertain.

To meet the situation one of the most characteristic of medieval institutions was created -- the religious order vowed to arms for the defence of the Holy Places. The first of these, the Order of the Knights Hospitallers, grew out of a work of charity whose object was the care of sick pilgrims. It was already a highly successful institution, supported from Europe by a well-organised system of begging when, in 1113, Gerard du Puy transformed it to meet the new problem of military defence. Five years later a second order began, called, from the site of its first home, the Order of the Temple. These new orders were made up of knights, all of noble birth, of serjeants, and of clerics for their spiritual service. All took the three religious vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. But the knights and serjeants were forbidden fasting and such corporal austerities as would lessen their fighting efficiency. For habit they wore, over their armour, a cloak Or distinctive character -- with, for the Hospitallers, a black cross and, for the Templars, a red cross. The new orders found no difficulty in recruiting their numbers. Fiefs, in Europe no less

than in the East, were liberally conveyed to them, and while France and England were soon covered with the houses which served them as recruiting centres, in the new states of the East they rapidly became the leading military power. The orders were autonomous. The grand-master of each was, like the chief superior of every other religious order, subject only to the pope. But the constitution within a kingdom already too little centralised, of these powerful, but independent, supporters was to prove ultimately a very great weakness. King, patriarch, barons, the military orders, so many forces acknowledging no subordination -- it would have required a marvellous religious spirit, an almost miraculous devotion to the ideal, to combine them all in any harmonious effort. It is matter of history how far from that ideal the Latin Catholics of Syria came to live. The climate, and the new luxuries and refinements of the Mohammedan civilisation were, only too often, as powerfully destructive of their morale as they had been, time and again, with their fellows who fought the Moor in Spain.

For the new Catholic settlements -- and such these kingdoms and principalities really were -- the war was never to end. The gains of the campaigns of 1098 and 1099 had to be supported by yet other gains; and then the ceaseless raids of the Mohammedans, from the north and south, must be beaten off and these in their turn raided. Egypt was weak, and for years not a serious danger. The states of the north, and the Emirs of Damascus, Kaifa and Mosul -- though stronger and more aggressive -- were mutually hostile. Then in 1127, Zengi, the ruler of Mosul, succeeded in creating a new unity that had only Damascus for a rival. The years 1131-1143 were for him a period of uninterrupted success against Antioch, Tripoli and the kingdom of Jerusalem too. Luckily for the kingdom, Damascus to some extent held off. Zengi, and, finding Jerusalem useful, its emir concluded a formal alliance with the kings which lasted until 1147.

But while the Catholics, strengthened by the reinforcements which never ceased to come, more or less numerous and well-provided, from Europe, thus maintained their hold against the Turks. they had to wage another kind of war, on another front, against the Greek emperor at Constantinople. For the Greeks, these several Latin states were so many imperial fiefs, owing the emperor homage. More than one of the princes had, in

circumstances of difficulty, promised and even done homage to them as to his suzerain. None of the princes, however, willingly endured such a regime. Hence a readiness on the part of Constantinople to support any one of the Latins against the rest. So it was that the emperor Alexis Comnenus (1081-1118) aided Raymund to establish Tripoli as a counterweight to Bohemond at Antioch. Later still his son John (1118-1143) and his grandson Manuel (1143-1180) found much richer opportunities for intervention. Raymund, prince of Antioch, was compelled in h 1137, by the appearance of an imperial army to do homage to John; and although the pope, Innocent II, in the following March, forbade alliances between the Latins and the Greek emperor to the detriment of other crusading states, the troubles began again in 1142. This time it was the people of Antioch who called in the emperor against Raymund. In 1143 the emperor, John, was murdered, and Raymund seized the opportunity to invade the Byzantine possessions. John's successor, Manuel, replied vigorously, sending an army and fleet to Antioch, and Raymund was obliged to do homage once more, this time at Constantinople, and even to accept as patriarch at Antioch, a priest chosen by the emperor from the schismatic clergy of his capital. This marked the highwater mark of the Byzantine success, the nearest it arrived to what Alexis Comnenus had promised himself when the crusades began in 1095. The empire had secured Asia Minor and the Latin states had made a beginning of doing homage.

In that same year 1144 a much greater disaster befell them. On Christmas Day Zengi captured Edessa. He was murdered shortly afterwards, but in his son, Nureddin, the crusaders had to face a still more dangerous enemy, for to his father's political ability and military skill he joined an unspoiled religious enthusiasm which transformed the whole character of the campaigns. They became a renewal of the Holy War, not a mere anti-crusade.

When the news reached the pope that one of the Christian states had fallen to the Saracens, it was to the King of France, Louis VII, that he turned. Louis enlisted the aid of St. Bernard and, at a great assembly at Vezelay (March 31, 1046), along with hundreds of his nobles, knights and lesser subjects the king took the cross. St. Bernard conceived the grandiose plan of a crusade in which all Christendom should at the same time attack all its enemies, the Saracens in the east, the Moors in Spain and the

still pagan tribes to the east of the Elbe. He himself led the campaign of preaching and, on Christmas Day, 1146, the emperor, Conrad III, after some resistance, followed the French king's example. By sermons, by writings, by personal exhortation St. Bernard gradually roused the West from its apathy, and soon both the emperor and the King of France had at their disposal armies of some 70,000 men.

For all its promise, however, this first crusade to enlist the personal support of the powerful kings was destined to fail. It had failed, indeed, before it set out. The Greeks, as always, made it a condition of their assistance that all conquests should be held as fiefs of Constantinople. There were disputes as to the route, which masked a more fundamental dispute, namely whether to support the Greeks or Roger of Sicily who was on the verge of war with them. Finally, the attempt to realise St. Bernard's plan had no other result than to disperse the strength of the movement or to delay its concentration. Many of the Germans went off to fight the Wends. The English and Brabancon contingent, travelling by the sea-route, halted to take Lisbon from the Moors.

The main armies reached Constantinople by the land-route through Hungary and Thrace, the French in good order, the Germans pillaging so badly that the Greek emperor had to send an army to protect his own people. At Adrianople the Greeks fought and defeated the crusaders. Conrad III refused point blank to do homage to Manuel Comnenus; whereupon the Greek refused even to see him, and the crusaders were hurried across the Bosphorus with all possible speed. The French had a more favourable reception from the emperor, but, even so, relations between the two forces were severely strained and some of Louis VII's advisers were eager to inaugurate the crusade by taking Constantinople. After a succession of disasters, their armies very much smaller, the king and the emperor at last reached Jerusalem in the spring of 1148. To regain Edessa was more than they could hope. The King of Jerusalem, Baldwin IV, proposed instead that they should assist him -- and his Mohammedan ally, the Emir of Basra -- to take Damascus. In July, 1148, the expedition marched. The Viceroy of Damascus managed, however, to break up the coalition. The crusaders won one battle, failed in another, and, raising the siege, retired.

This was the end of the wretched affair. Conrad and Louis returned to Europe, and their armies with them, to spread, as widely as the area whence they had been recruited, the tale of the great disaster. The damage done to the very idea of the crusade was huge, and the one definite change in the situation was the destruction of the alliance between Jerusalem and Damascus, the disappearance of the one force that stood between the kingdom and the aggressive Nureddin.

In 1150 St. Bernard endeavoured to reorganise the affair, but he found no one to listen to him. Kings and lords alike, for that generation, had had their fill. .

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



**5. THE IMPERIAL MENACE TO THE FREEDOM OF RELIGION:
(I) FREDERICK BARBAROSSA AND ALEXANDER III, 1154-
1177**

The new reluctance of Catholicism to rally to the defence of the Holy Places was significant. The forces active within the Church in the first generation of the great spiritual revival were beginning to languish. The disinterested idealism which, for sixty years now, had so marvellously inspired the universality of the Church had almost spent itself. St. Bernard, in whom the spiritual revival and its popularity were symbolised, died in 1153, and the morrow of the crusade for which he had so devotedly, but unsuccessfully, spent himself was a new struggle between the Church and the Catholic prince. It was not a struggle, this time, to regain from the prince rights of jurisdiction which had lapsed to him through the disorder of centuries, but, more fundamentally still, a struggle to determine the respective positions of pope and emperor with the Church; a struggle in which the emperor challenged the pope at the same time that his ambition challenged also the liberties of the Italian city states. The pope, in this contest, had from the beginning allies bound to him by the political danger in which they, too, stood from the foe who was the foe of the papacy.

Thus the imperial attempt consciously to restore Justinian and the Carolingians provoked a struggle complicated by political considerations, a struggle to be fought out therefore, on both sides, by the full lay apparatus of alliances and armies, as well as by the resources of ecclesiastical censure and prayer. There is about this necessary, and inevitable, preoccupation of the popes with the new Hohenstaufen emperor a certain worldly air. It lacks the pure idealism of the earlier struggle. None of the papal champions in it -- for all the real goodness of their lives -- has even come near to canonisation. The only saint of the struggle, the one purely ideal figure, is the English Archbishop of Canterbury, St. Thomas Becket, and his idealism, it is true to say, more than once gravely embarrassed the pope at a critical moment.

The prince who willed to revive in himself all the old universal power of Justinian, was the Emperor Frederick I, elected in the

very last year of St. Bernard's life, 1152. Tall and fair -- from his red beard called ever afterwards Barbarossa -- the typical German in bodily figure, as in his vague political idealism, he was at the time of his election a man thirty years of age, younger than St. Bernard by just a generation. His dream of transforming the idea of the Roman Empire into reality was soon given its opportunity. Invitations to come, armed, into Italy were not wanting. The nobles wished him to suppress the communes. In Sicily there were those who wished to see the Normans driven out. The pope desired the defeat of Arnold of Brescia.

Not until the autumn of 1154 was Frederick ready to advance. By the time he came to Italy Eugene III was dead, and his short-lived successor too. The pope whom Barbarossa met was the one Englishman to whom that high dignity has fallen, Nicolas Brakespeare, Adrian IV, a solemn, austere figure, a simpleminded reformer who had already made a name as the second founder of Norway's Christianity. Arnold of Brescia, driven out for a time in 1154, had returned to Rome. The city welcomed him, and restored the republic until, with unheard-of directness, Adrian laid Rome itself under an interdict. The measure was so far successful that Arnold's supporters deserted him, and he fled to friends outside Rome. Easter 1155 saw the pope and the Romans reconciled.

Barbarossa meanwhile had crossed the Alps, and was steadily advancing through Lombardy, where city after city opened its gates to him. Milan held out, but Frederick for the moment ignored it and passed through Tuscany towards Rome. At Campo Grasso pope and emperor met, and Frederick gave an unmistakable sign of his dispositions by utterly refusing the customary act of homage. Adrian, just as inflexibly, refused to proceed until it was given. It was three days before Frederick yielded, and when, immediately afterwards, the senate which, in Arnold's days, had ruled Rome, waited on him with a mixture of petitions and directions, he broke out violently against them. On Whit Sunday (June 18, 1155) Adrian crowned him emperor in St. Peter's. The Romans, irritated by the reception he had given the senate, attacked his troops, and the day ended in slaughter, and in Frederick's withdrawal -- with the pope, for his own safety, in the emperor's company.

The last weeks of Frederick's advance had also seen the end of

Arnold of Brescia. It had been part of the pact between pope and emperor that Frederick should capture and deliver Arnold over to the pope. The heresiarch was taken and confined in the papal prison. Thence he was taken out and hanged, his body burned, and the ashes thrown into the Tiber. About his end there still lingers a great deal of obscurity. It is not really known by whose authority he was put to death, whether by that of the pope, or of the emperor, or, as one account states, by the Prefect of Rome, without the pope's knowledge, for some private reason.

Frederick, crowned and consecrated emperor, returned into Germany. Adrian, left to himself, turned to the old diplomacy of alliance with the Normans and negotiations with the turbulent Romans. But to the emperor this Sicilian policy was most unwelcome, and at the diet held at Besancon (October, 1157) his indignation was given its opportunity. To the diet Adrian had despatched two legates -- one of them Roland Bandinelli, cardinal since 1150 and Chancellor of the Roman Church. The legates were charged to remind Frederick that as emperor it was his duty to defend the Church, the occasion of the admonition being the recent murder of the primate of Denmark. The emperor, the legate proceeded to say, must not forget that it was the Holy Roman Church which conferred on him the "signal favour of the crown", and that it was proposed to add favours still more valuable. When this part of the message was read out tumult shook the assembly. The word used by the pope to mean favour (beneficium) had also the more restricted technical meaning of fief, and at the suggestion that, as emperor, Frederick must acknowledge the pope as suzerain, the great feudatories turned on the legates. "From whom then does the emperor hold the empire if not from the pope?" said Bandinelli, a founder of the Canon Law speaking through the legate. Whereat only Frederick's personal intervention saved him from the sword of an angry German. The legates were expelled; the diet broke up.

Both parties now prepared for the struggle, Frederick organising Germany against the papal claims, protesting that the empire was not a papal fief, Adrian protesting as widely against the insult of the expulsion of his legates. The German bishops, in the main, showed as much sympathy with the emperor as, without a breach with the pope, was possible.

In the spring of 1158 Frederick once more invaded Italy. The papal legates sent to assure him that he had misunderstood the famous admonition, [] that beneficium meant no more than a useful favour, were ignored; and the emperor advanced 011 Milan. It speedily submitted and at the Diet of Roncaglia (November, 1158) the new imperial position was clearly set forth. The Archbishop of Milan proclaimed that the imperial will was law for the emperor's subjects, and legists from Bologna gave the sanction of the new learning to this resurrection of pagan theory. [] The new concept of law was rapidly translated into practical regulations. Commissioners were sent to all the cities of Lombardy to secure for the emperor his newly declared rights, the chief of them the nomination of each city's rulers.

The pope could not but be anxious. Italy being, by the new theory, a province of Frederick's empire, how soon would it be before he proceeded to exercise his imperial authority in Rome itself? What was the pope's political status for the future, if not that of a vassal to the emperor? The "Roman Question" was entering on a new chapter in its long and stormy history. If the Church's lately recovered freedom to elect its head were to survive, and that head's own independence in action, the emperor must, at all costs, be prevented from becoming the real ruler of Italy. The task was to occupy all the popes for the next hundred years.

Adrian's reply to the menace of Roncaglia was to demand imperial recognition of the papal claim to Ferrara and the lands made over to the Roman See by the Countess Matilda. Furthermore, he sought a pledge that Frederick would disclaim any right as suzerain in Rome, for Rome being papal could not be imperial. Frederick refused. "If I, Emperor of the Romans," he declared, "have no rights in Rome, I have no rights anywhere."

In April of the next year (1159) the war began. Milan revolted and Adrian, with his ally the King of Sicily, encouraged the Milanese. Frederick, in retaliation, revived the ghost of the commune and the pope was driven out of Rome. The next few months were filled with diplomatic duels. The pope endeavoured to unite the various Italian States against the emperor, while Frederick set out his claim to be, as Constantine's successor, the source of all the pope's authority as a temporal ruler. In official state

documents he had begun to place his own name and style before those of the pope, and the pope's protest against the innovation only provoked the retort that a monster of pride now sat in St. Peter's chair.

At this moment, when everything was set for the conflict, and, the imperialist party among the cardinals finally convinced, on September 1, 1159, the unexpected happened, the death of the pope. Fortune had given the emperor an immense advantage, striking down his practised adversary in the very opening of the duel. Moreover, he had the further advantage that the new pope might be one of his own, for all that the emperor was too far away from the scene to be able to influence the election personally. He would indeed hardly be aware of the Pope's death before the news arrived of his successor's election.

Since the death of Urban II (1099) it had been common practice to choose the new pope the very day his predecessor died. But the emperor had his supporters even in the sacred college, and they won the first point in the struggle when they secured that the conclave should open, not at Anagni -- where Adrian, still in exile, had died -- but at Rome, on a territory hostile to Adrian and all he stood for. The English pope, then, was buried in St. Peter's -- where in the sarcophagus of red granite he still rests--and the cardinals proceeded to elect his successor. The matter occupied them for the then unusual space of three days, and the result was a double election. The majority had elected Adrian's chief adviser, no less a personage than Roland Bandinelli. He took the name of Alexander III. The rest, three voters, had chosen a friend of Barbarossa, the Cardinal Octavian, who called himself Victor IV. For the third time in less than forty years the Church was threatened with schism, this time at a moment when it was facing the greatest peril it had known for a century.

The emperor did not make the mistake of immediately declaring for Octavian. He proclaimed himself neutral until the matter was settled by a council, and he did his utmost to keep the Kings of France and England neutral too. Next he summoned a council to meet at Pavia, and cited Alexander -- as Roland Bandinelli--and Octavian, as Victor IV, to appear before it. Alexander refused to appear, denying the emperor's right to call a council without the pope's consent. To which, when the council opened (February 5, 1160), Frederick replied by a renewal of his claims "to have a

right to call the council as emperor. It is well known that Constantine, Theodosius, Justinian, Charlemagne and the others called councils, and I am their successor." Fifty bishops, German and Italian, attended and after a preliminary harangue Frederick left them to their task. They were by no means of one mind. Some of the Italians were for delaying the matter until a truly universal council met. But slowly, under the influence of pressure, those who could not escape yielded, and before the week was out the desired unanimity was attained, and Octavian declared true pope. On February 12, Frederick solemnly acknowledged him as such.

Outside the empire he was less successful. By the end of the year France and England had decided for Alexander; by 1163 Spain, too, and Hungary, Scotland and Ireland. Even in Germany he had his supporters, led by the Bishop of Salzburg, and prominent among them the two new orders of Carthusians and Cistercians.

Alexander excommunicated the emperor and his anti-pope, and once more Frederick's army moved into Lombardy. Milan was again forced to surrender and the emperor ordered it to be destroyed. His treatment of the Milanese terrorised the other cities of Lombardy into immediate submission. Bologna, too, admitted him and Alexander was forced to flee from Rome (1161). Nowhere in Italy was he really safe and he finally found a home in France. The year 1162 was perhaps the most critical in the whole struggle. The pope's scheme for a league against Frederick had broken down; his chief supporters, Louis VII of France and the English king, Henry II, were quarrelling over a marriage; Frederick was master of Lombardy; and when Alexander supported Henry II -- as indeed he could not but do -- Louis began to negotiate with Frederick. Thanks in very large part to the German's lack of finesse the negotiation failed -- even ludicrously (St. Jean de Losne, August 29, 1162), and though Frederick held at Dole in Burgundy the council he had planned, the kings (reguli was the term his new imperialism used to describe them) were absent. Once more the emperor declared that, since Rome was a city of his empire, he must be allowed his say in the election of its bishop.

The next year saw the breach between the English king and the Archbishop of Canterbury over a particular application of the

same principle that divided Alexander and the emperor; and for the next two years the diplomacy of the harassed pope was taxed to the utmost to keep Henry II from going over to Frederick, and yet not surrender in England the rights for whose defence in Italy he was endeavouring to combine all Christendom.

Octavian died in 1164, and Frederick gave him a successor in the Bishop of Cremona, known as Pascal III. To accredit his new pope he summoned the diet of Wurzburg (Pentecost, 1165) and there it was decided that all bishops and abbots, monks and priests should swear an abjuration of Alexander under pain of deposition, loss of goods, mutilation and exile. There followed an intensive campaign throughout Germany to impose the oath. Against the new tactics Alexander was powerless. His scheme for an anti-imperialist coalition never matured, the position in England remained unsatisfactory; France was merely passive in its support; and, in 1166, the King of Sicily died leaving a child to succeed him. The pope's one hope, and he knew it well, was Lombardy and the communes' realisation that his interests were theirs too.

In 1167 the war began anew, Frederick marching once more into Lombardy, beating down on his way the resistance offered by the Bishop of Salzburg. He only halted in Lombardy to hold, at Lodi, a council which recognised Pascal III and then, heedless of the restored Milan and the incipient Lombard league, he made for Rome and Alexander. It was only a matter of time before he was inside the Leonine city; and while Alexander fled, to continue the resistance from the Colosseum, Frederick's troops ravaged and plundered, sparing not in the sack the very basilica of St. Peter. Master of the Apostle's shrine, the emperor now proposed a compromise. Both Alexander and Pascal should resign and a new election take place. This Alexander would not even discuss. Just in time he made his way out of Rome, while Pascal was enthroned and, on the morrow, crowned Frederick a second time.

The emperor's triumph, however, did not last long. Plague fell upon his army, claiming thousands of victims, and so suddenly that contemporaries saw in the disaster the avenging hand of God. The emperor had no choice but to abandon his conquest, and through an Italy now really hostile he made his way north, to

find himself hemmed in, unable to advance, too weakened to attack. Only the feint of a submission to Alexander saved him.

Then (September, 1168) Pascal III died, to receive as a successor Calixtus III -- an imperial nomination that preceded a new offer of peace to Alexander, which, inevitably, failed since it refused him recognition as pope. Alexander developed his Italian policy. He sent new blessings to the league of communes, protecting it against defaulters by threats of excommunication, and in return the league named the new strong place it was building Alessandria in honour of the patriot pope.

For the next five years there was a lull in the hostilities, emperor and pope waging a war of diplomacy in which Alexander, if he did not succeed in wielding his heterogeneous supporters -- Greeks, Sicilians, Lombard Communes -- into an alliance, at any rate kept them from each other's throats and defeated the emperor's attempts to win them from him.

Then in 1174, fifteen years since the struggle began, Barbarossa resolved on a fourth invasion of Italy. It was even more elaborately conceived than the one which had ended so badly in 1167. But both at Ancona and at Alessandria the Imperialists were thwarted. Behind Frederick's back Germany seethed with discontent, and once again he turned to negotiations. In the March of 1176 he was, however, once more in the field and made a sudden move against Milan. It was the prelude to the end, for, after years of organisation, the exasperated Lombards were now ready for him. The army of the League did not wait to be locked up, and in the fiercely fought battle of Legnano (March 29, 1176) they routed the emperor and destroyed his army. For three days it was thought that Frederick himself had fallen, and then, a solitary dishevelled fugitive, he stumbled into Pavia, alive but broken finally.

It was, however, long indeed before his haughty spirit would accept the fact. In October he made an effort to separate the pope from his Lombard allies, offering him recognition as pope, restoration of all the usurped rights and fiefs, and the surrender of the Matildine lands. [] Alexander was too loyal to be caught, and proposed a council at Ferrara at which the Lombards and the Sicilians too should be represented. The council appointed commissioners to meet in Venice and prepare there a definitive

treaty. When it seemed that the discussion over the Matildine lands would wreck the conference Alexander's diplomacy proposed a compromise. There should be a truce for six years, Frederick acknowledging Alexander as pope and the question of the Matildine lands being left for a further fifteen years; meanwhile they were to remain in the emperor's hands. Frederick's entourage brought him round to accept and on July 25, 1177, outside St. Mark's, he knelt before the pope begging for absolution. Pope and emperor together entered the great church, and eight days later the Peace of Venice was solemnly ratified. Alexander's "active patience" had been indeed rewarded, and in April, 1178 he was once more in occupation of Rome.

For the first time since his election, nearly nineteen years before, the pope was free to devote himself wholly to the normal work of the Church. His situation resembled not a little that of Calixtus II in 1123, and the shrewd mind of this first of the lawyer popes resolved to inaugurate in a new General Council the recovery of a spirituality brought low, inevitably, by twenty-five years of bitter division.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



6. THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF 1179

It was not the least of the tragedies of Barbarossa's aggression that it deprived the Church of a great constructive reformer, Alexander III, nineteen years of whose long reign the emperor contrived to fill with a struggle where life itself was the issue. Roland Bandinelli is, after St. Bernard, the greatest personage of his century. He was essentially of his age, in sympathy with all its aspirations, a pioneer of the new theological method and, as became Gratian's first great commentator, possessed of a mind that read principles behind decrees, tendencies in events. That such a man should be elected pope in the very maturity of his powers, and that such a pope should reign for the almost unprecedented period of two-and-twenty years, ought to have sufficed to undo all the mistakes of the many less gifted pontiffs who, since the death of Urban II, had endeavoured to reap the harvest of the great age of St. Gregory VII. It was, however, fated that Roland Bandinelli came to his high destiny at a moment of crisis so terrible that the work of St. Gregory's generation seemed about to be destroyed. The scholar and thinker must perforce show himself man of action. Not until the new danger was laid could the slow quiet task be taken up again of renewing a right spirit within the different members of Christ's mystical body. Alexander was an old man, close on eighty years of age in all likelihood, when, in 1179, he managed to summon the General Council [] that would seem the natural place for his great gifts to bear their fruit.

It was in fact convoked as a reform council, and as a general council so that the reform decrees might have greater prestige. It opened, apparently, on the first Monday of Lent (March 5), 1179, and among its three hundred bishops were representatives of the new Latin hierarchies of the East. There was also present an envoy from the Greek Churches, in schism now for a century.

The details of the discussions are less than scanty. There were three public sessions for the promulgation of the decrees, and the council's twenty-seven canons created, by their form, a new precedent in ecclesiastical legislation. They are longer and fuller than those of the earlier councils, nor are they set down as mere

regulations, but as the expression of a legislating mind. They are much more detailed and the reasons that promote the law are given with it. The whole legislation bears the mark of the trained legal mind that had called the council and had governed it. Especially is the new spirit shown in such canons as those [] which, together, set up the law creating and detailing the right of higher authority to intervene in collations to ecclesiastical benefices wherever the competent, lower authority neglects to do so, or again in the canon [] regulating the procedure by which bishops may judge their subjects, and their subjects appeal against their judgement.

Seven canons that deal with abuses show the pope to have been keenly aware of the damage wrought by the desire of wealth in clergy and laity alike. The exaction of fees for spiritual services -- burials for example -- or by reason of installations is forbidden. The pomp and circumstance of prelates on visitation -- and therefore the expense to their subjects -- is carefully regulated. No cleric is to hold a plurality of benefices, nor is he to dispose of ecclesiastical property by will. The custom that exists in some churches of paying a certain sum on appointment as dean is abolished. The laity are forbidden to dispose of ecclesiastical benefices and forbidden, also, to levy taxes on churches. There is, for the first time in many years, no repetition of the law forbidding clerical marriage, but the customary canon against clerical concubinage is repeated. There is, too, a new prohibition that the clergy are not to frequent convents of women unless that is their special work; penalties are enacted against delinquents.

The schism lately patronised by the emperor finds an echo in the annulment of all ordinations by all the successive anti-popes -- though Alexander showed himself more lenient here than Innocent II, depriving none of the repentant bishops, merely exacting a public oath of recognition and loyalty. Of more permanent importance was the legislation on papal elections that now completed the work of the Roman council of 1059. Then it had been decided that to elect the pope was the business of the cardinal clergy of Rome alone. Now -- with the memory of the schisms in 1130 and 1159 fresh in the mind -- it was laid down that a two-thirds majority of the voters was necessary for a valid election. Another canon fixed the age for the episcopate at thirty years and the priesthood at twenty-four.

Clerics were forbidden henceforward to act as lawyers in the civil courts or as surgeons and physicians. The power of the bishops was strengthened against the encroachment of some of the new centralised exempt orders. Monks were to confine their spiritual activities to their monasteries. The principle that in capitular discussions the will of the maior et sanior pars should decide was given the highest, formal, legal sanction. In cases where more than one person had the right of presentation to a church and where the patrons could not agree, the appointment was to rest with higher authority, the custom of installing two or more rectors with joint authority being condemned.

Like the two first Lateran Councils, the council of 1179 was concerned with social problems no less than with religious questions properly so called. Tournaments were strictly forbidden. Although the sacraments might be given to those fatally injured in them -- if truly repentant -- on no account, should they die, were they to receive ecclesiastical burial. The Truce of God was once more proclaimed; pilgrims and all those who worked for the production of food were taken under the Church's special protection, military commanders who molested them being excommunicated. Usurers were once more banished from the Church, and the rights of lepers to the benefits of the sacraments, and even to a priest and church of their own where their numbers made this feasible, were reasserted. Christians who assisted the Saracens were heavily censured; those, too, who lent themselves out in service to them, or to the Jews. Excommunication was also laid down as the penalty for those who robbed and pillaged the victims of shipwreck.

A very celebrated canon denounced the new menace to the Church and to civilisation presented by the neo-Manichees, and also by the bands of unemployed mercenary soldiers. Against the heretics the canon appealed to the Christian princes. Against the vagabond soldiery, brigands who terrorised whole countrysides, it endeavoured to raise the whole body of the faithful in a kind of crusade for the home front. The people were bidden to take courage and to fight manfully against these devils, and to be assured that, whoever died fighting them, died in a holy war, meriting thereby pardon for his sins and a blessed eternity. [] Finally the council made it obligatory for every bishop to establish in his cathedral city a school where clerics and poor scholars might be taught, such instruction to be given

without payment.

The day had not yet come when popes were to proclaim that, as God's vicars, they had a universal right of supervising earthly governments, but, as if in preparation for that claim, the newly centralised papal government of the Church was taking under its strong protection the cause of the weak and defenceless wherever found. That strength, of which the Roman Church was more and more aware as it more and more consciously centralised the organisation of its primacy, it was also beginning to use to strengthen the episcopal power throughout the world against lay usurpation and clerical acquiescence in it. To this noteworthy development, where St. Gregory VII is the pioneer, Alexander III is one of the chief contributory forces and nowhere more than in his General Council of 1179.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 8: THE CRISIS OF THE MIDDLE AGES, 1181-1198

1. THE IMPERIAL MENACE TO THE FREEDOM OF RELIGION: (2) THE EMPEROR HENRY VI

THE quite exceptional longevity of Alexander III [] had been an undoubted factor in the recent failure of the emperor to reduce the papacy. With that pope's death the phenomenon, more usual in medieval times, of short reigns returned: Lucius III reigned for four years, Urban III for less than two, Gregory VIII for a matter of weeks only, Clement III for three years, then Celestine III for all but seven. Five conclaves in the ten years that followed Alexander's death! It was all the more unfortunate for the Church in that these were the years of a new imperial aggression; and this time the means employed -- and successfully -- were those of diplomacy.

Lucius III, elected at Velletri (September 1, 1181) in accordance with the new electoral law -- for death had found Alexander III once more an exile -- was one of the late pope's most intimate counsellors. He had been, years before, a disciple of St. Bernard, who had given him the Cistercian habit. Innocent II, as far back as 1141, had made him a cardinal, and it was as Cardinal Bishop of Ostia that, in 1159, he had crowned Alexander III. He had been the chief factor in the speedy recognition of Alexander as pope in 1160 and had played a great part in the negotiations of 1177. He was of a more supple disposition than Alexander, and, at the price of concessions to the commune, he managed to regain possession of Rome within a few weeks of his election. By the following February (1182), however, he was once more driven out, and, desperate before his inability to protect the other cities of his States from the raids and violence of the Romans, he turned for help to the emperor.

It was not the new pope's first contact with Frederick. Already the emperor had sought to settle the question of the Matildine lands, left dormant in 1177, offering in exchange for them an

annual percentage of his Italian revenues. Lucius had, however, refused to discuss the matter while the other question left out at the Peace of Venice remained unsettled, namely the relation of the emperor to the Lombard Communes. In 1183, however, the six years' truce expired, and Frederick and the communes came to an agreement, in the Treaty of Constance. The emperor thereby abandoned his claim to name the rulers of the Lombard cities; he acknowledged the Lombards' right to fortify their towns and to conclude alliances and leagues; and, in return, the cities pledged themselves to allow the emperor free passage through northern Italy, and to give him the means to provide for his armies.

This was in June, 1183. The Lombards had won all they had fought for. The emperor had renounced the claims that would have made Lombardy a permanent Italian base of operations. But now, by another stroke of diplomacy, he acquired a much more certain base in the south. The means of this was the marriage of his heir, the future Henry VI, to the heiress of the King of Sicily. A matrimonial alliance with Sicily had been one of Frederick's schemes in 1173, but Alexander III had been too much for him. Now, with the Lombard question settled and the aged Lucius III isolated and helpless, the emperor had his way. The betrothal took place at Augsburg, October 29, 1184, and the marriage at Milan, fifteen months later. It was the gravest check for a hundred and fifty years to the papal policy of political independence. Future popes would have to meet the permanent menace of an emperor who was not only lord of Germany, but master of Sicily and Naples and with extensive rights in Lombardy, too.

Lucius III, for all his extreme old age and the political misfortunes which brought him to the emperor as to a protector, was by no means unmindful of the danger. Nor was he afraid to protest. Despite the emperor's insistence -- in order to secure the empire for his heir -- that Henry should now be crowned emperor with himself, Lucius steadfastly refused. Barbarossa began to prepare an offensive alliance with the Lombard towns. It left the pope, if tremulous, still firm in his refusal. Before the matter could go further Lucius died (November 25, 1185), leaving to his successor an almost impossible task.

It was at Verona that the pope had made his stand, where

through the summer of 1184 a long series of discussions with the emperor had taken place, in circumstances that made their meeting almost as important as a council of the Church. One of the questions then discussed concerned a heritage from the days of the schism. The Lateran Council of 1179 had declared null the ordinations of the anti-popes and of those who acknowledged them. The emperor asked for a revocation of this, and while the pope was willing to consider the matter, the cardinals urged that only a General Council had competence for it. The pope, thereupon, promised to call such a council to meet at Lyons. A further question discussed was the growth of heresy, and the outcome of this discussion was the famous joint decree of pope and emperor *Ad abolendam*. []

Lucius III died the next year (1185). The Archbishop of Milan who succeeded, as Urban III, was unable to hinder the Sicilian marriage, already arranged, but he took what opportunities came his way of limiting Frederick's success. He supported strongly the candidature of the anti-imperialist, Folmar, for the electoral see of Treves, and when Frederick volunteered to help Milan in its attack on Cremona, the pope forbade the Italian cities to join in the war. Urban was soon an exile at Verona, undecided whether to seek a refuge in Venice; and now, while Frederick marched against his German allies, the young Henry VI invaded the Papal States.

Suddenly the news arrived that Jerusalem had fallen to the Saracens. [] Consternation fell upon Christendom. The emperor himself took the cross and departed for the East. He left Henry as his regent. In this young sovereign the popes were to meet the most capable foe that had so far risen against them. Henry VI's Italian career divides itself easily enough. There is a period of preparation, and a first attack that ends in failure; then a period of intense activity in Germany in which several strokes of good fortune assist him, a second Italian expedition, and the most complete success; then, in the hour of his triumph, sudden death at the age of thirty-six.

Henry was a master politician, and he had already systematically placed men he could trust in all the strong places of the Matildine lands and the March of Ancona, thus isolating the pope from Lombardy, when, on November 18, 1189, the death of the King of Sicily renewed the crisis terminated two years before

by the crusade. Henry's wife, Constance, was now Queen of Sicily, [] but the kingdom which Henry proposed to occupy in her name was by no means unanimously agreed in her favour. There existed a powerful anti-imperialist party, and soon it had organised a new government with Tancred -- an illegitimate descendant of the Norman kings -- as king. The pope, now Clement III, secretly favoured this competitor to Henry, and by the end of 1190 Tancred was master of the situation. Henry then took the field in person, and as he marched through Italy the same good fortune fell to him as had befallen his father in 1159 -- the death of the pope (March 20, 1191). Better still, from the king's point of view, the cardinals elected an old man of eighty-five -- Celestine III. He was not at all willing to confer on Henry the imperial crown, [] but he had no means to prevent his occupation of Rome and no choice but to recognise him as emperor.

The new emperor next invested Naples, where Tancred and the best part of his forces lay. Here disaster followed upon disaster. The Neapolitan fleet destroyed the Pisan fleet that was in the emperor's service, and the July heats were too much for Henry's northern troops. Two of his chief lieutenants died, he himself fell gravely ill and, to crown all, his wife was captured, to become Tancred's prisoner. Henry had no choice but to return to Germany and reorganise. Southern Italy, for the moment, was free of him and the pope had a breathing space, in which to prevent new dangers -- if possible -- by diplomacy.

With the emperor, however, no understanding was possible so long as he refused to evacuate the papal territories he still held. For Celestine's legates he had indeed nothing but new threats. The pope proceeded to develop the other policy, of alliance with Tancred. He acknowledged him as King of Sicily and gave him investiture, Tancred conceding to the pope as suzerain the right to decide appeals and the right to send a legate to the kingdom every five years. Further, in a vain hope of conciliating the emperor, the pope persuaded Tancred to release his valuable hostage, the Empress Constance.

In Germany meanwhile (1192-1193) the emperor was faced with a powerful coalition, the centre of which was Henry of Brunswick. But the capture of Henry's uncle, the English king Richard Coeur de Lion, who also was an ally of Tancred, did much to break up

this league of German princes, and his enormous ransom largely solved for the emperor the question how to finance the new Italian expedition. Henry of Brunswick's marriage with the emperor's niece completed the pacification of Germany. Then, just as the emperor was ready to deal with Sicily, Tancred died, on February 28, 1194, leaving only a child to succeed him. Henry's task had lost all its difficulty. The papacy was truly at his mercy.

He set out in May, 1194. His diplomacy won him the fleets of both Genoa and Pisa, and while he was still at Pisa the Neapolitans came to proffer their homage. Henry was finally master of central and southern Italy.

He left Constance to rule his new acquisition, and returned to Germany to organise his next expedition: a crusade which should avenge the failure of that of 1190-1192, and should also make him master of Constantinople. The pope, who had not dared to protest at Henry's arrest of Richard Coeur de Lion, a crusader returning from the Holy Land, could only send a message of thanks and congratulation. Along with the grandiose plan to conquer the East and so make himself really another Constantine, there went the determination to transform the elective empire into a dignity hereditary in his own family. The emperor opened his campaign at the Diet of Wurzburg in 1196, persuading many of the bishops and nobles to give him signed promises of support. Next, to further the scheme, he sought to win from the pope the coronation of his baby son, Frederick Roger, then just two years old. With this in view he once again came into Italy. The pope was utterly helpless, but his ninety years gave him one advantage -- he could simply be deaf to the emperor's suggestion. He began by presenting Henry with a list of grievances: oppression of the Church in Sicily, the continued occupation of the papal territory by imperial garrisons; and then, when Henry became dangerously urgent, he promised to give a definite answer by the feast of the Epiphany, 1197.

That date found the emperor in his kingdom of Sicily, busy with the suppression of a widespread insurrection, long plotted under the oppression of Henry's German subordinates, and for whose explosion his own arrival was the signal. There were plots against his life, in which an alleged paramour of his wife was concerned: Henry had him tortured to death in her

presence. And there were savage reprisals throughout the kingdom: plotters burnt at the stake, sawn in two, buried alive. Finally the terror triumphed. By August, 1197, Henry was once more master. A month later fever had carried him off, with just the time before he died to leave his son and heir in the wardship of the one person he could trust in a treacherous world -- the ninety-year-old pope!

Celestine III lived only a few months longer, and with the election of his successor the wheel of fortune turned indeed its full. While, in place of Henry VI, there was the baby three years old, and while in Germany rival princes fought for the imperial crown, the cardinals, instead of electing yet another octogenarian, set in place of Celestine a man of thirty-seven, the Cardinal Lothario of Segni. He took the name of Innocent III (January 8, 1198).

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. THE DISASTERS IN THE LATIN EAST, 1150-1197

After the tragic fiasco, in 1148, of the Second Crusade, the Mohammedan offensive went from one success to another. Nureddin conquered what remained of the country of Edessa; he took some of the towns in the principality of Antioch; and the King of Jerusalem found his only hope of salvation to be an alliance with Constantinople.

In 1153 the king took from the Egyptians Ascalon, which had held out since the days of the First Crusade; but, as against this success, Nureddin, in the following year, took Damascus. There, for the moment, his direct attack halted: for the next fifteen years he and the King of Jerusalem fought each other indirectly, in the faction struggle which divided Egypt. By 1169 the faction which Nureddin supported had triumphed. Its leader was a man of genius, Saladin, and in 1171 he was sole ruler in Egypt. His accession to power meant the end of the religious schism which had for so long rent the Mohammedans; Egypt, to the south, was now as strong as Nureddin to the north. The Latins were yearly weaker, and more divided, while in Europe the papal energies were now wholly occupied in beating off Frederick Barbarossa's great bid for the control of the Church. It could only be a matter of time before the Latins lost their hold on Jerusalem. Only so long as rival Mohammedans faced each other in equal strength would Latins enjoy any security. Once either Saladin or Nureddin achieved a supremacy in the Mohammedan world, the remnant of Latin power would be swept away without much difficulty.

In 1174 Nureddin died; and Saladin began little by little to make himself master of Syria too. By 1183 Aleppo was his, and Damascus also. The circle was almost complete around the doomed Latin kingdom.

Its kings, of course, had not been careless of the approaching danger. From 1164 they called repeatedly on the West for help, and their appeal in 1184 had produced in France and England the new institution of a fixed tax levied for the support of the Holy Land. One very grave internal disaster was the extinction of the dynasty when, in 1186, Baldwin the Leper died without heirs.

His mother Sybilla had, six years earlier, married as her second husband a French adventurer, Guy de Lusignan, highly unpopular with the barons; now, since Sybilla was herself heiress to the throne, Guy became king.

It was at this critical moment, when the internal dissensions of the kingdom were at their height, that Raynald of Chatillon, lord of the impregnable fortress of Krak, half brigand, half pirate-for he had a fleet on the Red Sea, and lived largely on the pillage of caravans -- captured a caravan in which Saladin's sister was travelling, and this during a time of truce (1186).

Saladin proclaimed the Holy War to drive the Christians out, once and for all. A Mohammedan army, fired with all the enthusiasm that had once been the crusaders', swept down on the Western disorganisation. At Tiberias, in May, 1187, a joint army of Hospitallers and Templars was defeated and on July 4, at Hattin, the army of the kingdom was cut to pieces. Nothing lay between Saladin and his prey. One by one he occupied all the towns of the kingdom, except Tyre and Jerusalem. On October 2 he entered Jerusalem, too. Tyre, Tripoli and Antioch were all that remained of the fruits of 1095. After eighty-eight years of occupation there was need of another Urban II.

The reigning pope to whom the news of the battle of Hattin came was Urban III. Before he learnt of the fall of Jerusalem he was dead; and the shock of this news, when it arrived, killed his successor, Gregory VIII (October 21-December 17, 1187). It was to the aged Clement III that the task fell of once more rousing the Catholic world, or rather of organising the new enthusiasm which, immediately, began to show itself. If Jerusalem had fallen, it was said, this was because Christendom had sinned; and in a fervour of contrition for past apathy the scenes of 1095 began to be renewed. Everywhere, under the encouraging diplomacy of the papal legates, princes long at war came to terms: Henry II of England and Philip II of France, Pisa and Genoa, Venice and Hungary, the King of Sicily and the Byzantine emperor. All took the cross, and none more eagerly than the emperor Frederick Barbarossa, one of the few survivors of the disastrous crusade of 1147. Under his leadership all Germany prepared to send into the East the largest single army yet formed. The Sicilian Fleet set out immediately and saved Tripoli for the cross, and in May, 1189, the Germans marched out of

Ratisbon, 100,000 strong.

Barbarossa's host made its way through Hungary easily enough but when it reached the Byzantine frontiers it came into contact with a power, not merely suspicious, as in previous years, but so alarmed at this revival that it had already come to terms with Saladin, and was prepared to act as his ally. In the last stages of the march to Constantinople the Germans had to fight more than one pitched battle with the Greeks. In the capital itself the emperor threw the German ambassadors into prison, and the patriarch lavished indulgences on whoever would kill the Latin dogs. Frederick began to think of destroying Byzantium. He wrote home to enlist the sympathies of the pope, to beseech that the crusade might be directed against these traitors, and to his son, Henry VI, to assemble the necessary fleets. Finally the Greek emperor -- Isaac Angelus -- yielded, promising a safe passage for the Germans and opportunity to provision their forces. On March 30, 1190, they crossed the Bosphorus and began the march through Asia Minor. Despite terrible hardships they made their way successfully, taking Iconium by storm and then, on June 10, the greatest of disasters befell them. The old emperor, as he crossed the river Salef, was thrown from his horse and drowned. Consternation seized on the princes. Many turned for home; others got as far as Antioch; only a small part survived to join the main operation of the crusade, the siege of St. Jean d'Acre, the strongly defended gate to the Holy Land.

Here, as the siege continued (June, 1189-July, 1191) all the forces from all over Europe gathered, under a brilliant band of leaders, the most distinguished of whom were Philip II of France and the new King of England, Richard Coeur de Lion. As always, there were as many rivals as princes, and the jealousy of the two kings split the crusade from the beginning. But finally, thanks in great part to Richard's skill, the town surrendered. Before the month was out Philip returned to France leaving Richard supreme.

It was now decided to take Jerusalem, and through August and September the armies marched along the coast, occupying Cesarea and Jaffa. And now a wholly new feature appeared in the crusade. The long siege of Acre had done as much to familiarise the newly-arrived crusaders with their opponents as the permanent life in the East had long since familiarised the

various kings of Jerusalem and their nobles. A sort of military camaraderie had begun to grow, and out of it there now came a move to end the struggle by diplomacy. But Saladin, furious at Richard's massacre of two thousand Saracen hostages, refused to treat, as he refused also the extraordinary proposal that his brother should marry Richard's sister and rule Palestine. The negotiations gave Saladin time to bring reinforcements to Jerusalem, and when Richard prepared to attack, the more experienced chiefs of the military orders could only warn him of his foolhardiness. In the end Richard and Saladin came to terms. There was to be a truce for three years, the coast towns were to be shared, and small parties of crusaders were to be allowed in Jerusalem as pilgrims. This was on September 2, 1192. The crusade was over, and five weeks later Richard set sail for Europe. Once more years of effort, tens of thousands of lives lost, an immense treasure spent, and nothing achieved.

The next year Saladin died. He left to succeed him a brother, and seventeen sons. Soon Palestine and Syria were their much-disputed prize. The crusade had a new opportunity. This time it was left to the emperor Henry VI, Barbarossa's son and successor, to make the most of it. He was perhaps the greatest man the empire had known since Charlemagne, and, apparently, about to realise that dream of universal dominion which had haunted so many of Charlemagne's German successors. A stroke of luck had brought even the King of England within the range of his policies. He was ruler of Sicily and southern Italy as well as of Germany, and now, from Sicily, he plotted the conquest of the Eastern empire too. The first object of crusading zeal threatened now to be Constantinople. Henry took the cross in a solemn assembly at Bari on May 31, 1195, and six months later, at the German diet called to organise the details of the crusade, the changes in its political objective were admirably prefigured when the kings of Cyprus and Armenia gave over their realms to Henry and received them from him as their suzerain.

Meanwhile the task of recruiting new armies was pressed forward, Henry himself taking part in it. Through the spring of 1197 the new German forces began to gather in the harbours of southern Italy -- to the dismay of the inhabitants upon whom they lived, and to whom they were "less pilgrims than thieving wolves." In September 1197 the first departures took place. The

objective set them was Jerusalem, and the Holy City taken they were to join the emperor before Constantinople.

These forces came to Acre, took Sidon, defeated the most capable of their opponents, Saladin's brother, Malek, and by the capture of Beyrouth (October 23, 1197) reopened the way from Tripoli -- still in Latin hands -- to Jerusalem. They were then held up by the stronghold of Tiberias, and at the moment when they had decided to raise the siege the news reached them that Henry VI was dead -- had been dead, indeed, since three weeks after their departure. This was the end of all order in the crusade. A truce was patched up with Malek and the army dispersed under its various leaders.

In the tragic fiasco of these first attempts to regain Jerusalem, the beginnings are discernible of new secular encroachments in what was, in essence and in origin, a spiritual institution. It is the lay prince alone who now really counts in it. The crusade tends to be a thing controlled by him alone, directed to his ends, and along what lines he chooses. It ceases, at times, to be crusade at all; Catholics and Mohammedans fraternise, negotiate, and even plan marriage alliances. The old aim of expelling the unbeliever from the sacred soil of Palestine has lost its place as the absolute determining factor of the movement. And at this moment, when the papally-created institution is definitely slipping from the grasp of the papacy, the Eastern empire whose capital is Constantinople is beginning to seem to the crusader as great a foe as Islam. When next the zeal of Christendom is roused, these new tendencies will mature with unpleasant rapidity.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



3. CATHOLIC THOUGHT: THE MENACE OF ARISTOTLE AND AVERROES

When in 1161 Peter Lombard died, and Roland Bandinelli, now Pope Alexander III, began to be wholly absorbed in the defence of the papacy's independence against Frederick Barbarossa, the Catholic intellectual world lost the last of the really great personalities who had led it for now a hundred years. The next generation was not to produce any successor who could be compared to them. Yet it saw the emergence of a new intellectual force none the less, and one so far reaching in its effects that, by comparison with the thought that followed, the work of the century that closed with Peter Lombard is of hardly more than archaeological importance. This new force was the mind of Aristotle. From the middle of the twelfth century the invasion of Christendom by the philosophy of Aristotle, and the slow victory of his ideas in an unending series of fiercely fought battles, is, after the duel with the Hohenstaufen, the chief feature of the Church's history.

A philosophy strongly Aristotelian in sympathy has been now for so long the officially accredited means by which, in the Catholic Church, revelation is explained and its reasonableness defended, that it requires an effort to conceive that matters were once very different indeed. The history of the century between the death of Alexander III and that of St. Thomas Aquinas (1181-1274) shows that it was only after Homeric fighting, and three generations of hard thinking that the possibilities which Aristotle held for the rational exposition of Catholicism were understood and developed. To the majority of the theologians to whom Aristotle was offered as anything more than the logician -- as the physicist, that is to say, the psychologist, the metaphysician -- this founder of what, "on the face of it is the least religious of all the great philosophies" [] could only seem the most dangerous of foes. This was partly due to the shortcomings and incompleteness of Aristotle himself, but it was due still more to the company with whom, and through whom, he made his appearance. Aristotle came to the Catholic West in its first century of freedom from the necessities of a struggle for life, and he came to it as part of that superior Mohammedan culture which, dominant for centuries from India

to the Atlantic, had only lately ceased to menace Catholicism's very existence.

Aristotle had ceased to be studied in the lands that were once the Roman Empire since, in 529, Justinian closed the schools of Athens. The cult, so to call it, found a refuge with the Monophysites of Egypt and Syria, and in Persia too. When the Arabs conquered these lands in the first half of the sixth century, Aristotle, with much other cultural riches, passed to the new empire of Islam. How Greek philosophy developed in that empire, of the inevitable strife between its devotees and the Mohammedan theologians, of the alternations of protection and persecution from the different caliphs that were its lot throughout the next three centuries, must be read elsewhere. As the philosophy was driven from the Eastern caliphate, it began to flourish in Moslem Spain. From Spain, through translations made under the direction of the Archbishop Raymond of Toledo (1126-1150), this Greco-Arab philosophical and scientific culture began, in the last half of the twelfth century, to be known to the Catholic intellectual world which Abelard and his fellows had recently restored to life.

The translations were, to begin with, inevitably unsatisfactory, made as they were from the Spanish translation of an Arabic translation of a Syrian translation of the Greek original. But, apart altogether from translating Aristotle's text, these clerics of Toledo did something destined to fire every intelligence in France and Italy, and to give the whole Catholic world matter for thought eternally, when they translated the great Arabs and the great Jews whom in the past three centuries the study of Aristotle -- and no less importantly the study of Neoplatonic writings that passed for Aristotle -- had inspired. Finally, the translators were also authors, Catholics philosophising in the spirit of the writings they had translated. With these translations, philosophical ideas, true and false -- and often subtly akin, in their spiritual promise, to the highest aspirations of Catholic life -- entered into the very heart of the Catholic life of the next hundred years, and side by side with the fight to compel recognition of the real Aristotle's real value, another fight was waged to cast out the new, more insidious, pseudo- mystical elements of Neoplatonism.

That fight was the affair of the next century. The years which this

chapter covers merely saw the Aristotelian problem stated. Was Aristotle essentially anti-Christian and his philosophy necessarily destructive of Christianity, or did it offer, rather, the best means of rationally explaining Christianity to itself and to the world? The scholastic world was bitterly divided about this, as, a hundred years earlier, it had been divided on the question of using logic to study Revelation; the positions of the parties that were to fight the question to a finish began to be defined; and finally the arena was prepared that was to be the scene of the fights, the University of Paris, founded at the end of the twelfth century under Innocent III.

That the nature of the later, thirteenth century, crisis may be understood, something must be said of the chief exponents of this Greco-Saracen thought that the twelfth century saw making its way across Christendom from Spain. There are three Mohammedans, two Jews and the chief of their translators to consider: Avicenna, Al Ghazel, Averroes, Avicbron, Maimonides and Dominic Gondisalvi.

Avicenna, (Ibn Sina), born in Turkestan in 980, is one of the greatest figures in the history of philosophy. He was a man with a truly universal mind, who possessed an extraordinary knowledge of the natural sciences, of law, of theology and -- what gave him great fame through all the Middle Ages of medicine too. He was a passionate student of Aristotle, but the *Metaphysics* proved an insurmountable barrier, for all that he had read them so often that he knew them by heart, until he fell in with the commentary of Al Farabi. [] With the mastery of Aristotle thence gained, Avicenna's formation was complete. Much of his original work in philosophy has perished, but a kind of *Summa* of Aristotelianism as he conceived it, in eighteen books, survives to show the scale of his achievement and to explain the fact of his enormous prestige. His work, however, like that of all these Islamic philosophers, suffers inevitably from the twin defects that he worked on a text that was a translation at second-hand, and that his Aristotle included two famous treatises which we now know are of Neoplatonic authorship. Avicenna, for all his vast Aristotelian scholarship, is really a Neoplatonist. His aim is mystical, namely to achieve union with the Divine even in this life. He is not primarily a physicist, as assuredly was Aristotle, but his interest is psychological. Here, too, thought interests him -- and he builds from an examination

of thought processes -- simply as a means of arriving at his religious end. He shares the Platonist idea of the opposition between spirit and matter, the insistence of that philosophy on the immortality of the soul and its theory of Providence. Through a gradual ascent of knowledge man comes finally to the moment when in all things he sees God, and nothing but God; the knowledge of self disappears, and the mystic is rapt in contemplation.

As a system of practical mysticism related to philosophy, [] and in which, apparently, a place was found for all three Persons of the Blessed Trinity, Avicenna had, of himself, much to interest the Catholics who first studied him. In spirit, through his use of psychological analysis, he was something akin to St. Augustine, something very far removed from the impersonal metaphysics of Aristotle. A further point to be noted, is his attitude towards one of the major problems of Aristotelian interpretation, the theory, namely, by which Aristotle explains the spiritual character of the essential intellectual operation. For Avicenna the true first intellect of all mankind is the Demiurge-Logos, the agent of the Divinity's dealings with man. It is through this Logos, by participation in him, that is to say, that the individual mind understands.

The Spanish Jew, Avicbron (Salomon Ibn Gabirol, 1020-1058), it is convenient to consider with Avicenna, for they were later studied in combination by the school of Catholic scholastics to whom their ideas appealed. Avicbron, poet as well as philosopher, author of the Fons Vitae, had in view the same practical mystical end, namely to satisfy, even in this life, the religious man's aspiration to union with God. His Fons Vitae is remarkable for its special theory that all things are composed of matter and form -- he is possibly, here, a source of Gilbert of la Porree -- that God is the form of the universe considered as a whole, and that form is united to matter through the intellect. Avicbron supplies a common ground where mystics and natural scientists meet. He makes physics serve the needs of mystical aspiration. []

Al Ghazel (1059-1111) comes to his place in this story in a very curious way, for he was one of the leaders of the Mohammedan reaction which, after Avicenna's death in 1037, destroyed the philosophical movement in the Eastern caliphate. To ruin

beyond all hope of repair the hold of the philosopher on the thinking mind Al Ghazel first set out Avicenna's doctrine systematically. His summary was so clear, and so concise, that, in another country, a generation later, it did more than any other work to make Avicenna understandable and to popularise his thought. Avicenna's teaching on the soul now stood out in particular relief: that the soul is not merely the form of the body, that it is a substance, and that it is immortal precisely because it is a substance.

To translate into Latin these three related thinkers was part of the great work of Dominic Gondisalvi, Archdeacon of Toledo. Of Gondisalvi himself -- Gundissalinus, as he was to those who used him -- we know almost nothing; nor did he, in his own writings, show himself more than a mediocre compiler. But the materials which made up the compilation were new; and it was in such works as his *De Immortalitate Animae* and *De Divisione Philosophiae* that thousands into whose hands the more valuable translations never came, made their first acquaintance with the metaphysics and the ethics of Aristotle. Nor was Gundissalinus content merely to translate the greater writers. In one important particular he re-adjusted Avicenna himself. Sure as that mystic's system was of a hearing, in a generation when theology's chief importance still lay, for many, in its being a road to immediate union with God, and surer still for the undoubted half-Christian ideas it already contained, this correction made by Gundissalinus put the system's success beyond all doubt. Where Avicenna had placed the source of the intellect's illumination in the Demiurge Logos -- a being really distinct from God -- that illumination, with Gundissalinus, was the direct act of God Himself. That in this theory -- Gundissalinus-Avicenna -- man's intelligence was almost effaced before the activity of God is true; but the *prima facie* resemblance of Avicenna's thought to the traditional Augustinian theory of knowledge is greatly heightened by the theory. It is, in fact, a revival of Augustinianism strengthened by the support of Avicenna. Gundissalinus, also, is practical in his aim -- he makes much use of St. Bernard's *De Adherendo Deo* -- and it was its writer's mystical objective, writ large all over his work, that secured the new system its first welcome, without that primary hostile scrutiny which might otherwise have been its lot.

There was, however, still more in the system thus smuggled into

the heart of Catholicism than a doctrine of knowledge sufficiently resembling Augustinianism to be swallowed whole by the Augustinians. In Al Ghazel-Avicenna, Gundissalinus found a system which taught that the soul's supreme happiness consists in its union with the one, semi-divine, active Intellect; and that, even in this life, the union is possible, momentarily at least, for souls which are specially pure and detached from the body. This suggested to him an analogous Catholic theory whose summit is a mystical doctrine of ecstasy by direct union of the soul with God. Finally, this rough and ready adapter of Saracenic Neoplatonism left to the next generation a formidable problem, nothing less in fact than how really to co-ordinate this corpus of thought -- which he believed was Aristotelian, but which was in fact Neoplatonic -- with the teaching, traditional among Catholic mystics, of God as the soul's illuminator.

This Avicennian, or Gundissalinian, Aristotle was fortunate in the time of his appearance, for in the last years of the twelfth century it was the mystical theologians who dominated the scene at Paris, while at Chartres the Platonic tradition was still strong. But the intellect of the twelfth century was by no means entirely given up to the thought of the Divine, and of the surest means of earthly communion with It. Side by side with this, there ran a strong current of scientific materialism, of fatalistic astrology and, in the darker places, of atheism too. While to this side of contemporary life -- a very real side, that must never be lost sight of in the study of what have been called "the Ages of Faith"-Aristotle, as expressed in the spiritual idealism of Avicenna, made little appeal, there came from it a welcome at least as great to the Spanish Moor who seemed to those of this day, and to very many thinkers of the next century too, Aristotle born again. This was Averroes, born at Cordova in 1126, no ancient figure, for this end of the twelfth century, revived by the research of the scholarly, but, with all his superb understanding of the great master, still very much alive in the flesh. [] Averroes was perhaps the greatest of all who have worshipped at the shrine of Aristotle. The one aim of his life was to make Aristotle intelligible to his time, and the degree of his achievement is declared by the title the Middle Ages gave him. In a time when to comment Aristotle, or some part of him, was almost the first foundation of any intellectual fame, Averroes was, simply, "The Commentator." "Averrois," said Dante, "che il gran commento feo."

Like a true disciple of Aristotle, Averroes is first of all a physicist, and it is this fundamental interest in physics which links him immediately with those contemporary speculations, partly astrological, partly atheistical, which derived, and not merely through the Arabs, from a very distant antiquity. For Averroes, then, the First Source of all movement has an astral, cosmic character. The heavens of Averroes are a living reality, and the hierarchy of the heavenly intelligences is the chain linking man with the Primum Movens. Here Averroes shows himself, not merely Aristotelian, but as the perfection of a long Arabian and Neoplatonic tradition, the perfection because the most influenced by Aristotle. His Aristotle is none the less Neoplatonist, as witnesses this introduction of a theory of intermediary intelligences, emanated gradually through the hierarchy of the spheres. []

No commentator, however, was less influenced than Averroes by the spiritual elements of Neoplatonism. So much of a physicist is he that, for him, things are absolutely one. There is no distinction between their essence and existence, no possibility of movement from non-being to being, no possibility of creation. It is a physicism so absolute that it leaves no place for freedom, freedom for example of the will. All is necessary, determined, in an eternal evolution. Form, soul therefore, for the soul is the form of the body, is part of the material cosmos. Yet the soul can think, and thought is non-material. How explain this production of an effect higher in nature than the soul that produces it? Here Averroes, like Avicenna and like all who have striven to follow Aristotle, is brought up against one of the problems to which Aristotle gives no clear solution. We have seen Avicenna's solution already. Another tradition, dating from Alexander of Aphrodisias (2nd century A.D.), which persisted down to Avempace (1138), Averroes' own contemporary, solved it by developing, from doctrines implicit in the Aristotelian corpus, the theory of an operation between the passive intellect existent in each individual and a single active intelligence of the whole cosmos. For Averroes this was a wholly unacceptable compromise. He indignantly rejected it, and showed himself here the most radical of all the commentators by postulating the unity of the passive intelligence too. What then of the soul's immortality? For Averroes the soul is only immortal in the sense that the one active intelligence is immortal. Finally the First

Mover is inseparable from the whole of that which he moves.

Clearly the philosophy of Averroes -- of Aristotle too, if Averroes truly represents the essential Aristotle -- is not compatible with the revealed religion enshrined in the traditional teaching of the Church. What of his immediate effect? and what was it in Aristotle which, despite his formidable appearance of irrefutable, scientifically established materialism, was to urge the keenest and most orthodox minds of the next hundred years to attempt a new reading of his Metaphysics?

There IS one unmistakable feature of the thought of the old classical culture, and that is the common ground which it offers, both to philosophers and to scientists, in the facts of astronomy-- a kind of syncretism where the observed periodicity of stellar movements served as a scientific basis for a theory of universal determinism. This syncretism passed, with much else of the GrecoRoman culture, into the rich amalgam of the Arab empire in the East. For Al-Kindi (d. 860), the first of the great translators of Aristotle, astrology was the mistress of the sciences, and his successor and disciple, Albumasar (d. 886), showed a like reverence for it. Thenceforward the cult of the stars shared the varying fortunes of the old philosophy. Even the greatest of these thinkers, Avicenna, had a place for the stars as real determining influences upon human choice.

This cult of the stars had, on the other hand, been sympathetic, at least, throughout all its history, to a very radical materialistic atheism, as well as to pantheism. To this astral determinism Aristotle's thought had given a certain support and, although atheism played a part in Greek philosophy long before Aristotle, the new philosophies that came from among the continuators of Plato and Aristotle were more favourable to atheism than the earlier philosophies.

For more than one reason astrology -- with its implicit denial of moral responsibility -- was popular. People and princes alike, in all the last centuries of the antique world, fell before the temptation to use the astrologer, and to direct their lives by his erudite calculations. With the gradual Christian conquest of that culture the astrologer lost his hold, but from the ninth century, thanks in great part to the Arabs, who were now to be found in every city of Italy and southern France, the old practices slowly

revived. Works on astrology began to be translated before those of the philosophers, and they were more readily assimilated, more eagerly sought out. By the twelfth century astrology was, in a sense, omnipresent in Christendom; and the new spirit, if congenial to the school of Chartres, found its first great scientific opponent in Abelard. After Abelard's death it regained at Paris what ground it had lost, and then, as the influence of Averroes began slowly to seep through, new life came from his strongly organised thought to the allied astrological and atheistic speculations. Thanks to the new vigour thus infused, things that had slept for centuries began slowly to reawaken. Once more, the enormous prestige of Aristotle himself aided the movement.

By the end of the twelfth century there was then, undoubtedly, in the intellectual centres of the Catholic world, a strong current of ideas at once astrological and atheistic, and it was threatening to gain the chief seat of Catholic culture, the schools of Paris, in the very moment when the new organisation was forming that was to make them, with the papacy and the empire, the third great feature of Catholic life.

"Very early in the twelfth century it began to be rumoured everywhere that long before Christianity was heard of Aristotle had solved all the problems of human society." [] By the end of the century it was much more than rumour; and here we touch on the core of the new revolution in travail -- the genius of Aristotle himself. When the Catholic West began to read for the first time his *Physics*, the *De Coelo et Mundo*, the *De Anima*, the *De Generatione et Corruptione*, and the *Metaphysics*, it reeled before the sudden discovery of a new world. Here was a systematic study of the universe, in its own right and for its own sake, of things, plants, animals, man, the stars, and the Power that moulds the whole. [] A whole encyclopaedia of the natural sciences, a whole corpus of new facts, and a philosophy that explained them-it was a kind of sudden revelation in the natural order. And, over all, there presided the genius of the inventor of Logic. It was the key to the universe in the study of the universe, in the study of Nature for Nature's own sake, and in the light of the natural reason. There has, probably, never been anything, in the intellectual order, to equal this sudden restoration -- to a culture already possessed of one important part of the ancient culture-of all that it most lacked and most needed, namely the

vast body of the natural science of that ancient culture and the best of its philosophy. Not in one single generation could the gift be truly estimated, possessed, assimilated. The first effect, inevitably, was a confusion of sudden conclusions and half-truths, the inevitable fruit of half-understood principles. For the ruling authorities in the Church it presented an anxious problem, this vast corpus of knowledge, impossible to ignore, impossible not to use, and yet a knowledge shot through with Materialism, Pantheism and all that was least compatible with the traditional Faith. []

It was amid this swirl and turbulence of the new thought that in 1205, the pope, Innocent III, called into existence a new institution whose special purpose was the promotion of higher studies and the safeguarding of the traditional Faith, alike among those who studied and among those who taught. This institution was the University of Paris. It was the forerunner of scores of similar institutions, set up in the next two centuries by the same papal authority and, to some extent, it was the model on which all of them were fashioned; but in one important respect it was from the beginning a thing apart. What made this university at Paris unique was the extraordinary number of its students, the fact that these students (and the masters, too) came from all over Christendom, and the prestige in its schools of theological studies and of the study of the newly-revealed Aristotelian books. Already, for nearly a hundred years continuously, before the decisive act of Innocent III, this group of schools that centred around the school of the Bishop of Paris had been the universally recognised capital of the theological intelligence of the Church. Innocent III himself was a product of these schools.

To the town of Paris the schools were, by the end of the century, an immense asset -- and a grave responsibility in more than one way. And the prosperity of the schools was no less a matter of concern to the French king. Already it was beginning to be seen that, if the Italian nation had the papal capital itself as its glory, and the Germans the Empire, the French could boast in the schools of Paris a third institution no whit less effective than either of these throughout the whole of Christendom. Whatever made for the better organisation and greater contentment of these thousands of foreign scholars who were now a permanent element of life in the French capital, and a rich source of French

prestige and influence, must interest the monarchs who were welding France into a single country. The decisive act was the constitution of the whole body of these students and masters as a self-governing corporation, free at once from the jurisdiction of the local bishop and the local civil authorities; and this was what Innocent III did in 1205.

But in doing this it was far from the pope's intention to create within the Church such an unheard of novelty as an institution that was perfectly autonomous. The new universitas was the creation of the papacy; the popes would endow it liberally with privileges, they would lavish praises on it, [] fight its battles, defend its rights: but they would also control it -- control at least the main lines of its development -- during the first formative hundred years. For as a school to which all Christendom came in search of theological learning the university could be, inevitably, a most powerful source of general error as well as a general benefit. [] This was not a national institution -- and it was more than what we would call international: the schools of Paris in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were Christendom itself, hard at work upon the Bible, St. Augustine and Aristotle, upon divine Revelation, traditional theology, the new natural sciences and philosophy. Facing such a phenomenon, unprecedented in its kind as well as in its scale, the chief of Christendom could not be a mere spectator or patron. Here, too, he must rule.

And this papal control of the schools, in these years that were so critical, both for the faith and for the whole future of Western civilisation, [] was a model of practical wisdom and of truly Roman tact: -- the first, early prohibition of lectures on the Physics of Aristotle, and the Metaphysics, while these were yet such novelties that, inevitably, like men filled with new wine, students and masters fell with passionate enthusiasm into one error after another, into errors about the new doctrines as surely as into errors about their relation to the traditional faith; then, the strong insistence on the primacy of Theology among the sciences; and the gradual relaxation of the ban on Aristotle, until, finally, the great pagan is given droit de cite, and the study of his works becomes an obligatory part of the theologian's training.

As the first years of the new century went by, the translations

began to multiply -- and to improve. There was now, side by side with the early work of Gundissalinus, a second series of translations, made on the Greek text itself. And presently the opposition began to harden, and to fix itself: opposition, first of all, to Aristotle, and then, more usefully, to Averroes. Averroes, "who knew all there was to be known, understood all, explained all," seemed at first to point to the happy mean between the Neoplatonism of the Augustinians, the Aristotelianism of the last generation of Abelard's influence, and the Positivism of the physicists and astrologers. It was only slowly, and by degrees, that Paris began to realise that Averroes himself was the enemy. William of Auvergne, for example, master in the schools until 1228, and from thence on Bishop of Paris until his death (1249), strenuously opposes the special doctrines of Averroes, and at the same time attacks no less strenuously those who hold them -- for their slanderous imputation of them to Averroes!

Not until the next generation, apparently, to the last few years of William of Auvergne's episcopate, was Averroes seen to be what he is. By that time the man had arrived who was equal to the new situation -- St. Albert the Great.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



4. ANTI-CLERICALISM, HERESY AND ANTI-CATHOLICISM: WALDENSES, JOACHIM OF FLORA, ALBIGENSES

Between the accession of St. Leo IX, when the papacy began effectively to lead the reform movement within the Church, and that of Innocent III, lies a period of a hundred and fifty years, a period divided evenly by the Concordat of Worms and the first General Council of the Lateran. The movement which St. Leo inaugurated, and whose greatest figure is St. Gregory VII, had been, essentially, directed to the reform of abuses and to the restoration of Christian life throughout the Church. The leaders were men of holy life, monks for the most part, shocked to see the general neglect of the most elementary precepts of the Gospel, their hearts lacerated at the spiritual peril that endangered souls. Whence the bitterness of the struggle these pastors of souls waged, first against the unworthy clergy, then against the system which made their appointment possible, and finally against that lay control of clerical nominations which underlay the whole gigantic betrayal of the designs of Christ Our Lord.

It was seventy-five years before the struggle against the emperor ended, and although the fight against simony and clerical immorality, as well as the effort to restore the ancient ascetic habit of clerical celibacy, never slackened, it was inevitable that the major contest should absorb the greater part of the energies of the various popes. Despite the canons of councils, and the efforts of popes as active as they were intelligent and capable, despite the work of innumerable saints as shown in the new religious orders, in preachers like St. Peter Damian in the eleventh century and St. Bernard in the twelfth, political events, only too often, sterilised the best endeavours of all this good will. Much, very much indeed, remained to be done before every bishop was to himself and his people mainly a shepherd of souls, before every priest was competent intellectually and fit, morally, to explain the Gospel to his people and lead them to live in union with Jesus Christ.

The general condition of religion, as the storms of the ninth and tenth centuries left it, was such that even saints despaired. That even when the usurping lay power had been reduced, many of

the evils still persisted is not surprising. Clerical ignorance, lay brutality and superstition were still, in the time of St. Bernard and Alexander III, only too common. Tournaments, private wars, the organised brigandage, and the laxity of the great in matters of sex, usury and new abuses which grew out of the new freedom of the clergy from the lay control, a new clerical arrogance and a new clerical greed, and a new clerical ambition to control even the non-religious aspects of lay life -- there is a wealth of evidence to show the mighty task, which, eighty years after St. Gregory VII, still lay before a reforming papacy.

Even had the popes of the last half of the twelfth century been the single-minded religious of a hundred years before, much time would have been needed before their efforts could tell. Even the strongest of moral reformers depends naturally on the goodwill of those he would reform; and, in the nature of things, the will to be reformed is not a prominent characteristic of fashionable, and successful, sinners. Under the best of popes there would have been, here and there, a certain amount of anti-clerical complaint at the slowness of the pontifical will to correct and chasten those whose lives were the causes of scandal. As it was, with the new alliance between the papacy and the political needs of the Italian States, and with the beginnings of the papacy's new financial needs, and the means devised to satisfy these, anticlericalism began to show itself on a very large scale. Impatience with the half-reformed and increasingly wealthy clergy; impatience with the opposition of the higher clergy to the movement whence came the communes; disgust with the faults of the lower clergy; lack of instruction; and a craving for the better life to which the clergy should have led them; disappointment at the collapse of the Crusade as a spiritual thing, and disgust with those held responsible for the failure -- such causes as these gradually led, in many places, as the twelfth century drew to its close, to autonomous, lay-inspired movements that aimed at the moral regeneration of their members and the conversion of others to their ideals.

With this striving for a new, simpler, higher, moral life, conceived very often as that of primitive Catholicism and as the life designed by Christ Our Lord, a religious life independent of clerical direction, there went, too, a curious expectation of coming apocalyptic change. The day was approaching when, once again, God would visit His people and another saving

prophet would appear. Throughout Christendom, and especially in the south of France and in Italy, such ideas, from the middle of the twelfth century, began to spread increasingly.

The earlier part of the century had already seen the appearance of zealous Levitical preachers. Besides Tanchelin and Arnold of Brescia there had been, for example, Peter of Bruys and Henry of Lausanne. The first of these, an unfrocked priest, had been well known as an itinerant propagandist in the south of France. Organised religion, with its churches, its sacraments and its clergy, he declared to be a mockery. The Mass was a mere show, good works done on behalf of the dead a waste of time, since the living cannot in any way assist the dead. Another subject of his violent denunciation was clerical concubinage. This early pioneer of naturalistic Christianity met with a violent death at the hands of the mob in 1137. Apparently he made no effort to form a body of disciples; his mission was a personal matter, and the same is true of the ex-monk of Cluny, Henry, who followed with a similar gospel a few years later.

The most celebrated of the anti-clerical movements of the century, however, and the one with which it closed, differed from those inspired by Peter and Henry in two important respects. It definitely aimed at the permanent organisation of those who accepted it, and it made no attack on the traditional faith. This movement derived from a wealthy banker of Lyons, Peter Waldo. About the year 1176 -- whether through reading the story in the gospel of the rich young man to whom Our Lord said, "If thou wilt be perfect sell all thou hast. . ." or from hearing the story of St. Alexis, is uncertain -- he divided his wealth between his wife and the poor, and determined to devote his life to preaching to others the poverty to which he now had vowed himself. To live without owning was the one really good work, the one way of perfection, and therefore Peter Waldo, a man whose determination knew no limits, must preach it. His enthusiasm and sincerity quickly won him a following, and soon there was formed the nucleus of a kind of penitential brotherhood vowed to practise poverty and to preach it. The Archbishop of Lyons forbade them to preach, and when they persisted, expelled them from his territory. In 1179 they appeared in Rome, to appeal to Alexander III against their archbishop. The pope blessed their scheme of living a life of consecrated poverty, but he would not allow them to preach where the bishops were opposed to it.

This papal prohibition was the turning point of the movement. Against submission they urged the example of the Apostles themselves, and quoting their words to the Sanhedrin, " We must obey God rather than men," set the prohibition at defiance. Whence, in 1184, a stern condemnation of the movement from Lucius III, who, by then, had succeeded Alexander. It was now only a matter of time before these insubordinate apostles of poverty, critics already of evident abuses, would absorb some of the heretical notions in general currency everywhere since the days of Peter of Bruys. At first, however, their orthodoxy remained unspotted. Their disobedience to the prohibition of preaching is the most serious thing alleged against them by their earliest Catholic critic. Then they allowed women to preach, and they began to criticise, as useless and unavailing, good works and masse's offered for the souls of the dead.

With the beginning of the next century -- about 1202 -- their wanderings brought them into contact with other anti-clerical groups, definitely heretical and hardened by years of conflict with the bishops. Especially important in this respect were the Lombard associations of those who called themselves "The Humble" (Humiliati). This movement, too, had passed through a crisis like to that which had tested the Poor Men of Lyons. Those of the Humiliati who had refused submission had gradually come more and more under the influence of anti-sacramentarian teaching; and through contact with them the followers of Peter Waldo moved still further away from their first position as a kind of religious order within the Church vowed to heroic poverty. They began to oppose the personal merit of the individual to his sacramental status as the source whence he had power to bless or consecrate, to bind or loose in the sacrament of penance. Bad priests have lost all claim to be obeyed, they urged; to obey them is in fact sin. Confession to a layman is as good as, is even better than confession to a priest. The one source of power over souls, power, for example, to forgive sins, is to live as the Apostles lived, in absolute poverty, dependent on alms, and shod with sandals -- this last detail had a great importance. Sacramental acts were null if the priest were in mortal sin, and, since even the smallest lie was in their eyes a mortal sin, this must happen frequently. Prayers for the dead were useless. Oaths were always unlawful and so, too, it was unlawful to take human life. Any layman, in case of necessity, could, without any

ordination, say mass, provided he wore sandals, that is led the apostolic life of poverty.

But although, in the early years of the thirteenth century, Waldenses and Humiliati fraternised to the extent that through the Humiliati many of the old teachings of Arnold of Brescia passed into the Waldensian movement, the two sects never fused. The Congress of Bergamo (1218) that should have united them marks definitely their final division. The Italian group had never made celibacy a condition of perfection. Its members continued to live a family life in their own families. Again, although vowed to poverty, they by no means refused to work. Indeed by making manual work a virtue they became a power in the social life of the time, playing a great part in the early history of the textile industries in Lombardy. The Italians, also, could never bring themselves to that cult of Peter Waldo which for the Poor Men he founded was of the first importance. Nevertheless the failure to amalgamate the two bodies did not result in any lessening of the power of either. Their criticism and propaganda continued to be, as they had already been for forty years, a permanent feature of the problem that every bishop had to face in southern France, in Italy, in Switzerland and even in Germany.

Contemporary with the Lyonese Peter Waldo, and the pioneer of doctrines destined also to be an embarrassment for official Catholicism was the Calabrian abbot Joachim. Not indeed that Joachim failed to accept the traditional discipline, or made a frontal attack on any of the traditional doctrines. But the sanctity of his life gave a wholly unmerited importance to the apocalyptic fantasies which ran riot through all he wrote, fantasies destined in later years to bring to nought the heroic lives of thousands, and seriously to weaken in its first years the greatest organised movement of popular spirituality the Church had yet known -- the order of the Friars Minor.

Unlike Peter Waldo and the leaders of the Humiliati, Joachim was a man of education, who had spent much of his time at the most cultured courts of Europe -- Naples and Constantinople -- and had travelled extensively. He entered the order of Citeaux and in 1177 was elected Abbot of Corazzo in Sicily. In 1184 he sought, and received, permission from Lucius III to write a commentary on the Bible, and then, at fifty years of age, he began his real momentous career. For the remainder of his life,

seventeen years, the commentary was to be his main occupation, and the successive popes were, all of them, interested in it. In 1191 Joachim left Corazzo for Flora, where he founded the first house of a new order of solitaries. The new departure took place without any consultation of Citeaux, and four years of trouble between Joachim and the order followed, until, in 1196, the pope authorised the change and the new order.

Joachim was not a missionary, not a popular preacher, but essentially a contemplative, a solitary, and, above all, a seer. Nor, despite his strong denunciation of the corruption of the clergy, and criticisms which did not spare the Roman curia itself, was he ever rewarded with anything but veneration during his life. He made a formal submission of all he had written -- one work only was published in his lifetime -- and long after discredit had fallen on his books owing to the part they had played in later heretical movements, the prestige of his sanctity was sufficient for the pope to authorise the traditional cultus given him in the houses of the order he had founded.

The two chief features of Joachim's own teaching are a theory of the Trinity and, related to it, a theory of human history which not only explained the present and the past but also foretold the future.

The Trinitarian doctrine, directed against Peter Lombard, derived partly from that of Gilbert of la Porree. It treated as distinct realities the divine essence and the three Persons in whom it was manifested. The unity of the Trinity was no more than the collective unity which every group possesses.

For Joachim, as for all preceding Catholic students of the Scriptures, the Old Testament was the figure of the New. His new revolutionary contribution to biblical science was that he saw in the New Testament the figure of a third age yet to come. The Old Testament had been the age of the Father; the New Testament that of the Son; in the coming age the Holy Ghost would rule. Of this new age Joachim was the herald and prophet, fitted for the work by a special divine gift which enabled him to read beneath the known meaning of the Bible its final meaning, hitherto undiscovered. As the age of law and fear, in which men obeyed God as His slaves, had given place to that of grace, of

faith and the obedience of sons, so in the new age faith would give place to charity, filial obedience to liberty. Again, each age had its characteristic social type in which the ideal of Christian life was realised. In the first age it was the married; in the second age the clerics; in the age to come it would be contemplative religious, and here Joachim made the prophecy of the rise of a new order, vowed to poverty and work, which, to many of his contemporaries, seemed, in the Friars Minor, fulfilled to the letter on the very morrow of his death.

The three ages grew each from the other, and yet the end of each would be marked by immense catastrophes. The rites and sacraments of each age pass away with the age; they are but types of the better things to come. The Mass then will disappear as the Paschal Lamb had done. Even the redemption of mankind has not yet been perfectly accomplished; the Christ who appeared and lived in Palestine was Himself no more than a figure of the Christ who would appear. Nor, in the coming new dispensation, would the Church exist in its present state. The visible Church would be absorbed in the invisible, the new contemplatives would be everything and the clergy, necessarily, would lose their importance, lose their very reason for existence.

This new age was at hand. Joachim was precise, even to the year in which it would begin, 1260. Persecutions, a general religious catastrophe, would precede the final period of peace in which Jews and Greeks would return to religious unity and the revelation be made of the Gospel that was to endure for ever. This " Eternal Gospel " would not be a new gospel, but the spiritual interpretation of the existing written gospel.

Abbot Joachim, for all his pessimistic criticism of every aspect of Christian life, was no friend to either of the great movements with which he was contemporary, the anti-clerical Waldenses and the anti-Christian Cathari. His own theories were, however, no less mischievous. And yet, for long enough -- with the exception of his exposition on the Trinity -- they escaped condemnation. Partly because of his saintly life Joachim was generally, though by no means universally, accepted at his own valuation. Again, it is often the fortune of visionaries of his kind that while one type of mind mocks at their revelations as manifest lunacy, pious, or rather superstitious, fear, with

another type, sterilises the power of criticism. The fact remains that from now on a new and powerful influence is discernible in Catholic life, to persist as a source of trouble for another hundred and fifty years. Vague, obscure, full of contradictions, still more involved and anarchical as interested forgers began to interpolate the authentic Joachim, and to put into circulation under his name apocrypha that he would himself assuredly never have owned, it provided the critical and dissentient elements of the Church of the later Middle Ages with an inexhaustible fount of ideas and arguments, and with material for successful popular propaganda.

When the student turns from the idealism of Peter Waldo, or the reveries of Abbot Joachim, to the history of the Catharists who were their contemporaries he has the sensation of entering a new world altogether. Here are no Catholics whom disgust with the present condition of the Church drives into opposition, but the passionately enthusiastic pioneers of a new anti-Christian social order. They were the heirs to those Manichee doctrines which had provoked the repression of Diocletian, and enslaved St. Augustine centuries before, doctrines which had troubled the Rome of St. Leo and which, in later centuries, found a continuity of disciples in Asia Minor and the Balkans. Manicheans, Paulicians, Bogomiles, Catharists and Albigenses, [] whatever be the truth that all are corporally related, these various sects were, at different times, all of them inspired by a common body of doctrine, and a similarity of moral practice.

In place of the one supreme God whom the Church believed to be the creator and ruler of all, the Albigenses set two gods, one supremely good, one supremely evil. God and the devil shared responsibility for the universe and power over it.

The material element in the universe, and of course in man, is the work of the devil and it is wholly evil. Man, creation partly of God and partly of the devil, stands in need of salvation. The source of this is not, however, the Incarnation and redeeming death of Christ Our Lord. Christ, for the Albigenses, is not God nor is He truly man. He is an angel who found a temporary lodging in an apparent human body; His humanity was an appearance merely; His passion and death were illusions. His mission is to teach the truth that God exists and that in every man, by reason of his soul, there is something of the divine

through which he can ultimately escape the power. of the supreme evil. The Catholic Church is the enemy of Christ's Church, for it is the continuation in time of the synagogue. Hence on the part of the Albigenses an active hatred for the Catholic Church, and a never-ceasing effort to destroy its influence.

Salvation comes through the soul's emancipation from the body. So long as the soul is united to the body it is in danger of being lost to the devil, unless the person concerned has broken this power of the devil by receiving the Consolamentum -- a simple rite of sacramental character administered by the leaders of the sect. But whoever received the Consolamentum took upon himself thereby lifelong obligations of a most serious character, the momentary neglect of which annulled the rite received and involved him once again in the danger he had escaped. He was bound, for example, by accepting the rite to perpetual continency, to fasts which lasted the best part of the year, and in which little more than bread and water was allowed. He must never eat meat nor eggs nor milk nor butter nor cheese. He must never take an oath, nor take any part in a lawsuit which involved punishment. And with the rest of the Perfect -- for such he became when he received the Consolamentum -- he must live a common life. To receive the Consolamentum was then to enter an extremely severe kind of religious order.

From such an obligation the vast majority shrank. They accepted the Albigensian doctrine, they accomplished their duty of reverencing the Perfect, and they pledged themselves to receive the Consolamentum. But of those who received the Consolamentum many preferred to die, rather than face the horror that life was for the Perfect. This they achieved by a slow starvation, consecrated by the name of Endura. Suicide was the perfect act of the true Albigensian, and in the case of those whose ability to lead the life of the Perfect was doubtful, and who had yet accepted the Consolamentum under the fear of dying suddenly without it, the Endura was forced upon them. The Perfect surrounded the bed in which they lay and saw that no food came to them, and so in agonies that sometimes lasted for weeks they passed from life.

The Albigenses met for worship regularly. The service consisted of readings from the Bible -- especially from the New Testament,

which they venerated highly, of which they prepared a translation into the vernacular -- and from commentaries of a militantly anti-Catholic kind.

The body, they held, was wholly evil. This pessimistic principle was the basis of all the asceticism of the Perfect. It was the foundation of all their moral teaching. Life, since it involved the imprisonment of a soul within a body, was the greatest of evils. To communicate life the greatest of crimes. And the unnatural theory nowhere showed itself so unpleasantly as in the Albigenian condemnation of marriage. Nothing was to be so shunned as pregnancy. A woman with child they regarded, and treated, as possessed by the devil. Yet while they condemned marriage so strongly the Perfect -- for all that their own lives were ordered strictly according to their vows -- looked with tolerance on the extra-matrimonial sex-relations of the Believers. So long as the man and his companion were not married there was always the hope of their ultimate separation. An affection for fornication was a less serious obstacle than marriage to the transition from Believer to Perfect.

How did such a religion of despair and self-destruction ever come to take real hold of a people? To begin with, the devotion of the Perfect to their life must be realised. They preached their doctrine everywhere, and at the root of it all was a clear and simple explanation of the problem of evil. On the other hand the average Catholic priest never preached at all. The heresy was heard by thousands who never knew why they were Catholics, nor, in very many cases, what Catholicism was, beyond a system of religious duties. Again, the Perfect lived in great poverty and austerity, while the Catholic clergy took only too readily whatever chance of wealth and luxurious living came their way. The Perfect moreover had at their disposition a great deal of money, and they used it in generous almsgiving -- often perhaps with a view to proselytes -- and used it also to subsidise industries for the employment of the Believers. The heresy thus became rooted in the country's economic prosperity, and the very name Catharist became a synonym for weaver. The Perfect were also, very often, physicians, and in their convents they organised free schools for the Believers and their children. Finally, although the system liberated the convert from the difficult struggle between himself and his own desires which is the lot of fallen humanity, even in the dispensation of grace, it

did not impose on him any new set of commandments. Until he received the Consolamentum the Believer was bound by nothing but his own tastes, or the limits of his opportunity. And should he die without the saving rite he was not "lost" in the Catholic sense. There was no hell, no purgatory in the Albigensian scheme of things; but the crimes and shortcomings of life were expiated in a future life, or in a state of future trial. It was from the prospect of an endless series of possibly difficult lives -- St. Paul, they taught, had had to endure thirty-two in all -- that the Consolamentum delivered the Perfect. Nor, at the end of all, was there any resurrection of the body, for the body was essentially evil.

The distinction between the obligations of Believer and Perfect was, it may be believed, the decisive factor in the development which ultimately gave the whole of southern France and much of northern Italy to the new religion, the prospect of a life free from all external control, where "self-expression" had no sanctions to fear.

The earliest recorded appearance in western Europe of this heresy is the trial of thirteen of the clergy, charged with it at the Council of Orleans in 1022. About the same time there is evidence of it in Germany, and in northern Italy, and in the south of France too. Wherever it appeared it was universally execrated; and the mob showed no mercy to those suspected of sharing in it. Then, for years, there is little mention of it, until the second quarter of the twelfth century, when it is revealed as strongly established with Champagne, Languedoc and Milan as its chief centres. From Champagne it spread into Burgundy, Picardy, Flanders and the centre of France. From Milan the rest of Lombardy was infected, Tuscany too -- especially Florence, where by 1265 a third of the best families were Catharists -- and the March of Ancona. Rome itself did not escape, and Catharists were to be found throughout southern Italy, in Sicily and in Sardinia too. By a confusion with the groups who, at Milan, in the time of St. Gregory VII had fought clerical marriage, these opponents of all marriage were called in Italy Patarini.

The chief centre of all was Languedoc, the most cultured province of Christendom, the land where something still remained of the traditions of the Moors who once had conquered so much of it, an outpost of Saracen culture close to

the very heart of Catholic Europe. It was in this wealthy, refined, orientalisised civilisation, where Moors still abounded, and for which the "aggressive prosperity" of the Jews had won the name of Judaea Secunda, that heresy first began to find influential patrons. This was in the early years of the twelfth century, and from that time on, the Albigenses, under one name or another, are condemned and denounced in a whole series of councils, at Toulouse in 1119, the Second Lateran in 1139, at Rheims in 1148 and Tours in 1163 and in the Third Lateran of 1179. St. Bernard had been sent to preach against the movement but neither his sanctity nor his eloquence had availed much. From about 1160 the heretics began to have the upper hand, and from Languedoc the movement spread into Spain, to Navarre and Leon and especially into Aragon and Catalonia.

Everywhere in the south of France, St. Bernard testifies, churches were deserted, feasts no longer kept, the sacraments neglected. Thirty years later the Count of Toulouse, the chief ruler in the affected provinces, bears a like witness. Catholicism by now is quite definitely in the background. The heretics have won over many of the leading nobles, and the count declares that he dare not, and cannot, check the evil. At Toulouse itself the heresy was become the official religion of the town and the legates sent by Alexander III in 1178 were driven out with ignominy. Nor did the solemn condemnation of 1179 produce any greater effect. A mission was organised under the Abbot of Clairvaux, but though it deposed the Archbishop of Narbonne it effected little else. By the time of accession of Innocent III (1198) almost the whole population had, in greater degree or less, drifted from the Church and while the heretics preached unhindered in the streets of every city the Catholic clergy, when they did not openly go over to the sect -- as even bishops and abbots are known to have done - - sometimes secretly sympathised, and far from making any effort to organise resistance, made friends often enough with the now dominant party as the obvious means of securing favour and privilege. The Cistercians still kept to the severity of their rule, so far as their personal way of living was concerned, but the order was already collectively wealthy. Other monasteries were relaxed, abuses of luxurious living, of worldliness in dress, of simony and concubinage were rampant among the clergy. Money, it began to seem, was all-powerful in the matter of dispensations, and could even secure for the Catharists toleration, and the non-

execution of the new laws enacted against them. Finally, the new count, Raymond VI, the son of the count who in 1177 had lamented his powerlessness to improve matters, himself secretly went over to the sect. The Church, he declared in 1196, had no right to own. The man who despoiled it was thereby eminently pleasing to God.

A whole important province of Christendom was drifting into aggressive anti-Catholicism, while octogenarian popes could only look on and lament -- a key province which, by its geographical situation, lay between the capital of the new centralised papal leadership and the capital of the new Catholic scholarship, between the Roman Church and its traditional protector the King of France. As with the relations between pope and emperor, so in this other urgent problem of the new Manicheism, the election of Innocent III was to mean a revolutionary change in the papal policy.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 9: INNOCENT III AND THE CATHOLIC REACTION, 1198-1216

1. *THE CRUSADE AGAINST THE ALBIGENSES*

THE newly elected Innocent III [] had need of all the young man's energy, need of optimism and of confidence, to speak only of human gifts, if he was not to sink under the task that faced him. There was the menace of the new Moslem- influenced philosophical materialism in the schools of Paris; the problem of the new pious anti-clericalism of the penitential brotherhoods; the problem of the Manichee conquest of Languedoc; the problem of the future relations between the papacy and those unruly children of the Church the Catholic kings; the problem, too, which this last so largely conditioned, of the Latin East; and beyond all these the chronic task of recalling to every Catholic the standard of faith and good living to which, as a member of Christ's mystical body, he was called; the resumption and the completion -- if that were possible -- of the task which had been St. Gregory VII's, of removing all obstacles to the perfect working of God's Church as teacher and shepherd of men. It was a task which the Cardinal Lothario of Segni, fresh from his book *On the Contempt of this World*, took up willingly, eagerly, almost joyfully.

One of the first matters to which he applied himself was the state of things in Languedoc. Within a matter of weeks he had appointed two of the local Cistercians as his agents, accredited to the Prince, prelates and people. Their mission was to induce the prince to banish the heretics and to confiscate their property as the law of 1184 directed. Disobedience was to be punished by ecclesiastical censures, and to encourage the Catholic effort liberal indulgences were granted. As the year 1199 went by, with little to show in the way of success, the powers of these monks were increased. They were named as Innocent's legates and commissioned also to reform the lives of the local clergy. Even so they did not make much headway against the heresy, nor do much to change the clerical ill-living.

In 1202 the legates were changed and two other Cistercians were appointed in their place. One of these was Peter de Castelnau; he was bold and vigorous, and the attack at last began against the real centres of the sect. The Archbishop of Narbonne—who was, as it were, the primate of Languedoc -- was deposed when he refused to co-operate; and the Bishop of Toulouse deposed also, for simony. The Bishop of Beziers was suspended, and then the pope deprived all the bishops of Languedoc of their jurisdiction in heresy cases. This the legates alone could exercise henceforward, and in addition they received the power to deprive all unworthy clergy of their benefices, the deprived being denied all right of appeal. To add to the force of the legation the pope now named as its chief the head of the great Cistercian federation, the Abbot of Citeaux himself. Another Cistercian, Fulk -- a one-time troubadour -- was appointed to the vacant see of Toulouse and the Cistercian Bishop of Auxerre added to the band. By the year 1205 an active anti-Catharist propaganda -- instructions, controversy, sermons and pamphlets -- was in full swing, directed by the best disciplined religious of the time, papal commissioners who left the wavering Catholic no chance to doubt either his own faith or the will of the pope to correct disorderly living among his clergy.

Nevertheless the mission made very little progress. The Count of Toulouse still refused to co-operate, and repeatedly the legates asked to be relieved of their task. This the pope would not hear of and then the beginnings of a new force appeared, in the form of two Spaniards, Diego, Bishop of Osma, and Dominic Guzman, the prior of his cathedral chapter, sent to Languedoc by the pope when they had begged his leave to evangelise the Tartars of the Volga.

Dominic was at this time thirty-five years of age. He came of an impoverished family of the nobles of Castile -- a family which in his own generation gave several saints to the Church -- and he had had the great advantage of ten years of study in the schools of Palencia (1184-1194) at the time when, through the intellectual enthusiasm of Spanish clerics, the new knowledge was beginning its transformation of the west. In 1194 he had become a canon of the chapter of Osma, and when the bishop proposed to restore for his canons the original community life, under the so-called rule of St. Augustine, Dominic gladly co-operated. He was named sub-prior and five years later, on the prior, Diego's,

consecration as bishop, he succeeded him as prior. With Diego he had been despatched by the King of Castile to negotiate a marriage treaty with Denmark. This was in 1203, and in the following year he was again in Denmark with his bishop to fetch home the bride. The lady died, however, and the two Spaniards next went to Rome, to that meeting with Innocent III which changed both their lives and a good deal of subsequent history.

Diego suggested to the legates that, given the prestige won for the Perfect by their austerity and given the worldliness of the clergy, the pomp and circumstance of office with which, naturally, the legates surrounded themselves could not but be a hindrance to their work. He suggested that they model themselves for the future on the seventy-two disciples sent forth by Our Lord, with neither scrip nor staff -- let alone retinue or guards -- no money in their purse, no shoes to their feet. To give point to the advice he himself became a Cistercian and, with Dominic, who, however, remained a canon-regular, began to put the ideal into practice. After some hesitation the legates followed suit. The mission split itself into small groups of threes and fours, and, living in apostolic fashion, began to tour the countryside and towns preaching, instructing and -- a new feature -- holding formal disputations with the chiefs of the heretics which sometimes ran on for a week or ten days.

Through 1206 and 1207 the new kind of mission continued, its way of life commended by the papal approval. Converts began to come in, and to house those who were women Dominic made his first foundation at Prouille, a community of women to shelter converts, living under that rule of St. Augustine which he had himself followed for twelve years. The Cistercians supplied the campaign with yet more abbots, after their general chapter of 1207, and a whole body of Waldensians were converted. These Innocent III allowed to continue their life as a kind of religious order under their old chief Durand of Huesca, with the name of Poor Catholics.

It was now nearly ten years since the mission first began. Despite all the efforts the heresy still held firm, its prestige unshaken, and that prestige due very largely to the complicity of the princes and particularly to the complicity of the Count of Toulouse, Raymond VI. De Castelnau resolved on a final attempt to win or compel his co-operation. Twice the count had sworn to

assist, and now, when he formally refused, the legate excommunicated him and laid an interdict on his territories. Three months later (January 15, 1208) one of the count's serjeants murdered the legate.

It was a crime that recalled the death, forty years earlier, of St. Thomas of Canterbury. The count was generally held responsible, and the deed drew down upon him all the Catholic energy of the time. It brought to an end the mission of simple preaching: it was the beginning of a regular war to punish Raymond and to root out the heresy once for all. The Cistercians, in a specially summoned general chapter, voted all the resources of the order for the new crusade and the pope set all his power to organise it. The murderer was excommunicated and Raymond's own sentence renewed. He was outlawed and deprived of all his rights as ruler; his vassals were freed from their allegiance to him; his allies from their treaty obligations; and the pope looked around for some prince to whom to entrust the leadership of the expedition and the execution of the sentence. The new heretics were declared to be more dangerous than the Saracens, and to all who took part in the war the same indulgences and favours were granted as to those who went out to Palestine. Presently the forces began to gather and by June, 1209, a huge army of two hundred thousand was ready at Lyons.

Raymond, after vainly trying to enlist support from the King of France, and from the emperor, surrendered himself to the legates (June 18, 1209), promising to expel the heretics, giving security in seven castles, and submitting to a public scourging in the church at St. Gilles. A few weeks later, when the crusade had reached Valence he joined its army. By the end of August two strongholds of the heresy had fallen, Beziers and Carcassonne, and at Beziers the victors -- apparently as a measure of terrorism -- had massacred the garrison and thousands of the inhabitants. The forty days for which the crusaders were pledged to serve had now almost expired, and, content with this preliminary success, the mass of the great army prepared to return home. Before it dispersed, however, one of its chiefs, Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester in England, a baron from the north of France, was offered, and with some reluctance accepted, the heritage of the heretic Viscount of Beziers and Carcassonne. In the next ten years he was from this precarious base to maintain, single-handed, the fight against the

Count of Toulouse, against his numerous dependants and, most formidable of all, against the King of Aragon, Peter II, who as the suzerain of these southern French fiefs could not but be interested in their political fate.

From now on, the question of the Albigenses is mixed up with the personal ambitions of its chiefs and political rivalries. So it comes about that there is found fighting with Raymond, whose faith is suspect since he will not give up the heretics, a Catholic of such undoubted orthodoxy as Peter II. Whence, too, a new difficulty for Innocent III, in controlling the movement he has created and in keeping it true to its purpose, the extirpation of heresy, to which the question of the deposition of the family of Raymond bears, so far, no necessary relation at all. For four years the pope was besieged by the envoys of both parties. The legates in Languedoc, and Simon, urged extreme measures against the Count of Toulouse in whose promises, they asserted, no faith whatever could be placed. Raymond, on the other hand, and his ally the King of Aragon, continued solemnly to give every pledge demanded of them. And for a long time they managed to stave off the papal sentence.

The legates could judge better than the pope -- for all that the atmosphere of war may have made them partisans. They demanded that Toulouse, Raymond's capital and the centre of the whole affair, should surrender its heretics, and they met the refusal by re-excommunicating the count and laying all his territories under an interdict. He appealed to Rome and the, pope lifted the interdict and, while not confirming the sentence on Raymond, ordered that a council should meet in three months to consider his guilt. Meanwhile the Albigenses were steadily making good the ground they had lost. Those who had returned to Catholicism relapsed as soon as the crusading armies marched away. When the council met, at St. Gilles, 1210, Raymond had ignored all the obligations to which he was sworn. He had not dismissed his mercenaries, he still continued to patronise and favour the heretics. He thus played into the hands of the legates, who declared him incapable of testifying and therefore of clearing himself by oath.

Innocent, however, intervened yet once again. He sent Raymond a severe warning of what must follow on his perversity, and once more ordered him to co-operate in the work of extirpating

the heresy. Similar admonitions were sent to his allies the Counts of Foix and Comminges. Three councils at the turn of the year -- Narbonne in December, 1210, Montpellier in January, 1211, and Arles in the February following -- were to judge what they had done. This new move from Rome brought in once more the King of Aragon. For all his engagements with Raymond he could not afford to see these important fiefs, that commanded the passes of the eastern Pyrenees, fall into the hands of enemies such as vassals of the King of France would be. He therefore did his best to reconcile all parties. He recognised de Montfort as Viscount of Beziers and Carcassonne, he compelled his vassals to comply with the legate's conditions. But the Count of Toulouse, although he now married the king's sister, refused the conditions. He was thereupon re-excommunicated, and in April, 1211, the pope confirmed the sentence.

Through the rest of that year, and through 1212, de Montfort slowly conquered place after place. Peter II was away in the south of Spain playing a great part in the new crusade against the Moors, and soon Raymond was left with little else than his capital, Toulouse. The legate now urged the pope to depose him -- to set de Montfort in his place. This, however, Innocent would not do. Aragon's diplomacy, and his own natural fear of the Holy War becoming a means to make the fortune of a successful adventurer, kept the pope back. The legates were lectured for their partisan statements and bidden to wind up the crusade. Raymond was to be admitted to penance, and de Montfort reminded of his duties to Peter II, his suzerain (January, 1213). It was not until May, 1213, that the pope was convinced of the treachery of Raymond and of the trickery of the King of Aragon. Then he cancelled his letters of January, and ordered all concerned to submit to the legates. Peter, the Catholic champion against Islam, with the laurels of Las Navas de Tolosa fresh upon him, was warned that the heretics were more dangerous than any Moslem.

But Peter had already moved, and by the time the pope was writing these last paternal warnings, he was marching north with a huge army destined, he had every reason to think, to wipe out de Montfort for ever. There followed the campaign which ended on September 11, 1213, with the incredible battle of Muret. On that day de Montfort, with a force of some seven hundred cavalry, routed and destroyed Peter's army -- forty thousand

strong in all, three thousand horsemen -- with the loss of only nine men killed. Peter himself was among the slain.

The whole of Raymond's dominions now fell into de Montfort's hands, always excepting Toulouse. But Innocent still refused to do more than recognise him as administrator of these lands until the coming General Council (summoned for November, 1215). The nobles all submitted unconditionally, and Raymond made over his lands to the pope. Nevertheless, despite Innocent's endeavours, the war now reopened. This was due to the action of the papal legate at the court of France. The French king Philip II. called Augustus (1180-1223), had held back from the crusade ever since its inception six years earlier. But now, having defeated his allied enemies, England and the emperor, at Bouvines (July, 1214), he was willing to fish for whatever prize the upheaval in the south had to offer. In July the French cardinal who acted as legate at his court confirmed, in council, de Montfort's title as Count of Toulouse and renewed the crusade. A second council at Montpellier in January, 1215, also voted Raymond's deposition and the installation of de Montfort in his place, despite the protests of Innocent's legates there.

The final scene was enacted in the General Council when it met in the Lateran. The weight of evidence was too much for Innocent's hope of compromise, and on December 15, 1215, he recognised Simon de Montfort as Count of Toulouse. It was not, however, an unconditional recognition. All those lands which had so far escaped the crusade were assigned to Raymond's heir; Raymond himself was to enjoy a considerable annuity as long as he lived; his wife's dower lands were restored to her; and, finally, de Montfort was not created a sovereign prince. He was to remain what Raymond had been -- the vassal of the King of France. After seven years of stress, of bloodshed and of massacre in which neither side had the monopoly. the first great obstacle to the extirpation of the neo-Manichees had been surmounted. They were no longer protected by the State. In the next stage the State would co-operate with the Church against them. The primary agents of the Church in that next stage were the associates of Dominic Guzman, who about this time, 1215, begin to emerge as a new kind of religious order.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. ST. DOMINIC AND THE FRIARS PREACHERS

The advent of the crusade in Languedoc did not put an end to the campaign of preaching and discussion. Diego retired to his diocese; the legates had now the conduct of the war to occupy them; it was Dominic who was now the principal figure in the purely religious movement. A pious layman gave over to the use of the preachers whom he led, a house in Toulouse, where the Cistercian bishop, Fulk, gave Dominic and his small band recognition as official preachers. Then the bishop made over to them the church of St. Romanus in that city. By the time the General Council met in 1215, the new society numbered sixteen members, and Dominic, who had shown his sense of where his calling lay by refusing successively the sees of Beziers, of Comminges and of Navarre, set out for the council with Fulk, to secure the approbation of Innocent III for what promised to be a new religious order.

The pope had, at the very beginning of Dominic's venture, called on the legates in Languedoc to seek out and foster men of this type. but now, since the general council had decided that new religious orders were not to be encouraged, he bade Dominic consult with his companions and choose some one of the already existing monastic rules under which to arrange their common life.

In August, 1216, Dominic was once more in Rome. At Toulouse it had been decided that the most suitable rule was the so-called Rule of St. Augustine -- the rule under which, since 1194, Dominic had himself lived, and under which he had organised the house at Prouille. The general exhortations and principles of this rule called for some practical supplement, and in the constitutions drawn up to provide this Dominic was greatly influenced by the constitutions of the Order of Premontre. Innocent III had died [] before Dominic returned to Rome; and it was his successor, Honorius III, who in December, 1216, gave the new venture the papal approbation, as an order of canons dedicated to the work of preaching.

For all the traditional framework of the Augustinian rule and the status of an order of canons in which the preachers were now

officially set, it was a new kind of thing which the pope had sanctioned, and the novelty of its nature -- an order of priests whose one purpose was intellectual work for the salvation of others -- showed itself in an amazingly novel adaptation of the monastic code.

To begin with, the only stability the new order had was stability to the order. The monk vowed himself to a particular house: the Preacher to go wherever preaching took him. The aim of the new institute was preaching, and to the study which is a first necessity of the preacher's office all else in the life must be strictly subordinated. The claim of study was, in every case of a conflict of monastic duties, to have precedence. Thus it was directed that the church services were not to be unduly protracted and the office to be chanted briskly, so that the time for study was not shortened. The idea was to train apostles to combat, by their intelligence no less than by their ascetic life, a heresy seductive philosophically no less than morally. From the new monasticism there disappeared the one-time universal element of manual labour. In austerity of life the Preachers yielded nothing to the Cistercians themselves, but for the necessary manual work of the house -- since the need of preachers was desperate -- lay brothers were instituted from the beginning. Even, at one moment, the founder would have handed over to the brothers the entire control of the temporal concerns of the order.

The unit of the society was the convent of at least twelve preachers, ruled by a prior and taught by a doctor, for every house of the Preachers was a house of study; and from study, as long as he lived, the Preacher was never exempt. To the lectures, which all must attend -- even the prior -- the secular clergy were to be admitted should they so desire. The doctor lectured on the text of Holy Scripture, treating theological questions as they arose. A second lecture commented the Liber Sententiarum of Peter Lombard. In the larger convents there was a second lecturer for the Sentences. Once a fortnight there was to be a public disputation.

The convents were grouped into provinces, and in each province it was the aim to provide a school of higher studies. At the summit of the intellectual organisation were the Studia Generalia, presided over by a regent, who lectured on Holy

Scripture, and whom two bachelors assisted, one to lecture on the Glossa, the other on the Sentences. By 1248 there were five such studia, in the five great University cities of Paris, Oxford, Cologne, Montpellier and Bologna.

Lectureships were later created for the liberal arts, for logic, for natural science, for foreign languages (in view of the missions), and, in the Spanish houses, for oriental studies, for Hebrew, Greek and Arabic especially. The Friar Preacher was then a student for life. Whoever entered the order entered a university.

The Preacher was none the less a monk, in the austerity of his life and the public prayer to which he was bound. The abstinence from meat was perpetual. On all Fridays, on a score of vigils, and every day from September 14 to Easter, the Preacher had but one meal. He wore nothing but wool, he slept with his brethren in a common dormitory, he kept a silence almost as perpetual as his abstinence, and every day, publicly, at the chapter he confessed his offences against the rule.

Between this severe monastic observance and the new ideal of a learned apostolate in the world outside, there would seem to be an inevitable conflict, and the later history of the order shows, more than once, strong differences of opinion between the Preachers whom one ideal attracted as superior to the other. The difficulty arising from this dualism was present to the mind of the founder, who provided for it by a system of dispensations that is one of the features that makes his order, even to-day after seven hundred years, unique in the Church. This principle, that the superior not only may but must, when the good of the apostolate calls for it, dispense from any detail of the monastic observance, is set at the very head of the Constitutions, jointly with the definition of the order's purpose. The difficulty of course must persist, the equilibrium be sometimes hard to maintain, but there derives from the direction and from the spirit that inspires it a suppleness which perhaps no other order, as an order, possesses.

The convent buildings were to be as plain as possible, the territory worked from it carefully divided from that of its neighbours in the province. The Preachers were to go about in twos, to possess nothing, but to live on alms. Before Dominic died the poverty of the order received a new emphasis, for he

adopted the Franciscan ideal that not only should the individual religious not be an owner, but that the very institute should be utterly dependent on what the providence of God sent to it.

At the head of the province was the provincial prior, and at the head of the whole order the Master-General, to whom every Preacher at his profession promised his obedience. Here was centralisation indeed, as developed as that of Cluny. It was, however, tempered by a bold innovation, the principle, namely, that all superiors are elected by those whom they will govern and that they are elected for a time only. The prior is the choice of the brethren of the convent, the provincial prior of a special provincial chapter, a body composed of all the priors and two delegates elected by each convent of the province. The Master-General is elected for life by a body consisting of all the provincials and one delegate from each province. The provincial chapter -- all the priors and one elected delegate from each convent -- meets annually and so, too, does the general chapter. Carefully planned regulations protect the freedom of election from any usurpation on the part of officials in days to come, surer of themselves than of their brethren, and preserve the institute against the premature fossilization that is the end of bureaucracy in all things human. In the order the superiors are nothing, the order is all. No external signs of respect are shown to the priors; they are not to be given the ritual honours that fall to the abbots in the different older orders. When the term of office expires the superior resumes in the order the place he last filled as a simple friar.

Supervision lies with the order; the community of each convent is bound to present a periodical report on the government of its prior, the provincial chapter on the provincial prior, the general chapter on the Master-General.

While the new institution has features in common with all the preceding attempts to found a centralised order -- notably with Cluny, Citeaux, and with Premontre above all -- its essence was Dominic's own creation and in this it is revolutionary, in the idea, that is to say, of religious scattered in convents throughout the world, not tied by vow to any one house but to the general service of the order throughout the world, and all owing obedience to the one general superior. Hitherto no more had been achieved than a federation of more or less autonomous

monastic houses: in the Order of Preachers the Church welcomed the first religious order. Its curiously flexible rule has secured that, to a much greater degree than is usual, the ideal that gave rise to the order is still its very life. And the peculiar system of centralisation through "democratic" institutions continues to be, substantially, what St. Dominic planned and wrote into its first constitutions.

The original rule met its first revisers in the first general chapter held at Bologna in 1220. It was then that the decision was taken to adopt corporate poverty. The linen rochet which, as with the other canons-regular, formed part of the Preacher's habit, was given up, and in its place over their white tunic they adopted the monastic scapular. The title of abbot for the superior and of abbey for the convent were also abandoned. The Preachers were already, in reality, what they have since remained -- friars. Twenty years later it was the order's good fortune to have for its Master-General the greatest canon lawyer of the day, St. Raymond of Penaforte. He took the rule as St. Dominic had left it, and the decisions of the score of general chapters since his death, and arranging the whole scientifically, he produced what was henceforth the official text of the rule.

Once the order was papally confirmed, Dominic broke up the community of Toulouse and sent its members far and wide, three of them to the new university of Paris. Recruits began to come in, very many of them masters of arts, and in 1218 the Preachers were established at Lyons and Rome and Bologna. In 1219 the first Spanish houses were founded, at Madrid and Barcelona, houses also at Metz, at Rheims, Poitiers and Limoges, and six more in Italy. By the time of the general chapter of 1221 -- a matter of weeks only before St. Dominic's death -- there were sixty convents, organised in eight provinces: Provence, Spain, France, Lombardy, Rome, England, Germany and Hungary. Fifty years later, in those same eight provinces the number of houses had increased to three hundred and twenty, and there were the four new provinces of Poland, Scandinavia, Greece and the Holy Land. It is interesting to notice that, of the three hundred and ninety-four convents of 1277, no less than a hundred and forty were in the land where the neo-Manichees had once threatened to be supreme.

From the very beginning, the popes made continual and varied

use of the new arm they had themselves done so much to create. The Preachers were the Roman Church's agents for the visitation of monasteries and sees, they preached the Crusade, they acted as its fiscal officials -- the order's protests against such distractions passing unheeded -- and of course to them first of all, once it was established, was committed the Inquisition. The Preachers were the natural reserve whence popes, bishops, other religious orders and universities, too, drew their professors of theology. From the new order came the first biblical concordances and correctories, the first complete commentaries, and many translations of the Bible into the new national tongues, French, Catalan, Valencian, Castilian and Italian. They compiled manuals for preachers and for confessors -- the Summa Penitentiarum of St. Raymond of Penaforte their model and type -- and books of reference innumerable: collections of matter for sermons, for example, collections of stories about the lives of the saints, manuals to guide the catechist, and handbooks for those engaged in casuistry, such, for example, the Summa contra Catharos of Moneta of Cremona.

Christendom began to be instructed as the Preachers spread rapidly through its cities and towns.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



3. ST. FRANCIS AND THE FRIARS MINOR

The problem of the penitential brotherhoods of laymen, and of the anti-clerical, even anti-sacerdotal tendency of this movement, occupied Innocent III from the first months of his reign. For the Lombard groups of the Humiliati, no less than for the followers of Peter Waldo, the decision of Lucius III in 1184 had been the occasion of division. Many, the majority perhaps, left the Church rather than obey the prohibitions as to preaching. Others remained, and fifteen years later they were still following their special mode of life within the Church. These in 1199, for their better security, both against Catholic critics and against their own changeableness, Innocent organised in a new religious order. It comprised three classes. Those already married continued to live with their families, though practising the poverty of the Gospel. Others, without changing their lay state, lived a life in common under a rule. A third class were monks or nuns solemnly consecrating their new life by vows under a rule in which elements of the Benedictine and Augustinian rule were combined.

The new order, once approved, began to spread rapidly, as, in fact, all medieval orders spread. But long before the century in which it arose was finished, it had ceased to be a factor of real importance in the life of the Church, even in Italy. The first class -- its married members and those living in their own homes -- had disappeared; the other two had fused to become yet another monastic order. The poverty-loving laity who once had filled the ranks of the Humiliati were now being absorbed by a very much greater force, that had appeared within a few years of Pope Innocent's approbation of that order. This was the movement deriving from the life of St. Francis of Assisi.

Francis of Assisi -- Giovanni Bernadone by birth and baptism -- was one of several children of a wealthy cloth merchant of that town, and his Provençal wife. Francis was born about 1182. He was never a student, and his literary education was apparently never completed. But his wealth, his generosity, his wit, his musical gifts and gay disposition, made him, as he grew to manhood, one of the leaders of the fashionable youth of the city. With the rest of them he took his share in the wars between

Assisi and Perugia, spent some time in prison there, and fell ill in consequence. The slow convalescence led to much self-analysis, and to a determination, imperfect as yet, to do something better with his life.

The next year he was once more in the train of a knight, in pursuit of glory, but illness drove him back to Assisi. Much uncertainty of soul, prayer, and solitude filled the next few months. Then an heroic act of self-conquest sent him to embrace a leper whom, a moment before, he had passed by with shuddering horror. He made the pilgrimage to Rome and, another heroic victory over his tastes, he persuaded a beggar outside St. Peter's to exchange clothes and surrender his pitch for the day. Then he returned to Assisi, the same light-hearted Francis but a changed man. He was twenty-four or five years old.

What was he to do with his life? As he prayed in the half-ruined church of St. Damiano a voice bade him repair it. He loaded a horse with cloth from his father's warehouse, sold it at Foligno, and offered the price to the priest -- who refused it when he heard how the donor had come by it. More important still, the incident ended his home life. For his father renounced him, and Francis delightedly accepted the chance. Solemnly, before the bishop, he took God for his only Father, stripping himself even of the clothes he had so far worn. The bishop took him under his protection, and gave him the minor orders. For the next year he begged, and with what he gained he rebuilt St. Damiano and St. Pietro and St. Maria degli Angeli, the Church of the Portiuncula. Even yet, however, God had not shown him where lay his ultimate way.

One day, in 1208, as he assisted at Mass and heard the words of the Gospel, they seemed a command to him personally: "Go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. . . . Do not possess gold nor silver nor money in your purses: nor scrip for your journey, nor two coats, nor shoes, nor a staff." []

He knew now what God would have him do. He must live in absolute poverty and preach repentance for sin, brotherly love and peace. then followed the most literal following of the gospel that has ever been seen. Companions came to join him, one a local magnate, another a canon of the cathedral, and with them

the famous Brother Giles. They lived in huts built of branches and covered with mud; they ate what they managed to beg; they watched; they prayed; and they preached -- simple exhortations lit by that joy, that gaiety even, which was inseparable from Francis' character.

Seven more companions came in. The band called themselves the Penitents of Assisi. Francis compiled a rule for them, and in 1209 he set out for Rome, to win for his enterprise the blessing of the pope.

Innocent had reorganised the Humiliati, and he had allowed more than one band of converted Waldenses to continue their life in common, but the common poverty that now asked his sanction was something so much sterner still that, for the moment, he hesitated. A vision or a dream, it is said, showed him the Lateran shaken and falling, and only held by the efforts of Francis. Finally he consented, gave a verbal approbation to what had been done, sanctioned the rule and allowed the Penitents to preach penance wherever they might go. But all were to be clerics at least. They now received minor orders and Francis the diaconate.

The next ten years saw the incredible expansion. Francis and his friends wandered through Italy, living as the day found them, sleeping in barns or, when barns were closed to them, under hedges, working with the labourers, utterly careless of hardships. and everywhere preaching peace, reconciliation, penance and the love of God for man His creature. Not every one of Francis' disciples had the gay disposition natural to his master, but something of that innocent joy, mirth even, lit the whole movement. To the perplexed Church there had been given a new leader, in whose life Waldensian austerity and the poetry of the Troubadours were combined, and all at the service of a faith wholly orthodox.

These new "poor men" had, in fact, a theologian's appreciation of religion as an objective thing; they were submissive to authority; recognising authority as the way of spirituality; and they revered, too, the visible means of spirituality, the sacraments, the Mass especially and the priesthood by which alone the Mass is possible. What St. Bernard had done for religious life, St. Francis now developed but with an even vaster

effect. The Cistercian had himself chiefly preached in Latin, and the best of his work was directly addressed to the sanctification of the monk. The new preaching was in the vernacular tongues, and addressed to whoever would stand in the town square to listen. The new mission had a greater range than the old, and it developed the same powerfully effective treatment, the lesson of God's love through the human aspect of the mysteries of His incarnate life. When, for the Christmas of 1223, Francis at Greccio constructed the first crib, the development of religion's appeal to the ordinary man was set in a way where it was bound to advance with an altogether new rapidity. The Franciscans were the first order of revivalists within the Church, their whole aim and endeavour to rekindle love in hearts long since cold for all that the mind remained true.

Their immediate success outdistanced anything seen, before or since. Within ten years the number of those who had enrolled themselves as followers of Francis had reached five thousand. At the general assembly of the order in 1221 more than five hundred newcomers came to beg admission. It was inevitable, if the movement was not to suffer from its own success, that something of the happy informality of its cradle days must be sacrificed to a rule of more definite character. The rule as verbally approved by Innocent III, in 1209, the rule written down in 1221, which we still possess, left too much undecided and at the mercy of contrary interpretation. Hence, in 1223, a careful revision of the rule before it was solemnly approved by Honorius III.

About the share of others than St. Francis in this revision, about his own willingness or reluctance to accept their suggestions, the controversies still continue. Substantially it is the same rule as the rule of 1221 and this, it would seem from the language of the bull Solet of 1223, cannot really differ from that confirmed by Innocent III in 1209. As Honorius III confirmed it in 1223 it has been, ever since, the foundation of all Franciscan life; and for the century or more which followed the confirmation, it was the subject of fairly continuous controversy within the body of the order itself.

The rule of 1223, for all the legalist spirit which some would see in it, is by no means the carefully thought out code of St. Dominic's ordering, where a mass of detailed prescriptions

logically derives from two or three enunciated fundamental principles. It is a statement of an ideal of life, and the bare precepts necessary to maintain the ideal. Nor is the new family's organisation worked out in great detail. The aim of these lesser brothers -- Friars Minor -- is stated to be the Gospel life in obedience, without property, and in chastity. This obedience Francis has promised to the pope -- the other brothers owe it to Francis. There are clerics in the order and there are lay brothers. There is a fast from All Saints to Christmas, on every Friday, during Lent, and, if the friar so wishes, for the forty days from January 6. The friar is never to touch money or coins, not even through an intermediary. Those who can work may do so, but not so as to hinder prayer or devotion. No one is to preach unless approved for the purpose by the head of the order, and always with the consent of the local bishop. The end of their preaching is declared to be "the utility and edification of the people, announcing to them vices and virtues, punishment and glory. . . ." The soul of the movement is in Chapter VI. "The brethren shall appropriate nothing to themselves, neither a house nor a place nor anything. And as pilgrims and strangers in this world let them go confidently in quest of alms." Finally, they are to ask of the pope a cardinal protector "so that being always subject and submissive at the feet of the same holy Church, grounded in the Catholic faith, we may observe poverty and humility and the holy gospels of Our Lord Jesus Christ, which we have firmly promised."

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



4. INNOCENT III AND THE CATHOLIC PRINCES

The crusade against the Albigenses, the beginnings of the Order of Preachers, and the approval of the Friars Minor were for Innocent III so many means of countering newly arisen dangers to the future of Catholic unity. But older than any of these, was the danger, chronic since the time of Justinian, of the Church's dependence upon the Catholic State. The pope, above all, must not be politically subject to the emperor, and he must be able to control his own subjects, the powerful barons of the Campagna especially and the turbulent bourgeois of the towns. A series of monastic popes had begun the good work of liberating religion from the control of the lay lord, and, in doing so, they had brought to birth the Canon Law. One of the greatest of the canonists of this pioneer generation had next become pope himself. In a long reign of twenty-two years, filled very largely with resistance to a new assault on his spiritual independence, he had added enormously to the bulk of that law, had developed the field of the Roman Church's habitual action, and had, indirectly, definitely created the role of the canonist-pope. Such was the effect of Alexander III. In Innocent III that role was played in all its fullness. The consequences were literally, for once, epoch-making that, within seventeen years of Alexander's death, another superb canonist, fifty to sixty years younger -- younger by the age of two generations of thought in a time when legal thought was developing rapidly came to rule the Church, and that he ruled it for eighteen years.

Innocent III came to his post possessed of the whole theory of law, not merely learned in a collection of laws only half understood as Law. The corpus of legal deductions from the old truth of the Roman See's supremacy in the Church, which were the result of the application of that supremacy to the hundred happenings of everyday life, Innocent proceeded to apply on a greater scale than ever, thereby giving to it an even richer development than Alexander III, and setting an ideal, not only of constructive jurisprudence but of practical policy, which his successors have never lost. The new universal initiative which, with St. Leo IX, the Roman See had assumed, it could never, after Innocent III, abdicate nor safely neglect, nor could any other see ever, henceforward, be more than a dependent local

power.

The pope is God's vicar -- a phrase Innocent constantly uses, where his predecessors had said Vicar of Peter. His power in the Church is therefore absolute, his jurisdiction throughout the Church immediate, and explicitly declared to be such. Bishops are his representatives; and innumerable are the cases where, setting aside the elect of the chapter, Innocent appoints the man of his choice. Direct communication between bishops and the pope becomes much more frequent. All translations, resignations and, a fortiori, depositions are matter for the pope's exclusive decision, for a bishop is married to his church and jurisdiction in questions of the vinculum of marriage is the pope's exclusive prerogative. The pope has the right to examine and to exact an account of all episcopal administration; and it is a right which Innocent exercises continuously, setting aside here, very often, the right of the metropolitan. Especially after the Latin conquest of Constantinople (1203) does this tendency grow; and the pope, apparently, planned to Latinise the whole Church. Another consequence of the new juridical centralisation was the pope's enunciation, and in the most practical way, of his right to appoint any cleric to any office in any church throughout the world. They are not mere recommendations which begin to descend from Rome on the different patrons of benefices, but commands to appoint this person or the other. It says much for the way in which Innocent judged his age, and for the correspondence between its needs and his policies, that the bishops, although they resisted strenuously enough his efforts to coerce their political action, in these matters of spiritual government gave him absolute obedience, More than ever, from all over the world, on all manner of questions, bishops wrote to Rome for direction, for advice and for solutions. Innocent III's practice, the eighteen years' administration of a ruler, skilled in law and ruling with the deliberate design of developing his jurisdiction, completed the work of Alexander III, and crowned the Roman revival inaugurated in the lifetime of St. Gregory VII. What Damasus, Siricius, Leo the Great and Gelasius had begun, and the barbaric catastrophe had interrupted, these popes achieved; it only remained for Gregory IX to set it all down in the Decretals, and for their successors virtuously to use the splendid instrument.

But the theory of the papal power as that of God's vicar, did not

end with the Canon Law and the government of the spirituality. As vicar on earth of the King of Kings, the pope, it began to be held by the canonists, must share in God's universal power over mankind. If the Priest and the King are, both of them, set by God to rule the world, they are by no means equal parties in that task. The King is the servant appointed to carry out the instructions of the Priest. The Priest has the duty of supervising the King, of correcting him, and, where necessary, even of punishing him.

The State was on the way to become an organ of religion. Its rights, its very existence as a natural reality, antecedent in time to the Church, were, for these new theorists of the Canon Law, entirely lost to sight. All this was a striking reversal of what had obtained three centuries earlier under Charlemagne, when the State, with the consent of the bishops, in practice governed the Church. Christendom, the City of God upon earth, is one thing. It can therefore have but a single head -- had it more than one, a later pope [] will declare, it would be a monstrosity. As to who that head shall be there cannot, in Christendom, be any doubt. It must be God's vicar, the Roman Pontiff. It, for convenience, the pope had entrusted to the State one of the two swords committed to him by God, the pope remained, none the less, master of both. It is not from God directly that the kings receive their authority, but from God through His vicar, the pope. So much has the theory developed since the days of Gregory VII, thanks to a century of the new scientific ecclesiastical jurisprudence stimulated by the attempts of Barbarossa and Henry VI to regain their old control. These emperors had claimed an absolutism in which they would dominate the papacy and the Church. The canonists retorted by this theory of another absolutism where the popes would dominate the princes and their temporal authority. The one effectual answer to these developments of the canonists no one as yet was able to state -- the theory of the State as an autonomous natural society. But in these very years when the canonists triumphed, another school of working jurists was preparing whose sole inspiration was the Roman Law, and the end of the thirteenth century would see the canonists' first defeat at its hands.

The field open to the pontifical intervention was now, therefore, limitless. Not only the private life of the kings -- questions of marriage, for instance -- came into it, but questions of taxation also, questions of coinage, questions of the succession. In all of

these, somewhere, a point of morals was involved and the pope, thereby, was given a ground to intervene. Innocent III certainly believed himself authorised to exercise as pope -- apart altogether from what rights he might have as feudal suzerain [] -- a direct authority in these and in purely political questions too. It was the building of this theory into every act of Innocent's enormously busy reign, rather, even, than the most important of those acts, which gave to that reign its immense significance in the history of the next three hundred years. Canon Law had more than emancipated itself from the tutelage of Theology. How far could Theology now defend it, in the reaction already slowly preparing,. in the coming fight with the new civilian lawyers?

In marriage questions Innocent III intervened in Portugal to annul the marriage of the heir to the throne with a too-near relation; and he quashed the marriage of the King of Leon for a like reason, excommunicating the king until he separated from the cousin he had taken to wife. Still more resounding was the pope's strong action in regard to a much more important supporter of the papacy, Philip II of France. Five years before Innocent was elected, the King of France had repudiated his wife, Ingeborg of Denmark, and had taken in her place Agnes of Meran. Celestine III had admonished him, all to no purpose, but the new pope immediately warned him that unless he dismissed Agnes the kingdom would be placed under an interdict. Philip II persisted and in December, 1199, the papal sentence was carried out. Nine months later Philip submitted so far as to put away Agnes, and the interdict was lifted. For years the effort to persuade him to take back the queen continued, but not until 1213 was the pope finally successful.

With the English king, John, the pope had an even longer struggle, but in the end here, too, he was victorious. The question at issue was the succession to the primatial see of Canterbury or the death of Hubert Walter in 1205. The monks of the cathedral monastery elected their sub-prior. The king had desired the translation of the Bishop of Norwich. The suffragan bishops of the province of Canterbury were in arms against the monks' right to elect. Innocent confirmed the right of the monks, but set aside both their candidate and the choice of the king, and suggested to the representatives of the monks the English cardinal, Stephen Langton, a leading figure in the learned world of the time. This was in 1206. John resisted, refused to allow the

new archbishop to enter the kingdom, and punished heavily all who had shared in the election. In 1208, therefore, Innocent laid the whole of England under an interdict.

John, the strongest personality among the reigning princes of Europe, held out, ordering his clergy to disregard the censure. The next year he was excommunicated. Three years later (1212) Innocent declared him to have forfeited his right to rule; his subjects were freed from their oath of allegiance, and the King of France was charged with the duty of carrying out the deposition. Then John surrendered. He made over his kingdom to the pope, receiving it back as the vassal of St. Peter, and promising an annual tribute of a thousand marks. He accepted the archbishop and the interdict was lifted (June 29, 1214). The papal-suzerainty over the new vassal state was not a mere name. In the struggle between John and his barons, which had accompanied the struggle with the pope and which went on after this was settled, Innocent, like a good overlord, came to his vassal's assistance. The barons forced on John a recognition of their privileges -- the Great Charter of 1215 -- and when John appealed against it, Innocent absolved him from his promises. They had been made without the knowledge or consent of the overlord, and so could not lawfully bind the vassal.

How soon the new amity between John and the great pope would have ended we can only guess. In the course of the next year (1216) both of them died, and one of the first tasks before Innocent's successor was to secure for John's heir -- the child Henry III -- the full succession to his inheritance. All through the minority of this king papal legates watched over his interests, [] protecting his rights against the turbulent nobility with all the armament of papal censure and the new prestige of the Apostolic See.

Where Innocent III's conception of the papacy's universal lordship found most its striking exposition was, of course, in his relations with the empire. Here, at the beginning, fortune favoured Innocent supremely. He was elected while the anti-German reaction that followed the death of Henry VI [] was still sweeping all before it in Italy. In Henry's own kingdom of Sicily the reaction was led by his widow Constance, ruling as regent for her baby son, Frederick II. In the centre of Italy, too, in the papal lands Henry had occupied and in the lands of the

Countess Matilda, the anti-imperialist spirit was no less strong; and here, as in Rome itself, Innocent had little difficulty in re-establishing the temporal authority of the Roman See. It was not by any means a complete victory over the forces of disruption which had had their own way now for generations, but, thanks to the skill with which the new pope used his opportunity, the Holy See, in Rome and in Italy, was, by the end of 1199, in a stronger position politically than for forty years and more.

Henry VI died at the end of August, 1197. When Innocent was elected pope, in the following January, no successor to Henry, as King of Germany, had as yet been chosen by the German princes. Henry's son, the baby King of Sicily, was ruled out from that succession by his age. A much more likely candidate was Henry's brother, Philip of Swabia, who, however, as the chief agent of Henry's Italian policy, lay under the sentence of excommunication for his share in the violation of ecclesiastical rights.

In March, 1198, a gathering of German princes elected Philip, notwithstanding the excommunication. But not all the princes had taken part in the election. There was a strong minority which had no desire to see a fourth king and emperor from the Hohenstaufen; three months after the election of Philip, these other princes elected Otto of Brunswick, the younger son of Barbarossa's lifelong rival, Henry the Lion. So it came about that, where Innocent's predecessors had been faced with the menace of a strongly united empire under a master politician, Henry VI, who was also King of Sicily, Innocent III -- his rights as suzerain over Sicily once more recognised -- saw Germany torn by civil war, and the rivals, Philip and Otto, striving each to enlist his support. In a short nine months the wheel had indeed turned.

The pope was, at first, most carefully neutral. As the year 1198 ran out, and through the spring of 1199, Philip gained steadily. By May of that year he was almost everywhere victorious, and a gathering of his supporters notified the pope, from Spire, that Philip had been elected emperor, and that his nobles and bishops would support him in his endeavour to regain all the jurisdiction of his brother and predecessor, Henry VI (May 28, 1199). The peril that had hung over the papacy and Christendom in the reign of the aged Celestine III began to threaten once

again.

Innocent protested immediately that, in proclaiming Philip emperor, the diet of Spire had gone beyond its powers. The princes had the right indeed to elect their king, but it was for the pope alone to make the German king emperor. Beyond this protest Innocent, for the moment, went no further, all his energies being directed to driving out of Sicily the partisans of Philip, who had successfully occupied the kingdom and were rebuilding the centralised despotism of Henry VI.

By the January of 1201 the pope had made up his mind, and in March he published his decision. The reasoning that lay behind it is contained in one of the most famous of all papal statepapers, the Deliberation on the question of the Empire. [] Frederick of Sicily the pope rules out because of his age; Philip, also, the pope rejects -- as one lying under excommunication for offences so far unamended and unrepented, and also because he came from a family traditionally hostile to the Church. The empire moreover is not, in law, a family heritage; and to confer it upon yet a fourth Hohenstaufen would be to make it hereditary in fact. It is then to Otto that the pope makes over the supreme dignity, who comes of a family for loyal centuries to the interests of religion; wherefore "By the divine authority transmitted to us by blessed Peter, we recognise you as king, and we command all men to swear to you loyalty and obedience."

On June 8, 1201, Otto solemnly pledged himself to restore to the pope all the territories occupied contrary to the will of the Holy See in the previous fifteen years: the Patrimony, Ravenna, Spoleto, Ancona; and to make over the lands inherited from the Countess Matilda. The war now took another turn and the pope intervened, setting all his diplomacy to rally supporters to Otto, outside Germany as well as among its princes. Philip replied through the proclamation of the diet of Bamberg (September 8, 1201). The pope, it was declared, was a foreigner, and the election of the emperor was the concern of Germany alone; it was rather the emperor who should name the pope, than the pope the emperor; ancient history showed how true this was. The bishops agreed with the lay princes.

For reply (May, 1202) the pope repeated his ruling, and the reasons for it, stating with legal formality the relations of the

pope and princes to the empire. The German princes are declared to possess the right to elect the king and emperor-elect. But the source of their right is the Apostolic See. The right was granted to them when the pope transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans. The king elected by the princes the pope may reject -- for the pope is not bound to crown as emperor a candidate who is unworthy, who may be, for example, a person excommunicated, or even a heretic. The pope, then, is to judge the fitness of the candidate; and if the pope reject him the princes must elect another, in default of which the pope will himself choose the emperor. Should it so happen that two candidates are elected -- the present difficulty -- the princes must call in the pope to arbitrate. Should they not do so, the pope will decide without their invitation. In making his decision the pope is to be guided, not by the legality of the elections that have been made, but by the qualifications and character of the rivals elected.

The bishops who had signed the manifesto of Bamberg were now excommunicated, and their resistance brought upon Germany a renewal of the schism of forty years before. Soon, in many sees, there were two bishops -- the excommunicated supporter of Philip and the bishop recognised by the pope -- and contests everywhere.

Despite the pope's activity Otto's cause, however, continued to decline. He lost supporters steadily, and in Italy the native anti-papal forces, given new life through their association with the greater conflict, prevailed once more. The work of 1198 was undone, and Innocent driven from Rome like the weakest of his predecessors. In Germany Otto's army was destroyed and he himself fled for safety to England. All along the line Philip was victorious and, to all appearances, finally victorious. But he still needed the pope, and, in June, 1206, he made a bid for recognition. Between him and the pope's support there lay the old excommunication for his invasion and robbery of Church lands. Now he offered to submit. Innocent suggested to Otto that the question of the election be submitted to arbitration. Otto refused. Philip gave satisfaction for the crimes that had earned his personal excommunication in the time of Innocent's predecessor, and was absolved (August, 1207). He next offered to make all the restitution in Italy to which Otto had pledged himself. Everything was tending to a complete reconciliation

between Innocent and Philip when, in June, 1208, he was murdered, by a personal enemy, for reasons of private revenge.

If Otto and the princes could now come to terms, the war would cease. An accommodation was found: Otto married his predecessor's daughter, and he consented to submit himself to a re-election. This time the princes accepted him unanimously. There remained the pope, Otto's patron so long as his cause had had a fighting chance, and thanks to whom, in very large part, he was now the elect of Germany. Otto, in the first critical stage of the struggle, had already made all the desirable promises. Now, as emperor-elect, petitioning the pope for the imperial crown, he renewed them, in the Charter of Spires (March 22, 1209). On October 4, 1209, Otto IV was crowned at Rome by the pope. After eleven years of diplomacy and war, years of a patient firmness equal to his high claims, Innocent had seemingly restored the papal overlordship to where it had been at Barbarossa's accession.

His victory was little more than an appearance. Otto was no sooner crowned than he began to show himself more Ghibelline than the Hohenstaufen, and heir to all the ambitions and the policies of Henry VI. The territories of the Holy See were once more occupied; imperial officials were installed in the different Italian cities; and the emperor invaded Sicily, the kingdom of the pope's ward and vassal, Frederick II.

Innocent fought the new tyranny by every diplomatic means in his power and then, just thirteen months after the coronation, he excommunicated Otto and freed his subjects from their allegiance to him. Saul had proved unreliable; another would take his place.

Innocent's David was the young King of Sicily. In September, 1211, the imperial crown was offered to him, and a year and three months later he was crowned King of Germany at Frankfort. All that was Hohenstaufen in Germany rallied to him, and Otto's fortunes declined as rapidly as they had declined before Frederick's uncle ten years earlier. The papal diplomacy succeeded now where then it had failed. Philip II of France was free at last to be the pope's ally, in Germany as in Languedoc; French interests and the papal interests coincided; and in the great battle of Bouvines (July 27, 1214) Otto's cause went down

for ever. He died four years later, but from the day of Bouvines, Frederick was safely master in Germany.

Innocent, to whose policy Philip of Swabia had finally bent and who had next imposed his will on Otto, had finally succeeded in destroying Otto, for his disloyalty, and had set in his place his own ward and pupil. After seventeen years of endless vigilance, and of a use of all the means he could command, the genius of Innocent had checked the menace of Languedoc, and had secured the Church from the equally dangerous political domination of the empire. The existence of religion once again made secure he could resume the work of reform, give himself wholly to that restoration of Christian life throughout the Church the need for which had inspired every pope for a hundred and fifty years. It should begin with a general council.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



5, INNOCENT III AND THE LATIN EAST

But before the story of Innocent III's general council is told, some account must be given of the way in which he dealt with the problem of the Latin East.

From the very moment of his election Innocent planned to restore the crusade. It was to be, once more, a papally directed thing; and the ideals that inspired it were to be protected against the selfishness of the magnates. Appeals to the princes of Europe, and requests for information to the bishops in the East and to the heads of the military orders, began to issue steadily from Rome. Legates were commissioned to restore peace between the warring kings; the papal diplomacy set itself to conciliate and win over the schismatic church of Armenia; and to resolve the new, most pressing problem of all -- the relations of the West with the empire of the East: Constantinople's malevolent neutrality must be turned. Here was a complicated problem indeed. The reigning emperor, Alexis III, had been welcomed as an ally by Innocent's predecessor who, for all that the Greek was a schismatic, had dreamed of setting him up to counterbalance the danger to religion from the Catholic Henry VI. The strange allies had in common a hatred of the Hohenstaufen, for the Greek emperor's dethroned predecessor -- Isaac Angelus -- was father-in-law to Philip of Swabia.

Innocent III proposed to himself, at first, to bring the hundred and forty years' schism to an end, and thus to make Alexis III the chief of the new crusade. There would thus be an end to the old quarrels between the Latins who had won the battles and the Greek emperor claiming the Latin conquests as his own long lost territory. While, then, the pope was pressing forward with the usual preparations for a crusade, he was also negotiating with Alexis the calling of a general council that would restore the East to the unity of the Catholic faith. What the pope did not, as yet, realise was that the empire of the East was breaking up. It lacked a fleet; its army was wretchedly provided, the soldiers' pay in arrears; in all the provinces still nominally subject to Constantinople there were movements making for political autonomy which the government was powerless to arrest; and the empire was not only menaced by the Turks, but by the

Bulgarians and the Venetians too. Even if the pope succeeded in his plan to end the schism, the Byzantine empire, as a crusading force, was an arm that would break the first time it was used.

By the March of 1201 the vast preparations were so far advanced that the leaders of the crusade opened negotiations with Venice for the transport of men and stores. The terms agreed upon were that the republic should receive eighty-five thousand marks, and a half of whatever conquests were made. The pope's scheme, for an alliance with Constantinople, was ignored. The crusade, this time, was to make directly for the centre of the Mohammedan world, Cairo; and the armies were to be ready to sail on June 24,

This agreement Innocent ratified, with a solemn prohibition against attacking Christian States. The pope knew -- none better -- how, since the failure of the crusade of 1189-1192 and the quarrel of Barbarossa with Constantinople, the new idea had gained force that the Greeks were as much the enemies of the crusade as the Turks. Henry VI had actually planned to destroy the Greek Empire as the first step towards Catholicising the East; and now the crusaders had chosen as their leader a near relative of the dead emperor, Boniface of Montferrat, who had scores of his own to pay off in Constantinople. The dethroned emperor, Isaac Angelus, was an old ally; and the new line, so Boniface held, had been responsible for the death of his brother Conrad, a famous leader of the crusading armies in 1192. There was every chance that this Hohenstaufen- inspired leadership would take the crusade into the Hohenstaufen channel.

At this moment, March, 1201, there arrived in Italy Alexis Angelus, the son of the dethroned emperor. He did his best to enlist the sympathy of the pope and, more effectively, he came to an arrangement with his brother-in-law, Philip of Swabia - - at the moment under the papal ban, but the brains of the crusade. It is highly probable that it was at this interview (December 25, 1201) that the decision was taken to use the crusade to restore the dethroned Isaac Angelus. Within a few months Boniface actually proposed this for Innocent's sanction, but the pope held by his pledge.

The crusaders at last began to gather at Venice. Here again, the diplomacy of Philip and Alexis was busy; and, although no attempt was made to force a decision, the idea of capturing

Constantinople as a first step towards the lasting triumph became familiar to all. The army was smaller than had been hoped. Even pledging all their resources, the Crusaders had not been able to raise more than four-sevenths of the sum promised to Venice. It was now suggested that they assist the Venetians to reconquer Zara now, and so wipe out their debt. There was a lively opposition to the proposal. The papal prohibition to attack Christian States, disobedience to which entailed excommunication, stood in the way; but in the end the plan was accepted and in November, 1202, Zara was captured from the Hungarians and restored to Venice.

At Zara, too, the Hohenstaufen scheme was adopted. The leaders of the crusade, fresh from suing out an absolution for the crime of Zara, now came to a definite understanding with Alexis as representative of the deposed Isaac Angelus. They would assist him to recover his throne, and in return he promised to restore the church of Constantinople, with its dependencies, to the Roman obedience, to pay a huge money indemnity to the crusading army, to join in the crusade himself and to maintain an army in the Holy Land. Once more there were violent dissensions in the crusading army, but, as at Venice, the majority accepted the pact. Chief among those who refused and who, at this stage, abandoned the crusade was Simon de Montfort.

On May 24, 1203, the armada set sail from Corfu. A month later it was in sight of Constantinople, and on June 24 it anchored off Chalcedon. Innocent, still true to his policy had, long before this, expressly forbidden the expedition.

From Chalcedon the leaders summoned Alexis III to yield. He refused, and on July 7 the siege began. Ten days later there was a general assault. Alexis III fled, the partisans of Isaac brought him out of prison and acclaimed him as emperor, and the gates were opened to the Latins. On August 1 Isaac's son Alexis, brother-in-law to the excommunicated Philip of Swabia, at the moment waging war on the pope and his protege Otto in Germany, was crowned as joint emperor with his father. It only remained for him to carry out the promises made at Zara.

To this, whatever his good faith, there were difficulties that were insurmountable. To begin with Alexis Angelus was not, as yet,

master of more than the capital. Then the sum promised as an indemnity was far beyond what his treasury held. The Crusaders decided to winter at Constantinople. As the imperial subsidies delayed, they took to looting; and presently something like a state of war developed between the Crusaders and the populace of the capital. In February, 1204, the discontent in the city brought about a revolution. The recently restored Isaac, and his son, were murdered and the successful leader of the movement was proclaimed as Alexis V. He reigned for a matter of weeks only. The Crusaders decided to make themselves masters of the capital and to set up an empire of their own. They arranged how the immense booty of the city's wealth was to be shared; they arranged the procedure for the election of their emperor; they arranged, finally, how the territories should be divided: to the new emperor a quarter; to Venice three-eighths; and the remaining three-eighths, in fief, to the different leaders.

All this carefully arranged, they attacked on April 9. They were, however, repulsed. Three days later they attacked again. After a furious day of fighting they were masters of part of the town and, since Alexis V fled in the night, the morning of the thirteenth found them undisputed masters of the city. Three churches were appointed as depots for the loot, and then followed one of the great sacks of history. Never since Constantine placed there his capital, nine hundred years before, had Byzantium yielded to an invader. Now, all the accumulated treasures of a thousand years were to be had for the taking. Nothing was spared, the churches and convents were plundered as systematically as the palaces of the emperor and his nobility. Finally the emperor was elected -- Baldwin of Flanders -- and, on May 16, 1204, he was crowned in St. Sophia with Latin rites.

It remained to be seen what the pope would do. The new emperor sent an elaborate letter full of explanation of the many advantages that would accrue to religion from the conquest, and, when this failed to reach the pope, he despatched an embassy to make it all clear. Innocent, however, faced with the fait accompli, and with all the different Greek claimants to the empire dead, Angeli and Comneni alike, had no difficulty in accommodating his practical mind to the new situation. That situation was indeed the result of disobedience to his orders. The Ghibellines had triumphed. It remained for him to bring back to his authority as many as he could of the Crusaders and to

safeguard the interests of religion in the new world united so forcibly to the West.

It was not long before the pope had measured the strength and reality of the reunion. The Latin empire in the East suffered in its very foundations from all the deadly insufficiency which had ruined the enterprise in Syria. Like the King of Jerusalem the emperor was little more than a primus inter pares. Then, too, between the new state and Syria lay Asia Minor and the two new states, of Nicaea and Trebizond, in which the Byzantines proceeded, with no hindrance from the Latins, to organise themselves. The Latins had, of course, inherited all the anxieties of the Byzantine emperors of the last three centuries, and their emperor was scarcely crowned before a Bulgarian invasion called him into the field. The Latin empire, far from providing a new basis for the crusade and new armies, was an additional liability to the already overtaxed religious enthusiasm of the West, and it threatened to eat up resources that might otherwise have helped to change the situation in Syria.

Innocent III soon understood: the Holy Land remained as a major problem; and so long as he lived the pope planned and strove for its recovery. But in those plans the new Latin empire had no great place. It was, once more, the direct assault of the West on Islam that Innocent had in mind. To the execution of his policy there were even more than the usual distractions. There was the long war in Germany, the struggle with John in England, the crusades against the Moors of Spain and the heretics of Languedoc. But by 1215 the way was clear. One of the tasks of the General Council would be to organise, under the new Western emperor, a crusade whose successes should rival the glory of the first.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



6. INNOCENT III AND THE REFORM OF CATHOLIC LIFE: THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF 1215

Whatever the degree of their individual sanctity, learning, or political capacity, one idea, beyond all others, never ceased to inspire the activities of the popes from the time of the Council of Sutri onwards -- the idea so to purify the life of the members of the Church, that through them God's perfection should shine forth and the city of God be realised upon earth. That all Catholics should live the life of the Gospel, the life of the counsels and the life of the precepts, was the whole aim of the Church's institution; and all the struggles waged by popes with the powers of this world were, in the last analysis, designed for this end -- to remove the obstacles which hindered the Church's mission of regenerating souls to God. Not that princes, and their usurpations of spiritual jurisdiction and the like, were the only obstacles. The hindrances presented by human weakness, human wickedness and human folly in a myriad individual lives still remained. Here was the very field of the Church's mission.

Finally the Church itself, considered as a means of regeneration, called for continual examination: more especially since, in these last two centuries, the Roman See had done so much to centralise administration. When the eleventh-century popes assumed the new role that made them the accredited initiators of every good work, they assumed a new responsibility for the vast world they directed, and for the good order of the machine through which they ruled. Their consciousness of their new responsibility is seen in the series of general councils which they begin to summon, one in every generation, and which are concerned primarily with the exposition of a standard of Catholic life, and with regulations designed to maintain that standard. The early [] general councils were called, all of them, to define special points of faith which had begun to be called in question. They met in the lands where the disputes had arisen, and they were called at the request of the contending parties. The period which saw this institution develop was that time when the West -- and Rome along with the West -- passed through the frightful chaos of what it is convenient to call the Barbarian Invasions. These over, and Rome at last able to begin to organise her supremacy, a new type of general council appears,

whose chief concern is the practice of religion, and it is summoned at Rome's initiative. There are six [] such councils in a hundred and fifty years and the greatest of them all is the one summoned by Innocent III in 1215 -- the Fourth Council of the Lateran. This was the greatest gathering of the whole Middle Ages, and through it, better perhaps than through any other event or institution, we can realise that extraordinary unity of medieval civilisation, the quality that made the medieval, for all the very real differences, really at home anywhere in Christendom and which, without destroying social and economic distinctions (and even their disadvantages), did so much ultimately to neutralise them.

The council was called, by letters of April 4, 1213, to meet on November 1, 1215. All the bishops were invited, the heads of the new centralised religious orders too (an innovation in procedure produced by this new feature of religious life), Cistercians, Premonstratensians, Hospitallers and Templars, temporal princes also (another innovation), representatives of republics, even of the innumerable tiny city-states. All the bishops were ordered to come, three or four alone from each province excepted. Chapters, whether of cathedrals or of collegiate churches, were to send delegates, and the exempted bishops were to do the same. Two main problems were to occupy the council's attention, the question of the Holy Land and the question of the reform of Catholic life. Meanwhile a general enquiry was organised to provide particular matter for the discussions on reform.

The council actually opened on November 11, 1215, with four hundred and twelve bishops present, eight hundred abbots and priors, and representatives of all the States. The number of bishops from Germany was very small. The war now raging between Otto IV and Frederick II, and the remains of the schism which had in some sees placed both a papal bishop and an imperial bishop, made it impossible for many bishops to leave their churches.

There were three public sessions, the opening session on November 11, the second on November 20, and the final session on November 30. Before the first session, and between the other two, private meetings of one kind and another were held, at which the preparatory discussions took place which issued in

the decrees ultimately promulgated at the final session. At the second public session there was a discussion on the claims of Frederick II to the empire as against the excommunicated Otto, and the council supported Innocent's action. There was also, apparently, a discussion on English affairs. The excommunication of the barons in rebellion against John was confirmed, and the council also assented to the pope's suspension of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, for his support of the rebels. At the final session there was a stormy discussion on the subject of the partition of the lands of Raymond VI of Toulouse, as to whether Simon de Montfort should be confirmed in his possession. The pope, here, was opposed to the council which would have recognised Simon. In the end, as has been related, Innocent was able to arrange a compromise. Finally, in this same session the seventy canons of the council [] were solemnly promulgated.

The first canon is the famous profession of faith Firmiter, a statement of Catholic belief directed primarily against the Albigenses and the innumerable anti-sacerdotal sects of the day. It emphasises the creation of all things, spiritual and corporal alike, by the one sole God. The devils, too, are God's creation. That they are now evil is the effect of their own perversity. The reality of the Incarnation of the Only-begotten Son of God is affirmed once more, with a greater precision as to its mode. The sanctions of the future life for present conduct are explicitly set out. There is but a single Church for all believers. Outside of it no one can be saved; within it Jesus Christ Himself is priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the appearance of bread and wine, the bread being transsubstantiated [] into the body and the wine into the blood by the power of God; so that, to make perfect the mystery of unity, we may receive of His where He has taken of ours. No one can bring this sacrament into existence but the priests duly ordained by that power of the Church which Jesus Christ gave to the Apostles and their successors. Baptism, by whomsoever administered, if it is rightly administered in the Church's form, is profitable to salvation as much to little children as to adults. Sins committed after baptism can be made good by sincere penance. Not only virgins and those who lead a life of continency, but the married also can attain eternal happiness, by true faith and a good life.

Then follows a still more lengthy canon condemning the book of Joachim of Flora against Peter Lombard. The pope, in this canon, takes the unusual course of setting out Joachim's argument before proceeding to declare -- in a form that is even more unusual -- " We, however, with the approval of the Sacred Council, believe and confess with Peter Lombard" -- what the true teaching is. Joachim's theory is condemned; but the canon expressly declares that the condemnation is in no way to be taken as a condemnation of his foundation at Flora, which is a model of religious observance. Joachim, it is further noted, submitted all his writings to the apostolic see to be amended as the pope thought necessary, since, as he himself wrote, the Roman Church is the mother and teacher of all the faithful. This second canon concludes with a brief judgement on the pantheistic theories of Amaury de Bene, theories it describes as not so much heretical as insane.

The council then turns to review the life of the Church, to denounce the weakness and the wickedness of its members, and to provide punishment for the obstinate. It begins with the clergy.

Clerics living in sin are to be suspended, and, if they ignore the suspension, they are to be deposed. Bishops who allow such scandals to continue -- and especially if they allow it for the sake of money or some other advantage -- are also to lose their office for ever. Even more severely are clerics to be punished for sins of this kind in places where the discipline is such that they could, had they chosen, have married. [] Drunkenness is another bad habit There are clerics, and bishops among them, who sit up all night carousing; drinking competitions are not unknown; the next day's Matins finds them absent from choir. Other bishops hardly ever say Mass, and laugh at the idea of assisting at it. When they do assist they do little more than gossip with the laity and transact business. [] There is another type of ecclesiastic who delights in hunting and fowling. This is forbidden, no matter what his rank, and it is forbidden even to keep hunting dogs and birds.

Canon 16 has a long list of things which the clerics must not do: civil employments, trade (especially if it is dishonest), miming, acting, frequenting taverns (absolutely forbidden save for the necessities of travelling), dicing and even looking on at games

of chance. Clerics are to be soberly dressed. Their garments are to be of a moderate cut, neither too long nor too short, and fastened up to the neck. Red and green are colours definitely forbidden. Clerics are not to wear embroidered gloves nor shoes. They are not allowed to gild their spurs, bridles, saddles nor any part of the harness of their mounts. Nor are their bridles or belts to be ornamented with gold or silver. Bishops are to wear linen unless they are monks, in which case they are to keep the habit of the order to which they belong. Clerics are not to have any part in trials that involve the punishment of death, nor are they to look on at executions. They are forbidden all military employment. They are not to act as surgeons. They are not to bless ordeals. This last prohibition, since it removed the one thing that gave the ordeal its value, was the beginning of the end of that superstitious usage.

That such abuses as those, for whose correction these laws are made, may not arise in the future, the council proceeds to legislate in the matter of clerical appointments.

Sees are not to be left vacant. If the chapter concerned does not elect within three months, the right (and duty) of providing the new bishop passes to the metropolitan. [] If the chapter follow the method of election, a simple majority suffices. [] The unlawful interference of the secular power is provided against by a canon which decrees that whoever accepts election in such circumstances not only is not elected, but loses all right to be elected, to any post at all in the future. Those who elect him are also to lose both office and income for three years, and to lose all electoral rights [] The bishop, or abbot it may be, once elected, it falls to the metropolitan, or diocesan bishop, to confirm the election. He is to examine if the election has been made in due form and to examine if the elect be suitable. Should he confirm the choice of an unsuitable person -- especially one lacking in the requisite learning, or of evil life, or who is under the canonical age -- the confirmation is invalid, and he loses all rights in the matter of the next election, and is himself suspended until the pope absolves him. []

It is, once more, strictly forbidden to confer on the same person more than one benefice with cure of souls. The pope notes that the legislation of the previous council (the Third Lateran of 1179) about this scandal has had scarcely any effect, such is the

impudence and greed of mankind. For the future, acceptance of the second office entails loss of the first. Whoever attempts to retain the first loses also the second. The patron of the first benefice is to make a new appointment, immediately its holder has accepted a second. The bishop's diligence in the observance of these salutary laws is not to be left to his own unaided conscience. At the annual provincial council there is to be an enquiry into all nominations to benefices since the bishops last met. Bishops who have made unsuitable appointments are to be admonished. If, after a second admonition, they have done nothing, they are to lose all rights of patronage, and the council is to appoint an official to exercise the right in their place. If the negligent bishop is the metropolitan himself, he is to be denounced to the Holy See. The disability laid on such bishops no one but the pope can remove. A last rule about appointments is that no cleric shall be given a canonry in a church where his father is already a canon -- whether the cleric be born in wedlock or no. All such appointments are null, and those who make such appointments are suspended.

The new papal centralisation would protect the Church against unworthy clergy. It aims at protecting the clergy against rapacious prelates. Bishops are warned that they must not rob the clergy serving those churches which are in the gift of the bishops. The pope has heard of unfortunate priests who receive only one-sixteenth of the revenue due to them, the episcopal patron retaining the rest. Nor are bishops to make visitations an excuse for bleeding their clergy. The canon of 1179 is re-enacted, and bishops who have offended are now required, not only to make restitution to the full, but to give in charity a sum equal to that they have had to restore. Metropolitans who neglect complaints of this kind made against their suffragans are to be severely punished.

Bishops, in canon 10, are reminded of their duty to preach, and when the bishop is not equal to the task, when for example the diocese is too extensive. he is to choose suitable priests to assist him. In all cathedral and collegiate churches he is to establish priests to act as his coadjutors in the work of preaching and hearing confessions. It is the bishop who is responsible for the education of the future clergy. The decree of the council of 1179. that in each cathedral, and in all the greater

churches, there should be established a master to teach grammar, and in the metropolitan church a lecturer in theology, had in many churches the present council states, been entirely ignored. Whence it is now re-enacted, with this difference that a lectureship in theology is ordered to be founded in every cathedral. The bishop, furthermore, is specially warned to see that the clergy are trained in the administration of the sacraments. Better few good priests, so canon 27, than many bad ones. Churches are not to be used as depots in which the clergy may store their property. They are to be kept scrupulously clean, and the Holy Eucharist -- the chrism also -- is to be kept under lock and key.

One of the most constantly recurring complaints of the sectaries is that the clergy are too fond of money. The council, in a series of canons, labours to protect from this all too human vice the sacred things of God committed to the clergy's stewardship. Bishops are forbidden to receive offerings of money from those they absolve from excommunication. They are not allowed to receive fees on the occasion of consecrations, blessings of abbots and ordinations. Convents of women are ordered for the future to abstain from demanding a premium, under the plea of the convent's poverty, from girls who wish to become nuns. Nuns received under such an arrangement are to be transferred to other convents, as are also the nuns responsible for the arrangement. The same is to apply to communities of men. Bishops are not to take advantage of a parish priest's death to tax the church beyond what the law allows, nor to enforce the payment of such taxes by laying an interdict on the church. For moneys thus obtained double restitution is to be made. With regard to the fees customary at funerals and marriages, while the clergy often ask too much, the laity as often offer nothing. The Sacraments are to be given absolutely without charge. On the other hand, the custom of the laity making a free offering is to be encouraged.

The 62nd canon regulates the use of relics, and hopes to check the trade in spurious relics by ordering that no new relics are to be exposed for veneration without the Holy See's authentication of them. Collectors of alms, again, are not always genuine nor truthful. The canon gives a specimen of the letters of credence that should, and for the future must, guarantee them not to be frauds. The dress of such collectors is regulated, and they are to

live religious lives. Bishops are warned not to grant extravagant indulgences.

A last class of abuses are those where the laity are the sinners. Lay patrons are warned against farming out benefices at a starvation rate, and reminded that lay alienation of church property is null and void. Lay patrons, and the official lay defenders of the Church, are warned against abusing their office to their own personal profit. Offences of this kind entail serious legal disqualifications that continue for four generations. Clergy are not to be taxed without a license from the pope. Those who levy such taxes without his permission are excommunicated, and all their acts are legally null. Should their successors not repeal such taxes within a month of assuming office, and give satisfaction for the wrong done, they fall under the same penalties. Another canon deals with evasions of tithe and canon 54 recalls that tithes have precedence of all other taxes and must be paid first.

Seven canons are taken up with the religious orders. To avoid grave confusion in the Church it is now forbidden to establish any new orders. Those who wish to be monks or nuns are to choose an existing approved rule. Founders of new houses are to do likewise. No abbot is to rule more than one monastery. Abbots are forbidden to exercise certain episcopal rights, to judge marriage cases, for example, to grant indulgences or to allot public penances. Monks must respect the rights of parishes in the matter of funerals, and the privileged monasteries' power of giving burial within the monastery to such laymen as are oblates of the house is given very strict definition: an oblate is one who lives in the monastic habit, or who, during his life, has made over his property to the monastery; a mere annual subscription is no qualification enough. No monk is to stand security for a debt without the abbot's permission. Monks to whom land that is tithe-bearing has been given are not exempt from payment of tithes.

The most important canon of all, so far as monks are concerned, is the twelfth, which, incidentally, marks the high water mark of Citeaux's influence in the Church of the Middle Ages. In every ecclesiastical province, it is now enacted, there shall be held every three years a common chapter of abbots, and of priors in those orders which do not have abbots, where so far this has

not been the custom. All are to attend. The chapter, to begin with, will invite two Cistercian abbots of the neighbourhood to lend the assistance of their experience of the procedure at general chapters. The Cistercian abbots will choose two of the chapter and these four will preside. The object of the chapter is a thorough review Of the state of monastic life throughout the province. It has power to decide where reforms are needed. The chapter must appoint visitors for all the religious houses of the province, of women as well as of men, empowered to correct, as representatives of the Holy See, whatever calls for correction, and to denounce evil-doers to the local bishop. The bishops are to watch over the ordinary life of the monasteries so that the visitation will always find everything in good order. They are to be the monasteries' protectors, defending the monks especially from lay tyranny and usurpation.

The council also legislated for two of the sacraments. Canon 21 is the once famous law *Omnis utriusque sexus* that every Catholic, under pain of being debarred from church while alive and being denied Christian burial when dead, should, at least once a year, confess his sins to his parish priest, and, if only at Easter, receive the Holy Eucharist. The canon concludes with a warning to confessors about the spirit in which they should receive confessions, and of the obligation not to reveal what is confessed to them. Offenders against this last prescription are to be thrust into a severe monastery, there to do penance for the rest of their life. Related to this canon is the one which follows, reminding physicians that it is their duty to see that their patients remedy the ills of the soul no less than those of the body, and forbidding them to recommend, as a remedy for sickness, practices in themselves sinful. Three canons concern the sacrament of matrimony. Clandestine marriages are severely condemned and the clergy forbidden to assist at them. Clergy who are negligent in this matter are to be suspended for three years. The impediments of consanguinity and affinity are notably restricted: henceforward they invalidate marriage only as far as the fourth degree.

The relations between Jews and Christians are also before the council's mind. Christians are to be protected by the State against the rapacity of Jewish moneylenders. Jews -- and Saracens too--are to wear a special dress so that no Christian shall come to marry them in ignorance of what they are. During

Passiontide Jews are to keep indoors; there have been only too many riots caused by their mockery of the Christians' lamentations on Good Friday. No Jews or pagans are to be elected or appointed to a public office; it is contrary to the sense of things that those who blaspheme Christ shall hold authority over Christ's followers.

It is perhaps the canonist that, in Innocent III, is the source of all his policy. In the General Council summoned by him Canon Law and procedure receive very notable attention. Seven canons deal with procedure in trials of one kind or another. Other canons regulate excommunications, rights of appeal, and the rules for the trial of clerics, the rights of chapters to correct their own members, and the rules for resignation of benefices. The clergy are forbidden to extend their jurisdiction by encroaching on that of the civil courts. But the most elaborate of this series is the third canon which details the policy to be followed in the pursuit of heretics. []

The laws were made. How could the council secure that the would be observed, that the bishops, once retired into the distant sees, would put into practice what they had accepted? The sixth canon is an attempt to provide the means. It lays down that the bishops of each ecclesiastical province are to meet annually, for the correction of abuses -- clerical abuses particularly -- and for the express purpose of maintaining the discipline which this council establishes. Official investigators are to be appointed for each diocese, who shall report to the provincial council whatever they have found needing correction and uncorrected. Negligent bishops are to be suspended from office and from income, and the decisions of the provincial council are to be published in every see through the annual diocesan synod.

The new canon lawyers had soon begun to collect and classify the decisions now pouring out from the popes, on all kinds of questions, in reply to appeals from bishops everywhere. There were 4,000 such from Alexander III, more than 5,000 from Innocent III -- all set out in professional legal form, relating the case to principles, law that was living. Innocent III and Honorius III each sponsored a collection of his own decretals. By the time of Gregory IX there were too many collections. They overlapped. The law could not, always, be known with certainty. This pope

then commissioned a Catalan Dominican -- St. Raymund of Penaforte -- to reduce the vast mass to a coherent code. In 1234 the code was ready -- the Five Books of the Decretals, 1963 capita in all, destined to be the basis of the Canon Law down to 1918. This code of 1234 was henceforward the only law, and it was universal, to be taught in all universities, to be administered in every bishop's court. Boniface VIII was to supplement it in 1295, and John XXII in 1317. But the main work was done in 1234, and with every year that passed it deepened the effect of the papacy as ruler of the whole church. (cf. CIMETIER, *Les Sources du droit ecclesiastique*, Paris, 1930; VILLIEN, art. *Decretales* in D.T.C.)

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 10: THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY: ACHIEVEMENT AND PROBLEMS, 1216-1274.

1. THE IMPERIAL MENACE TO THE FREEDOM OF RELIGION: (3) THE EMPEROR FREDERICK II.

HONORIUS III, elected pope two days after the death of Innocent III, was by no means another Innocent, for all that his life had been spent in his predecessor's service. He had indeed been a personage of importance in the Roman Church for now thirty years. As the head of the Treasury he had done much to reorganise the whole financial administration, and the Liber Censuum, a kind of ecclesiastical Domesday Book, is his work. He was also the compiler of the twelfth Ordo Romanus and the author of a life of St. Gregory VII. It was this trained, careful, mild-mannered official whom Innocent had chosen to tutor the early years of the new Emperor Frederick II, and possibly this close association played a part in his election. But Honorius was now an old man, and the event was to show very speedily how mistaken were any hopes of future co-operation between pope and emperor based upon their years of intimate association. It is questionable whether even Innocent himself could have controlled his ward now arrived at man's estate.

Frederick II, twenty-two years old when Innocent's death deprived him of his guardian, and set his tutor on the papal throne, was the wonder man of his generation. A dozen strains and influences mingled in his blood: the force of his grandfather Barbarossa, the political craft of his father Henry VI, the military gift of his mother's Norman blood, a passion for learning, and all the rich amalgam of the old long-civilised state where so far he had passed his life, that Sicily which, even after one hundred and fifty years of Norman rule, was still more Oriental than European, as much Moslem as Christian. Competent, determined, crafty, and altogether without scruple, Frederick awaited only the opportune moment In this ward of the popes the independence of religion was to meet, yet once again, an enemy who could not triumph and the Church survive.

For the eleven years during which Honorius ruled, his indulgence to the young man he had fathered masked the danger. Frederick's vow to lead a crusade went unfulfilled, and the old pope contented himself with admonitions and reproaches. Seven times in ten years the farce was re-enacted, the emperor first fixing a date, and then offering his excuses which the pope, with inexhaustible faith in his goodwill, was paternally content to accept. Frederick had pledged his word -- as the condition of his election to the empire -- that he would never unite to it the crown of Sicily. Sicily he had made over to his son Henry. In 1220, however, Henry was elected King of the Romans, emperor-to-be. The pope protested, and Frederick explained that it had been done without his knowledge. He renewed all the lavish promises of restitution of the long-lost Matildine lands, took the cross once again, annulled all laws that encroached on clerical privileges, and Honorius was satisfied. Meanwhile, during these eleven years, Frederick built up a new scientific despotism in Sicily, and planned to renew his grandfather's attempt to make himself master of Lombardy (1226, Diet of Cremona). This was too much, even for Honorius, and a breach seemed imminent when, in 1227, the old pope died. In his place was elected the Cardinal Ugolino. He took the name of Gregory IX -- significantly.

Gregory IX, as the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, had been, since the election of Innocent III, one of the most prominent figures in the Curia. He was a near relative of that pope who had created him cardinal in the year of his accession (1198). He had also chosen Ugolino as one of the legates to whom was committed the delicate task of reconciling Philip of Swabia in 1207. Two years later Ugolino was once more in Germany as legate, in connection with the re-election and coronation of Otto IV. He had played a great part in the conclave of 1216, and under Honorius III he had been legate in Lombardy and Tuscany, and then charged with the preaching of the crusade of 1217-1221. He was himself no mean scholar, trained in the schools of Paris and Bologna and especially versed in the new Canon Law. His own life was mortified and exemplary. He had been a personal friend of St. Francis, whom he had advised in the composition of the definitive rule, and he had had much to do with the first approbation of the Order of Preachers also. His career reveals him as a man of exceptional strength of will, impulsive, passionate, and yet able to forbear. For the eleven years of his

predecessor's pontificate he had had to look on while the enemy grew in strength and prepared the positions from which he would attack. Now, after all these years of Frederick's successful dalliance, the Church had once more for pope a man with character and strength of will.

It was in the March of 1227 that Gregory IX was elected. Frederick was now, by right of his wife, King of Jerusalem; a crusade was once more in preparation and the troops converging on Brindisi. On September 8 Frederick set sail. A few days later he had returned. The long delay that had kept the army in camp through the southern Italian summer had bred a pestilence; thousands of the troops had perished; Frederick, so it was announced, had contracted some kind of fever- hence his return. The crusade, the greater part of it, returned with him; the armies broke up, the men made their way home. Was Frederick's illness real? It is not possible to say. Certainly the pope thought it feigned, the latest, merely, of a series of ingenious devices to escape his duty as emperor and the obligations to which he had repeatedly pledged himself by oath. The crusade was at an end, and much of its army destroyed by Frederick's negligence. On September 29 the pope solemnly excommunicated him for his breach of the crusader's vow, and two weeks later in a letter to the Christian world he pointed out the repeated pledges and perjuries of Frederick since his election to the empire in 1215. The pope wrote a private letter, at the same time, to the emperor explaining that public opinion, already outraged by Frederick's plunder of sees, abbeys, and hospitals in his kingdom of Sicily, had a right to some satisfaction and that Frederick's last exploit had left him no choice but to act; nevertheless the pope was being merciful; he had not, for example, deprived Frederick of Sicily: let Frederick respond in the same spirit.

The emperor replied by a denunciation of the pope for the lack of charity with which he had stirred up hatred against him throughout the world. On March 23, 1228, Gregory issued a second excommunication because the emperor had ignored the first, and with it an interdict that was to operate in every place where Frederick halted. Furthermore, if Frederick continued in his evil course, he should be deprived of Sicily. This was on Maundy Thursday, and by the Wednesday of Easter Week the emperor's partisans in Rome had driven the pope forth.

Frederick ignored this sentence too, and renewed his preparation to accomplish that lay conquest of the East which had been the ambition of the last two Hohenstaufen Princes also. He set sail from Brindisi on June 18, 1228, with a curiously mixed force which included, besides Germans and Italians, some of his own Mohammedan subjects. In July he took possession of Cyprus as regent for the young king, who did him homage, and in September he landed at St. Jean d'Acre.

The Mohammedan world was passing through one of its periods of disunion. The Prince of Damascus and the Sultan of Egypt had been lately in conflict, and for a long time now the sultan's need had driven him to diplomatic relations with the emperor. By the time Frederick arrived the sultan's enemy was no more, and the sultan's promises of Jerusalem to Frederick worth correspondingly less. But Frederick knew the Mohammedan world as few Western princes, and it was possibly an advantage to him in the negotiations now beginning that he was known to be under the pope's ban, officially not a Christian at all, with the Patriarch of Jerusalem renewing the interdict, the military orders holding aloof from him and every Dominican and Franciscan in Palestine preaching openly against him.

The emperor's diplomacy was successful. On February 4, 1229, the treaty of Jaffa made over to him Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Nazareth with the roads thence to Acre and the villages through which they passed. On the other hand, the Mohammedans living in the ceded territory were to remain the sultan's subjects, to enjoy the full exercise of their religion, and to retain possession of the great mosque of Omar that stood upon the traditional site of the Temple. Also, Frederick pledged himself to prevent any attack from the West for ten years. It was for Frederick a diplomatic victory of the first order. On the other hand, the old crusade principle of restoring the one-time Christian lands to Christian rule was abandoned entirely. Catholicism, under this new arrangement, no longer aspired to drive out the infidel.

Frederick's triumph was consummated when, on March 11,] 229, accompanied by his nobles and knights and his Saracens without any kind of religious ceremonial, he took the crown of Jerusalem from the high altar of the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre and crowned himself king. The clergy held aloof, the patriarch refusing even to enter the city. The faithful were no

less hostile and when, six weeks later, the emperor made his way to the ships that were to take him back to Europe, the butchers of Acre pelted him and his escort with offal.

On June 10, 1229, Frederick landed at Brindisi. During the year of his absence in the East, the war had developed in Sicily between his forces and those of the pope. The Sicilians had begun by invading the Papal State. Later Gregory had gained the upper hand. But the emperor's return was the beginning of a general rout; the papal troops retired, and Frederick took a terrible revenge on those of his subjects who had recognised the excommunication and fought against him. There were wholesale executions, some hanged and others skinned alive. The pope launched a new excommunication against the emperor (August 29, 1229) and made a new appeal to Christendom for assistance.

The response was, perhaps, poor; but Frederick desired peace at least as eagerly as the pope, and after months of negotiation it was concluded at San Germano (July 23, 1230). On all points Frederick yielded. He promised to evacuate all papal territories, to restore the confiscated Church property, and to recall the bishops he had exiled; the partisans of the pope were to be granted an amnesty; the Church's rights in Sicily were confirmed anew; an indemnity was promised to the Templars and Hospitallers

For Frederick the peace of 1230 was simply the first move in his elaborate plan to achieve world dominion. It would give him time to reorganise his forces, and to make himself master of Italy before finally reducing the papacy. To the success of his scheme the open enmity of the pope would be fatal -- as would be any distraction from troubles in Germany. The next few years saw Frederick pursuing apparently contradictory policies in Germany and Italy. North of the Alps he lavished exemptions and privileges upon the Princes, frittering away all that imperial hegemony which his father and grandfather had done so much to construct. In Italy, with as much skill as strength, he was, at the same time building up a strong, highly centralised despotism -- first of all in his kingdom of Sicily. Then, to the anxiety of the pope, he openly declared his policy of extending the system to northern Italy; the Lombard cities were finally to lose their rights. The diet of Ravenna (November 1, 1231) which

saw this proclamation made, saw the emperor also in the role of the persecutor of heretics and the protector of the Dominicans because they were inquisitors. The plea that his enemies -- in Lombardy and in Germany -- were heretics would ultimately be one of Frederick's justifications. The time would come when he would denounce the pope himself as the protector of heretics.

If Frederick had need of some measure of papal support -- of papal neutrality certainly -- during these crucial years, the pope stood equally in need of Frederick's aid. Time and again the hostility of the Romans drove the pope from his city. Each time the pope appealed to Frederick to fulfil his role of protector and reinstate him. Each time Frederick was lavish in his promises but left the pope to his own devices.

So the years of this uneasy truce went by. In 1235 Frederick was occupied with a revolt in Germany led by his son, the youthful Henry VII. This put down, in July-, 1236, he appeared once more in Italy, with a huge army, to end the independence of the Lombard cities once and for all.

The pope did his best to stave off the war. He explained to Frederick that the Lombards were the victims of calumny, that truth and peace were his own one, sole aim. He complained of the way in which Frederick had neglected to carry out the treaty of 1230. Frederick, however, pressed on resolutely, sending the pope evasive and, as the pope complained, highly disrespectful messages in reply. On November 1, 1236, he took Vicenza, sacking the town and massacring the inhabitants. A year later the great victory of Cortenuova (November 27, 1237) reversed his grandfather's defeat at Legnano. Save for Milan, Alessandria and Brescia he was now master of northern Italy. As he prepared to lay siege to Alessandria, Gregory approached him once more with proposals for peace. The emperor's only reply was to imprison the legates who had brought them (May, 1238). He next attempted to break the understanding between the pope and the Lombard League, but at the very time his envoys were opening the negotiations at Anagni with Gregory, he dispatched an army to capture Sardinia -- a papal fief.

Gregory IX, for all his natural fire, had shown himself as patient as his predecessor. Certainly Innocent III had taken a shorter way with the shiftiness of Raymond of Toulouse. By 1239

Gregory had come to the end of his long-suffering, and on March 20 of that year he renewed the excommunication against Frederick in a document which listed his crimes for the information of Christendom. The emperor had imprisoned papal legates; he had been the cause of the seditions in Rome; he had kept sees vacant in Sicily and imprisoned and murdered the clergy there, he had for years plundered sees and churches, and had usurped Church territories; he had robbed the Templars and the Hospitallers; he had laid unjust taxes on sees, monasteries and the clergy generally; he had broken the pledge of 1230 to grant an amnesty, and he had thwarted the efforts of the pope to renew the crusade. As to the common opinion that Frederick was a heretic, the pope for the moment reserved himself. Meanwhile, the emperor was put out of the Church, and all places where he halted were laid under interdict. The clergy who ignored this sentence and officiated in despite of it, incurred suspension for life.

This was far more serious for the emperor than anything which had happened so far. He retorted to the pope that he would speedily be revenged, and he prepared, in his turn, an encyclical to the princes of Europe denouncing the "wickedness enthroned in the Lord's seat." All mendicant friars -- Dominicans and Franciscans -- of Lombard birth were expelled from his kingdom of Sicily and, a short time later, all friars indiscriminately -- so closely were the new orders as such seen, already, as attached to the service of the Roman Church. All who brought papal documents into the kingdom were to be hanged.

The pope replied in a still more eloquent condemnation, filled with phrases from the Apocalypse. "A great beast has come out of the sea. . . this scorpion spewing passion from the sting in his tail. . . full of the names of blasphemy. . . raging with the claws of the bear and the mouth of the lion and the limbs and the likeness of the leopard, opens its mouth to blaspheme the Holy Name. . . behold the head and tail and body of the beast, of this Frederick, this so-called emperor. . . ." It recapitulated the emperor's crimes; it exposed his calumnies; it condemned him as a heretic for his denial of the pope's authority and for his assertion that the world in its time had been led astray by three impostors, Moses, Mohammed and Jesus Christ, for his mockery of the mystery of the virgin birth and his declaring that nothing is to be believed that cannot be proved by the natural

reason.

To this terrible indictment Frederick replied in the language of a Father of the Church, pained at the pope's lack of charity- "the pharisee who sits on the plague-stricken seat, anointed with the oil of wickedness. . . ." He makes a most pious profession of faith and retorts that the pope is a liar. It is he who is the sole cause of the trouble and, quoting in his turn from prophecy, the pope is "the great dragon, the rider on the red horse, the universal destroyer of peace, Antichrist himself."

The war was now on indeed. Truce between such adversaries was impossible. Writers on both sides flooded Europe with their pamphlets, and while Frederick gained steadily in the field through 1239 and 1240, the pope strove to form an anti- imperial party in Germany, and called a general council to meet in Rome for the Easter of 1241. He persuaded the Genoese to provide an escorting fleet for the prelates, and the Venetians to invade Apulia. Frederick issued a general order that all bishops and prelates en route for the council were to be arrested, and licensed his subjects to rob them. He made desperate efforts to detach Genoa from the pope and even to win over the Order of Preachers. Then, on May 5, 1241, his fleet met, and defeated, the Genoese fleet as it neared the end of its voyage convoying the fathers of the council. Three ships were sunk and twenty-two captured with something like a hundred bishops, two of the cardinals, the Lombard deputies and four thousand Genoese. The emperor prepared to march on Rome.

Three months later, with the crisis at its full, Gregory IX died (August 21, 1241). Frederick had reached Grottaferrata just nine miles away.

There were at the moment twelve cardinals in all, two of them Frederick's prisoners. The ten at liberty were closely guarded by the real ruler of Rome, the Senator Matteo Orsini, and, in a seclusion that was little better than an imprisonment, for two months they hesitated and debated whom to elect. To hasten the decision the senator inflicted on them all manner of hardships. In the end three of the cardinals died of disease contracted in the filthy and insanitary hole where, for two whole months of the Roman summer, they had been huddled. Finally they agreed on the Milanese cardinal, Godfrey. He accepted, and took the name

of Celestine IV. He was advanced in years, sick as a result of the conclave, and seventeen days later, before he was consecrated, he died.

The confusion was now greater than ever. Three of the cardinals, rather than face a renewal of the horrors they had recently undergone, fled to Anagni; three remained behind in Rome; Frederick still held to his prisoners. Three of the cardinals were partisans of Frederick; the others refused to leave Anagni unless Frederick consented to release his prisoners and to withdraw his army from the neighbourhood of Rome; Frederick refused utterly, and the deadlock was complete. From October 1241 to June 1243 it continued. Finally, St. Louis IX of France intervening, the emperor released his prisoners, and on June 25, 1243, the Cardinal Sinibaldo Fieschi was elected and took the name of Innocent IV.

The new pope, by birth a nobleman of Genoa, was already known as an expert canonist. He had taught Canon Law at Bologna and for the last twenty years he had been employed in the most important posts of the Roman Church. Gregory IX had made him a cardinal in 1227; he had been Vice-Chancellor; and from 1235 he had filled, for the most critical years of all, the difficult post of Papal Legate in Lombardy. He was, then, as well acquainted with the personalities engaged in the controversy as with the principles around which it raged. It was now evident that the pope was not merely fighting another Henry IV, or Barbarossa, but an anti-ecclesiastical theory of world organisation, aggressive and fully armed. No wiser choice of a champion against it could have been made than that of this calm unmoved Genoese, trained lawyer and practised administrator. Nor had Innocent IV the disadvantage of being known as an intransigent. Whatever the origin of the idea, he passed popularly for being favourable to an understanding with Frederick. His nearest relatives had fought at Frederick's side, and his election was hailed as a triumph for the emperor. Frederick, if the story is true, knew better. "I have lost a friend," he said. "No pope can be a Ghibelline."

The history of the interregnum and of the two years that went before, made it evident beyond all doubt that Frederick would never rest until the pope was his chaplain, and himself as great a power in the Church as in his own kingdom of Sicily. It was not

the least of the new pope's merits that he realised this from the beginning and acted accordingly. His first messages to Frederick were peaceful, and to his request for a conference the emperor replied by sending to him his two chief advisers, the legists Piero della Vigna and Thaddeus of Suessa.

The negotiations ended with Frederick renewing all his old pledges to restore the papal territory he occupied, and granting an amnesty to all who had recently fought against him, even the Lombards being included. This was on Holy Thursday, 1244, but before April was out the pope had to protest that Frederick was once again breaking his sworn word. Frederick, in reply, suggested a personal conference between himself and Innocent. The pope, with the memory of the last two years fresh in his mind, was, however, too wary to be caught. This time he would retain his freedom and use it to attack. Disguised as a knight he fled to Genoa, and thence crossed the Alps to Lyons, a city where the sovereign was the archbishop and his chapter -- nominally within the emperor's jurisdiction, but close to the protective strength of the King of France, St. Louis IX.

The council which Gregory IX had planned, Innocent realised. It met at Lyons in the July of 1245, two hundred bishops and abbots attending. This first General Council of Lyons is unique in that its main purpose was a trial. The emperor was making it his life's aim to restore the ancient subordination of religion to the State. The pope was determined to destroy him, to end for all time this power which had once, for so long, enslaved the Church and which, for a good century now, had never ceased its attack on the Church's restored independence. There was to be no return to the bad days which had preceded St. Leo IX and St. Gregory VII. Since none but a fool would place any reliance on Frederick's oaths, Frederick should be deposed.

On July 7, 1245, the council, in solemn public session, listened to the recital of the emperor's crimes and shifty, insincere repentances. Then, despite the pleading of Thaddeus of Suessa, it accepted the decree of deposition.

Frederick, in reply, circularised the reigning princes of Europe. If the decree of deposition is perhaps the clearest expression yet of the theory of the papal power over temporal rulers as such, Frederick's riposte may be read as the first manifesto of the

"liberal" state. For it sets out, against the papal practice, a complete, anti-ecclesiastical theory. All the anti- sacerdotal spirit of the heresies of the previous century finds here new, and more powerful, expression. The supremacy of the sacerdotium is denounced as a usurpation, and anti-clericalism, allied now for the first time to the pagan conception of the omnipotent state-a doctrine popularised through the rebirth of Roman Law-offers itself as a world force with the destruction of the sacerdotium as its aim. Thanks to the imperial legists, and especially to the genius of the two already mentioned, the new point of view is set forth imperishably in this manifesto, and the princes of Christendom are invited to join with the emperor in his attempt to destroy the common enemy. The Church, they are told, is part of the State, and, for all that Frederick guards against any overt denial of the pope's authority, the Catholic prince is, for him, inevitably a kind of Khalif. It is this prince's mission to keep religion true to itself, to reform it whenever necessary, and to bring it back to the primitive simplicity of the gospel. Frederick had indeed revealed himself. The theory is the most subversive of heresies, and it is the emperor, the pledged defender of orthodoxy, the prince the very *raison d'etre* of whose office is orthodoxy's defence, who is its inventor and patron. His reply to the excommunication more than justified the attitude of Gregory IX, and Innocent's initiative.

Frederick, then, proposed to free the Church from sacerdotalism, from clerical ambition and greed. He planned to take Lyons and to imprison pope and cardinals as he had done the prelates taken at La Meloria in 1241. Through 1246 the scheme went forward until the emperor's army was ready.

Two things saved the pope. The King of France -- St. Louis IX -- to whom he appealed, for all that he had not offered to share in the war against the emperor and had not broken off relations with him since his deposition, made it known to Frederick that should he march on Lyons, French armies would bar his way. Secondly, at Parma, on June 6, 1247, Frederick's forces suffered a severe defeat.

Innocent had been as busy as Frederick since the council. His diplomacy had brought about the election of a successor to Frederick in Germany -- Henry Raspe first of all and then, on his death, William of Holland. Round the new emperor the pope

sought to organise an anti-Hohenstaufen crusade as, fifty years earlier, Innocent III had organised a crusade against Raymond of Toulouse. To all who went to Germany to fight the enemy of religion all the usual crusade indulgences and privileges were granted, and the pope found a host of preachers in the new orders of St. Dominic and St. Francis. It was not, however, in Germany that the issue was to be decided. Italy, the real centre of Frederick's policy, was the battlefield where the main fight went forward. In February, 1248, the papal troops gained a second victory at Parma, and although in Sicily their success was less, in the Duchy of Spoleto and the March of Ancona they carried all before them, capturing in 1249 Enzo, the most gifted of all Frederick's sons.

Frederick, his head still unbowed, set himself to find new friends, and he was in the midst of preparations to renew the attack when death struck him down (December 13, 1250). The wildest stories circulated as to the manner of his passing. One and not the least unlikely, is that he asked for the habit of the Cistercian order, to which he had always shown an attachment. For Innocent and the Church it was deliverance from the greatest of perils, and the bull (*Laetentur Coeli* -- January 25, 1251) in which the pope announced the news, testifies to the degree of the strain. Nevertheless, although Frederick was dead the Hohenstaufen survived, in the two sons of the emperor who continued the fight -- Conrad in Germany and Manfred in Sicily. The way was, however, open for the pope to return to Italy. He left Lyons in April, 1251, reached Perugia in November and stayed there another year and a half. In October, 1253, after an absence of nine years, Innocent re-entered his see.

While the war continued, the pope looked for a new vassal on whom to confer the forfeited throne of Sicily. His first thought was the Earl of Cornwall, brother to the English king, Henry III. On his refusal he turned to the brother of St. Louis -- Charles of Anjou. By June, 1253, the first negotiations were ended and the pope presented the conditions under which the crown of Sicily would be granted. The king was to do homage to the pope; he was to pledge himself not to hinder the Church's full exercise of its exclusive jurisdiction over clerics, and in ecclesiastical matters, not to tax the clergy, and to leave the administration of vacant sees entirely to the Church. Charles now drew back, and while he hesitated news arrived from Germany which

revolutionised the situation. Conrad was dead (May 21, 1254) and, like his grandfather Henry VI, sixty years before, this born enemy of the popes had named the pope as guardian for his infant heir Conradin.

The pope's first thought was to make what use the opportunity offered of strengthening his hold on Sicily. He called on the regent, Berthold, Archbishop of Palermo, to hand over the government to him as overlord and marched south with an army. Before Innocent would come to an understanding he intended to be in possession, acknowledged as suzerain. The regent refused to surrender and was excommunicated. On September 8 the papal army took San Germano, and the regency collapsed. Berthold resigned and Manfred accepted the pope's terms. He was confirmed in the fiefs his father had bequeathed him and granted recognition as regent for certain territories on the mainland. Conradin's titles as King of Jerusalem and Duke of Swabia were recognised. His claims to succeed in Sicily were left undecided.

The pope was now (October, 1254) master of the situation. The kingdom of Sicily was, for the moment, as much his possession as the Papal State itself. What were his plans for the future? Did he intend to rule it directly until such time as he thought fit to confer it on Conradin? Did he intend to annex it to the Papal State? Was he likely to carry out the project that would have made the Earl of Lancaster king? There is room here for differences of opinion, and historians are by no means agreed as to the pope's intentions. Whatever plans had taken shape in his mind, a sudden change on the part of Manfred threw everything into confusion once more. In an affray in which Manfred's responsibility was engaged, the Count of Borello was murdered. Manfred fled to raise supporters among his father's Saracens at Lucera, and by November the war was on once more. On December 2, 1254, he defeated the papal army and took Foggia. Five days later, at Naples, Innocent died.

Historians -- Catholics equally with the rest -- have not spared bitter words for Innocent IV. His inflexibility and determination in the long struggle, and the rigidity they developed, are set aside by side with the more seductive and picturesque traits of his treacherous enemy. The treachery is forgotten, and the menace too, which the family tradition presented, in pity for the tragic

end of the dynasty. But Innocent IV was one of the greatest of the popes none the less, a man whom nothing short of the high ideals of St. Gregory VII inspired. His tragic pontificate knew few peaceful days; his greatest achievement, like all violent victories, left a mixed legacy to his successors. But again, the achievement was great; and it sets him at least as high as the predecessor and namesake who, in popular fancy, has altogether overshadowed him. One of the writers best qualified to judge Innocent IV, the scholar who edited his registers, sums it up thus: [] "The Holy See had survived one of the most terrible crises it had ever faced, thanks to the sang-froid, the decision and the incomparable tenacity of this great pope."

The activities of Innocent IV were not wholly absorbed by the struggle with the Hohenstaufen. His vassal the King of Portugal he deposed for his encroachments on ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and in his place appointed his brother. One of the kings in Russia made over his kingdom to him. In all the far Eastern territories where heathenism still survived -- Prussia, Livonia and Esthonia -- he created sees, and in several embassies he did what he could to win over to the faith the new hordes from the East, the Tartars, who for a moment seemed about to throw Europe back into the savagery and chaos of the tenth century. There was not any aspect of Christian life that Innocent failed to support. but very often his support could go little further than sympathetic words, so greatly was he occupied with the battle for life against Frederick.

This preoccupation with the theologico-political problem told nowhere more unfavourably than in the affairs of the Latin East.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



2. THE CRUSADE OF ST. LOUIS IX, 1247-1254

Pope Gregory IX had, in August, 1230, ratified Frederick II's treaty with the sultan as part of the peace of San Germano, and Frederick had thereupon sent out one of his marshals, Richard Filangieri, to rule the new acquisition. Filangieri proceeded to centralise the administration, and ignored the old feudal constitution that made the barons the real rulers of the kingdom. The result was a civil war, which spread to Cyprus too, and occupied the next few years. When Frederick once more fell foul of the pope, after 1236, this struggle, too, passed into the East.

In 1243 Frederick's son Conrad, the child of the marriage with the heiress of Jerusalem, came of age and the barons seized the opportunity to proclaim that the regency of Frederick was at an end. As Conrad was an absentee, a regency was, however, inevitable and the barons conferred this on the Queen of Cyprus, the next-of-kin to Conrad's mother. The imperialist garrison at Tyre resisted, but was speedily forced to surrender. A year later the Sultan of Egypt attacked, his forces swelled by the sudden addition of ten thousand Mohammedans -- the Kharis -- in flight before the new Mongol victories of the successors of Genghis Khan. In September, 1244, Jerusalem was once again in the hands of the Mohammedans.

The news caused throughout Europe something considerably less than the universal dismay that had been the effect of Saladin's victory in 1187. There was, however, enough of the crusading spirit still alive to make the question of the recovery of Jerusalem one of the main questions before the Council of Lyons in the following June (1245). Innocent IV spoke of the state of the Latin East as one of the five wounds that afflicted the Church, and it was decided that yet once again an attempt should be made to rouse all Christendom, through the now traditional means of sermons and special embassies to the princes. The clergy were to contribute a twentieth of their revenues, the crusaders to be free of all taxes for three years, and tournaments were once more forbidden in the interests of the crusade. At the same time the pope planned a new offensive against the Mohammedans through an alliance with the ferocious Mongols, who, descending on the Near East from the

all but legendary country of China, seemed, from their victories of the last few years, about to destroy Mohammedanism for ever.

In the vast army of the Mongols all the peoples, and all the religions, of the vast continent between the Urals and the wall of China were represented. Among them were the Nestorians -- Christians lost to the sight of the popes for eight hundred years, who, in that time, albeit heretics, had built up a flourishing Church that included in its ranks Chinese and even Turks! The grandson of Genghis Khan was himself married to a Nestorian, and daily in his camp the religious offices of the Church, mass and the rest, were celebrated and officially announced. It was no doubt through the Venetians, informed of this through the commercial relations that took them everywhere, that the pope knew of the favourable disposition of the Mongols, and in 1245 he dispatched Franciscans and Dominicans to the East in the hope of converting the Mongol princes.

None of these negotiations had, however, any effect on the fortunes of the crusade. The task of retrieving the disaster of 1244 was taken up once more by the French and by their king in person, St. Louis IX. Alone of the princes of Christendom, he set all his energy to the task. In England the preaching of the crusade had produced chiefly a flood of new protests against the financial levy that accompanied it; the King of Norway was allowed to turn his forces against the pagans of the north; the Spanish princes were occupied with the Saracens on their very threshold, the Catholics of Germany were bidden gain the indulgence by fighting the pope's battles against Frederick II. It was left to the King of France to recover the holy places.

He set out in June, 1248. At Cyprus, envoys from the Mongols, who were at the moment preparing to attack the Caliph of Baghdad, met him, proposing an alliance. By the time St. Louis's acceptance reached the camp the Khan was dead, and it was three years before the saint learnt the news of this failure (1251). By that time the crusade of 1248 had ended in disaster

Like the crusaders of 1219, St. Louis directed his attack on Egypt. On June 7, 1249, he took Damietta and then halted until reinforcements arrived from France. His army was as lacking in discipline as it was short in numbers. The reinforcements,

Templars, Hospitallers and French crusaders under the King's brother Alphonse de Poitiers, brought the forces up to twenty thousand cavalry and forty thousand foot, and the army prepared to attack Mansourah. The first successes of the fight (February 8, 1250) were thrown away through the foolhardy recklessness of another of St. Louis's brothers, the Comte d'Artois. St. Louis's heroism finally drove back the Saracen attack, but the victory left the crusading army exhausted. The Saracens now blockaded the camp, dysentery and enteric fever set in, and on April 1 the order to retreat on Damietta was given. As the broken forces retired the Saracens attacked yet once again. It was a massacre rather than a battle, the greatest loss of the whole crusading movement. The knights and nobles were spared for the sake of what ransoms they might bring, but something like thirty thousand of the army were slain, and St. Louis was captured. He obtained his release by the promise to surrender Damietta and to pay 1,000,000 gold besants. The Saracens, in return, promised to free all the Christian prisoners in Egypt.

For another four years St. Louis remained in the East, negotiating for the release of the Christian captives, strengthening the defence of what places in Palestine were still in Christian hands, Acre, Jaffa, Sidon, Cesarea. He was, however, never able to reorganise the offensive, and finally the news of the death of his mother, who was governing France in his absence, forced him to return (April 24, 1254).

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



3. INNOCENT IV AND THE PAPAL MONARCHY

It remains to note the contribution of Innocent IV to that corpus of theologico-political doctrine in construction since the time of St. Gregory VII. Here the finished canonist Sinibaldo Fieschi shows himself, as pope, the scholarly equal of the other pontifical jurists, Roland Bandinelli and Lothario Conti. []

The theory, as it left Innocent III, he strengthened considerably, from the point of view of its defence in an age increasingly hostile, by insisting on the authority of the Church rather than that of the pope. There is not so continual an emphasis on the rights of the pope's personal authority, in this matter of the duty of mankind universally to acknowledge the supremacy of the sacerdotium. Here Innocent IV prefers to appeal to the divinely instituted right of the Church. A striking example of this is his bull *Agni sponsa nobilis* of March, 1246 -- incidentally a singularly moving piece of papal eloquence. His claims for the papal authority are of course not less extensive than those of his predecessors. The pope has power to bind and to loose universally. Not only all Christians, but all their affairs come within his scope. This authority he has the right to exercise universally, at any rate occasionally (*saltem causaliter*) and especially by reason of the moral aspect of a question (*maxime ratione peccati*). [] Both the swords, then, are in the Church's keeping. An important distinction makes clear the different position of the emperor -- the man who fills the papally created office -- and the different hereditary monarchs. who are not, by virtue of their consecration, by any means subject to the prelates who consecrate them in the way in which the emperor, from his consecration, is subject to the pope.

These theologico-political theories did not meet with universal approbation from the princes of the time. Not only the revolutionary half-heretic Frederick II, but such excellent Catholics as St. Louis IX of France and his mother the famous Blanche of Castile resisted stoutly on occasions. There were two spheres especially where the claims of pope and kings overlapped and where, from now onwards for centuries, friction between the two jurisdictions was chronic. There was, first of all, the matter of the: Church's judiciary power. For centuries the

Church alone had tried accused clerics; and, in some matters, laymen, too, were answerable before its courts. The new legal renaissance which, through all western Europe, was now beginning to transform the organisation of the different States was bound to challenge the older institution. Especially in France were the protests in this matter strong.

In England the martyrdom of St. Thomas of Canterbury had fixed public opinion on this question in an anti-royal sense, but England was the chief centre of the protests in the second of the spheres where Church and State overlapped. This was the matter of taxation. The great characteristic of the external activity of the Roman Church, since the time of St. Leo IX, is the rapidity with which, after the forced inertia of centuries, it centralised the administration of its primacy. That centralisation was the secret of its strength in the later battles with Barbarossa and with his grandson Frederick II. The Roman Church had reformed itself; it had reformed and liberated the other Churches too. Under a succession of indomitable popes it had fought off every attempt to enslave religion once again. But the process had been expensive. The vast administrative machine, the endless procession of legates and popes perpetually in motion from one end of Europe to the other, and finally the armies and the fleets -- all these made demands on the treasury which the resources of the Roman See alone could never meet. That the whole Church should help to finance the battles fought by Rome on its behalf was only just. With the increased centralisation there spread, ever and ever more widely, the new Church taxation. []

Within this elaborate financial machine, inevitably -- or quasi-inevitably -- there had grown up abuses of a very grave kind. The protests heard so early as the time of Alexander III, were almost by the middle of the thirteenth century, a permanent feature of Catholic life. In Innocent IV's reign, especially, they came in thick and fast, and from no country so violently as from England.

To the presence of these two sources of complaint among good Catholics Frederick II had already appealed. He was not indeed successful, but his intensive propaganda, the way in which he drew the world's attention to the matter, did much to fix the trouble in very concrete fashion in Catholic life and tradition. Henceforward the anti-clericalism of orthodox Catholics is a

steadily growing menace to the future of religion.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



4. THE END OF THE HOHENSTAUFEN: URBAN IV, CLEMENT IV AND CHARLES OF ANJOU

Innocent IV had died at a moment when it was just his courageous, patient strength that the cause of the Church most needed. On his successor's handling of the incipient revolt of Frederick's son Manfred the whole history of the next fifty years -- and of how much else? -- would depend. This time the interregnum was short -- thanks to one of Innocent's kinsmen who locked up the cardinals at Naples before they had time to disperse. After a very brief discussion they elected, on December 12, 1254, the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, Rinaldo Conti, yet a third pope in fifty years from the family of Innocent III and Gregory IX. He was a man of holy life, learned, a great patron of the Franciscans, an experienced administrator and diplomatist, a cardinal for twenty-seven years and one of the four who, during the long absence of Innocent IV, had acted as papal commissaries in Italy (1244-1254). It was a career which, to all appearance, promised well for the new reign. Alexander IV, however -- such was the new pope's style -- was yet again to prove how often an excellent counsellor proves a bad ruler. The seven years of his rule were, politically, years of continuous disaster, and his death in 1261 found the Holy See weaker in Italy than for seventy years.

Manfred steadily regained all he had lost in Sicily. Conradin's guardians he won over to make common cause with him, and the pope, resourceless, was driven to Innocent IV's first plan, of delivery through foreign aid. Once more Henry III of England was approached (April, 1255) and after six months of negotiation the thing was arranged and Henry's younger son, Edmund of Lancaster, invested as King of Sicily and the pope's vassal. The conditions accepted were that Henry should pay all the expenses so far incurred by the Holy See (135,000 marks) and the arrears of interest on that sum, and that he should provide an army and a general. He was licensed to take for the expedition all monies collected in England for the crusade, and his own vow to go on the crusade was commuted into a vow to drive Manfred out of Sicily. Should Henry neglect to fulfil his part of the contract, he was to lose all monies hitherto advanced, and to be excommunicated, while England was to suffer an interdict.

Manfred continued to gain ground. Thousands went over to him, even from the pope's own army, which was so weakened by desertions that, in 1255, it had to retire across the frontier. The pope thereupon sent urgent messages to England bidding the king hasten his preparations. When, in January, 1256, the pope's candidate for the vacant empire died, Alexander forbade the electors, under pain of excommunication, to choose Conradin and pressed the election of Henry III's brother, Richard, the Earl of Cornwall who had refused Innocent IV's offer of Sicily two years before. But not all this show of papal favour could move Henry to any activity beyond promises. He was, of course, at this very time, on the verge of a political crisis at home of the first magnitude. Not all the popes, nor all their threats, could have won another penny from the barons of England, or from the bishops.

So for seven years it went on, Henry continually begging an extension of the time limit: the pope, now bankrupt and with no choice but to assent -- for of all the princes of Christendom, Henry III was the only one to be interested in the affair: and Manfred steadily consolidating his gains. In August, 1258, Manfred felt himself so secure that he threw off the mask, and, disregarding whatever claims Conradin might have -- who was, at any rate, of legitimate birth -- he had himself crowned King of Sicily at Palermo.

Alexander could do no more than plead with Henry and in September, 1260, Manfred, by a great victory at Montaperto, became the dominating power in Tuscany, too. He was once again excommunicated and, of course, he again ignored the sentence. He was well on the way to being master of Italy when, May 25, 1261, Alexander IV died.

His disastrous reign formed an interlude between two great anti-imperial offensives. The drama of Innocent IV's reign was now to be resumed. The irresolute Alexander was to be followed, in swift succession, by two hard-headed Frenchmen, shrewd, practical realists thanks to whom the dream of Innocent was accomplished and the Hohenstaufen razed from the land of the living.

The first of these was Jacques Pantaleon, who at the time of his

election was Patriarch of Jerusalem. He was not a cardinal, but an experienced ecclesiastic whom urgent affairs had brought at this time to the papal court. After a three months' conclave, in which an English Cistercian and a French Dominican had both declined the terrifying splendour, the eight members of the sacred college were still undecided, and then the patriarch's name was suggested. and unanimously they elected him (August 29, 1261). He took the name of Urban IV.

The new pope was a man seventy years of age or more. He was a canonist, trained in the University of Paris, and he had spent most of his life in administrative duties at Laon and Liege. When Innocent IV had noticed him at the Council of Lyons and taken him into the papal service he was already elderly. That pope sent him into Germany, as legate, in 1247 and again in 1252 to organise a party and raise money for William of Holland. In 1253 he was made Bishop of Verdun and in 1255 Patriarch of Jerusalem. After his five years of service in the debris of the Latin realms of the East, given over now to civil war between Venetians and Genoese, between Hospitallers and Templars, the shrewd old Frenchman can have needed no further instruction on the need for a strong hand at the centre of things. As pope he proceeded to apply himself with an energy and a ruthlessness that give him, with Julius II, a place apart in papal history. A contemporary diplomat set him down as the ablest pope since Alexander III.

Urban IV turned first to set his own administration in order. In twelve months he had created fourteen cardinals, seven of them his fellow countrymen, all of them men of distinction. A thorough examination was made of the whole financial system. The accounts of all creditors were scrupulously investigated, and all over Christendom the kingdoms, sees, abbeys and churches on which the Roman Church had claims were reminded of their obligations and were induced to pay at least in part. As the pope thus collected the debts due to him so, in the same systematic way, he set himself to pay what he owed. Church property that was pledged he gradually redeemed, and slowly he began to refortify the Papal State. His greatest feat, however, was to build up a pro-papal party among the bankers of Florence and Siena -- a measure which was to bring forth its fruit in the time of his successor.

By 1263 the pope had more or less restored the reality of his rule in his own State, and he had rescued his cause from the perilous isolation into which, under Alexander IV, it had drifted. At the same time he had begun to provide for the danger which Manfred presented.

Manfred had begun by a bid for recognition that an offer of money accompanied. Urban had, however, no intention of reversing the policy of years, and of recognising this illegitimate Hohenstaufen. He had already determined to set up in Sicily the French prince Charles of Anjou, and until that delicate scheme was safe he had to use all his skill to keep Manfred from a new offensive.

It was in December, 1261, three months after his election, that Urban made the first offer to the French. St. Louis hesitated, halted by the thought of Conradin's possible claims and of the claims of Edmund of Lancaster -- to the irritation of the pope who insisted that he was hardly likely to risk St. Louis' salvation by proposing to him something that was sinful. Finally, the pope won the king over, and he allowed the offer to be made to Charles of Anjou, his brother. The conditions were laid down (June, 1263), Edmund of Lancaster was formally notified that the offer made to him was withdrawn (July, 1263) and on August 15 the treaty between Charles and the pope was concluded. It contained all the usual safeguards. Charles was to do homage to the pope as overlord, to pay an annual tribute, to pledge himself not to usurp the rights of the Church and to preserve the rights of the nobles and people of Sicily. Meanwhile (August, 1263) Charles had been elected Senator -- an appointment that made him, to all intents and purposes, the civil ruler of Rome where, since the time of Honorius III, none of the popes had been able to live, save for short and infrequent intervals. Not only was Charles elected but, an unheard-of thing, he was elected for life. The pope at once protested. It would have been impossible for him to do otherwise. To consent to see ruling Rome, independently of himself, the man who would soon be ruler, too, of all Italy from Naples downwards, would be to exchange the menace of the Hohenstaufen for a danger still more real.

Manfred still more than held his own, despite Urban IV's diplomacy. Charles, on his side, realised the pope's dilemma and profited by it. Much of the annual tribute was remitted, and

the pope accepted him as Senator. So matters stood when, on October 2, 1264, Urban IV died.

It was five months -- despite the urgency of the position -- before the cardinals could agree on his successor. Then, February 5, 1265, they elected another Frenchman, the Cardinal Guy Fulcodi -- a choice that crowned the most rapid career in all papal history, for the new pope, less than ten years before, had been a happily married jurist in the service of the French King without ever a thought of Holy Orders. He was a noble, and the son of one of the chief advisers of Raymond VI of Toulouse. Like Urban IV he was a product of the University of Paris, where he had made a name as an expert in both civil and canon law. He followed his father's profession, grew famous as an advocate and was appointed to the council of Raymond VII. He married and had two daughters. Then he passed into the service of St. Louis IX of France, who ultimately made him a member of his private council. Somewhere about 1256 his wife died, and like his father before him -- who on his wife's death had become a Carthusian-Guy Fulcodi turned to the Church. He rose rapidly, named Bishop of Le Puy within a year and Archbishop of Narbonne in 1259. As a prelate he kept his place in the French king's service, and was employed very largely in arbitration. Much of his time was spent in hearing appeals that concerned the inquisition of Languedoc, and he was responsible for a noteworthy decision on the degree of proof required before a man was condemned for heresy. It should, he declared, be "clearer than the day itself." He was one of Urban IV's first cardinals (1261) and in 1263 that pope sent him as legate to England, on which mission he was still absent when he was elected pope.

The new pope thus had an experience of administration and of dealing with men that could scarcely have been bettered. He was, too, a man of extremely ascetic life, modelled, apparently, on the lives of the Order of Preachers to which indeed he was very greatly attached. As pope, he took the name of Clement IV.

It was natural, if not inevitable, that Clement IV should continue the policy of his immediate predecessor. It is possible, since he had been one of the negotiators between Urban and Charles of Anjou, that he was elected pope for that very reason. Nevertheless, there was a shade of difference between the

political atmosphere of the two reigns. It was due entirely to the fact that, in the second, Charles himself at last appeared in Italy.

Clement's first act was to renew the notification to Henry III of England that his claims had lapsed, and the next was to confirm Charles in all his rights, renewing the conditions laid down two years before. The crusade against Manfred, "the virulent offspring of a poisonous race", was renewed and new efforts made to raise money. By June, 1264, Urban IV had spent 200,000 pounds (Sienese money) and the treasury was nearly empty. Nor was there much to hope for from the interest of Christendom. "In England," said the pope himself, "there is opposition, in Germany hardly anyone obeys, France groans and grumbles, Spain suffices not for itself, Italy gives no help but plays one false." []

However, on May 21, 1265, Charles of Anjou arrived in Rome with a small force. The main body of his army was still in France and preparing to make its way overland through Lombardy. Charles had few men, he had no money. Manfred was as strong as ever, and before the French could pass through Lombardy the papal diplomacy must defeat Manfred in the courts and cities of the north of Italy.

The pope's one real asset was the character of Charles of Anjou -- haughty, ambitious to the point at times of mania, but the great captain of the day, a capable organiser, brave, and as energetic as Manfred was indolent. Charles of Anjou has gone down to history with the memory of his virtues forgotten in the clamour aroused by his undoubted pride and cruelty. It is one of the ironies of things that it is for precisely these vices that the conqueror of the Hohenstaufen has been damned by writers of Hohenstaufen sympathies. Charles of Anjou compares more than favourably with any one of the five generations of that treacherous race with which the Roman Church had to contend, from Barbarossa to Conradin, his great-great-grandson.

The financial crisis was surmounted thanks to the papacy's understanding with the bankers. The following of Charles was costing daily two thousand livres tournois before 1265 was out, and the revenue and property of the Roman churches were given in pledge. In December the army from France arrived. On January 6, 1266, Charles was crowned in St. Peter's as King of

Sicily. A few days later he set out to crush Manfred. The battle took place, January 20, 1266, outside Benevento. Manfred's army was defeated, with great slaughter, and he himself was slain. With that disaster the Hohenstaufen ceased for ever really to trouble the papacy. The menace that had hung over its spiritual independence since Barbarossa's declaration at Besancon, a hundred and nine years before, seemed at last destroyed.

It remained to be seen how Charles of Anjou would develop. Already, in the matter of senatorship, there had been a hint that the pope feared lest his new champion should prove a master. Was the chronic problem of the papacy merely about to enter on a new stage of its long vexatious history?

Four months after Benevento, Charles resigned the senatorship, and while Clement gave himself to the double task of rousing an indifferent Christendom to the needs of the Holy Land and of paying off his debts, the King of Sicily took possession of his conquest. The Sicilians found his rule oppressive. Some of the greater nobles were dispossessed. French officials were imported. There were new heavy taxes. Soon there were complaints, and from the pope strongly worded remonstrances such as that provoked by the terrible sack of Benevento after the victory in January. "You respect nothing," he had then written to Charles, "neither the goods of the Church nor of others, not age nor sex. You are crusaders, and you have looted the churches and convents that you should have protected; you have destroyed the sacred images, you have violated women consecrated to God. These thefts, these murders, these appalling sacrileges were not committed during the fight but for the whole week that followed, and you did nothing to restore order."

Gradually, throughout the kingdom, a party began to form and a name to be whispered as its leader -- Conradin. The grandson of Frederick II was now a youth of seventeen, still in Germany, King of Jerusalem and Duke of Swabia. He was won over to patronise the coming revolt, and in a flaming manifesto he denounced, as King of Sicily, the popes, Innocent IV and Alexander IV, who had refused him his father's kingdom and announced his intention of conquering it himself. The action had all the old Hohenstaufen spirit, and the pope retorted by excommunicating Conradin and

by a reminder to the princes of Germany that Charles of Anjou was the lawful King of Sicily and that if Conradin persisted he would be deprived of his title to Jerusalem as his grandfather had been stripped of the empire and Sicily.

Conradin, nothing deterred, set out in September, 1267. In October his banner was hoisted in Rome, where the new senator had gone over to his cause, and on the 21st of that month he was at Verona with ten thousand men.

The pope renewed the excommunication on all who supported him, including the Romans; he named Charles of Anjou imperial Vicar for Tuscany; he despatched legates into Germany to prevent the movement spreading there.

In January, 1268, the invader was at Pavia, in April at Pisa. Charles failed to capture Rome; the Saracens at Lucera were in revolt; and when Conradin, making for Rome, passed by Viterbo -- where Clement IV still dwelt -- the pope might well have despaired. Rome received Conradin with enthusiasm and on August 18 he set out for Lucera. Charles, however, intercepted him near Tagliacozzo (August 23, 1268) and after a fierce fight routed his army. A week later he entered treacherous Rome in triumph, while Conradin fled, a forlorn fugitive, from one place to another. In the end he was captured and handed over to Charles, who thereupon proceeded to the act which has damned him for ever with posterity. He summoned a commission of legists to advise him whether Conradin could be put on his trial as a disturber of the peace. They were divided in their opinion. A minority advised Charles he had the right. Conradin was thereupon tried and condemned to death. Absolved from his excommunication and fortified with the Mass and the Holy Eucharist, on October 29, 1268, he was beheaded publicly at Naples. So ended the Hohenstaufen.

Just a month later, to the day, Clement IV too died. It was twenty-three years since Innocent IV had deposed the last emperor, nineteen years almost since the last emperor had died. Not for three years more did the cardinals manage to give a successor to Clement IV. Now for three years Christendom was to have neither emperor nor pope.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



5. THE INQUISITION

The troubles, civil and religious, of the unhappy provinces of the south of France were not ended by the decisions of the Lateran Council of 1215. Raymond VI soon renewed the war, in the hope of dispossessing Simon de Montfort, and de Montfort himself quarrelled with the papal legate. In 1218 Simon was killed as he besieged Toulouse. His son, Amaury, who succeeded to his rights, was not so strong a character as his father. In the next six years Raymond won back some of his lost territories, and Amaury endeavoured to check his recovery by bringing in the King of France. He made an offer of his lands to Philip II in 1222 but the king refused. Two years later, after Philip's death, the offer was repeated to his son, Louis VIII. The new king accepted, and there now began a purely political war in which the French aimed at the annexation of Languedoc to the royal domain.

The pope could not be indifferent to all the fluctuations of these eight years (1216-1224). Whatever the political ambitions of the French kings, the fact remained that the Counts of Toulouse were not to be trusted in the matter of repressing a singularly menacing anti-Catholic force. The French kings, on the other hand, would show it no mercy. Hence, on Louis VIII's determination to make himself master of Languedoc, Honorius III gave his expedition all the status of a crusade, with the usual indulgences and privileges for the crusaders. He also sent a subsidy in money. The English court, on the other hand, preferred to have Raymond VII [] -first cousin to the English king -- ruling the province which bordered Gascony, the one remaining possession of England in France, and at Rome the English worked hard to persuade the pope of Raymond's complete orthodoxy. The legate in Languedoc, too, was brought round to this opinion and, withdrawing the crusade privileges, he certified Raymond to the pope as a good Catholic. Louis VIII, thereupon, drew back. The Council of Montpellier (June, 1224) should have ended the affair. But the old story was repeated. Raymond, for all his oaths, did nothing to repress the heresy. The pope decided against him, and when Louis VIII, in 1226, marched south it was the end of the independence of Languedoc. City after city fell before the French advance. Louis himself died in the November of that year but his widow, regent

for the boy king Louis IX, continued the policy. Raymond was forced to surrender.

On Holy Thursday, 1229, like his father twenty years earlier, he appeared before the legates, outside the great door of Notre Dame at Paris, barefoot, clad only in his shirt, to be reconciled. He promised yet once again, to pursue heretics, to dismiss the brigands he employed, to restore the stolen Church property; he promised also to endow ten chairs in the University of Toulouse, two of theology, two of canon law and six of the liberal arts; he promised to take the cross and to spend five years crusading in Palestine. As to his dominions, part was made over at once to the crown. The remainder was to go after his death to his daughter Jeanne, and Jeanne was betrothed to the French king's brother, Alphonse of Poitiers. It was the end. Raymond gave no more trouble. He died in 1247. Twenty-five years later Jeanne, too, was dead and her husband. They had no heir, and the whole of the possessions of the Counts of Toulouse reverted to the French crown.

It remains to be told how the pope, upon the surrender of 1229, provided for the extinction of heresy in the territory wrested from Raymond VII. This is the story of the origin of the Inquisition.

The Inquisition was simply a reorganisation of existing institutions. The history of the repressing of heresy goes back to the first Christian emperors. Heresy meant civil commotion in addition to being an act of rebellion against the truth of God revealed through the Church. Whence a double reason for the prince -- zealous in God's service and bound by his office to maintain peace -- to restrain the heretic. The first ecclesiastical reference of any importance to the repression of the neo-Manicheans whom we call Albigenses, is the canon of the General Council of 1139, which calls on the civil power, in a general way, to repress them. Mobs, and the civil power itself, had already shown a disposition to deal severely with these heretics. Robert II of France had burnt them, and Henry II of England had them branded on the forehead. It was, apparently, the joint representation of Henry II and Louis VII of France that induced Alexander III to the next step. The pope began by deprecating undue severity in the matter. "It is better to absolve the guilt than to attack innocent life by an excessive

severity. . . ." Scripture bids us beware of being more just than justice. [] The King of France was not convinced. He asked for the Archbishop of Rheims, whose extensive diocese was greatly troubled by the sect, complete freedom of action. The outcome of these representations was the decree of the Council of Tours in 1163. The four hundred and more prelates who, under the pope's presidency, took part in this council, declared that heretics were to be tracked down and that the princes should imprison them and confiscate their property. In England, about the same time, it was enacted -- by the civil authority -- that their houses should be destroyed. Sixteen years after this decree of Tours, the General Council of 1179 renewed the exhortation to the Christian princes. The great step forward in the matter was, however, the decree *Ad abolendam* of 1184, the outcome of the meeting of Frederick Barbarossa and the pope Lucius III at Verona. Once again we note the intervention of the State, and in the decree a new, and ordered, severity. This decree the Lateran Council of 1215 made its own, adding somewhat to its detail, and what it laid down was the law as Gregory IX found it when, after the French occupation of Languedoc, he called the Inquisition into being.

By this law [] all heresies contrary to the profession of Faith set out in the first canon [] and those who professed them were condemned. The civil authority was charged to see to their suitable punishment. If they were clerics they were to be deposed, and their goods to be given to the church they served. If they were laity, their goods were to go to the State. Those suspected of heresy were to prove themselves innocent. Should they neglect to do so they were excommunicated; and if they persisted in the excommunication for twelve months they were to be condemned as heretics. The princes were to be admonished, persuaded, and if necessary compelled by ecclesiastical censures -- excommunication for example or interdict -- to swear that they would banish all whom the Church pointed out to them as heretics. This oath, henceforward, they must take on first assuming power. Princes who, after due warning, refuse to take this oath, or to purge their realms of heretics, are to be excommunicated by the metropolitan and his suffragans. If their refusal continues beyond a year, they are to be reported to the pope, that he may declare their vassals absolved from their oaths of allegiance and offer their territories for occupation to Catholics who will drive out the heretics --

saving always the right of such a prince's suzerain. Catholics who thus take up arms to fight the heretics are assimilated in all things to the crusaders in the Holy Land.

Those who, in any way, support heretics are excommunicated. If within twelve months they have not made their submission, they become iure infames, lose all power of testifying in law suits, of sitting in councils, of electing others, of holding public office; they cannot make a valid will nor inherit; if they are judges their sentences are null and void; if notaries the instruments they draw up are invalid; if clerics they lose both office and benefice. They are not to be given the sacraments, nor, should they die, Christian burial. Their alms and offerings are not to be accepted and clerics who do not observe these laws are to be deprived. Clerics deprived for this particular negligence need a special dispensation from the Holy See before they can be reinstated.

As to the detection of heretics, there is now laid upon all archbishops and bishops the duty of a periodical visitation, at least once a year, personally or by commission, of all those places within their jurisdiction where heresy is rumoured to exist. They are to take the sworn testimony of three or more witnesses of good standing -- if necessary the whole population is to be put upon oath. Those who know of heretics, of their secret meetings, or of any who differ in life or manners from the generality of the faithful, are to report the matter to the bishop at these visitations. He is to convoke the persons accused, and they are to prove their innocence. If they have already been accused, and have since then relapsed, they are to be punished canonically. If they refuse to put themselves on oath they are to be presumed heretics. Bishops who neglect this important duty are to be denounced to the Holy See and deposed.

To the will to repress heresy and to fight the menace of the new paganism, as it shows itself in this legislation, nothing could be added. The weak point was that this legislation depended for its execution upon the local bishop, and it was impossible for the pope to supervise, as thoroughly as the state of things required all the activities of the Catholic episcopate throughout the world. Gregory IX solved the problem by substituting for the local bishop official inquisitors, sent out by himself from Rome, to whom, as the pope's representatives, the local bishop, in this matter, must give place. This was the novelty of the Inquisition.

From this moment there began to develop around the Inquisitor a defined, ordered system of legal practice, which succeeding popes sanctioned and corrected.

It was in 1233 that Gregory IX thus made the defence of the Faith in Languedoc his personal care, and appointed as his agents the Dominicans of that province. They were reluctant to take on the work, and, apparently, did not relish the prospect that the order would become identified with the Inquisition. Whereupon the pope called upon the order of St. Francis to share the burden.

We have a fairly detailed knowledge of the procedure of the new institution, based on such of its own records as have survived, and also on the manuals written for the guidance of the Inquisitors. The popes were very exacting as to the qualifications of the Inquisitors themselves. They were to be men of mature years, of unimpeachable character, skilled in Theology and in Canon Law. Their conduct was strictly supervised, and there are sufficiently numerous instances of their deposition for breach of the rules to prove that the popes really had a care for the rights of those whom the Inquisitors pursued. Gregory IX, for example, condemned the French Inquisitor to lifelong imprisonment for cruelty to his prisoners. Over the Inquisitor there hung a sentence of excommunication that fell automatically if he used his extensive powers for any but their destined purpose. The manuals enable us to see the whole functioning of the machinery. The Inquisitors, arrived in a town, showed their credentials to the magistrates. The proclamations were made that all Catholics must denounce whatever they knew of heresy in the town, and the heretics given a set time in which to confess and abjure. The trials were conducted with great care. Those accused were allowed counsel [] and after their trial they had the right to appeal to the pope. They were not, it is true, given the names of their accusers, but they had the right to give in a list of their enemies, and if any of the witnesses against them appeared on this list their testimony was struck out.

According to the gravity of the offence -- whether the accused was one of the Perfect or only a Believer, whether he was actually a heretic or merely a Catholic who had protected or sheltered heretics -- and according to whether the accused confessed or persisted in his heresy, the penalties differed

widely. At the lightest they were purely spiritual, the obligation of additional prayers over a fixed time. The most severe were confiscation of property, imprisonment and, as the years went by, death by burning.

These more severe penalties the Church did not invent, any more than it invented the practice of torturing the accused and witnesses. It took them over from the civil jurisprudence of the day, and the civil jurisprudence found a model and a warrant for them in the law of the Roman Empire, the revival of which had gone hand in hand with the growth of the Canon Law for now nearly a century. Torture, Pope Nicholas I had declared to be forbidden by all law, human and divine. Gratian had followed him in this. It was Frederick II who restored torture to its place in legal practice, in the Sicilian Constitutions of 1231. Twelve years later there is a record of the use of the rack by Inquisitors, and in 1252 it was formally prescribed by Innocent IV. [] It is to be noted that the use of torture was not left merely to the whim of the Inquisitor: the conditions for its use were carefully regulated. Nor does its use seem to have been an everyday matter. The Inquisitors whose writings survive express themselves sceptically as to the value of the confessions thus obtained. But torture was an approved part of the procedure, and from the time of Alexander IV the Inquisitor was present while it took place.

It was apparently Gregory IX who, first of the popes, consented to accept the extreme penalty of death by burning, as the "due punishment" decreed by one after another of his predecessors. [] The Canon Law said the State must give the heretic "due punishment" [] and the State, from the last years of the twelfth century, began to interpret this, following perhaps the tradition of the Roman Law in cases of Manicheism, as death by fire. Frederick II put that penalty into his Lombard Constitutions in 1224. It was applied by the Bishop of Brescia in 1230, and in that year or the next Gregory IX, perhaps under the influence of that bishop, with whom he was in very close relation, incorporated the imperial constitution in the register of his own acts. []

Such was the formidable weapon which the popes devised to root out the last traces of Manicheism in Languedoc. Of the details of its operation in the thirteenth century we do not know very much. Certainly it succeeded. The Albigenses ceased to be

a menace. But it is not possible to say with anything like exact statistics what proportion of the accused were proved guilty, what proportion of these remained true to their heresy, what proportion of them were punished and how many suffered death. []

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



6. THE TRIUMPH OF THE CATHOLIC INTELLIGENCE: ST. BONAVENTURE, ST. ALBERT THE GREAT, ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

The terrible conflict of the papacy with the Hohenstaufen emperors, for all the demands it made on the attention of the popes, was not the only, nor the most important, business of the generations that witnessed it. There was proceeding simultaneously, in the university, a stubborn intellectual contest to preserve the traditional belief of the faithful threatened with destruction in the cyclone of new philosophical ideas. Not the victory of popes over emperors, not the preservation of the sacerdotium from the regnum, but the victory of Catholicism over Averroism was perhaps the most signal achievement of all this famous thirteenth century. Will the Christian intelligence, brought up at last against the more or less complete achievement of the intellect of Antiquity, find a means of using it, or will it be itself transformed by that achievement? Such is the doubt that the conflict will resolve, such the essence of the crisis of the years 1230-1277, the most dramatic of its kind since that of the second century. The revelation of God through the traditional teaching of the Church, the spiritual appeal of Plato, the scientific strength of Aristotle, these are the forces. What the new thought held of menace for Catholicism, and what it held of promise, has already been explained. It remains to describe the battle which filled the middle years of the century, and in the short space of a general history this is perhaps best done by a few words about the leading Averroists, Siger of Brabant and Boethius of Dacia, and by analysing, with reference to this matter, the teaching of the great thinkers on the Catholic side, the Franciscan Bonaventure, the Dominicans, Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas.

History is, no doubt, full of surprises that should not surprise us; and one of these discoveries that never ceases to be a shock is that, in past ages, human life was just as complex as in our own. What more and more dominated the life of that primary organ of Catholic thought, the University of Paris, as the thirteenth century drew towards its end, was the Aristotelian philosophy as interpreted by Averroes. "Do we not read in [Averroes'] works that nature shows us in Aristotle the pattern of

the final perfection of human nature? that Providence gave him to us in order that we might know all that can be known? . . . Aristotle's writings are a whole, to be taken or left; they form the system of the written reason, so to say. . . all that we now need to do is to study again the master's theses as Averroes interprets them." [] These words, of a modern authority, describe very well what was then happening to many. Siger of Brabant and Boethius of Dacia were, in their own time, much more important than later ages have grasped. []

Not the least curious feature about this situation is that it was in the theologians that the philosophers, now troubling the peace of the schools, had made their first acquaintance with Averroes. William of Auvergne (1180-1249), William of Auxerre (d. 1231) and Philip the Chancellor (d. 1236) show an understanding of the new doctrines, and a philosophical ability to deal with them, that is far beyond what any philosopher of the Faculty of Arts then possessed. It is this knowledge derived through the theologians that will be the first capital of the new Averroism -- and Siger will be largely debtor (for his basic information) to St. Thomas himself.

Once the masters in the Faculty of Arts began to use the commentaries of Averroes on their own account, that is to say, as an aid in their own philosophical task of lecturing on the text of Aristotle, some of them speedily fell before the dual temptation to identify the Arab's interpretation with the thought of the Philosopher, and to equate Aristotle's teaching with philosophic truth itself. These masters were, it seems, clerics teaching Logic and Physics; and once they began to teach their Averroistic Aristotle without any regard either for the natural hierarchy of the sciences, or for the natural law that each science is a world of its own, once they began (in other words) to repeat the ancient error that seems eternal, and to invade the territories of other sciences, confusion was certain, and discussions that were violent; most of all were the results explosive when, in the name of philosophy, it was the territory of the theologians that was invaded.

Siger of Brabant (1235-1281,4) is the Averroist of whose work, thanks to some recent discoveries, we know most. At the time of his first defeat -- the condemnation of his theories by the Bishop of Paris, Etienne Tempier, December 10, 1270 -- Siger was still

quite a young man, ten years junior to St. Thomas perhaps. The theses then condemned are statements of particular Averroist doctrines: that the intellect of all mankind is, numerically, the one same intellect; that the human will wills and chooses of necessity; that the world is eternal; that there never was a first man; that the soul is not immortal; that there is no divine Providence so far as the actions of individual men are concerned. In the later condemnation, of March 7, 1277, theses are singled out which describe the Averroist "approach" to philosophy and the Averroist ideas about its place in a Catholic's life -- for all these Averroists claimed to be both "philosophers" and Catholics; [] such theses, for example, as that: the Catholic religion is a hindrance to learning; there are fables and falsities in the Catholic religion as in other religions; no man knows any more from the fact that he knows theology; what theologians teach rests on fables; the only truly wise men are the philosophers; there is not a more excellent way of life than to spend it studying philosophy.

Siger may stand for the common enemy, against which a variety of spirits no less ardent or competent were now debating -- spirits far from agreement among themselves about the reply to some of the fundamentals under discussion. []

An apostolate of thought was no part of the plan of St. Francis of Assisi. The obstacles to man's return to God which he fought were of another order. The world which he planned to save was astray, not so much in belief as in practice; the audience to which his message went was made up of Catholics whose belief was as sound as his own, but Catholics whose spiritual progress a practical cult of self, worldliness, ambition and the attendant envy, jealousy and hates were paralysing. Nevertheless it was inevitable that, as the years went by, the apostle whom the universal charity of St. Francis inspired should turn also to the other type of Catholic whose first peril came from a constant intellectual malaise with regard to the mysteries of his faith. No less than the Preachers, the Friars Minor -- for all that their organisation was by no means so favourable to this work -- turned to the new world of the universities in their passion to work for the salvation of souls. The most gifted, and the most influential, of all their early professors was undoubtedly John of Fidanza, called in religion Bonaventure. An outline of his career and of his teaching, in its

affirmations and in its denials, will show how far the Catholic intellectual movement had developed since those closing years of the twelfth century when the new thought began to gain a hold on it. []

St. Bonaventure was born in 1221, five years before the death of St. Francis, at Bagnorea near to Viterbo. He entered the Friars Minor at the age of seventeen and at Paris he was the pupil of the very first of the Franciscan doctors, the Englishman Alexander of Hales who, in his old age, had crowned a triumphant career in the schools by abandoning all for the Lady Poverty. In 1248 St. Bonaventure took his licentiate's degree and for the next seven years taught in the university. His course was interrupted by the fierce attack made on the Friars' position in the university by the Masters of Arts, which was also in some measure an attack by the Aristotelians on the Traditionalists. The pope intervened, and when he confirmed the Friars' rights he named St. Bonaventure to be the occupant of the chair assigned to his order. A year later he was named general of the Friars Minor (1257) and his career as a professional theologian came to an end.

The object of all St. Bonaventure's teaching is practical. Through theology, through philosophy, too, he will lead man to attain God and to attain Him as the Being who is supremely lovable. It is love of the object which is the motive that urges the assent of Faith. The knowledge of God we have through Faith is surer than any other knowledge, surer than the philosophical knowledge that comes through reasoning. Philosophy is, none the less, most useful to explain the truths of Faith and to justify our assent to them. Man's life is a pilgrimage towards God, and in the saint's treatment of theology from this point of view we see revealed all the simple charm of the piety of his order. In him St. Francis lives again. Everything that meets man on the road cries God to him, if man is but attentive. Faith: helped by reason reveals God in all. True it is that man does not read the message as readily as God had intended. It is the penalty of the fall that man's perceptive powers are dimmed. A special grace is necessary that man, as he now exists, may discover God. He must be formed again, purified, enlightened. Nevertheless, it remains true that the whole universe is formed to express God and God's infinite love, to be a book in which all may read its author the Trinity. The saint is not over-concerned to elaborate

these proofs of God's existence from the things He has created. "The splendour of creation reveals Him, unless we are blind. His works cry ' God' to us and, unless we are deaf, must awaken us. The man must be dumb who cannot praise God in all that He has caused; he must be mad not to recognise the first origin of all, where so many signs abound."

God is equally discernible, to every man, in his own soul if he will but look into it. Here it is not a mere reflection of God that meets the believer's gaze, not a mere trace of His power, but His very image. For the idea of God is bound up with the very simplest of our intellectual operations. Unless the idea of a self-existing being were present to the mind, man could not know anything. The image of God is naturally infused into the soul, and whoever will gaze into its depths must find God. Note, however, that it is not any understanding of God's essence, that comes in this way to the searcher of his own soul, but merely the realisation that God exists.

In his solution of the problem how we know, the saint makes use, at the same time, of ideas that are Plato's and of others taken from Aristotle. Corporal things we know through the senses, universal truths by the intellect. The senses are necessary for all knowledge of things below the soul. To know the soul, and whatever is above it, is the function not of the senses but of the intellect and an interior light, namely the principles of knowledge and of natural truths innate in the soul. For each of the orders of knowledge there is thus its own mechanism, and if Aristotle is the distant author of the saint's explanation of our knowledge of corporal reality, for his theory of the higher knowledge he is indebted to Plato -- to Plato through St. Augustine, and to St. Augustine for the idea of this synthesis of the two. Natural knowledge has, then, a double aspect, as man is intermediary between God and things. The things that are below him he knows with relative certainty, the things above with absolute certainty, and yet in a confused way only, knowing them as he does -- not in the Divine ideas themselves -- but in the reflection of these external ideas that he finds in his own soul.

It is then from creatures that we come to God. Our first knowledge of God is as Creator and, for St. Bonaventure, to admit the eternity of the world is to admit a contradiction. All

things are created, and in all created reality matter and form are to be distinguished, in the angels, in the human soul too. The soul is thus a complete substance, and upon this doctrine the saint builds his proof of its immortality. There is not only one substantial form to each being, but several forms according to the properties of the being, several forms hierarchically subordinated to the general form and thereby saving the unity of the being.

The work in which St. Bonaventure's thought finds its fullest exposition is his Commentary on Peter Lombard, composed about 1249-1250. Its frontal attack on the main theses of the Averroists is almost the first evidence we possess of the extent to which, by this time, they had captured the University of Paris. St. Bonaventure insists on the origin of the universe through the creative act of God. The Aristotelian theory, of a universe that is eternal, he even thinks contradictory to reason. The Aristotelian teaching on the unicity of form -- as dear to the Averroists as the theory last named -- he rejects, and he rejects with it two other tenets of that school, namely the doctrine that places the principle of individuation in matter and the doctrine that spiritual substances are simple. His general position has been summed up thus by a modern writer: [] "The seraphic doctor would have it that all human knowledge is profoundly religious. He admits the role of the senses and of the intellect in the process of knowing. He recognises their necessity and their value, but he considers that intellect and sense are by themselves insufficient if we are to know with a knowledge that is absolutely sure, perfect and certain. That is why he strengthens their value by this ray of divine light which burns in our mind and which comes to us from Christ the Word, the God-man."

St. Bonaventure's approach to the burning question of the defence of revealed truth against the new danger is extremely important. He is, in time, the first great opponent of Averroism; and in his attack he includes, from the beginning, several of the Averroistic theses which derive from Aristotle, and which another school of the Faith's defenders will accept as fundamental to their philosophy and to the defence of the Faith. The struggle around the Aristotelian corpus of doctrine as Averroes presents it, will soon be complicated by this inner struggle between the Catholic critics of Averroes themselves. St. Bonaventure's opponent here is St. Thomas Aquinas.

It was St. Bonaventure's fate that he was not only a thinker. The university professor had in him talents of another kind and, in 1257, ere his courses had done much more than reveal his genius, he was taken away to rule and re-model his order at one of the greatest crises in its history. He was but thirty-six, and for the seventeen years of life that remained to him he had other cares to occupy him as well as that of the defence of the traditional belief against the forces that now menaced it. His disciples in Paris, however, kept his teaching alive, and never did St. Bonaventure himself cease to be even passionately interested in the debate, from time to time even returning to Paris to lead his party. But from the time of his election as general it ceased, inevitably, to be his first preoccupation; and, to that extent, his knowledge of the situation was no longer first hand, his opportunities less than those of one who, like St. Thomas, never ceased through all those critical years to form one of the corps of teachers and disputants.

St. Bonaventure's doctrine had the advantage -- relative to the contest now drawing on -- that it was first in the field. Also it was in keeping with the spirit that so far characterised, not merely the Franciscan school at Paris, but the general theological teaching of the university. It was, that is to say, a faithful critique of the new philosophical world in the spirit of St. Augustine, and it reflected all the Platonic spirit that showed in the greatest of the Fathers himself. That it had, on the surface at least, a something in common with Avicenna, [] through Avicbron, none as yet had seen, nor does St. Bonaventure himself seem ever to have known, at any rate, the latter. The Franciscan critique was first in the field. It was, however, insufficient; and it had the further disadvantage that it was tied to psychological and metaphysical doctrines that would not stand if scientifically criticised. There had lately left Paris, at the time when St. Bonaventure's Commentary on the Sentences was in composition, the Catholic who was to answer Averroes, reconcile Aristotle and, at the same time, expose Avicenna and Avicbron too. But to understand something of the qualities that make St. Thomas Aquinas different, not in degree only but in kind, from every other Catholic thinker of his own and every century, a little must be said of his formation, and of the principal force in it, Albert of Cologne.

Albert -- canonised so recently as 1929 -- has, ever since his own time, been unanimously styled "the Great", and this for his own achievement. [] Had there never been a St. Thomas to profit by his genius, he would still have been " the Great". Apart altogether from the high place he occupies by reason of his association with the more original thinker who was his pupil, St. Albert has an immense claim on the attention of history. He was, unquestionably, the most learned man of the whole Middle Ages, one of the most learned men who have ever lived. He was born in Germany, the son of one of the emperor's vassals, a generation or so earlier than St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure. Padua was the centre where his first studies were made and by the time he applied for admission into the Order of Preachers he was already known as a scholar of unusual erudition. His interests were already fixed -- the study of the natural world in all its aspects-and his wide reading made him master of all that vast GrecoArab literature pouring into France and Italy for now nearly a hundred years. Albert's mind was of the same cast as that of Averroes or of Aristotle himself. It was the world of external reality that primarily attracted his attention, and about that world he made himself, finally, as well informed as either of his predecessors. He was to be the Catholic Averroes, the Catholic Aristotle, knowing all, explaining all. This indeed was his ambition and his aim "to make all these things understandable to the Latins". In the crucial moment of the intellectual struggle the Catholic tradition received in Albert a scientist, a physicist, sympathetic not only to the metaphysical and psychological doctrines of the new learning but to its astronomy, its astrology too: no mere repertoire of carefully arranged learning, however, but an alert, critical mind, ambitious to relate the whole truth about nature known through science with the truth about God and creation revealed through the traditional teaching of the Church. Albert was that rarity indeed, the complete theologian who is also the complete scientist.

It was in 1223 that he became a Dominican, received into the order by St. Dominic's successor, Jordan of Saxony, who, incidentally, was the great mathematician of the day. For the next twenty-two years Albert studied and taught in one convent or another of his order -- not without opposition from those less enlightened brethren whom he somewhere stigmatises as bruta animalia blasphemantes in iis quae ignorant. When in 1245 -- the year in which at Lyons Frederick II was condemned and deposed

-- he appeared as professor in the University of Paris the effect was extraordinary. The combination of such secular learning and of theology had about it something of the miraculous. No hall in Paris could hold the thousands who flocked to his lectures. They were given finally in the open air, in the great space which is to-day the Place Maubert -- a name which itself is, it is said, nothing but a corruption of Place Maitre Albert.

St. Albert's written work is contained in some dozens of huge volumes -- many of them, after all these centuries, still in manuscript. Their titles give an idea of the universality of this German Dominican's scientific interests. In St. Albert, then, there appears for the first time, what so far the intellectual development of the Middle Ages had lacked, namely a view of knowledge as a whole related to the whole universe of fact and experience. He is not just another commentator, the best equipped so far. His work is a new explanation of the universe, made in Aristotle's spirit, and according to Aristotle's method. But the explanation is St. Albert's and it won him, immediately, the rare distinction that his books were used as texts. For the schools of his own day St. Albert ranked, with Aristotle himself, as an authority.

What of his attitude to the burning questions of the hour? It would seem that St. Albert was primarily a scholar, and not a polemist. The discovery and exposition of truth, the instruction of those who as yet did not possess truth, was the one concern of his life. Direct criticism of the leaders of opposing schools of thought, even of the errors they propagated, formed no part of his scheme of things. Truth in the end is victorious by its own sheer nature. It needs but to be known and error disappears. None the less, the discussion going on around finds an echo in his work, and on all the problems he gives his opinion.

His first great service is his insistence that Philosophy and Theology are distinct sciences. More accurately than anyone so far, does he define and defend the rights of reason in theological studies, and analyse its role with regard to mysteries. Reason is not omni-competent. There are things beyond its power of knowing, of understanding, of proving. The domains of faith and reason are separate; in its own domain reason is free; Aristotle may reign there without any danger to faith. With regard to the possibilities of man's knowledge of God in this life, and to the

way in which man comes to what knowledge is possible, St. Albert is most reserved, thanks here to the double influence of his understanding what knowledge is, and of the teaching of the so-called Areopagite. In this life man can never know God save "through a glass in a dark manner". God cannot be directly intelligible. What man's intellect can perceive directly, is the trace of God. God is not then directly intelligible to man in His created works.

What of the divine in man's own soul, and of the divine role in that intellectual operation which is the essential characteristic of the human soul? For Averroes that intellectual operation was ultimately the operation of a being that transcended the individual soul -- the soul, considered as "intelligent," really ceased to be individual. In Avicenna's theory it was only a special divine intervention that made intellection possible. The Augustinian explanation, and that of its greatest champion in the time of Albert, St. Bonaventure, was, in its effect, closely allied to that of Avicenna. St. Albert, although he rejects Averroes in the matter of the soul's mortality, yet differs in this solution of the problem of its essential activity, from Avicenna. He will not abandon the individuality of the soul; nor can he, yet, wholly reject Averroes' arguments for the singleness of the active intellect. For Albert the Great, the soul as the principle of sense life and of vegetative life is united to the body and individualised: as the principle of intellectual life it is separated from the body, for it cannot, as an individual, think in universals.

Such is the saint's first position, the first essay in reconciling the newly-discovered psychology as to the nature of the soul with the truths of faith on the same subject. It is the work of a thinker who, if he understands the supernaturally taught truths of his faith, understands also, and to the full, the compelling force of a coherent logical doctrine of natural science. It is not, however, in the name of truths acquired through faith that St. Albert modifies Averroes. Averroes, though the greatest of commentators, is but a commentator. The saint is another, and steadied, as he studies his Aristotle, by his firm grasp of the truth that man's will is free, refusing to the heavenly intelligences any power to determine the inner workings of man's spirit, he perceives that the intellect is not so distinct from the soul as Averroes' theory presupposes. In Aristotle, individualism has a more important place than the classic

commentator allows. For the moment [] St. Albert's thought is content to halt the march of Averroes.

Albert's first reward, apparently, was that he was regarded in some quarters as responsible for the spread of Averroism, among the signs of which are the decision of the faculty of Arts in 1252 making obligatory the study of Aristotle's De Anima, or that which, three years later, made Aristotle as a whole the staple matter of its studies: two revolutionary changes which, in the then state of things, were tantamount to basing the whole teaching of the faculty on Averroes. By this time (1256) St. Albert had long left Paris. In 1248 he had been charged to organise the studies of his order at Cologne. The pope, Alexander IV, alarmed at the dissensions in Paris which threatened to end the university's usefulness -- dissensions between the secular masters-of-arts and the friars, related dissensions between the advocates and the opponents of the new learning - - ordered an enquiry. St. Albert at the moment was at the Curia and, as a leading authority on the question, he was commissioned by the pope to refute the theory of Averroes that was the root of the trouble. Hence in 1256 his book De Unitate Intellectus contra Averroem. The book did not however, end the greatest of St. Albert's troubles, that in his absence from Paris (1248-1255) some of those whom he had trained had developed into Averroists of a most radical kind, and were justifying the development by a reference to his teaching. Whence a resolve on the part of the philosopher to leave the academic life. The pope had desired to use him in Germany and, the saint now consenting, he was named Bishop of Ratisbon.

At Paris meanwhile the struggle continued to rage. Not all of Albert's followers had gone astray. The greatest of them all, Thomas Aquinas, was once more in Paris, teaching now, and developing his own thought, no less than that of his master, to criticise Averroes and to refute the Averroists completely. There were now three parties in the arena. The Averroists; the Traditionalists who clung to St. Augustine; and the anti-Averroist disciples of St. Albert. The first worshipped at the shrine of Aristotle. The second fought the first, as Catholics on the points where the Averroist theories clashed with revealed truth, and as Platonists on the differences in philosophy. The third group was the one really critical party. It fought the Averroists with their own weapons. It used Aristotle as it used

Plato and the Neoplatonists, that is to say as far as reason justified the use. Whence a certain suspicion of this group on the part of the Traditionalists -- a suspicion that was by no means lessened when the group criticised and attacked the fallacious Avicennianism latent in the Traditionalist exposition of Catholicism. This three-cornered contest filled the next twenty years (1257-1277) from the time when St. Thomas received his master's degree to the famous condemnation of his theories by the Bishop of Paris.

St. Thomas Aquinas was born in 1225 at the castle of Roccasecca, a fortress of the Terra Laboris, half-way between Rome and Naples. Like St. Albert he was the son of one of the emperor's vassals, a baron of the kingdom of Sicily, the powerful Count of Aquino. [] The war between pope and emperor was to be renewed before St. Thomas was out of the nursery, and it was to divide his family. Frederick 11, St. Thomas' sovereign and kinsman, influenced his early years in another way too, for after a boyhood spent at Monte Cassino (1230-1239) it was to the emperor-king's newly-founded University of Naples that he was sent. Not the least of the kingdom's debts to the genius of Frederick was this well-equipped centre of studies in which he designed that all his subjects should be trained. Frederick's own court was something of an academy where reigned one of the leading scientists of the time. This was Michael Scot, Averroist and astrologer, learned in the new Arab learning, translator of Aristotle, of Averroes and of Avicenna and, Roger Bacon bears witness, a commentator of great authority. This academic court has been described as the earliest centre of Italian scepticism, and Frederick II was one of its first propagandists. The royal foundation at Naples, it need not be said, was of a like spirit. Here St. Thomas had for his initiator into higher studies yet another Averroist, Peter of Ireland.

In this half-Arab school he remained until 1244 in which year he offered himself as a novice to the Friars-Preachers and was accepted. As he made his way to Paris, his brothers, disgusted at this waste of opportunity on the part of the clerical younger son through whom the Church offered boundless- prospects to the family influence, kidnapped him and locked him up in the dungeon at Roccasecca. There he remained for a year with the Bible and Aristotle to while away the time. In 1245 the pope

intervened and the saint was allowed to follow his vocation. The order sent him to Paris where (1245-1248) he studied under St. Albert. In 1248 he accompanied his master to Cologne. After four more years of Albert's tuition he returned to Paris where for the next seven years (1252-1259) he studied and taught and gained his degrees. From 1259 to 1268 he was at the papal court -- Anagni, Orvieto, Rome and Viterbo -- still teaching and writing. He returned to Paris, for four years, in 1268, and after a short period in Naples he died in 1274, in the Cistercian abbey of Fossanova near to Roccasecca and to Aquino, on his way to the General Council of Lyons to which he had received from the pope a personal summons.

St. Thomas was, then, no cloistered solitary. From the day when, a boy of fourteen, he left Monte Cassino, he lived continuously in the great centres of the agitated life of the time. It was in the very midst of a turbulent academic crisis that he taught and wrote, the crisis of 1256 that threatened his order at Paris, the later crisis of 1270 when before riotous and hostile audiences he had to defend the orthodoxy of his teaching. To few indeed of the saints has there fallen so violently active a setting for their contemplation.

The output of St. Thomas, who died before he was fifty, is enormous. In the Paris edition his complete works run to thirty-five volumes quarto. Roughly his writings lend themselves to a triple classification. First of all there are his Commentaries, the inevitable commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, a commentary on Aristotle, a third on the self-styled Denis the Areopagite, and others on Sacred Scripture. In the second class are the two best known of his works: the Summa Contra Gentiles and the Summa Theologica. Thirdly there is the mass of miscellaneous writings, among them the very important treatises on special questions, the Quaestiones Disputatae and the Quodlibetales.

The saint is, of course, vastly learned in all the traditional literature: Holy Scripture, the Fathers -- and especially St. Augustine whom he mastered as no one else before him and, probably, as no one since, and whose greatest disciple he assuredly is -- his scholastic predecessors, his contemporaries. In the matter of the new learning, thanks to St. Albert and, perhaps to Peter the Irishman, he gives evidence time and again

of a really unusual erudition. He knows all these authors in their own works -- a circumstance which differentiates him immediately from the mass of his contemporaries and, among them, from St. Bonaventure. It is not, however, to the mere weight of learning that St. Thomas owes his hard-won supremacy. His tranquil, ordered mind never ceased to grow, and, despite the racket of the never ceasing controversy, it grew in ordered peace. As a writer he is impersonality itself -- if the phrase be allowed. Never, hardly ever, in all the vast literature that is his work, can there be discovered any trace of the disputes. All is set down in a cold clear style where the words are wrung dry of any but the exact meaning they are chosen to express. The poetry of his soul, its never ceasing aspiration to God, the fire of his love for God -- these things are only to be discerned in the saint's clear exposition of the truth whence they all derived. Not Euclid himself is more distant-nor more adequate. In St. Thomas the mot juste meets the genius for whom it exists.

The immensely valuable body of neo-Aristotelian learning as dangerous, apparently, as it was valuable, impossible to ignore as it was impossible to suppress, had found in St. Albert the erudit who was also a thinker, the erudit and thinker who was a theologian too. In St. Thomas it found still more: it found the prince of ordered thought and a thinker who, if less of an erudit than St. Albert, was supremely critical, admirably fitted to assess the materials that awaited him, and with these, and with others of his own devising, to build a new system which should finally succeed in relating philosophically God and His universe, the data of His revelation and the fruits of man's reasoning.

The difference could not be greater between the genius of the two great minds with a sketch of whom this volume opens and closes, the intensely personal, rhetorical, psychological Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, detached, metaphysical, transparent; St. Augustine who cries his message in a hundred tongues, and St. Thomas through whose transparency Truth unmistakable peacefully looks, with final reassurance, upon those who seek.

When St. Thomas began to write, as a young man of thirty, the tendency was universal, among all his contemporaries, to minimise the place of man in the universal scheme of things. For

the Averroists it was Nature that was everything, and Nature was wholly material. For the traditional Augustinians the all-important spirit was something isolated from matter. All, for one reason or another, agreed that what worked intellectually in man was not a power proper to man as such, but a single force outside man and common to all. The new professor at first notes the quasi-unanimity, and although he does not accept the current doctrine he does not as yet see his way to reject it as erroneous. Three years or so after his first major work -- the Commentary on the Sentences -- he wrote the Summa Contra Gentiles (1259) and now his attitude changes altogether. A closer study of Aristotle's De Anima compels him to declare that the current theories of the singleness of the active intellect do not derive from Aristotle. At the same time that he deals this blow to the contemporary Averroists, he rejects also the Avicenna-Gundissalinus explanation -- to which, by now, the patronage of the mystics and Traditionalists has given enormous prestige -- that the single active intellect is God. Both theories jeopardise, if they do not destroy, the autonomy of man's thought.

St. Thomas, knowing Avicenna through and through, knows by this time that he is really a Neoplatonist, filling up the gaps in the Aristotelian theory with deductions inspired by Neoplatonic ideas. Avicenna, quoted so often and so respectfully, in the earlier work, is now seen to be the enemy as truly as Averroes, and is treated as such. Even more sternly does St. Thomas deal with Avicbron, whom, unlike some of his contemporaries, who approve him, he knows to be a Jew. No writer is more mischievous than this last, whose mystical attraction is blinding a whole school to the consequences latent in his theory of the absolute passivity of matter. Avicbron, sacrificing man's intellectual autonomy more than most, is ultimately a pantheist and a determinist, and the more dangerous because, thanks to Gundissalinus, given so Christian a disguise.

The great opponent for all the theologians was, of course, Averroes and, from the beginning, he is the great opponent for St. Thomas, too, who stigmatises his theories as heretical, even when he will say no worse of Avicenna than that he is erroneous. None the less, in its make-up, the mind of St. Thomas is of the same kind as that of the Spanish Moor. There are many points where the two agree -- and where they are alike opposed

to the Traditionalist Augustinians whom Avicenna and Avicenna are; leading into unsuspected difficulties. They agree, for example, that matter is the principle of individuation; and that it is impossible to demonstrate the non-eternity of the world. They agree, too, in the method of their commentaries. Here St. Thomas follows Averroes, and not his own master, St. Albert -- a very notable instance of St. Thomas' independence. St. Thomas is not, as from a principle, Averroist or anti-Averroist. He is strongly opposed to the peculiar contribution of the Moor to the debate -- his radical theory of the singleness of the intellect, passive and active -- but he knows Averroes as well as his most enthusiastic follower, he understands his value and he uses him scientifically, critically. [] A further point in connection with Averroes illustrates St. Thomas' independence of his own master. Far more strongly than St. Albert does he dissociate himself from the Averroist Physics and Astrology, source of a determinism which St. Thomas opposed more strongly still

The *Contra Gentiles* is, however, much more than a masterly critique of contemporary tendencies. It contains the first sketch of St. Thomas' own philosophy; a system which shows him as less influenced by the Arabs than any man of his time, and in strong reaction against them all. It is to end in a discovery that is all his own

This discovery -- by virtue of which "What Lavoisier is to chemistry, that St. Thomas is to all science, to all philosophy, to all morals" [] -- is the simply expressed truth that the active intelligence is not single but multiple, and there is an individual active intelligence proper to each individual man, that his individual active intelligence is an essential element in each man's personality. Nay more, the soul of man, the form of man, is precisely his active intelligence. It is his active intelligence all his own, personal to himself, that makes man man. Here is indeed a basis offered to individualism! Man, each man, is a world complete in himself, and each man is a thing apart, unique, in the created universe. The theory opens out limitless fields of human rights, human responsibilities, human possibilities, to the psychologist and to the moralist. The study of man must reveal a richness and variety of life that is limitless. Routine, the inevitable routine of a mass-produced human activity, with all its deathly dullness, can never be truly

characteristic, or be attributed as truly characteristic, as humanly characteristic, of man and of his effect in the universe. Of a world peopled by such creatures too much can never be hoped or expected. A deeper optimism must henceforward inspire the study of man. The creative act of God -- its wisdom, its ends--are seen in a newer light.

The determining influence that moves St. Thomas to the mighty step of this declaration is experience, observation of the fact of life, and hard rationalist analysis of the fact observed. The mystical traditionalist explained the universe by an a priori theory of God's universal action: the materialist by a similarly incomplete theory of matter. St. Thomas, the first fully to understand what exactly that third element -- man -- is, explains the universe through God and man and matter. He is thereby the greatest of all humanists, giving, for the first time, scientific form and philosophical demonstration to a truth that others had no doubt implicitly held for centuries, but whose metaphysical basis he, for the first time, lays bare and from which he, later, will make, scientifically, all the necessary deductions. With the exposition of this theory, that the individual active intelligence is the form of each human being and the source of his moral autonomy, a good half of the *Contra Gentiles* is taken up. In the *Summa Theologica*, the fruits of another ten years of thought and experience, the discovery is explored and exploited to the full.

The *Summa Theologica* (1266-1272) is not a polemic directed against subtle erudite foes. St. Thomas, here, has not primarily in view the Arabs and their more or less conscious disciples. He is the Catholic theologian pure and simple, setting out the whole, theory of God and His universe -- and especially His creature man, -- as Holy Writ, the Catholic tradition, and human reason make it known. To the author's grasp of the nature of faith and the nature of human reason, and to his unerring delimitation of their spheres of operation, the work owes an utter and entire absence of confusion that makes it a thing apart; the hesitations, the ambiguities, the incoherency, the contradictions, that have dogged all attempts to relate philosophically God and His creatures, now at last disappear. And the saint's own great metaphysical discovery is related to ethics in a way that makes the new work a new kind of thing.

This is apparent if the *Summa Theologica* be compared, not with the work of St. Thomas' contemporaries merely, but with his own earlier book that is a commentary on Peter Lombard's classic text. Examination, even a cursory examination, of the table of contents of the *Summa* shows at once that St. Thomas has, in his book, added a whole series of entirely new chapters to the body of theological teaching. The end of the *Pars Prima* [] is a very catechism on the metaphysics of the Active Intelligence. Then in the *Prima-Secundae* there are no less than seventy-one *quaestiones* where all is new, plan and detail alike, occupied with the psychological justification of the new theory, and through it giving a new scientific value to the theory of the morality of particular acts. There are, for example, the elaborate analyses of intention, choice, deliberation, and consent, [] questions that St. Bonaventure, to take but one example, never touches at all, and in the discussion of which St. Thomas is a pioneer. Perhaps even more striking, and more eloquent at a glance, is the general comparison set out by Fr. Gorce between the scheme of the *Commentary* of 1255 and that of the *Summa*. Nothing so shows how greatly the study of human nature is enriched by St. Thomas' grasp of its fundamental reality, how rightly he might claim to be the very prince of humanists. In matter of Theodicy the *Summa* has seventy-three questions, as against the sixty-one of the *Commentary*; in the discussion of man's relation to God, one hundred and eighty-one against seventy-three; in the discussion of man, his psychology and his morality three hundred and twenty-nine against thirty-six. More particularly the saint has twenty-six questions, entirely new, in the *Summa*, on God's government of the world. Where the *Commentary* has seventeen distinctions [] on the morality of particular acts, the *Summa* has two hundred and four. On the essence of the human soul and the foundations of moral philosophy -- the end of life, human acts, the passions, the virtues -- the *Summa* has again seventy questions where the *Commentary* has not a single distinction. St. Thomas is the creator of a new philosophical, theological humanism. He is indeed *sui generis*.

It is a theology where every aspect of being is envisaged from the point of its relation to intelligence. For St. Thomas God is the Being who is eminently Intelligence, the created universe the perfectly balanced production of the Divine Intelligence. Whence a new strength of optimism, that informs the whole of St.

Thomas' outlook, as he describes and discusses God, His creation, the story of man, his origin, his turning away from God and the great system by which man returns to God. The creation, the fall, the incarnation and redemption, the Church, grace and the sacraments -- each is in its own place; and without the possibility of confusion the whole vast panorama of Revelation is surveyed scientifically and rationally.

The Summa Theologica is the greatest book ever written. It has about it the eternity of the metaphysical. It is as relevant to-day as it was to those who first read and studied in it. But, given the passionate discussion among all the saint's contemporaries on the theory that underlay the whole exposition, whether it is really man who thinks and acts, lives and is immortal, the Summa, for the generation in which it was written, should have been all-conquering, among the Catholics at least. It was, however, nothing of the sort. The supreme triumph of the Catholic intelligence was greeted by a storm of opposition and criticism which, inevitably, all but destroyed its usefulness, outside the saint's own order for years and even for centuries.

The source of this opposition was the theological faculty of the University of Paris. Here the methodology and the practice traditionally associated with the name of St. Augustine still reigned supreme. It was a tradition by no means ignorant, or scornful, or suspicious, of philosophy. But in philosophy it was anti-Aristotelian; and in so far as it had found anything sympathetic in the new Greco-Saracen [] movement, it had found it in Avicenna and Avicbron. The naturalist, physicist and astronomical aspects of the movement -- all that derived from its study of Aristotle's Physics (the features which, for the faculty of Arts were, of course, the crowning glory of the movement) -- were abhorrent to it, thanks to the atheistic tendencies of so many of the Arab physicists, and of some of their thirteenth century disciples. The mentality of Averroes was repugnant to men of that tradition, and that of St. Albert little less so. St. Thomas could hardly look for favour from the faculty of Theology, appreciative as he was of the new physics and of the new psychology.

Still less would he appeal, to the theologians, as a critic of the pseudo-mysticism of Avicenna. Here he had to encounter a second opposition -- namely from the Franciscan theologians,

disciples of St. Bonaventure. It was an Englishman, John Peckham, a future (and very famous) Archbishop of Canterbury who, at the moment, led this school. Platonism was, on the face of it, a deeply religious philosophy, with close affiliations to Catholicism in its doctrines of Providence, of moral judgement and retribution, and in its general insistence on the reality and primacy of the spiritual Aristotelianism, on a first examination, was the least religious of all the great philosophies. In a combination due to the theological genius of St. Augustine certain Platonic theories had hitherto reigned unchallenged. Of this Augustinian Platonism the Franciscan school was a very strong fortress indeed. Avicenna, and Avicenna too, because of their multiple affinities with this Augustinian Platonism had been leading influences with all these early Franciscans, from Alexander of Hales at the beginning of the century to Peckham at its end; Avicenna seemed a useful counterfoil to the unmystical and rationalist Averroes. Whence, by the time the *Summa Theologica* was in course of composition (c. 1266-1272), certain philosophical doctrines, of Platonic and Neoplatonic alloy, were assumed as necessary to the rational defence of Catholic truth -- such doctrines as that of the plurality of forms, of the complete substantiality of the human soul, of the supremacy of the will among the soul's powers, and the doctrine that it is by a participation in the Divine knowledge that man's intelligence comes to its knowledge of natural truths.

To theologians to whom this was truth, St. Thomas had all the appearance of being a dangerous rationalist, infected with the spirit of Averroes, a most unspiritual iconoclast denying even the possibility of all those semi-emotional hopes and aspirations to an immediate union with God in this life as a thing natural to man. St. Thomas could not be right and the *Itinerarium Mentis ad Deum* be, in what relates to man's natural activity, an accurate description whether of fact or possibility -- for there is no direct road of knowledge, independent of the senses, by which the soul can naturally journey to God. St. Thomas ends for ever, along with the a priori proofs of God's existence, all the theory of intuition and innate ideas and the mystical structure that is built upon it. The world is not an open book where the natural reading of man directly reads God.

It was Peckham who, in person, led the attack; but behind Peckham was not merely the memory of St. Bonaventure's

teaching, but St. Bonaventure himself, General, for a long time now, of the order of Friars Minor, and Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church to be, tending more and more -- with, before him, the spectacle of the growth of Averroism since 1250 -- to a position that suspected the usefulness of philosophy at all in theological discussion, and ready to qualify St. Thomas' teaching of the unity of the substantial form as "insanity." The new movement of repression envisaged all who were suspect of sympathy with Averroes and the new physical theories of nature, Roger Bacon, for example, Siger of Brabant and, along with these, St. Albert and St. Thomas.

The first signs of the coming condemnation were the two university sermons of St. Bonaventure preached in 1267 and 1268. The second, particularly, was a refutation of all the theories, later stigmatised in the sentence of 1270. It is noteworthy that the philosophical errors refuted in this sermon are refuted, not by philosophical argument, but from the teaching of Sacred Scripture. Reason is not to be trusted too much. Faith and mysticism are safer guides. []

To St. Bonaventure's new critique of the role of reasoning in theological study St. Thomas made no direct reply. He simply continued in his chosen way. In 1270 it was proposed to condemn fifteen propositions as Averroist errors, two of them -- that the substantial form in man is one, and that all spiritual beings (e.g. the human soul, the angels) are simple -- doctrines maintained by St. Thomas in opposition to the tradition that the Franciscans still defended. At the more or less ceremonial discussion of Easter that year, amid riotous scenes where Peckham led the opposition, St. Thomas very boldly defended his teaching on some of the points on which he was most attacked. In the event, the two Thomist propositions were omitted from the text of proscribed doctrines but, at the end of the year, at another public debate, the violent scenes were renewed. The discussion turned on the theses that had been condemned and on those, upheld by St. Thomas which had escaped condemnation. [] The zeal of his sincere-minded opponents was, of course, directed to prove, out of St. Thomas' own argumentation, that he was no less an Averroist than those whom the condemnation had affected. With a courage and a peacefulness that astonished even his own religious brethren, he continued steadily to fix the undeniable limit between the

condemned errors and his own intelligent defence of the Faith.

The troubles were, however, not yet over. St. Thomas still clung, for example, to his theory of the soul as the one substantial form of the body, and a new campaign began, directed to force a condemnation of this untraditional novelty as Averroistic. At Easter, 1271, the question was even raised whether reason had any place in theological study at all, or whether theology should not rather be determined simply by authoritative declarations. In 1272 the saint left Paris for Naples -- never again, as it happened, to return. The next year St. Bonaventure launched a direct attack on the essential theses of St. Thomas' position in theology, unity of form, simplicity of spiritual substances, theories about the faculties of the soul, and about beatitude.

Both the great adversaries died the next year (1274) [] but the discussion continued. The faculty of Arts, which considered St. Thomas, theologian that he was, the glory of the university for his defence of reason, had petitioned that his body might be brought for burial too the university. It was perhaps as a reply to this that the theologians, in 1277, chose the very anniversary of his death (March 7) to publish, unhindered now, its condemnation of his doctrine. The pope, John XXI - - himself as Peter of Spain one of the most distinguished lights of the university world [] -had demanded of the Bishop of Paris a report on the state of the university. Official enquiries had resulted in a rounding up of errors and of their professors. A vast episcopal decree of condemnation was the result, running to 219 theses. [] They cover every conceivable error deriving from the theories of Aristotle and his various commentators, and errors of other kinds also. Among them, inserted by his adversaries, are some of the characteristic and fundamental theories of St. Thomas. A few weeks later the condemnation was repeated in England, and here the person responsible was one of the saint's own brethren, Robert Kilwardby, Archbishop of Canterbury, a scholastic of the pre-Albertine period of his order's studies.

This time the opponents of St. Thomas had gone too far. The reaction was immediate, led by St. Albert who still survived in a green old age. But the debate continued, nevertheless, and it was only the canonisation of St. Thomas fifty years later (1323) that really settled, for many of his opponents, the question of his

orthodoxy. []

For us St. Thomas is so eminently all that is Catholic Theology and the philosophical teaching officially sanctioned by authority, that it is not easy to grasp the fact (and its implications) that he the one original theological thinker of the first rank that his age produced, was not for his own age -- nor for those which immediately followed -- the all-overshadowing genius we universally revere. The great men of his own day -- for the orthodox -- were St. Bonaventure and St. Albert; and St. Albert's prestige was from his scientific knowledge and it did not profit greatly his philosophy, nor that of the gifted pupil he then overshadowed and by whom, since, he has himself been so eclipsed. Catholicism had human nature not been free to do otherwise, should have united around the stupendous genius of St. Thomas. The hour had indeed given to its witless trust the key to all the centuries, But it was not until too many of the critical years had gone by, irrevocably, that the saint came into his supremacy. The repudiation of 1277 set others to preside at the capital of Christian thought for the next two hundred and fifty years. Not St. Thomas but Ockham is to dominate the fourteenth century; and the Nominalist criticism, that will produce whatever of a theologian Luther was is to develop unchecked by what alone could really have checked it, a general understanding of the realism of St. Thomas.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)



A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH To the Eve of the Reformation

by Philip Hughes

Vol. 3: 1274-1520

CHAPTER 1: GESTA PER FRANCOS, 1270-1314

1. *BL. GREGORY X AND THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF LYONS, 1270-1276*

IN the summer of the year 1270, terrible news came to France from Africa, and to all Christian Europe. The King of France, St. Louis, had died of fever in the camp before Tunis, and the crusade was over. A world of effort, of sacrifice, and of suffering had gone for just nothing; and something unique had passed from a singularly troubled world. The one leader whom, for his righteousness, all Christendom might have trusted was dead.

In that summer of 1270 the figure of the great French king stood out with especial significance. It was now sixteen years since the last of the emperors had died, vanquished by that papacy which his house had striven to enthrall. In those sixteen years Germany had been given over to anarchy, while the popes, with very varied success, had worked to consolidate their new, precarious, hold on independence. In the end no way had offered itself to them but the old way, the protection of some Christian sovereign's defensive arm. To find some such prince, and install him in southern Italy as king of their vassal state of Sicily, was, then, a first obvious aim of papal policy. No less obviously, St. Louis IX was the ideal champion. Years of negotiation, however, had failed to persuade him to become a partner in any such scheme. The saint was by no means accustomed to accept unquestioningly the papal solutions for political problems. But, in the end, ten years' experience convinced him that, so long as the chaos in southern Italy continued. the popes must be wholly absorbed by the single problem of how to remain independent amid the ceaseless war

of political factions. On the other hand, the general affairs of Christendom stood in too urgent need of the papacy's constructive direction for any such papal absorption in Italian politics to be tolerable: the Italian disorder must be ended; and so St. Louis had not only assented to the papal policy but had allowed his youngest brother, Charles of Anjou, to become the pope's man, and to lead a French army into Italy for the defeat of the last remnants of the Hohenstaufen kings of Sicily. []

The pope's chosen champion had now destroyed the pope's enemies -- but the papal problem remained. Already, by the time Charles had to fight his second battle, it was becoming evident to the pope who crowned him and blessed his arms -- Clement IV -- that the victorious champion threatened to be as dangerous to the papal freedom as ever the Hohenstaufen had been. Strong protests against the new king's cruelty and tyranny began to be heard from the apostolic see. This pope, French by birth and for the greater part of his life a highly trusted counsellor of Louis IX, bound closely to the king by similarity of ideals and mutual esteem, was ideally equipped for the difficult task of guiding the new French venture through its first critical years. His sudden death, in November 1268, only two months after Tagliacozzo, was an immense loss; and this swelled into a catastrophe; first of all when the cardinals left the Holy See vacant for as long as three years, [] and then when, while the Church still lacked a pope, death claimed St. Louis too. For long there had been no emperor, there was no pope, and now the King of France had died. The last sure hope of checking the ambitions of Charles of Anjou had gone. In St. Louis's place there would reign the rash simplicity of his son, Philip III. Charles would have an open field, every chance he could desire to build up a situation which the future popes would have to accept -- unless they were prepared to start a new war to destroy him, as he had destroyed for them the heirs of Frederick II.

Of the two deaths the more important by far was that of St. Louis. Sanctity is rare in rulers, and rarest of all is the sanctity that shows itself in the perfection of the ruler's characteristic virtue of prudent practical ability. The pope's death found the Church in crisis -- it did not create the crisis; but the French king alone could have brought the papacy and Christendom safely through the crisis. One thing alone could have saved it, and he alone could have done that one thing -- namely, maintain the

tradition, now two centuries old, of French support for the popes in the difficulties which arose out of their office as guardians of political morality, while yet refusing to be a mere instrument for the execution of the popes' political judgments. The papacy needed the French -- but it needed also to be independent of them; and Christendom needed that the French should retain their independence too, and not become mere tools of popes who happened to be politicians as well as popes. This difficult and delicate part St. Louis managed to fit to perfection -- as none, before or since, has fitted it. And never was the lack of a prince to fit the part productive of greater mischief than in the twenty-five years that followed his death. For one main event of those years was the reversal of the traditional Franco-Papal entente that had been a source of so much good to both powers and, indeed, a main source of the peace of Christendom.

The Holy See, when Clement IV's death in 1268 delivered it over to the unprecedented calamity of a three years, vacancy, was already gravely embarrassed by the opposition of various Catholic powers to its leading policies. The popes were, for example, determined on a renewal of the crusade; but the great maritime republics of Genoa and Venice were all for peace with the Turks: war would mean the loss of valuable trade, defeat be the end of their commercial empire. The popes, again, had been favourably impressed by the Byzantine emperor's moves to end the schism between Constantinople and Rome that had gone on now for two hundred years; but Charles of Anjou wanted nothing so little as peace with Michael VIII, whom he was planning to supplant as emperor. The Lombard towns were the scenes of continual strife, the feuds bred by generations of civil war still active. The anti-papal forces in these cities found a curious ally in that wing of the great Franciscan movement which demanded a return to the most primitive form of the Franciscan life, and saw in this the kind of life all Church dignitaries ought to lead. The anarchic element in this movement, which threatened the existence of all ecclesiastical authority, was naturally welcome to rulers who, in every city of Italy, and beyond Italy too, aspired to restore the arbitrary omnipotence of the emperors of ancient Rome and secure thereby the exclusive triumph of material interests. [] This active unnatural alliance of Franciscan Spirituals and totalitarian capitalists of one kind and another, the popes were bound to fight; and here they were gravely hampered by a legacy from the

papacy's own recent past. In the long struggle against the last great Hohenstaufen emperor, Frederick II, the central authority in the Church, under the popes Gregory IX (1227-1241) and Innocent IV (1243-1254) "saw itself compelled to turn all its activity towards those resources and influences of a temporal kind that were necessary for its defence, and to expand the whole system of its temporal activity in order to secure itself against the attacks of its tireless foe." []

This use, by the Vicar of Christ, of fleets and armies to maintain his independence -- and the chronic need for this use in the "Ages of Faith" -- this willing acceptance by the popes of suzerain status in the feudal world over more or less reluctant royal vassals, John of England in one generation, Charles of Sicily in another; this raising of huge sums of money by loans from bankers and by levies on all the sees of Christendom in turn; this use of the crusade ideal and formulae to describe and characterise wars against European princes who remained the popes' children in the Faith despite their disobedience; all this, to the modern reader, seems often to need a great deal of explanation. And the popes who defended, in this particular way, those rights and that independent status which, undeniably, were the bases of the general recovery of Europe from barbarism, had to meet, as we shall see, much criticism of a similar kind from their own Catholic contemporaries.

Naturally enough the first form the criticism took was resentment, well-nigh universal, at the financial levies. From the moment when, in 1261, the newly elected French pope, Urban IV, began the great move to haul the papacy out of the political slough where he found it, the popes' need of money never ceases. Both the bad effect on those who collected the money, and the resentment of those from whom it was extorted, are henceforth permanent active elements of the state-of- the-Church problem. Already by the time Charles of Anjou had established himself in the kingdom of Sicily (1266) there was -- we can now see -- cause for anxiety on this score.

At the other pole of the main axis of European affairs the French State, too, had its serious chronic problems. The traditional policy which had, by 1270, secured the Capetian kings' uniquely strong hold as rulers of a great nation, has been well described as "the slow collaboration of interests and public opinion." [] In

a century when popes are to be counted by the dozen, France had been so lucky as to have but two kings and both of them really great rulers. [] Their achievement was very great, but it was not complete; and a modern French historian [] has well described some elements of the problem St. Louis left to his son, Philip III, and which, aggravated by the fifteen years of this king's weak rule, faced the next king, one of the most enigmatic figures of medieval history. This was Philip the Fair, whose reign (1285-1314) was a turning point in the history of the papacy and the Church. " France was falling to pieces. One after another the institutions upon which the whole fabric rested were breaking up and giving way. . . . Some of the feudatories were as powerful as the king himself, the Duke of Aquitaine, for example, who was also King of England; others, such as the Duke of Brittany or the Count of Flanders, ruled provinces that were really foreign countries in their way of life; in Languedoc the people detested the French. From one end of the country to the other, a myriad contradictory uses, customs, traditions, jurisdictions, privileges contended and struggled; none of them subject to royal regulation. The great mass of the nation was set against the classes that ruled. . . everywhere the national life was disorganised; anarchy seemed imminent, and it seemed only too likely that several important provinces would become independent states or fall under foreign rule."

Philip the Fair would meet his problems with new resources and a wholly new combination of strength and ruse. In his bid to be really master of every element of French life, not only would he come into violent conflict with the papacy -- as other French kings had done in their time -- but he would inaugurate a new tradition in the relations of the principal monarchy in Europe with the Holy See. He would not be the partner of the pope, but his master. In his grandfather, St. Louis, there had been seen the perfection of the older conception, the French king allied with the papacy in an implicit pact of mutual assistance, a true defender of the independence of religion and at the same time just as truly defender of the rights of the French clergy-rights to property -- against the papacy itself. This devotion of St. Louis to the cause of the papacy did not ever entail any blind following of every detail of the papal policies. The king refused to allow Frederick II to capture Lyons while the General Council assembled there that was to condemn him; he even assembled an army in case Frederick should move. But, on the other hand,

he did not, once Frederick was condemned and excommunicated and deposed by the pope, offer the pope his aid to carry out the sentence. St. Louis remained carefully neutral. Again "In his relations with the French episcopate, whether it was a matter of fiefs or even of applying disciplinary power, Louis IX showed a care to exercise control, and a susceptibility about his rights which conflicted only in appearance with his zeal for the interests of religion. It was his conviction that the prerogatives of the crown were necessary to the good order of the community, and thus the saint made it as much a matter of conscience to defend them well as to use them rightly; the prestige of those to whom religious jurisdiction was confided did not obscure the saint's clear vision of what was right, and in all matters he paid less attention to the noisy demands of the representatives of the clergy than to the canonical rules which ought to be the inspiration of their conduct." []

Such was the delicate situation and such the prince lost to the Church, to Christendom no less than to France, on August 25, 1270. Charles of Anjou, supreme for the moment, took charge of the crusade. He made a pact with the Sultan which brought the whole affair to an end (October 20) and, a month later, re-embarked the armies and sailed back to Europe.

Meanwhile, at Viterbo, the papal election continued to drag on. Holy men appeared to harangue and to warn the sixteen cardinals. The General of the new Servite Friars, St. Philip Benizi, fled from the offer of the honour. The kings of France and Sicily tried what a personal visit might effect. Then the people of Viterbo, in desperation with the cardinals' indifference to the scandal caused by their incompetence, took a hand and stripped of its roof the palace where the electors met. At last, on September 1, 1271, the cardinals gave power to a commission of six of their number to elect a pope, and that same day the six found their man. He was Theobaldo Visconti, not a cardinal, nor a bishop, nor even a priest, but the Archdeacon of Liege; and at this moment away in the Holy Land, encouraging the heir to the English crown in the forlorn hours of the last of the crusades. It was weeks before the archdeacon heard of his election, and months before he landed in Italy to be ordained, consecrated and crowned as Pope Gregory X (March 27, 1272).

The new pope, a man perhaps sixty years of age, was one of those figures whose unexpected entry into the historical scene seems as evident a sign of God's care for mankind as was ever the appearance of a prophet to Israel of old. He was largehearted, he was disinterested, a model of charity in his public life no less than in private, free from any taint of old political associations, simple, energetic, apostolic. His first anxiety was the restoration of Christian rule in the East: to this the European situation was secondary. But for the sake of the Crusade, the European complications must be speedily resolved, despite all the vested interests of long-standing feuds. In this work of reconciliation Gregory X's apostolic simplicity, and his aloofness from all the quarrels of the previous thirty years, gave to the papal action a new strength. A vision now inspired it that transcended local and personal expediency.

There was, the pope saw, no hope for the future of Catholicism in the Holy Land, no hope of holding off the Saracen from fresh conquests, so long as Rome and Constantinople remained enemies; and it was the first action of his reign to take up, and bring to a speedy conclusion, those negotiations to end the schism which had trailed between the two courts for now many years. That this policy of reunion, an alliance with the Greek emperor, Michael VIII, cut clean across the plans of Charles of Anjou to renew the Latin empire at Constantinople, with himself as emperor, and across his pact with Venice to divide up the Christian East between them, did not for a moment daunt the pope. Nor did the claims of Alfonso X of Castile to be emperor in the West hinder the pope from a vigorous intervention in Germany which resulted in the unchallenged election of Rudolf of Habsburg, and a close to nineteen years of civil war and chaos. A Germany united and at peace with itself was a fundamental condition of a peaceful Christendom.

This admirable pope knew the problems of Franco-German Europe by personal experience, from the vantage point of life in the middle lands that lay between the rival cultures. His direct diplomacy had thwarted the plan of Charles of Anjou to force the election of his nephew, the King of France, as emperor, and now the pope so managed the diplomatic sequence to the election of Rudolf of Habsburg that it brought these rivals into friendly collaboration. And he managed, also, in a personal interview at Beaucaire, to soothe the disappointed Alfonso of Castile.

Nowhere, at any time, did Gregory X's action leave behind it resentment or bitterness.

The Crusade, reunion of the separated churches of the East, and the reform of Catholic life, thrown back everywhere by the fury of the long war with the Hohenstaufen, were Gregory X's sole, and wholly spiritual, anxieties. Christendom must be organised anew, refitted throughout for the apostolic work that lay ahead. The first, most obvious step, was to survey its resources, to study its weaknesses and then find suitable remedies. This would best be done in a General Council, and only four days after Gregory's coronation the letters went out to kings and prelates, convoking a council to meet at Lyons in the summer of 1274.

Gregory X is, above all else, the pope of this second General Council of Lyons. Nowhere in his well-filled reign is his largehearted trust in the better side of human nature more evident, his confidence that charity and a right intention in the pope would call out the same virtues in others. And certainly the greatest charity was needed in whoever hoped to heal the long, poisoned dissension that kept the churches of the East estranged from Rome. The schism, in its causes, went back centuries. Latin despised Greek as shifty and treacherous: Greek despised Latin as barbarous and uncivilised. The association of the two during the various crusades had steadily sharpened the antagonism. Finally there was the memory of the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204, the sack of the great city, the massacres, the expulsion of the Greek ruler and his replacement by a Latin, with a Latin bishop enthroned as patriarch in the see of Photius and Cerularios. That Latin regime had endured for less than sixty years. On July 25, 1261, the Greeks had returned under Michael VIII. Constantinople fell to him with scarcely a struggle, and with the Latin empire there crashed the Latin ecclesiastical establishment. That the immediate reaction of the then pope -- Urban IV -- himself a one-time Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, was to plan a great crusade of recovery, was most natural. That never before in their history were the Greeks so hostile to the Latins, was natural no less. And if this was the moment when Michael VIII proposed to the pope to bring the schism to an end, the observer might see in his action no more than the clearest of signs that the Greek emperor realised how slender was his hold on the new

conquest. The King of France -- St. Louis -- had taken the cross in response to Pope Urban's appeal; and Venice, the real author of the piratical conquest of 1204, was also actively preparing. No pope, however, would hesitate between a restoration of obedience forced at the sword's point and a general return to obedience on the part of Constantinople and all its dependent churches. Michael's shrewd move held up the military expedition. From the day when Urban IV sent his Franciscan envoys to discuss Michael's proposal (28 July, 1263) the emperor knew his immediate danger was past.

Urban IV died (October 2, 1264) before much more had been done than to make clearer than clear how diverse were the intentions of emperor and pope. Michael had proposed first of all to complete the work of national unity; to drive out of the imperial territories, that is to say, what Latin rulers still remained. Urban thought that the religious reunion should come first.

Once a new pope was elected, Clement IV (February 5, 1265), Michael was able to begin all over again. It was a great advantage that Clement's plans for a crusade were directed to an expedition against the Holy Land itself. Constantinople now seemed secure against any western attack, and the emperor could safely begin the theological hedging and jousting. The Greeks, seemingly, proposed a council in which the differences of belief should be discussed. The pope replied, in the traditional Roman way, that the Faith being a thing that was settled, such discussion was impossible. The pope's ambassadors could indeed go into the questions raised by the Greeks and, once the union was a fact, there could be a council to ratify it. And Clement sent a declaration of faith to the emperor (March 1267).

Constantinople was, however, at this moment in the throes of an ecclesiastical upheaval, which produced three successive patriarchs in eighteen months. Politics had the main share in this and now, unfortunately, although the patriarch in possession was a strong supporter of Michael as emperor, he had the disadvantage of being violently anti-Latin. Michael, perforce, must go slowly; and then, while he was considering Clement's reply, the pope died (29 November, 1268) and there began one of the longest vacancies the Holy See has ever

known. []

If the long vacancy solved, for Michael, the immediate problem how to frame a submission to Rome that would be palatable also to his patriarch, it raised once more the problem of the security of his empire from western attacks. His chief danger in the West lay in the King of Sicily, Charles of Anjou. For this leading Guelf had no sooner overcome the Sicilian Ghibelline (1266), than he began to show himself, in the East, a most faithful follower of Ghibelline policy. To all the kings of Sicily-Norman, Hohenstaufen, and now Angevin -- the emperor at Constantinople was the traditional enemy. It was an antagonism that went back before the crusades, dating from those days when the Normans first conquered from the Greek emperor these Italian lands. And when the Sicilian kingdom fell to kings who were also German emperors, the traditional Mediterranean policy they inherited cut across the simplicities of the papally planned crusade. For these imperialists were enemies, first, of Byzantium. They might conquer the Turk ultimately, but their present thought was rather the Eastern Empire. An assault of this kind had been in the mind of the Emperor Henry VI when death so prematurely carried him off (1197). Seven years later, with the active assistance of his brother, the Emperor Philip, the plan was realised and Constantinople torn from the Greeks -- though not to the profit of Sicily. In the next generation Frederick II, Henry's son was the champion of the imperialistic idea and, surrendering the whole substance of the crusade, he negotiated a settlement with the Turks without any pretence of destroying their power. And now the conqueror of Frederick II's heirs was showing himself just as hostile to Byzantium, just as openly averse to any war against the Turks.

In 1267, while Clement IV and Michael VIII were seemingly planning a reunion of Latin west and Greek east, Charles began to style himself King of Jerusalem, and made the claim that he was heir to the last Latin emperor of the East. He was carefully building up a strong position for the future, gathering in claims and rights which, once Michael VIII was conquered, would become political realities. Clement out of the way, what should stay him? By the spring of 1270 his plans were completed, and to Michael VIII the end seemed very near. In his desperation he appealed to the cardinals and also to St. Louis. The saint, sympathetic to the scheme for reunion, and ever the enemy of

such schemes of realpolitik as Charles of Anjou was promoting, halted his brother most effectively by summoning him to take his place in the crusade then preparing against Tunis.

St. Louis' tragic death (25 August, 1270) set Charles free to renew his efforts against Michael VIII, and he had already done much by negotiations with the Latin princes in Achaia and the Peloponnesus, when he met the greatest check of all, the election as pope of one resolved, before all else, to bring together Greek and Latin to defend Christendom against their common foe the Turk. Charles might now style himself King of Albania, and ally himself with Michael's Greek rivals (1272), and even send Angevin forces and some of his own Saracen archers to attack Michael in Greece (1273): the new pope had passed too speedily from desires to action, the work of the Council of Lyons was a political fact, and on May 1, 1275 the King of Sicily was compelled to sign a truce with Michael.

The motives of the Greek emperor in offering his submission to the various popes and so proposing to bring to an end the schism that had endured for two hundred and twenty years were, then, evidently no more than political. Such practical statesmen as Urban IV and Clement IV would no doubt have grasped this, and acted accordingly, long before any formal act of reunion was completed. Gregory X was more optimistic than such papal realists. He readily listened to Michael VIII's new offers and sent a distinguished commission of theological experts and diplomatists to Constantinople to initiate the good work.

The four envoys [] -- Friars Minor -- took with them the creed or profession of faith, drafted by Clement IV. This the emperor, the bishops, and the people were to accept, and thereupon emperor and prelates were to take their places at the coming council. The arrival of this commission at Constantinople was the beginning of an immense theological excitement. It was immediately evident that the bishops would by no means obey mechanically any order from the emperor to submit themselves.

The leading theological question was the Latin doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, or rather whether the Latins had any right to express this doctrine by adding to the so-called creed of the Council of Nicaea the words

"and from the Son". [] The Greek bishops began by denying their right to do so, and gave the Latins an ultimatum to end the scandal by withdrawing the phrase. The emperor then took charge, and explained to his bishops, in private, that if this proposed arrangement with the Latins fell through, the empire was lost. As to the Latin formulae, no one could object to them as a matter of conscience, for the doctrines they expounded were perfectly orthodox. And he brought theological authority, and also earlier declarations of the Greek episcopate, to support the statement. The most learned man of the day was John Beccos, the chartophylax, [] and to him the bishops now looked for the reply that would non-suit the emperor's plea. Beccos, however, contented neither party. He did not refute the emperor; but he declared the Latins to be heretics. Whereupon Michael ordered his imprisonment. The patriarch, for his part, organised his bishops to refute the emperor's case and all swore an oath to resist the proposed union.

The prospects of reunion seemed slight indeed. But the emperor could not afford not to buy off the danger that threatened from Sicily and Venice. He was helped by the conversion of Beccos to his views. In prison the chartophylax had set himself to study in the Greek Fathers the doctrine of the processions in the Blessed Trinity. St. Athanasius, St. Cyril and St. Maximus attested that the Latin teaching was the Catholic faith. Beccos, thereupon, revoked his judgment that the Latins were heretics and became the emperor's most enthusiastic aid. While the convert argued with the bishops for the orthodoxy of the Latin position, Michael tried a mixture of diplomacy and pressure. All that would be asked of them, he asserted, was a recognition of the primacy of the Roman see, of Rome's right to judge all cases in final appeal, and that they should pray for the pope publicly in the liturgy. It was in this last point that the final difficulty lay. The popes had tampered with the sacred wording of the creed: how could an orthodox bishop give them any countenance? Michael retorted by threatening the opposition with the penalties of high treason; at the same time he pledged himself that the bishops would not be asked to add so much as an iota to the creed. Reassured, the bishops consented now to accept the emperor's three points; also to make a joint protestation of obedience to the pope.

When the Greek deputation reached Lyons (24 June, 1274) the council had been in session for seven weeks. It had opened on

May 7 with elaborate ceremonial and a sermon from the pope. Then, on May 18, it had passed the decree establishing the point of faith about the Filioque, [] and on June 7 twelve decrees regulating the procedure to be followed in elections of bishops and abbots.

The arrival of the Greeks interrupted these legislative proceedings. The ambassadors were received with solemn ceremony; they presented the letters from the emperor and the Greek bishops; they declared they had come to show their obedience to the Roman Church and to learn from it the true faith. Five days later was the feast of SS. Peter and Paul. At the mass, sung by the pope, the epistle and gospel were chanted in Greek as well as Latin, and the credo likewise (with the Filioque clause repeated three times by the Greeks). St. Bonaventure preached a great sermon. On the octave day, July 6, the formal act of reunion and reconciliation took place. The letters from Constantinople were read; in the emperor's, he repeated the creed sent to him by the pope and declared it to be the true faith, accepted as such by him because it came from the Roman church. He pledged his eternal fidelity to this doctrine, his obedience to the papal primacy. In return he asked that the Greeks be allowed to keep the creed unaltered by any reference to the procession of the Holy Ghost from God the Son, and also that their ancient rite be left untouched. And the emperor's ambassador confirmed all this by an oath made in his master's name.

The General Council which met at Lyons in 1274 was summoned as a great assize to find means for the restoration of Catholic life no less than for the recovery of the Holy Land. With this in view, Gregory X had asked bishops in various countries to send in statements setting out the main reasons for the spiritual decay which he deplored, and to propose remedies.

By far the greater part of the reforms enacted in the thirty decrees of the Council [] have reference to evils in the life of the clergy. . The pope, indeed, was to bring the council to a close with a sermon in which he declared that bad bishops were the principal cause of all that was wrong. [] In the council he made no scruple about a direct attack on scandal in the highest place of all, the negligence of the cardinals in allowing vacancies of the Holy See to drag on for months and for years. On more than

one occasion already, the faithful people had intervened to coerce the indifference of the cardinals by locking them up until they came to a decision, and a decree of the council [] now authorised and regularised these extreme measures, imposing the conclave as the rule henceforward. On the death of the pope the cardinals present in the city where he died were to await ten days, but no more, for their absent brethren. Then, with but a single servant each, they were to take up their residence in the palace, living together in a single locked room without any curtains or screens to shut off any part of it. This conclave [] was to be so arranged that none might enter or leave it unseen by the rest, that there would be no means of access to the electors or of secret communications with them; no cardinal must admit any visitor except such as were allowed in by the whole body to treat of the arrangement of the conclave. The new pope -- so Gregory X seems to have intended -- would thus be speedily elected, for his law next provides that should the election be delayed beyond three days "which God forbid", the cardinals' food was to be restricted to a single dish at each of their two daily meals; after five days more they were to be given only bread with wine and water. There are regulations for the admission of latecomers, for the care of sick cardinals who may leave and then wish to return. The cardinals are forbidden to occupy themselves with any other business than the election, and all pacts or conventions made between them are declared null, even though they be confirmed with an oath. Nor is any cardinal to receive anything of his ecclesiastical revenues as long as the vacancy of the Holy See endures; these are sequestered and at the disposal of the future pope. Finally, in order that these provisions may not become a dead letter, the responsibility for providing the conclave and guarding it is laid on the civic authority of the town where it takes place; heavy penalties being provided for those who over-act the rigour towards the cardinals which the new law demands.

The cardinals objected strongly to the proposed law, and for a time there was a brisk duel between them and the pope, each striving to enlist supporters from among the bishops. And it would seem that the general sense of the council was against the reform as proposed, for it was not promulgated until some months after the council had dispersed.

The most usual way of appointing bishops or abbots was still, in

1274, by an election, where the canons or monks had each a vote. A whole series of decrees enacted in this council shows the many serious abuses which affected the system, and how thoroughly, in these last years before something was devised in its place, the Holy See strove to reform them. Appeals against elections (or provisions) to churches are to be made in writing and to be countersigned by witnesses who swear their own belief in the truth of the objections made and that they can prove this: penalties are provided for those who fail to make good their charges. [] The elect must await confirmation before entering upon his charge. [] He is to be informed of his election as soon as possible, to signify his acceptance within a month, and, under penalty of losing the place, seek confirmation within three months. [] Voters who knowingly vote for one who is unworthy sin mortally, and are liable to severe punishment. [] No voter is allowed to appeal against the one for whom he has voted -- certain special cases apart. [] Far too many appeals are sent to Rome where the motive is not really serious. This practice is to cease [] and in cases where a double election has been made no objection will be allowed for the future against the majority on the score of lack of zeal, of worth, or of authority, where the majority numbers two-thirds of the voters. [] If objection be made that there is an evident defect, whether of due knowledge or otherwise, there must be an immediate enquiry into this. Should the objection be shown devoid of foundation, those who made it lose all right to pursue any further objection they have raised, and they are to be punished as though they had failed to prove the whole of their objections. [] Finally, to protect the successful against the malice of the disappointed, it is laid down that those who revenge themselves on electors for not supporting them by pillaging the electors' property or that of the Church or of the electors' relatives, or who molest the electors or their families are by the very fact excommunicated. []

The elective system was already beginning to raise problems almost as serious as those it solved. In another hundred years it would have disappeared in the greater part of the Church, and bishops be directly appointed or "provided" by the pope. The foundation of the new system was the decree Licet (1268) of Gregory X's immediate predecessor Clement IV, a lawyer pope who had come to the service of the Church after a great career as jurist and administrator in the service of St. Louis IX. By that decree Clement IV had reserved to the Holy See the appointment

to all benefices vacated by death, if the holder at the time he died had been a member of the Roman curia or had died in the city where the curia then was. [] This new law had caused much dissatisfaction among the bishops, no less than among other patrons of benefices. At the General Council they strove to have it revoked. But though Gregory X was not, apparently, unsympathetic, he would do no more than modify it slightly, [] and allow that vacancies falling under the reservation might be filled by the patron if the pope had failed to fill them within a month from the holder's death. []

What of the man appointed? and especially of the man who was the foundation of the whole system, the parish priest? It had already been laid down, a hundred years before this time, [] that no one must be appointed to a parish who was younger than twenty-five. But this law had too often been disregarded, and so the Council now declared [] that all appointments which violated the law were null and of no effect. It also reminded the nominee that he was bound to live in his parish and, if he were not a priest already, that he must seek ordination within a year or else ipso facto lose his benefice. Non-residence of beneficiaries -- of bishops and of parish priests especially -- was one of the chronic weaknesses of the seemingly powerful structure of medieval Catholicism. The popes never succeeded in their war against it, nor against the related mischief that the same man held more than one benefice: only too often, indeed, policy led the different popes to connive at these evils, and in the end, more almost than anything else, it was these that brought the imposing structure down to the dust. At Lyons, in 1274, laws were made to control the pluralist. No parish was to be given in commendam [] unless to a priest; he must be of the canonical age of twenty-five and not already provided with a parish in commendam, and the necessity (on the part of the Church) must be evident; furthermore such appointments are good for six months only. Any Contravention of these conditions invalidates the appointment ipso iure. [] As to pluralists -- clerics who hold more than one benefice -- bishops are to make a general enquiry and if one of the benefices held entails a cure of souls, the holder is to produce the dispensation authorising this. If this is not forthcoming, all but the first received of his benefices are to be taken as vacant and given to others. If, however, he is lawfully authorised he may retain all he lawfully holds, but it is put upon the bishop's conscience to see that the cure of souls is

not neglected. Bishops are specifically warned to make certain, when they confer a benefice that entails a cure of souls, that if the beneficiary already holds such a benefice he is dispensed to hold the second with a dispensation which explicitly mentions his possession of the first cura animarum. []

Episcopal control of the clergy is strengthened by a canon which forbids bishops to ordain another bishop's subjects without his leave: bishops who transgress, lose automatically the right to ordain at all for twelve months. [] The clergy are given a useful protection against the bishop in a new rule [] about visitation expenses. Bishops were already allowed to exact a certain support in kind when they made the official visitation of a parish. The custom was, however, developing of asking money or gifts; another abuse was to exact procurations -- the payments in kind -- without making the visitations. The council deals with these abuses (already noted and condemned by Innocent IV) by decreeing that all who have exacted these unlawful presents must restore double their amount to the victims. If the restitution is not made within a month, the bishop loses all right to enter a church until payment is made; his officials, if they are guilty, are suspended from office and benefice. Nor is any willingness of the injured party to remit the amount due, or part of it, to affect the automatic operation of the law.

Clerical immunity from the jurisdiction of the lay ruler was an ancient institution more and more contested in the last centuries of the Middle Ages. Gregory X at Lyons made a concession to the princes, enacting [] that the cleric in minor orders who contracted a second marriage lost all his clerical privileges and was henceforth wholly their subject. On the other hand, another canon [] denouncing yet again [] the barbarous custom called 'reprisals', -- by which, if the guilty party were beyond the law's power, the nearest innocent members of the community were made to suffer in his stead -- fixed a special penalty of excommunication and interdict for those who subjected ecclesiastics to this abuse.

There are two new laws to safeguard Church property, whether from lay rapacity or from cowardly negligence on the part of the clergy who should be its special defenders. Excommunication is henceforward to fall automatically on anyone -- whatever his

rank -- who, unauthorised, takes upon himself the occupation and administration of the property of a vacant see or abbey, and also upon the clerics or monks who abet this usurpation. Those who enjoy such right of administration are warned not to go beyond their right, and that they are bound not to neglect the properties entrusted to their care. [] The second law [] forbids prelates -- without the leave of their chapter and the Holy See -- to make over their lands to the lay lord as the price of his protection, retaining for the Church a mere use of the property. All contracts of this kind hitherto made without leave are now annulled, even though confirmed with an oath. Offending prelates are to suffer a three years suspension from their office and their revenues, and the lords who force such contracts upon them, or who have not restored what they obtained through past contracts of this sort, are excommunicated.

The reform legislation of the Council did not only touch the layman in his relations with the clergy. In two canons, on usury and usurers, it strove to halt a mischief that lay at the very roots of social life. Already, by a law of 1179, as the Council recalls, the notorious usurer [] was barred from the sacraments, and if he died he was forbidden Christian burial, and the clergy were not allowed to take offerings from him. These prohibitions had been largely ignored, and now, not only are they renewed, but it is forbidden [] to states and rulers to allow usurers to take up residence within their territories, or to allow those already there to remain. Within three months they must be expelled. If the lord is an ecclesiastic, disregard of this new law entails automatically suspension from his office, a lay lord incurs excommunication, and a community or corporation interdict. As for the usurer himself, [] he is not to have Christian burial, even though his will directs that restitution be made, until this has actually been done or substantial pledges given according to forms now provided. Members of religious orders -- and others too -- who bury usurers in disregard of this law are themselves to be punished as usurers. Unless a usurer first make restitution, or give a real guarantee that he will do so, no one is to witness his will or hear his confession, or absolve him. If his will does not provide for restitution it is, by the fact, null and void.

There is also a canon [] about conduct in church and abuses of the church fabric from which much may be gleaned about the day to day religious life of the time. Churches are places built for

prayer, places where silence should reign, and this especially during the time of mass. All are to bow their heads in reverence whenever the holy name of Jesus Christ is pronounced, especially during the mass. The church is not to be used for secular purposes, such as meetings, or parliaments, nor as a court of law; if trials are held there the sentences rendered are, ipso facto, null and void. Churchyards are not to be used for fairs. It is a terrible thing, says the canon, if places set apart for man to ask forgiveness for his sins become to him occasions of further sin. This canon inaugurated the popular devotion to the Holy Name, and the great confraternity still so flourishing, founded by the Dominicans at the command of Gregory X [] to further the devotion.

Five of the remaining canons are directed to the reform of legal procedure; most of them relate to the law governing the punishment of excommunication. Excommunication is not incurred by those who hold intercourse with the excommunicated unless these have been excommunicated by name. This is a clarification of a canon of the last General Council. [] Absolution, from any censure, which has been extorted by violence or threats is not only null and void absolutely, but also involves those using such threats in a further excommunication. [] Those who give permission to their servants or subjects to murder, imprison or injure in any way, whether it be the officials responsible for a sentence of excommunication against them, or relatives of the officials, or those who refuse all intercourse with them since the excommunication, are by the fact excommunicated a second time; so too are those who carry out these orders. If within two months they have not sought absolution from this second excommunication, they can only be absolved from it by the Holy See. [] Another new law [] is directed to check the hastiness of ecclesiastics in issuing penalties whose effects are general. Canons who, as a punishment, propose to suspend the church services, must now give notice of this in writing, with their reasons, to the person or persons against whom this action is directed. If the canons fail to do this, or if the reasons assigned are insufficient, they lose all right to their revenues for the time the services were suspended and must moreover make satisfaction for any losses thereby incurred to those they meant to punish. Also, and here is a reference to a superstitious instinct not yet wholly departed from our midst, it is most strictly

forbidden to emphasise the fact of the divine displeasure, to which the suspension of offices supposedly testifies, by such detestable practices as treating the sacred images irreverently -- for example, throwing them to the ground and covering them with nettles and thorns. This the bishops are to punish with the utmost severity.

To check the growing tendency to drag out law suits by maliciously contrived delays, and thereby to fleece the litigant, the council now enacted a most stringent canon. All advocates and proctors are henceforward to declare on oath, not only that they will do their utmost for their client, but also that should anything transpire in the course of the trial to convince them that his cause is not just, they will immediately withdraw from the case. This oath is to be taken at the opening of every judicial year, and heavy penalties are provided for neglect to do so or for any breach of the oath. Also, the canon fixes maximum fees for both advocates and proctors and puts upon them the obligation to restore anything accepted in excess of these amounts -- again under heavy penalties. []

Perhaps the Council's most important piece of legislation, after the law establishing the conclave, was the twenty-third canon *Religionum diversitatem nimiam*, on the new religious orders. From the moment when religious -- men formed by the discipline of the monastic vows and life -- had first begun to give themselves to the apostolic work of preaching the gospel and reconciling sinners to God, there had been trouble with the parochial clergy whose peculiar business and charge this work had always been. It was from among the religious that the missionaries had come who had converted the West from heathendom. On their labours was built the greater part of the present fabric of parishes and sees. It was the religious who was the trained man, in the early Middle Ages, the parochial priest the more or less well-gifted amateur; and as with habits of life so was it with professional learning. The vast mass of the parochial clergy had nothing like the chances of study which were open to the monk. The revival of learning which produced the universities no doubt improved their chances enormously, and indeed it was the chief function of the universities to educate the clergy. But, even so, universities were never so many that the whole body of the clergy passed through them. And long before the medieval universities reached the peak of their achievement

as seminaries for the education of the parochial clergy, St. Dominic first and then St. Bonaventure had provided the church with a new kind of religious who was primarily a missionary priest, and the last word in the professional clerical sciences and arts, theologian, preacher and confessor. By the time of the Council of Lyons in 1274 Dominican and Franciscan priests were to be numbered by tens of thousands, and almost as numerous again were the priests of other new orders that had sprung up in imitation. Some of the new orders were as admirable as the models which had inspired them. Others were less so. For very different reasons the appearance of both types ruffled the peace of the clerical mind.

Already sixty years before the Council of Lyons, the Church had shown itself anxious and troubled by the task of controlling the new spiritual enthusiasm as it showed itself in the new missionary brotherhoods. These were almost always lay movements in origin; rarely was it to a priest that the inspiration to lead this kind of life seemed to come. If there was zeal in plenty in these movements there was rarely any theological learning, or any appreciation that this was at all necessary for the preacher. Very often there was a definite anti-clerical spirit; sometimes there was heresy too. For very many reasons, then, the first rumours that a new brotherhood had been formed to preach penance and the remission of sins, and that it was sweeping all before it in some city of Languedoc or Umbria, can hardly have brought anything but deep anxiety to the Roman curia or to its head.

When the bishops poured into Rome for the General Council of 1215 they brought with them from every see of Christendom the tale of disputes between clergy and religious. Sixty years later, with the new mendicant missionary orders at the flood of their first fervent activity, they took similar tales to Lyons. From Olmuc in Bohemia, for example, came complaints that the Dominicans and Franciscans had gradually ousted the parochial clergy from all contact with their people. Baptism was the only sacrament for which the parish priest was ever approached. And where the people went, there they took their offerings. The bishop's suggestions, in this instance, were drastic indeed. These mendicant orders should lose their general power to hear confessions, or to preach except in the parish churches. Only those should preach or hear confessions whom the local bishop

chose and authorised. Nor should any new friary be founded without the local bishop's leave.

The mendicants no doubt put forward once again the solid reason for their admittedly wide privileges; once they lost their exemption from all jurisdiction but that of the pope, how long would they survive in a world where there were bishops? In France, in the early days, the Dominicans, for example, found themselves treated just as layfolk, bidden to attend mass on Sundays, with the rest, in the parish church, and to confess to the parish priest as other parishioners were bound. [] Twenty years nearly before this time (1274) the differences between clergy and mendicants had blown into a great conflagration at Paris, where the university had demanded from the pope all but the suppression of the orders and, at the pope's bidding, St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure had stated the orders' case. Now, at Lyons, the question was raised again: it had already become, what it was to remain for centuries, one of the chronic problems of the Church, and one of the chronic evidences how harsh a soil human nature is to divine charity.

The decree now enacted deals drastically with all abuses, with institutes inaugurated in despite of existing law, and with lawfully founded institutes which have degenerated or seem to be tending that way. But it goes out of its way to protect and to praise the two great orders of St. Dominic and St. Francis.

The Council of 1215 -- says the new law -- had forbidden [] the foundation of any new orders. This prohibition was now renewed, because, despite that law, rashness and presumption had brought into existence an unbridled mob of new orders -- of new mendicants especially -- who did not deserve approbation. Therefore, for the future, no one is to found any new order, or to enter one if such be founded. All orders and mendicant orders founded since 1215 and not approved by the Holy See are abolished, Those founded since and approved by the Holy See, and which live by alms collected from the general public and whose rule forbids them any rents or possessions, and to whom an insecure mendicity through public begging affords a living, must now follow this rule, namely members already professed may continue to live this life, but no more novices are to be received; no new houses are to be opened; no properties may be alienated without leave of the Holy See, for these properties

the Holy See intends to use in aid of the Holy Land, or the poor and for other pious purposes. Any violation of this rule entails excommunication, and acts done in violation of it are legally void. Moreover, members of these orders are forbidden to preach to those outside their ranks, or to hear their confessions, or to undertake their funeral services. This 23rd canon, it is expressly declared, does not however extend to the Dominicans and Franciscans whose usefulness to the Church in general (it is explicitly said) is evident. As for the Carmelites, and the Hermits of St. Augustine, whose foundation dates back beyond the Lateran Council of 1215, they may continue as they now are until further decision about them is taken. A general scheme, says the canon, is in preparation that will affect them and indeed all the orders, non-mendicants included. Meanwhile members of the orders to whom this new rule now made applies, are given generally a permit to enter other approved orders. But no order or convent is to transfer itself as a whole without special leave of the Holy See.

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. THE SHADOW OF ANJOU, 1276-1285

Gregory X died at Arezzo. January 10. 1276, on his way back from France to Rome. Only eleven days later the cardinals, putting into execution for the first time the new law of the conclave, unanimously elected the Friar Preacher, Peter of Tarentaise. This first Dominican pope was a Frenchman. He took the name of Innocent V and reigned for just five months. There was a short interval of three weeks and the cardinal deacon Ottoboni Fieschi, a nephew of Innocent IV was elected -- Adrian V (11 July). His reign was one of the shortest of all: he was dead in seven weeks, before he had even been ordained priest. For the third time that year the cardinals assembled, and elected now a Portuguese, the one-time Archbishop of Braga, Peter Juliani, who has his place in the history of scholastic philosophy as Peter of Spain. He took the name of John XXI but, scarcely more fortunate than the other two popes, he reigned only eight months. On May 20, 1277 the ceiling of his library fell in and the pope was killed.

These short pontificates wrought much harm to the still fragile restoration of Gregory X. In all the elections of that fateful year, Charles of Anjou was active. Both the French pope and the Portuguese showed themselves much more sympathetic to his policy than Gregory had been; Innocent V favouring him in Italy and John XXI, apparently, willing to forward his designs on the Eastern empire. But nowhere was the change in the personality of the pope more to be deplored than in the most delicate matter of all, Rome's relations with the newly reconciled Eastern churches. Here John XXI showed himself heavy handed and perhaps made inevitable the action of his successors that was to wreck the whole work within the next five years.

A more certain -- but accidental -- effect of John's short reign was to revive the abuse of over-long vacancies in the Holy See. The cardinals' opposition to Gregory X's conclave regulation had been strong. Their criticism now brought John XXI to suspend it, meaning to provide a new rule. His sudden death found the cardinals without any rules at all to bind them and the Holy See was thereupon vacant six months (20 May-25 November, 1277).

The pope ultimately elected was John Gaetani Orsini, one of the most experienced diplomatists in the curia, a cardinal for more than thirty years, who took the name of Nicholas III. None since Innocent IV (1243-1254) had come to the high office with such -- extensive knowledge of the curial routine, of the major problems of the time and the personalities around whom they turned. Nicholas had been Innocent IV's close companion in his exile, [] and in 1258 had played a great part, as legate, in the national histories of France and of England at the time of Simon de Montfort's first triumph. Since the death of Clement IV (1268) he had been the strong man of the curia, a force to be reckoned with in all the subsequent elections. He is credited with the election of John XXI and in that pope's short reign was, indeed, the power behind the throne. Through all the years that followed Charles of Anjou's introduction into the politics of church defence Nicholas III had been his warm supporter. But events during the several vacancies of 1276 had chilled his enthusiasm. He was now critical, if not hostile, and certainly awakened from the simplicity he had shared with the scholarly French and Portuguese popes, whose inexperience of politics failed to read beneath the surface of Charles's courtesy and seeming submissiveness. The facts were that the King of Sicily's diplomacy had begun definitely to check Rudolf of Habsburg in Germany; that he was once again menacing the Greek emperor and that his power overshadowed all Italy. Charles now took the style of King of Jerusalem, Hugh III having abandoned the mainland and retired to Cyprus, and sent to Acre as his vicar, Roger de St. Severin. The Templars of Venice supported him and the barons of the kingdom had no choice but to do him homage. Of the two great questions of the day, not the crusade seemed now the more urgent but the freedom of the Papal State, and the indefinitely more important thing bound up with this, namely, the freedom of the papal action and so of religion everywhere. It was to be the main aim of Nicholas III to check this new advance of the King of Sicily.

Presently immense plans for the future organisation of Europe began to take shape. New papal agents of proved character and high diplomatic ability -- the future popes Martin IV and Nicholas IV, the Dominican Master -- General John of Vercelli -- began to knit together the medley of jealousies and rivalries in which the ambition of such magnificent men as Charles of Anjou found its perennial opportunity. It was a great pontificate, though all too

short for the task before it. Nicholas III was already an old man at his election (25 November, 1271) and in less than three years he was dead (22 August, 1280) Nevertheless he had notably lessened King Charles's hold on central Italy by refusing to allow his re- appointment as Senator of Rome and imperial vicar in Tuscany. More, by a special constitution Nicholas III made it impossible for the future for any reigning prince to be senator. The new senator, in 1278, was the pope himself, and he appointed his nephew to act in his place. Charles, knowing himself for the moment outmanoeuvred, submitted gracefully. In Germany the pope continued Gregory X's policy of support to the new emperor-elect. He won from Rudolf -- and from all the German princes -- an explicit renunciation of all the old claims over any of the territories now counted as States of the Church.

Had Nicholas III still greater plans in mind to establish permanent friendliness between the Habsburgs and Capetians? Did his too speedy death put an end to one of the best of all chances of preventing the coming long centuries of Franco-German warfare and its sequelae of world destruction? Opinions differ, but the pope is credited with the desire to make the empire hereditary in the Habsburg family, and to make the German kingship a reality beyond the Rhine and the Danube. The kingdom of Arles would be detached from the empire and, united with Lombardy, form an independent realm under a French prince. A second Italian kingdom would be created in the lands between the Papal State and Lombardy. Italy, like Germany, would experience a new, peaceful political order. The Papal State would enjoy a new security. Charles of Anjou would be satisfied -- and yet controlled. The major causes of Franco-German rivalry would be forestalled.

But Nicholas died before his liquidation of the political debts of 1276 had been so successful as to allow such major schemes any chance of success. He was the first pope for a hundred years to make Rome his regular dwelling place and all but the last pope to do so for another hundred; he has his place in history as the real founder of the Vatican. The new orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic found in him a constant friend, and his registers show how constantly he turned to them to provide bishops for sees all over Europe. The one real blemish was his over-fondness for his own family. It has won him a most unenviable mark as a pioneer in the vicious business of papal

nepotism, and a blistering memorial in the Inferno of Dante.

Among the things which Nicholas III did not find time to do, was to provide the much-needed regulations about the papal election, and after his death the Holy See again remained vacant for six months -- time enough and to spare for Charles of Anjou to turn to his own profit the reaction which usually follows the disappearance of a strong ruler. The new pope, Martin IV (elected 22 February, 1281) Simon de Brion -- was a Frenchman and, from the beginning, he showed himself a most willing collaborator in all the King of Sicily's schemes. It would not be correct to describe him as, in any sense, the king's tool. All goes to show a long-standing identity of views between himself and Charles, and the cardinal's long career in the service of the Holy See had shown him to be a skilful diplomatist and administrator. Like very many of the popes since Innocent III, he was a product of the University of Paris. Like Clement IV, he had been high in the service of St. Louis IX. With many more he had left that service for the Roman curia at the invitation of the newly-elected French pope Urban IV (1261), who had created him cardinal. Much of his life continued to be spent in France as legate, and it was he who had negotiated, for Urban IV, the treaty which made Charles of Anjou the papal champion and set him on the way to become King of Sicily. It is not surprising that in the years between Charles's victories and his own election (1268-1281), Simon de Brion was the king's chief advocate and supporter in the curia. He was, it is said, most unwilling to be elected. No doubt he foresaw the stormy years that awaited him, the difficulties that must follow on any reversal of the cautious policy of the last nine years, and he was an old man. He was to reign just over four years and to initiate a series of political disasters that would leave the prestige of the papacy lower than at any time since the coming of Innocent III (1198).

To Charles of Anjou the election supplied the one thing so far lacking. In the fifteen years since his conquest of Sicily, the king had made more than one attempt to extend his power at the expense of the Byzantine emperor at Constantinople. St. Louis IX had checked him in 1270, Gregory X in 1275, Nicholas III in 1278. Now, with a pope of like mind with himself, his ambition was to be given free reign.

First of all, Martin IV, within two months of his election, reversed

the vital decision of Nicholas III that the civil government of Rome should never be given into the hands of a sovereign prince, by appointing the King of Sicily Senator for life. [] The immediate result was a miniature civil war in Rome that lasted throughout the reign, with all the customary sequelae of excommunication and interdict. Martin himself never lived nearer to Rome than Orvieto and Perugia.

Next, Martin IV definitely broke with the Eastern churches. It was seven years all but two months since the solemn ratification at Constantinople, [] by the Greek bishops, of the reconciliation made at the Council of Lyons. Never, during all that time, had the popes felt happy about the reality of the Greek submission to their authority; and never had the great mass of the Greeks seen in the act of their emperor, Michael VIII, anything more than a base surrender to the despised and hated Latins. From the very beginning, very many of them, courtiers even, and members of the emperor's own family, had refused all relations with the clergy who accepted the union. But, so long as Gregory X lived, Michael was confident that the schemes of the King of Sicily, to restore, in his own person, the Latin empire at Constantinople, would be effectively checked. This pope's personal experience of the gravity of the crisis of Christianity in the East, and his determination, in the interest of the projected crusade, to forestall any warfare between rival Christian claimants to Eastern principalities, were solid advantages that far outweighed, with the ruler at Constantinople, the popular and the clerical hostility to the union.

But the unlooked-for death, in January 1276, of this rarely experienced pope, patient, understanding, the reverse of doctrinaire in his handling of delicate practical problems, changed all. Moreover, Gregory X had three successors in less than twelve months, and the upset in the curia caused by the rapid appearance and disappearance of these popes was, inevitably, a great opportunity both for those who wished to see the union destroyed, and for those who had never thought it could be a reality. The first of these popes, Innocent V, showed himself much cooler towards Michael VIII than his predecessor had been. For Innocent was a Frenchman, [] such another man of God as his predecessor, it is true, and no more of a politician. But he was a supporter of Charles of Anjou. When Michael demanded that the pope, for the protection of the Byzantine

empire in the approaching crusade, should strengthen the emperor's authority by excommunicating the Latin princes already in arms against him, Innocent, in his perplexity, could only reply by a general exhortation about the need for unity. Before anything more could be asked of him, or a new Eastern crisis develop, his five months' reign was over (June 22, 1276). Adrian V, who followed him, lasted only seven weeks. Then came a third pope favourable to Charles, the scholarly Portuguese, John XXI. It was this pope who despatched to Constantinople the embassy planned by Innocent V, charged to obtain from Michael his own personal oath that he accepted the faith of the Roman See as set out at the General Council, and to absolve the Greeks from what censures they might have incurred through their adherence to the schism now terminated. The nuncios were also to excommunicate, and to put under interdict, all who opposed the union. [] At first all went well. The emperor made no difficulties; his son and heir, Andronicus, wrote a most dutiful letter of submission, professing his enthusiasm for the union; and the Greek bishops, at a synod in April 1277, reaffirmed their acceptance of the primacy of the Roman See and of the orthodoxy of its teaching about the procession of the Holy Ghost. But in reaffirming this, the bishops somewhat altered the terminology of the statement adopted at Lyons.

John XXI was dead before this last, disconcerting detail of the Byzantine situation reached the curia. It was five months before the vacancy was filled, and another twelve before Nicholas III took up the question. From now on we can note a new stiffness in the Roman attitude. For example, the Greeks are now told that they must add the Filioque clause to the creed. This was, of course, more than the General Council had asked; but there was now every reason why Rome should be doubtful whether Greek opposition to the use of the clause was not the outward sign of a refusal to accept the Roman terminology as orthodox, of a clinging to the old contention that, on this point, the Latins were heretics. The use of the clause was become a touchstone of orthodoxy, as the use of the word homoousion had been, nine hundred years before, in these same lands. The pope also, it would seem, proposed to pass in review the whole Greek liturgy and rite, for he bade his envoys to allow only those parts which were not contrary to the faith. The nuncios were to travel through the chief cities of the empire and to see that all these

various orders were really obeyed, and the emperor was to be persuaded to ask for the appointment at Constantinople of a permanent cardinal-legate; so only could Rome be assured that the Greeks really meant what they had professed.

Already there had been riots against the union, and now the emperor and his bishops came to an understanding. They would not break openly with the new papal commission (since only the pope's intervention could preserve the empire from the designs of Charles of Anjou), and the emperor pledged himself, whatever the consequences, not to consent to add the Filioque to the creed. It was now only a matter of time before the purely political intentions of the chief supporters of the union became so evident that a breach with Rome must follow. While, at Constantinople, the emperor stifled all opposition, and punished with terrible cruelty those who stirred up the ever recurring anti-papal riots, to the pope he perjured himself lavishly. The Greek bishops, subtly contriving neither to refuse the pope's demands nor to satisfy them, sent to Rome a reply that was little more than a mass of texts from the Greek fathers, where any and every word but the "proceed" of the Lyons definition was used to express the relation of the divine Word to the Holy Ghost. Only the sudden death of Nicholas III (August 22, 1280) and the six months' interregnum which followed, delayed, it would seem, the rupture that was now all but inevitable.

Then a final certitude came with the election, as Pope Martin IV, [] of the King of Sicily's staunchest partisan in the curia. Charles had now every encouragement to prepare the type of crusade which the kings of Sicily traditionally favoured, the plan whose basic idea was to install themselves at Constantinople as emperors and make war on the Turks from this new vantage point. Venice -- also traditionally hostile to the Greeks, and already responsible for the crime that had transformed Innocent III's crusade into an immense act of piracy -- became his ally (July 3, 1281) and the pope, this time, joined the anti-Byzantine coalition. [] The date was fixed for April 1283.

But Michael VIII had not, for a moment, failed to understand that the bright prospects which the election of Gregory X had opened to him were now gone, perhaps for ever. While he carefully maintained diplomatic relations with Martin IV in the state befitting a loyal Catholic prince, Michael, too, made his

preparations. But long before they were complete, only four months after the pact with Venice, Martin IV took the final step. On November 18, 1281, he excommunicated Michael as a patron and protector of heretics, of schismatics and Or heresy.

The emperor did not, however, reverse his religious policy. As long as he lived, another thirteen months only, there was no repudiation of the work of Lyons. It was only after his death (December 11, 1282) that the anti-Roman reaction began. It was extremely thorough. The new emperor, Andronicus, publicly confessed his submission to the pope as a grave sin and begged to be given suitable penance. The patriarch favourable to the Latins -- John Beccos, almost the only sincere convert among the higher clergy -- was deposed, and his successor (the anti-Roman whose place Beccos had taken in 1275) had all the churches of the capital purified with solemn rites, while a sentence of three months' suspension was laid upon the whole body of bishops and priests. The emperor obliged his mother, Michael's widow, to abjure her allegiance to tile pope, and he even refused a religious funeral to his dead father. So Michael, after twenty years of religious trimming, in the interests of Byzantine independence, was found, at the last, rejected and cast out both by the Catholics and by the Orthodox. Although it is extremely doubtful whether, inaugurated in such circumstances, any reunion would have long endured, Martin IV, when he excommunicated its main support, the Emperor Michael, sealed its fate in an instant. Also, in excommunicating the emperor he was excommunicating the prince whom Charles of Anjou was planning to supplant -- excommunicating him at the very moment when the Sicilian king's plans were ripe. It is little wonder that the pope's contemporaries judged his act severely, nor that some were very ready to see, in the disasters to the papal arms which followed, the manifest chastening hand of God.

For chastisement -- if such it were! -- arrived with speed. Far away from Constantinople, at the very opposite end of the Mediterranean Sea, was a prince who, for years, now, had nourished a bitter hatred of the French, the King of Aragon, Peter III. Peter had seen his father make over to St. Louis IX Aragonese rights in Languedoc, and also, in the interests of this settlement, break up the unity of Aragon by creating the new kingdom of Majorca. He had seen St. Louis' son, Philip III,

intervene powerfully to the south of the Pyrenees in the neighbouring kingdom of Castile -- and in a succession dispute that concerned Aragon very intimately. The French King of Sicily, Charles of Anjou, was especially an enemy; for Peter's wife was the daughter of that King Manfred of Sicily whom Charles had routed and slain at Benevento in 1266, the granddaughter of the last great Hohenstaufen, Frederick II. She was therefore, since Charles of Anjou's execution in 1268 of Conradin the last male of the line a personage of the greatest interest to all the remnants of the Ghibelline party which, suppressed these sixteen years but by no means destroyed, still swarmed in every state and town of Italy. Peter's court was the last refuge of the party, and there, biding his time in exile, was Manfred's capable Sicilian minister, John of Procida.

It was this political genius who planned the great coup. While Charles was busy with his plans to capture the empire of the East, binding to himself the great commercial states of Genoa and Venice, and securing the assistance of the new pope, John of Procida linked together Peter III and the Emperor Michael, the native Sicilians who had already learnt to detest their French rulers, and the Italian Ghibellines everywhere. A great conspiracy against Charles and his suzerain the pope was already afoot, when Martin IV threw over Michael VIII. The rising at Palermo on Palm Sunday, 1282, [] and the massacre of the French which followed -- the Sicilian Vespers -- was the Ghibelline reply. Before Charles was able to put down the insurrection, Peter III had landed in Sicily. The French were out, and out for all time. Only the mainland territory remained to them and a war had begun, in which the pope was directly involved, that was to last for twenty years. []

The pope was involved because Charles was his vassal, the vassal indeed of St. Peter. The pope had no choice but to intervene and, in the name of St. Peter, with all means spiritual as well as temporal, defend his vassal against the Aragonese invader. He excommunicated the King of Aragon -- who, also, was his vassal -- and gave him three months in which to submit; should he obstinately hold out, the pope would depose him. [] Peter III ignored the excommunication. He had present victory on his side and, in a war that was to be chiefly decided by sea power, he had also the genius of the great admiral of his day, the Sicilian Roger de Loria. The pope then deposed Peter. [] He

offered the crown of Aragon to yet another French prince, Charles of Valois, a younger son of the King of France, and, when the offer was accepted, [] the pope, to assist the Frenchman, proclaimed a real crusade against Peter. [] Peter's subjects were released from their oaths of allegiance, forbidden to acknowledge him as king, to pay him taxes or other dues. The kingdom was laid under an interdict. To finance his papally-appointed rival, immense sums of money were advanced by the pope from the moneys collected for the war against the Saracens, and special tithes were levied on ecclesiastical property in France, Provence and Navarre, in Aragon, Majorca, Sicily and in all Italy; and also in the dioceses of Liege, Metz, Verdun and Basle. To all who helped the good work of installing Charles and expelling the Aragonese King of Aragon, all the favours, temporal and spiritual, were granted which might be had by going out to the Holy Land to fight the Saracens. The popes had been unable for years to reorganise the holy war. Now it had reappeared, in Spain, and directed against a Christian prince whose crime it was to have made war on a papal vassal.

The King of France took up his son's opportunity [] and soon a great French army was preparing to invade Aragon, with a fleet moving in support along the coasts of the Mediterranean. Sicily, since Roger de Loria's destruction of the Neapolitan fleet, was impregnable to the Aragonese. A direct attack on Peter's homeland, if successful, would be the simplest way to loosen his hold on the island.

At first all went well. The French invaded Rousillon in May 1285, and on September 7 took the Aragonese city of Gerona. But now a double disaster fell upon them. Fever took hold of the army and slew more troops than the enemy. And de Loria, in a great battle off Palamos, destroying the French fleet, cut the main line of the army's communications, the chief means of its reinforcement and supply (September 4). Among those struck down by the fever was the King of France himself, and he was carried back, amid his retreating troops, to die at Perpignan (October 5). For the first time in history French policy had sent a conquering army beyond the natural frontiers of France. The venture had ended in a great disaster.

Charles of Anjou had been spared, at any rate, this crowning

humiliation [] he had died in January 1285, while the expedition was still in preparation, and its chances seemed excellent. [] Pope Martin, too, died before he saw how his collaboration with the Angevin was ending (28 March, 1285). All that the collaboration had in fact achieved was to end the chances of the reunion scheme of Gregory X, and to involve the papacy in a new war where the stake was not, any longer, the pope's independence -- the one real danger to this, anywhere in Europe, was in fact that very vassal of the pope in whose interest the pope was at war. And the papacy was faced now with the fact, surely full of omen, that in two important territories, Aragon and Sicily, the bulk of the people and clergy were standing fast by the ruler whom the pope had declared to be no ruler, ignoring the excommunication, the deposition and the interdict laid upon them. If, despite such lavish use of the spiritual arm, despite this all but official identification of the temporal with the spiritual, the popes should lose in the conflict, what would be the reaction in the sphere of the people's devotion to papal authority as the centre and source of religious life? Again, all over Italy the Ghibelline factions were busy. Lombardy, the Romagna, Tuscany were filled with insurrection and riot, and there too this same intermingling of spiritual and temporal was a leading, and inevitable, feature of the struggle. Those on the one side were, by the fact, bad Catholics: their opponents were engaged in war that was holy. And from Germany, untouched by the actual struggle, came loud complaints about the taxes levied on ecclesiastical revenues to finance the papal diplomacy and arms. Martin IV's successors were scarcely to be envied.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



3. FRANCE AND THE SICILIAN WAR, 1285-1294

The next pope was a very old man, Honorius IV (1285-1287). The ill-fated French expedition to Aragon had not, indeed, yet begun its march when he was elected (2 April, 1285); but although Edward I of England intervened immediately, [] suggesting to the new pope that he persuade Philip III to halt the military preparations and that negotiations be opened with Peter of Aragon, the die was cast. Honorius, a noble of ancient Roman stock, [] might well intend -- it would seem he did so intend -- to reverse his predecessor's policy, and to follow the ways of Nicholas III and Gregory X, working for peace by removing the causes of wars before these became impossible to control. He would hold in check the new powerful French combination, now master of France and southern Italy, by a constant support of the Habsburg emperor in Germany; and also, while, as a good suzerain, he supported the King of Sicily, he would carefully supervise his whole political activity. But the pope could hardly condone, out of hand, the Aragonese occupation of Sicily: it was by all the standards of his time, no more than a successful act of international piracy; nor could he, humanly speaking, have expected the King of France to abandon the profitable holy war against the pirates, now, upon the instant, and at his sole word. The mischief done by the alliance of Pope Martin with King Charles must, perforce, work itself out.

Had Honorius IV enjoyed anything beyond one of the shortest of papal reigns he might, however, really have achieved the aims of his peace-inspired diplomacy. For within nine months of his election the whole international situation altered very remarkably. Charles of Anjou had died and his successor, Charles II -- a feeble king indeed by comparison with his formidable father -- was a prisoner of war in Aragon; Philip III of France had met his tragic death at Perpignan, and the new king, Philip IV, had tacitly abandoned the crusade against Peter III; Peter III himself had also died, of his wounds (November 10, 1285), and had divided up his lands: [] Aragon and the new conquest, Sicily, were no longer united under the one ruler.

Honorius made good use of his opportunity in southern Italy. Taking over, as suzerain, the actual administration, he decreed a

general restoration of law and government such as these had been before the first Hohenstaufen kings had built there the centralised, despotic state that was a model of its kind. And the pope even began to show himself willing to negotiate with Aragon about Sicily. At the same time, in Germany, Honorius IV arranged to crown Rudolf of Habsburg as emperor, to set thereby a seal upon Gregory X's restoration of the Empire. Since Rudolf had refused to join the crusade against Aragon, and had protested against German church revenues being used for it, this great gesture would fix firmly before the mind of the time the papal determination not to be the tool of French ambitions.

But Honorius IV was already in his seventy-seventh year, and long before the date appointed for the coronation (2 February, 1288) he was dead (13 April, 1287); his diplomacy had scarcely begun to put the new situation to good use. With Honorius there disappeared the last authentic representative of the skilful diplomatic tradition that went back to Innocent III, the tradition in which the popes had managed the rival chiefs of the *respublica christiana* while yet contriving never themselves to descend into the arena of inter-state competition, and always to give to their action the authentic note of an intervention from outside all conflict. Martin IV had dealt that tradition a terrible blow; his immediate successor had not been given the time to repair it; now would follow two long weakening vacancies of the Holy See [] and two weak pontificates; and when, ten years after the death of Honorius IV, there would come once more a strong pope, moved to remould his universe after the best thirteenth century tradition, the moment had gone by. Nor was that strong pope, Boniface VIII, gifted with the wholly impersonal zeal, and detachment from all but the good cause, which had been the essence of the success he so needed to renew.

The best papal interpretation of the pope's role as chief of the *respublica christiana* called for action that never passed beyond diplomatic practice backed by sanctions that were spiritual. But in a world where every temporal thing could be regarded as help or hindrance to spiritual well-being, and where, by universal consent, the temporal was subordinate in excellence to the spiritual, it had only been a matter of time before the temporal -- blessed and consecrated for the purpose -- was, in a score of ways, pressed into the service of the spiritual. With Gregory IX (1227-1241) and Innocent IV (1243- 1254) especially, [] the Holy

See's use of such temporal things as armies, fleets, systems of taxation, banking and loans, had expanded enormously; its whole conception of its own authority and jurisdiction over temporal affairs had expanded too. By the time of Martin IV and Honorius IV the papacy had become a kind of supranational European kingship, and to quote as a description, if not justification, of their authority the text of Jeremias about planting and uprooting [] was now a commonplace of the *stylus curiae*. So long as the papal policies were victorious, what criticism there was of these new developments remained, for the most part, underground. But the succession of disasters in the reigns of these two last popes was an opportunity the critics could not resist. All over Italy the Ghibelline tradition was flourishing anew after a generation of eclipse; and alongside it there flourished a lively revival of the spiritual teachings associated with the great name of Joachim of Fiore. []

The Incarnation and the Passion of Our Lord were not, according to this new evangel, the high point of the divine mercy to man, and the foundation of all that would follow. The reign of Christ was but a preparation for a more perfect dispensation, the reign of the Holy Ghost. This was now about to begin. There would no longer be a church; the pope would joyfully resign his power to a new order of contemplatives; the active life would cease, and all Christendom become a vast monastery of contemplatives, vowed to absolute poverty; the law of spiritual effort would cease and, the Holy Ghost being poured out in a new and perfect effusion of gifts and graces, the law of spiritual joy would reign unhindered. Pope, cardinals, hierarchy, systematic theology, canon law -- these would not only disappear but their very presence and survival were, at this moment, hindrances that delayed the coming of the new age. The first duty of the faithful soul, then, was to abandon them, to abandon the reign of Christ, to leave the bark of Peter for the bark of John, and so prepare the way for the coming reign of the Holy Ghost. []

These theories are destructive, evidently, of all that Catholicism has ever claimed to be, and destructive also of the whole civilisation which, then, was very evidently bound up with traditional Catholicism. For many years, however, the theories had found enthusiastic support in one section of the great order of mendicant preachers, vowed to live in poverty, that was the

great legacy to the Church of St. Francis of Assisi. To those elements in the order who had looked askance at the new detailed regulations called for by the very expansion of the order, and to those who fought the introduction of systematic theological study for the preachers, and to all those -- and they exist in every generation -- who had joined the brethren to satisfy and achieve their own spiritual ideals (and after their own way) these anarchical doctrines were most welcome. Already, in 1257, the pope had had to intervene to save the order from developments that would have dissolved it into a chaos of spiritual factions. Under the general then elected to govern it -- St. Bonaventure [] -- who was maintained in office for seventeen years, unity was slowly and peacefully restored and the "Joachimite" tendencies disappeared. But they had never been destroyed. Always there had been friars who remained attached to them, and the tradition of devotion to them had been carefully handed down through thirty years in more than one convent of Languedoc and central Italy. The obvious preoccupation of the popes during all this time with the paraphernalia of courts and governments was fuel on which the fire of these "Spirituals" fed greedily. For years they watched these developments and denounced them. In the present disasters to the causes favoured by the Holy See, they saw the manifest chastisement of God's hand, proof that their own theories were true, and the best of all encouragement to press on the attack and destroy the present church.

The "Spirituals" possessed at this time (1287) a leader of great intellectual power, personal charm, and known austerity of life, Peter John Olivi. He was still a young man, [] and had been a pupil at Paris of Peckham and of Matthew of Acquasparta, the two greatest of St. Bonaventure's own pupils. Olivi was an unusually complex kind of Franciscan, for he was an "intellectual," a scholastic philosopher and theologian indeed of very high power, a "Spiritual" also, and, lastly, a subtle commentator of the gospel according to Abbot Joachim. From a very early age he was regarded as a force in his order; Nicholas III had consulted him when the great decretal *Exiit Qui Seminavit* was in preparation. And then, four years later, in 1282, at the General Chapter of his order at Strasburg, Olivi was accused of teaching false doctrine. His Franciscan judges condemned several of his philosophical and theological theories and Olivi accepted their verdict, under protest that the Holy See had not

condemned them. For four years thereafter he was under a cloud, but now, in 1287, his old master, Matthew of Acquasparta, had been elected Minister General, and Olivi was given a lectorship in the great Franciscan school of Santa Croce at Florence. One result of this promotion was a great revival of "Spiritual" ideals in Tuscany.

Still more important to the Spiritual movement than Olivi's personality was, seemingly, the sympathy professed for these friars by one of the leading figures of the curia, the Cardinal James Colonna. He was the lifelong friend and confidant of the pope, Honorius IV, and his contact with the Franciscan Spirituals came through his affection for his very remarkable sister, herself a Franciscan nun of the strict observance and known to us as Blessed Margaret Colonna.

All the old controversies about the real meaning of the rule of St. Francis now revived. Were the "Spirituals" the only real Franciscans? Had the pope any right to lay down rules which -- so the "Spirituals" maintained -- contradicted the will of St. Francis? And with these controversies, and the controversies and fantasies about Abbot Joachim's theories, there went a medley of speculation, preached and rhymed about everywhere, as to the approaching end of the world, the coming of antichrist, the manner of man he would be, and where he was to be looked for. A great internal crisis was evidently threatening. Unusual wisdom, and sanctity too, would be needed in the popes if these restless elements were to be converted to a re-acceptance of the traditional way to perfection, namely dependence on the supernatural forces which the Church of Christ was founded to dispense. Toxins long latent -- whatever their origin -- in the mystical body were increasingly active in the blood stream. How could they best be rendered harmless, and the members they affected be made healthy?

It was against this background of threatening chaos and revolt that the cardinals debated the election of a successor to Honorius IV. After eleven months they came to a choice, the cardinal Jerome of Ascoli, Pope Nicholas IV: the new pope was a Franciscan.

But Jerome of Ascoli's election promised little to such of his brethren as were tainted with the apocalyptic theories of Abbot

Joachim. The new pope had indeed, for a generation, been a leading influence in Franciscan life, but not in the circles where Olivi was a master. After a brilliant early career, as teacher in the University of Paris and administrator, Jerome had been sent to Constantinople in 1272 as the envoy of Gregory X, charged with the delicate business of bringing the Greeks to take part in the forthcoming General Council. At Lyons he had appeared with the Byzantine ambassadors as a kind of liaison officer and when, during the council, St. Bonaventure, now a cardinal, resigned his charge as Minister-General of the Franciscans, Jerome of Ascoli had been unanimously elected in his place (20 May, 1274). Very suddenly, only seven weeks later, the saint died, and from that time onward Jerome had been the determining force of orthodox development within the order. It was he who, as Minister-General, had summoned Olivi to deliver up certain of his manuscripts and on reading them had ordered them to be burnt for the harmful theories they contained. Another friar to feel the weight of his severity was Roger Bacon who also, amongst other things, showed a passionate credulity about the Joachimite prophecies. It was, seemingly, by Jerome of Ascoli's orders that this now aged Franciscan suffered his last monastic condemnation and imprisonment.

Nicholas III (1277-1280) had made use of Jerome as a diplomatist and, in 1278, had given him the red hat. The new cardinal had, at the pope's command, retained for a time the general direction of the order and he had been the chief influence in the promulgation of Nicholas' great decretal *Exiit Qui Seminavit* (14 August, 1279) which gave an authoritative decision about the real meaning of the Franciscan ideal of religious poverty, in the hope of ending finally the long disputes of fifty years. The next pope, Martin IV, made him cardinal-bishop of Palestrina, the city that was the chief centre of the Colonna influence; and from now on Jerome of Ascoli gave himself to the care of his diocese. History knows little more of him, in fact, until his unanimous election as pope eight years later.

The death of his predecessor, Honorius IV, in April 1287, had not, of course, halted the war or the wartime diplomacy. The long conclave which followed was a golden opportunity for all parties to develop new positions and advantages. The most striking success had fallen to the King of Aragon. It was his especial good fortune that he still held prisoner Charles II of

Sicily, and the special opportunity for exploiting this was the proffered mediation of the English king. Edward I (1272- 1307). If Charles II -- religious, conscientious, timorous -- is the one lamb-like figure in all this long contest, our own Edward I, caught between the rival duplicities of the Aragonese king and Philip the Fair of France, [] shows an inability to appreciate the realities of the case which, in another, might also be taken for lamb-like innocence of the ways of wolves. Time and again Edward's political anxieties made him the tool of the astute Alfonso and so, ultimately, destroyed all belief in the bona fides of his arbitration and played the French king's game, giving the pope whatever justification he needed for favouring France rather than England.

The first fruit of England's intervention was the Treaty of Oloron (25 July, 1287). Aragon consented to release the captive Charles II -- who had already renounced his rights to Sicily -- on the hard conditions of an immense money payment, the surrender of sixty-three noble hostages (among them his three eldest sons), and the pledge to negotiate a peace between the two Aragonese kings [] on the one hand, and the chiefs of the Franco-Papal alliance on the other, within three years: should a peace satisfactory to Aragon not be concluded King Charles was to return to his captivity or surrender his lands in Provence. The Papal legates, present at the conference, allowed the treaty to be signed without any protest. It was a quasi- surrender of all that the popes had been fighting for in the last five years.

The King of France, however, refused the offer of a truce, refused the hostages a safe conduct through his territory, refused all facilities for the payment of the indemnity. The college of cardinals, also, showed themselves hostile to the treaty, and when, seven months after it was signed, they elected Nicholas IV, one of the pope's first actions was to quash and annul it absolutely, to cite the King of Aragon to appear at Rome within six months for judgment, and to order Edward I to negotiate the liberation of King Charles on terms that the Holy See could accept (15 March, 1288).

[genealogy page 39] Louis VIII + Blanche of Castile => Charles of Anjou K. of Sicily 1266-1285 & St. Louis IX 1226-1270 St. Louis IX 1226-1270 + Margaret of Provence => Philip III 1270-1285

James I of Aragon => Isabella & Peter III Philip III + Isabella => Philip the Fair 1285-1314 Peter III => Alfonso III & James II

NB. Margaret, the wife of St. Louis, was also largely Spanish by blood

The vigour of the papal reply was promising. It was followed up by the negotiation, under papal auspices, of a treaty between France and Castile (13 July, 1288) in which the two kings pledged themselves to a new attack on Aragon in alliance with the Holy See, and, after some delay from the pope, by new concessions to Philip IV of Church revenues to finance the offensive (25 September, 1288). The Ghibellines had been too active throughout the summer for the pope to be able to maintain his first independent attitude to France. Pisa had opened its harbours to the fleet of de Loria. At Arezzo the bishop had gone over to the same cause. At Perugia there were like activities, and at Rome itself the city was preparing to welcome the anti-papal forces as it had welcomed Conradin twenty years earlier. The pope was at the end of his funds. The only way to wring a loan out of the French was by more concessions.

Meanwhile Edward I had renewed his diplomatic work with the Aragonese and, for total result, he had achieved a treaty [] still more favourable to Aragon than the treaty the pope had annulled. But the English king had, this time, made himself responsible for the indemnity and the hostages, and Charles II had at last been set free.

A sad dilemma awaited him, for the pledged negotiator of peace walked into a world of friends determined on war in his support. The pope ordered him peremptorily to resume the style and title of King of Sicily. The King of France refused to listen to his argument, and sent him on to Rome with a protective escort of French knights. The pope, knowing now that France was really behind him, felt stronger than ever before. He excommunicated the Ghibelline bishops of Pisa and Perugia, and ordered the King of Aragon to give back the money paid over in accordance with the new treaty; also to surrender the hostages and to come to Rome by October 1 (7 April, 1289). Whereupon the Ghibellines in Rome rose, and after bloody street fighting drove out the pope. He fled to Rieti, forty miles to the northeast of Rome, on the very frontier of King Charles' realm and, undismayed by this

local defeat, on Whit Sunday (May 29) in the cathedral there, he crowned Charles as King of Sicily with all possible pomp. Just a fortnight later the Florentine victory of Campaldino (11 June) broke the Ghibellines of central Italy. Success, it would seem, had justified Nicholas IV's bold initiative. This was the high-water mark of his reign. The full flood of papal favours was loosed for the King of France, praise for his devotion in resuming the task taken up by his father in 1285, still more financial concessions (to be wrung in specie from the clergy of France), the preaching once more of the holy war against Aragon.

In reality it was the French who had triumphed; and this aspects of events was by no means lost upon the chief hindrance to their domination in western European politics, Edward I. The King of England was necessarily interested in Franco-Spanish relations because he was Duke of Aquitaine. The fact that he was also, as Duke of Aquitaine, the vassal of the French king made his interest -- and above all his present intervention as mediator -- highly unwelcome to the French, an irritant that came near indeed to being a casus belli. Philip the Fair had not been able to prevent the arbitration, but the award had been so patently anti-French and anti-papal that it had crashed almost of itself.

Edward now approached his problem from a wholly different angle. To divert the pope from the approaching offensive against Aragon, he proposed a new expedition to the Holy Land. He had, months before this, taken the cross and sworn his crusader's oath (December 1288) and now he besought Nicholas IV to rally all the princes of Christendom and to fix a date for the armies to set forth. No demand, publicly made by a special embassy, could have been more embarrassing, at the moment, for the pope. But, as if to prove him right in his preoccupation with the problem of Sicily, de Loria chose this moment to land a Sicilian army on the Italian coast not ten miles from the papal frontier and to lay siege to Gaeta (June- July 1289).

Edward was, for the moment, most effectively answered; and a Neapolitan army moved out to besiege in turn the Sicilian army besieging Naples. And now came two astonishing reversals for the Franco-Papal plans. First a terrible thunderbolt from the East, the news that the Sultan of Egypt had suddenly moved on Tripoli, the second greatest stronghold still in Christian hands,

and had taken it. To the English ambassadors' demand that, in the interest of the Holy Places, they should be allowed to negotiate a peace or a truce between the armies around Gaeta the pope could not now say no. And then Charles II -- just as his son Charles Martel had the Sicilians at the point of surrender -- took command of his army, not, however, to fight but to reinforce the pleas of the English. In the conferences which followed he renewed to de Loria his old renunciation of all claims on Sicily, barely three months after the pope had solemnly crowned him as its king. But Charles II was now well away from the pope, and had outdistanced the legates sent to watch his conduct of the negotiations. By the time they arrived de Loria was celebrating his triumph.

All this was a great defeat for the pope, for the new treaty set free the Sicilian fleet to aid the Aragonese. The chances of a successful war against Aragon had suddenly shrunk, with Naples out of the war and de Loria set free to repeat the feats of 1285. With the aid of Charles II the papal diplomacy turned to consider how most easily to make peace with Aragon. The plan finally decided on was ingenious. Charles of Valois, titular King of Aragon since Pope Martin IV's grant in 1285, to enforce whose right the popes had been waging this holy war, would surrender his claims. Alfonso of Aragon -- styled by the popes a usurper, but the actual sovereign, descendant and heir of the long line of Aragonese kings -- would, in return for this recognition, surrender all rights and claims to Sicily. Finally, Charles of Valois, as compensation for surrendering his rights to Aragon, would receive in marriage a daughter of Charles II of Naples who would bring him as dowry her father's hereditary lands of Anjou and Maine. Charles II was willing. It only remained to win the consent of Alfonso, and of Philip IV of France; and in the first months of the new year (1290) an embassy especially strong in personnel left Italy for France. The legates were the two cardinals who had been sent to Gaeta, Gerard of Parma, cardinal bishop of Tusculum, and Benedict Gaetani, the future pope Boniface VIII.

It was now, at all costs, most important that the brother kings of Aragon and Sicily should realise that the King of France actively supported the pope's plan. No one understood this more clearly than the king and, yet once again, he prepared to turn to the permanent advancement of the royal power in France the pope's

present need of his support. Philip the Fair's opportunity lay in a dispute that had, for some time now, been raging in France between different bishops and the royal officials.

It was, once more, the bitterly fought question -- never finally decided with any finality in these centuries when all Europe was Catholic -- of the power of the king over ecclesiastics in temporal matters, and the question of the power in temporals of ecclesiastical lords over their vassals; but the conflict was, this time, to prove the greatest opportunity so far given to a new force in the public life of Christendom, to the lay jurist trained in the law of ancient Rome, the man whose political ideal was to create anew, in the person of the medieval king, the emperor of Roman legal theory.

It has already been noted [] how one very important feature of the reform of Christian life associated with St. Gregory VII (1073-1085), a turning point in the history of civilisation, was his care to recover, by learned researches, the half-forgotten tradition of the ancient Church law. The development, from these ancient sources, of the new scientific canon law, which, by the time of Boniface VIII, was an almost essential instrument of Church government, was contemporary with a great revival of the study of the law of ancient Rome, as this is set out in the corpus of law books published and imposed by the authority of the Emperor Justinian (527-565). [] How the two systems developed side by side, each influencing the other, so that from the schools of Bologna in the twelfth century came the first great canonists and the first great civilians too, is one of the commonplaces of medieval history. [] One, most important, result of this renaissance of legal study was the civilians' discovery and development of the Roman conception of sovereignty, as Justinian's books set this forth.

The authority of the ruler, in the early Middle Ages, over his subject who was a free man was considered to derive from a personal relation between the two. It was a relation symbolised in the act of homage, by which the vassal swore to be true to his lord, and by which the lord was considered bound to protect the vassal. What authority over the subject thence accrued to the lord was limited by known and mutually acknowledged conventions. Nor could the lord, rightfully, extend that authority outside the acknowledged field -- say in the matter of exacting

financial aids -- without the previous consent of the inferior.

But the civilian legist discovered in the Roman Law an authority that was a different kind of thing altogether -- the res publica, public authority. For the Roman jurist sees not only the thousand, or the million, men living together under the rule of the one prince, but, as a thing distinct from any of them, or all of them, he sees also their collectivity, a something superior to them all, and for the sake of which, and in the name of which, they are ruled -- the State (if we may, by many centuries, anticipate the modern term). It is this res publica that is the real lord: and even the emperor is its servant, even when he is using those extraordinary, final, absolute, sovereign rights that are the very substance of his imperium.

As the centuries go by, the delegation of X or Y to be emperor, and so to wield lawfully these sovereign powers, becomes but a memory, a formality; and then less than that, until, long before the time of Justinian, the emperor has become indeed, what a medieval jurist describes him, *lex animata in terris*. The State is already a postulate of political order, to which all else is subject; from which all rights derive; owing its authority to none, but itself the source of whatever authority there is; and now the emperor has become the State incarnate. Nowhere do restrictions limit him that derive from any contract with his subjects. Whether he make new laws, or impose new burdens, his right is, of its nature, not subject to their discussion. []

That the splendour of this sovereign omnipotence -- impersonal, imprescriptible, indivisible, inalienable -- dazzled those on whom it first shone forth from the long neglected texts of the ancient Roman jurists, is understandable. And for a time they all clung faithfully to the primitive faith that, upon this earth, there could be but one such source of rights. Princes might be many, but there could only be one incarnation of such sovereignty as this. To the one emperor all other kings must then, in some way, by the nature of the case, be subject.

But gradually, during the thirteenth century, legists in lands where the new emperors of these later times -- the anointed chiefs of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation -- possessed not a title of real authority, in the bitterly anti-imperial city states of northern Italy, for example, and in France,

developed an accommodation of the theory of sovereignty, that would make, say, the power of the King of France over the French the same kind of splendid, impersonal, all-powerful sovereignty. The new maxim began to have legal force that all kings were emperors, in respect of their own subjects; [] and of them too was Justinian's dictum held to be true that the prince's decision has force of law. [] No sovereign prince needs to seek assent or confirmation, from any source, in order that his will may truly bind his subjects.

There are many more implications -- of very great importance for the history of the legal, political, and social development of medieval Europe -- in these principles as they are now being developed. But the interest of these developments for this chapter is in a type of mind which they produced, the mind of the lay jurist who was now to win the Catholic prince's first victory over the papacy and always, henceforward, to fight the princes' battles against the claims of the Church. [] These developments produced, also, the new "climate" in which, more and more, the fight was from now on to be waged. Against the "common good" which the theologians preached as the criterion of just laws, the legist would now set his own criterion of the "public welfare"; and it would be roundly stated that, given so good a system of law, theology ceased to be necessary for jurists. []

This new conception of royal authority which the study of Roman Law began to produce, would, in the end, alter the whole relationship between king and subject. It also threatened to alter the whole relationship between king and pope. [] Whatever its importance, helpful or harmful, for the civil life of a nation, it is yet, by its very nature, a conception inimical to such an institution as the Catholic religion. From its first appearance, therefore, it is an idea which the popes never cease to fight; and the papal preoccupation with this struggle is, henceforward, a main topic of Church history in every century; for no theory about the nature of their power is more welcome to ruling princes than this that their rights are absolute, once the ingenuity of the jurists has really adapted it to their use.

The reign of Philip the Fair is the time when the jurisdiction of the French monarchy makes its first notable advances on the jurisdiction of the vassal lord's courts, advances based on a

principle of political theory -- that all institutions in the kingdom are subject to the king's jurisdiction -- and the campaign is conducted systematically by the professional, civilian, jurists in the king's service. When such advances met the jurisdiction of a lord who was an ecclesiastic they encountered opposition that was due, not to something merely local, but to the Canon Law, to a reality more universal even than the king's jurisdiction, a system of law that was likewise based on principle. There had been, in recent years, fights of more than usual importance on this matter between the royal officials and the bishops of Chartres and Poitiers. When, in the late autumn of 1289, after the Truce of Gaeta, the King of France took up again the question of subsidies for the war, he pressed for a settlement of these dangerous disputes about the rival jurisdictions. If the pope wished for effective aid from France he must not hinder the king's plans to preserve the monarchy and keep the nation united. Philip the Fair is using the pope's extremity to strengthen his position at the expense of ecclesiastical immunities that are centuries old. He twice, within three months, sent to the pope a formidable list of his grievances against the clergy and signified to him that these complaints came in the name of "the counts, barons, universities and communes of the realm." [] It is not merely the king, the pope is warned, but the whole nation that demands a settlement favourable to France.

Also, it appeared, Philip was disturbed at the pope's apparent partiality for England. In England, too, the last few years had seen trouble between the king and the Church on similar matters of jurisdiction, but the English king had managed to enforce his will without unfavourable comment from Rome. Moreover, in this very summer when Edward's intervention had, at Gaeta, for a third time in two years, cut across the papal policy, Nicholas had appointed one of Edward's subjects and chaplains, Berard de Got, to be Archbishop of Lyons. Here there was indeed a powder-mine, and under the circumstances the nomination was, on the pope's part, an incredibly imprudent move. For Lyons, on the very borders of France, was nevertheless a free city within the jurisdiction of the emperor, and the sovereign in Lyons itself was the archbishop with his chapter. Of late, the Emperor, Rudolf of Habsburg, had shown a new kind of interest in the affairs of these Burgundian lands, and at Besancon he had intervened with an army. Never had it been so important for France that the Archbishop of Lyons should be friendly; and the

pope's nomination of Berard de Got gave Philip the opportunity of claiming to be himself the sovereign of Lyons, and of stating, under a new set of circumstances, the case he was already building up in the disputes at Chartres and Poitiers. That royal case went to the very heart of things, the fundamental relation between pope and king, between Church and State; and it is a foreshadowing of the great storm which, in another ten years, was to rock to its very base the good relations between the two. The king's advisers make no secret that their aim is a strong, centralised, singly- governed state, nor of their enthusiasm for this ideal. And, something never before heard of in France, they now flatly deny that the pope has any jurisdiction in temporal matters outside the lands granted him by Constantine. For the king, they declare, within his own realm is sovereign everywhere. Here indeed was grave matter, threats veiled perhaps, but threats without a doubt, and from the papacy's sole effective supporter in its struggle with Aragon and Sicily; threats of such a kind that, by comparison, the revolt of Sicily was but a trifle.

Nicholas IV's first reply to Philip was to increase his favours; and in order to prove how impartial past severities on the question of jurisdiction had been, a special embassy was sent to England to lecture Edward I on his shortcomings and bid him make himself more pleasing to God in this matter before offering himself as God's champion in the Holy Land. But this did not suffice. Philip the Fair returned to the matter with a further list of grievances and stiffened his terms to Charles II very considerably. Little wonder then that Nicholas IV, stirred mightily, sent his two best diplomatists and legists to France, nor that they were absent on their mission for a good twelve months.

The French king agreed to the arrangement proposed for the reconciliation of Aragon. [] At Tarascon, in the following April, Alfonso III too, after some hesitation, accepted the pope's offer, pledging himself to come to Rome and make his submission.

Between the dates of the two political negotiations, the legates had settled with Philip the Fair the dispute about ecclesiastical jurisdiction, after more than one stormy scene with the clergy in a national synod that sat at St. Genevieve in Paris for fourteen days in the November of 1290. A royal ordonnance announced

the terms of the agreement. The king's contention that he was, for all his lay subjects, supreme in matters of temporal jurisdiction was accepted; and clerics who no longer lived a clerical life were recognised to be subject to him as though they were laymen. .

On the other hand the king expressly reprov'd, and condemned as excesses, certain procedures of his officials that cut across the exercise of the bishops' jurisdiction in temporals. The old immunity of the clergy from lay jurisdiction, outside cases that concerned fiefs as fiefs, was confirmed, and also their traditional immunity from lay taxation. It was a treaty where compromises seemed equal or. both sides, fair and reasonable. But the concessions made by the king are, too often, qualified by captious clauses, and the rights recognised to the clergy are set out in language that is vague. There is nowhere mention of any penalty for the king's officials should they return to their old practices; and the important question who shall decide and how, if king and clergy disagree about the meaning of the pact, is left without any means of solution.

For the moment, however, all seemed well, and with a year of busy and apparently successful diplomacy behind them the legates returned to Rome (February 1291). The King of France had been reconciled with the pope and was making ready for the new, and no doubt final, assault on the Aragonese usurper in Sicily. The King of Aragon had abandoned his brother to his fate, and was preparing his own submission and the reconciliation of his kingdom with the Church.

And then, once again, came news from the East that wrecked in an instant all that the pope may have thought he had achieved. (On May 18, 1291, the Sultan of Egypt captured Acre, after a three-weeks' siege; the last stronghold the Christians possessed in the Holy Land had fallen, the most luxurious and civilised city of the Christian world. []

Close upon this catastrophe came another unexpected blow. The King of Aragon died, on June 18. His successor was his next eldest brother, the King of Sicily, late so skilfully isolated from all help from the Spanish homeland. Sicily and Aragon had now a single ruler. And finally, to complete the tale of losses, within another month the papacy's one disinterested supporter

in Germany was dead, the Emperor Rudolf (15 July). Nicholas IV had treated him shamefully enough. He had put off the promised coronation, at the very time when he was preparing to crown Charles of Naples, the tool of Rudolf's rival, Philip the Fair; and he had intervened in Hungary to annul Rudolf's grant of the kingdom to his son Albert, preferring to the German yet another French prince, Charles Martel, the King of Naples' younger son. [] Rudolf had nevertheless remained loyal to the role of peace-bringer assigned him by Gregory X in the restoration of the empire. Now he was gone, and in a Germany which ignored the pope rival candidates battled for the succession.

By the summer of 1291 the whole policy of Nicholas IV lay in ruins, and from all the malcontents of Italy a great sound of reprobation arose. Ghibellines, "Joachimites" and the dyscoli among the Franciscans all joined in a single cry. The true cause of the loss of the Holy Land was the pope's preoccupation with the war against Sicily; not the Aragonese kings but the Sultan was the pope's real enemy. What these critics, as bitter and as vociferous as they professed to be pious, did not know was that the Aragonese kings had been well informed about the Sultan's expedition before ever it marched. More, they had helped him to prepare it, for they were his secret allies, [] sworn to recognise whatever "conquests, castles, fortresses, countries and provinces God should allow the Sultan and his sons to make in Syria, Laodicea and Tripoli." The Aragonese kings had also pledged themselves to disclose to the Sultan any plans made between the pope, the Christian princes or the Mongols for a renewal of the Crusade. Should the pope, or any Christian prince or religious order, attack the Sultan they were pledged to make war on him, and they bound themselves, finally, not to give any aid to the Christian forces in the Holy Land should the Sultan declare that these had committed any breach of the truce arranged at the time of the capture of Tripoli (1289). In return, the Sultan had guaranteed to the brother kings Sicily, the Balearic Isles and whatever conquests they might make from the French. The ink was still fresh on this infamous transaction while Alfonso was negotiating with the legates of Nicholas IV the pact of Tarascon, and pledging his dutiful submission to the pope. And now his successor, the new sovereign of the united kingdoms, James II, had the pope but known it, was the pledged and devoted ally of the Turk: as his father, the hero of the Sicilian Vespers, had been before him, in that very enterprise.

[genealogy page 49] LOUIS VIII 1223-1226 => St. LOUIS IX => Philip III 1270-1285 => Philip the Fair => 1285-1314 Philip III 1270-1285 => Charles of Valois K. of Aragon (by Martin IV, 1284)

LOUIS VIII 1223-1226 => Charles of Anjou K. of Sicily (by Clement IV, 1226) => Charles II => Charles Martel K. Of Hungary (by Nicholas IV, 1289)

But Nicholas IV, ignorant of this supreme treachery, rose manfully to the task of rallying Christian Europe to the needed new assault on Islam. A council was summoned to devise plans and gather resources; a provisional date was fixed when the expedition would sail, March 1293; ambassadors were despatched to negotiate a peace between the great maritime states of Venice and Genoa, to Byzantium also, and to the Mongols, to knit together an alliance on a Dew grand scale.

Among the first to give a wholehearted adhesion was Edward I of England. But from France came a cold and cautious refusal. Philip the Fair was bidden to take the cross, or make over to those who would the crusade moneys which already, for years now, had been accumulating in France, and to consider a marriage between his sister and Edward I which, healing the new antagonism, would be the basis of the new holy war. But the French king noted how the new King of Aragon, reversing the policy of a generation, had made peace with Castile -- an anti-French peace; and he saw a strong movement in Germany to elect an anti-French emperor in succession to Rudolf. Once more Philip took up his old policy towards Rome, playing now through the Florentine bankers on the pope's fears and needs. He promised nothing about the coming crusade, but instead demanded a new crusade against Aragon and the concession of yet more tithes to finance it.

Nicholas IV gave him the only answer possible. The disaster in the Holy Land had changed the whole situation. Palestine must now be every Christian's first care. All else must wait until the council met and made its decisions (13 December, 1291). And yet, even in this extremity, the pope did not dare to show himself over-generous in reply to Edward I's offer of service. The English envoys also were told they must await the council's decisions and meanwhile the pope repeated his list of

grievances against the king (12, 18 February, 1 March, 1292).

The time for the council was now drawing near and gradually there began to come in to Rome the opinions of the various provincial councils, summoned by the pope's order to sound the sentiments of Christendom. More than one of them, especially of course in France, supported Philip's schemes. The Sicilian question should first be resolved by the expulsion of the Aragonese; an emperor should be elected who would be favourable to France. What would have been the opinion and projects of the Church as a whole we shall never know, for the General Council never met. On Good Friday, 1292 (4 April), suddenly, unexpectedly, Nicholas IV died: and in this great crisis of Christian history the cardinals left the Holy See vacant for two and a quarter years.

The death of the pope brought the whole crusade movement to a standstill. Whatever the latent enthusiasm of the general body of the Christian people, the pope was the only sovereign really anxious about the disaster; and once it became evident that the twelve cardinals [] would be unable to make a speedy election, the various princes turned their attention to questions nearer home.

The real centre of interest for the Christian princes was the activities of Philip the Fair. The moment was now at last come when the long antagonism between France and England must break into open war. The diplomatic duels of the last few years in which each had fought the other, over Aragon, over Sicily, over the affairs of the Empire and the middle states of the Lotharingian lands had, naturally, sharpened tempers on both sides. But this long fight had been, after all, secondary; a mere struggle for position preliminary to a definite settlement about two most important matters where interests vital both to France and to England were violently opposed. These matters were the clash of jurisdiction in the immense territories of France where Edward I ruled as Duke of Aquitaine, Philip the Fair's vassal; and next the war of semi-legalised piracy between the mercantile fleets of both kings that had gone on now for some years.

It is doubtful whether, by the year 1293, any human power could have averted the coming conflict. Certainly none but the pope could have delayed it any longer; the continuing vacancy of the

Holy See made war inevitable.

Both sides looked round for allies and made settlements with their other foes. Philip the Fair now completely reversed his policy towards Aragon. In a war against England he could not afford to be simultaneously at war with a power whose fleet was master of the western Mediterranean, and he made peace with James of Aragon; [] at the same time he patched up some of his differences with princes on his eastern border.

Moreover he intervened to create a French party in Rome. He found ready support in the Colonna -- that clan of Roman nobles who, for centuries now, had played a leading part in the politics of the papal state, lords of a score of towns and fortresses in the mountain country between Rome and Naples, [] and masters thereby of the communications between Rome and the South; wealthy, ambitious and turbulent. Their present head was that James Colonna whom we have already seen as the patron of the Franciscan spirituals, a cardinal since the time of Nicholas III. In the late pope's reign he had been all powerful, and Nicholas IV, amongst other favours to the family, had created a second Colonna cardinal, Peter, the elder man's nephew. John Colonna, the older cardinal's brother had, in the same pontificate, ruled Rome for a time as senator.

James Colonna was, at this moment, one of six cardinals who remained in Rome, divided against their colleagues who had fled to Rieti from the plague, and divided still more bitterly among themselves into equal groups of pro-Colonna and pro- Orsini. The Colonna were the more powerful and had recently driven out the Orsini and it was to the Colonna cardinals that the French diplomacy now addressed itself, with offers of lands (September 1293).

In return the Colonna cardinals prepared to elect the kind of pope France wanted, and first they notified the absent majority of the Sacred College that they -- the three who alone had remained in Rome -- were the only real electors and that within a certain date they proposed to elect a pope. But this manoeuvre failed completely. All the train of canonists, Roman and foreign, whom the day to day business of the curia drew to Rome, was now at Rieti with the majority of the cardinals. The Colonna manifesto was put to them as a case in law. Unanimously they

rejected the claim, and by five votes to two the Rieti cardinals made the decision their own, and fixed the coming feast of St. Luke (18 October, 1293) for the opening day of the conclave, the cardinals to assemble at Perugia. The Colonna had lost the first move, and the appointed day found them reunited with their colleagues at Perugia.

The election, however, still continued to drag, and the factions remained deadlocked for yet another ten months. In March 1294, the King of Naples paid the conclave a state visit. Beyond the fact that he was allotted a seat among the cardinal-deacons, and that he had a lively altercation with one of them, Benedict Gaetani, we know nothing of what he accomplished. In the papal state Orvieto was now at war with Bolsena; the Romans had overturned the government of their city, and called in as senator one of the last surviving officials of the Ghibelline regime of thirty years before. Affairs had gone from bad to worse and seemed about to touch the worst itself, when, in the first week of July, the news arrived that the cardinals had elected a pope.

For the task of reconstructing the badly-damaged fabric of Christendom they had chosen an old man of eighty-five, Peter of Murrone, a hermit who, for many years now, had lived in the inaccessible solitudes of the Abruzzi. The newly elected had begun life as a Benedictine monk. After governing his monastery for a year as abbot, he had sought leave to live as a hermit. Soon the spiritual want of the peasantry around forced him into new activity as a kind of wandering preacher, and he became to this mountainous countryside very much what St. Francis had been, fifty years earlier, to Umbria. Disciples gathered round him and presently Peter had founded a new religious order which followed a way of life based on the rule of St. Benedict. And next, once the various houses of the order were established, the founder had given up his place in it, and had gone back to the life of solitude that had been his ideal throughout. What brought him to the notice of the cardinals in July 1294, was a letter one of them had received from him, violently denouncing their incapacity to provide the Church with a head, and threatening them all with the wrath of God unless they found a pope within four months. The indignation of the letter seems to have been due to a meeting with the King of Naples (whose subject Peter was) after Charles II's fruitless visit to the cardinals at Perugia; the king had explained to the hermit

what an immensity of harm the long vacancy had wrought. The effect of the letter was instantaneous. That same day the cardinals chose Peter for pope (July 5, 1294).

Their choice, of course, struck the popular imagination immediately, as it has held it ever since. And yet the brief reign of Peter di Murrone was, as might have been expected, little short of disastrous. No one, in the end, realised this more clearly than Peter himself. There was only one way out of the situation, and being a saint he took it, abdicating his high office as simply as he had accepted it.

Peter was not enthroned as pope -- and did not assume his papal name, Celestine V -- until August 29, nine weeks after his election. The interval was filled with the beginnings of the great scandal that marked the reign, the acts by which the King of Naples laid hold on the whole machinery of church government, while the eleven cardinals -- still at Perugia, still divided -- could think of nothing more helpful than to beg the man they had elected to leave Neapolitan territory for his own Papal State, and to refuse all his demands that they leave the Papal State and come to him at Aquila.

While this deadlock endured (July-August) the Neapolitans and some of the cardinals, and a host of adventurers, clerical and lay, made the most of their splendid opportunity. The basis of this was, of course, the new pope's utter and absolute inexperience of anything beyond the guidance of a small community of peasant monks, his excessively delicate conscience, his simple belief in the goodness of man, and his never-ending desire to put all his authority and power into the hands of others while he retired to solitude and prayer. "His entire and dangerous simplicity" one chronicler of the time remarks as a cause of troubles, while another writes of his unawareness of frauds and of that human trickery in which courtiers excel. [] In these brief weeks the papacy fell into the most complete servitude which, perhaps, it has ever endured; and it did so with the pope's entire good will, utterly unaware as he was of the consequences of his acts.

The King of Naples was at Celestine's side almost as soon as the official messengers sent with the news of his election. Two high officials of the Neapolitan kingdom -- laymen both -- were

given key posts in the administration of the universal church; another subject of King Charles was put in command of the papal armies; and a fourth, who as Archbishop of Benevento had already betrayed Celestine's predecessor, was given the highest post in the curia after the pope. Next the king suggested to Celestine that the number of cardinals was dangerously small -- there were but ten of them. Celestine agreed to create more, and accepted a list of twelve, all proposed by Charles. Five were Frenchmen, like the king himself. Of the others, six were clerics very much at Charles's service (and all Neapolitans) -- one of them the chancellor of the kingdom -- while the seventh was really promoted in order that the king's son, Louis, [] could be given the vacated see of Lyons. Thus was the number of cardinals more than doubled in a day, and a permanent majority secured for Neapolitan interests.

The king's next move was to persuade the pope to leave the little town of Aquila, that had been the scene of these unusual events, for Naples, his capital. This proposal was strongly opposed by the cardinal Benedict Gaetani who, after holding aloof long after the others, had now joined Celestine. But the king's will prevailed and Celestine, with Charles alone beside him, and carefully segregated from the independent cardinals, set out for Naples. The journey saw still more surrenders to the king. He was freed from the oath he had sworn not to detain the cardinals on Neapolitan territory should Celestine chance to die; the Archbishop of Benevento was created a cardinal, privately and without any ceremony, or notification to the rest of the Sacred College; and the important law of Nicholas III that forbade any sovereign prince to accept the office of Roman Senator was repealed. Also, as the pope passed by Monte Cassino, he changed the rule (substituting that of his own order) and appointed one of his own monks as abbot.

Meanwhile, the papal resources had been shamefully exploited for the private profit of all who could get at the machinery; appointments, pensions, grants of land, of jurisdiction, of dispensations fell in showers. The pope was even induced to set his signature to blank bulls, which the recipient filled up as he chose.

And now the King of Naples overreached himself. It had been a lifelong practice with Celestine to pass the whole of Lent and of

Advent in absolute solitude and prayer, making ready for the great feasts of Easter and Our Lord's Nativity. Towards the end of November 1294, as Celestine began to speak of his coming retreat, the king suggested to him that, for the conduct of church affairs during these four weeks, it would be well to name a commission of three cardinals with full power to act in his name. Celestine agreed, but a cardinal (not one of the three) came across this extraordinary document as it awaited a final accrediting formality. He urged upon the pope that here was something beyond his powers. The Church, he said, could not have three husbands. And with this, Celestine's scruples began to master him. Quite evidently he was not the man for the office; ought he not to give it up? and after days of prayer and consultation with friends and with the canonists, he finally resolved the two questions that tormented his conscience. Could the lawfully-elected pope lawfully resign the office? How ought this to be done? The first point Celestine appears to have decided for himself on the general principles of resignation to be found in the manuals of Canon Law. The cardinals whom he consulted agreed that his view of the law was correct. In the delicate technical question about the best way to carry out his plan, Celestine had the expert assistance of Gerard Bianchi, cardinal-bishop of Sabina, and of Benedict Gaetani. Finally, he issued a bull declaring the pope's right to resign and then, in accordance with this, before the assembly of the cardinals, he gave up his great office, laying aside his mitre, his sandals and his ring (December 13, 1294).

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



4. BONIFACE VIII, 1294-1303

Celestine V had renewed the law of the conclave. [] This excellent measure brought it about that the vacancy was soon filled, for the election was over in a single day. At the first ballot Matteo Orsini was elected. He refused the office. The second ballot was inconclusive. At the third, the cardinals chose Benedict Gaetani, December 24, 1294. He took the name Boniface VIII.

Not the least of the difficulties that awaited whoever succeeded Celestine was the primary duty of neutralising the harm produced by the scandalous exploitation of the hermit pope's inexperience. And whatever the personal character and disposition of that successor, it would be only too easy to distort, for the generality of men, his restoration of the ordinary routine of a pope's life after the idyllic episode of Celestine -- the pope who rode upon an ass to Aquila for his coronation, and who had lived in a hut of rough planking set up in the splendid hall of the royal palace at Naples.

Boniface VIII was not the man to be turned, for a moment, from his obvious duty by any such anxieties as these. Indeed -- and this is one of the weaknesses in his character -- it is doubtful if they would occur to him as causes for anxiety. He had a first-rate intelligence, highly trained, and a first-hand acquaintance with every aspect of the complex problem before him, and with most of the leading personalities whom any attempt to solve it must involve. His own speciality was Law, and as a papal jurist Boniface was to close, not unworthily, the great series of popes that began with Alexander III, just over a hundred years before him. He was himself the nephew of Alexander IV, and was thereby kin to the great Conti family whence had also come Innocent III and Gregory IX. For many years the various popes had made use of him in diplomatic missions, and one of these, in 1268, had brought him, in the suite of Cardinal Ottoboni, [] to the London of Henry III, in the turbulent years that followed the Barons' War. The French pope, Martin IV, had created him a cardinal, and Boniface, in the Sacred College, seems to have been what, as pope, he described himself, always a strong friend to the interests of France and of Charles of Anjou. Certainly in

his great mission to France in 1290 -- the peak of his diplomatic career -- he had not given signs of anything like a militant independence of the lay power as such. Indeed he had been all that was tactful and conciliatory towards Philip the Fair. In the conclave at Perugia he had shown himself amused and sceptical about the move to elect Celestine V, [] and for some time had kept aloof from the regime which followed. When finally he had rejoined his colleagues it had been to watch, somewhat disgusted, the uncontrolled plunder of rights and property that was the order of the day, and then, with his firm advice -- once this was asked -- to point the only way out of the scandal.

The nine-years reign of Boniface VIII was to be one of the most momentous in all Church history; it is, indeed, generally regarded as marking the end of an epoch, and the beginning of the new age when the popes and religion gradually cease to be taken into account as factors in the public life of the Christian nations. And from its very beginning the reign was one long crisis for the pope -- a crisis which, for by far the greater part, was not of his making and which arose from the convergence, brought about by a master adversary, of forces which had plagued the Holy See for years. The chronic problem of the Sicilian revolt; the active Ghibellinism of central and northern Italy; the anti-papal hostility among the Spiritual Franciscans; the determination of the French to maintain and increase their hold upon the Holy See; the renaissance of the wild theories associated with the prophecies of Abbot Joachim; the prevailing talk about the speedy coming of anti-Christ -- these were elements of trouble for which Boniface VIII was in no way responsible. Nor were the new elements his invention; the carefully fostered rumours, for example, that he was not lawfully elected, the jealous hatred of the Colonna cardinals, the libel that he was a heretic (this derived from Charles II's anger at his influence with Celestine and was heard from the very outset of his reign), the associated libel that he had first procured the invalid resignation of Celestine and then his murder -- all these elements were rapidly combined and used in the business of making the pope a tool of French policy.

On the other hand, Benedict Gaetani continued to be his old, violent self, too well aware of his own splendid talent, of the great successes of his public career. He was jealous of his authority, impatient of contradiction, his self-control easily

shaken by evidences of malevolent opposition, of treachery, of blackmail -- and these were all to come in plenty. As a cardinal he had had the opportunity of improving his family's fortunes, [] and he had used it to build up a really considerable feudal lordship in the countryside whence he came, the Lepini mountains and the valley of the Sacco, the neighbourhood of Anagni and Segni. He had not succeeded without making bitter enemies of those he had managed to dispossess. From among them the great clan of the Colonna, whose rivalry he had thereby challenged, would one day recruit willing assistants for the great raid on Anagni that brought the pope's life to an end. It had been a great career for thirty years or so, and it had brought Boniface many, many enemies. He knew well the general duty that lay before him, to deliver the Holy See from the toils in which the events of the last twenty-five years had enmeshed it. Once free of these it would resume its natural place, and lead Christendom as in the great days of Urban II, of Alexander III and Innocent III.

The new pope was confident, and a new strong tone would be evident from his first acts, but there would not be anywhere that reality of strength which only comes from new, generously conceived solutions; from solutions devised by the rare mind which, at a turning point of history, has divined that the actions of men in a long-drawn crisis have ceased to be merely the fruit of political expediency, and that they are now the signs and proof of fundamental change in their whole view of life. It was to be the pope's greatest misfortune -- and the misfortune of religion -- that he remained unaware of the nature of what was now happening, and hence had no more resource with which to meet a real revolution of the spirit than those political and legal combinations in which his genius excelled. The time needed a saint who was also a political genius: it was given no more than an extremely competent, experienced official. []

The new pope, immediately, so acted as to prove the freedom of his see from all royal influence. He solemnly rebuked and degraded the senior cardinal who had been Charles II's first and principal instrument in the enslavement of Peter of Murrone; he instantly (as requested by Celestine) [] revoked all dispensations, grants, appointments, pensions, exemptions, incorporations, the whole mass, indeed, of what were now described as *varia minus digne inordinata et insolita*, made by his predecessor; also all promissory grants of benefices made

since the death of Nicholas IV, Celestine's predecessor; he suspended all bishops and archbishops nominated by Celestine without the advice of the cardinals; he dismissed the laymen whom Celestine had appointed to curial posts; he dismissed from his household all the officials and chaplains appointed under Celestine; and he ordered the papal court to leave for Rome, forbidding any official business to be transacted as from Naples, or any letters to be issued until he had been crowned in Rome and had established the curia there in manifest independence. It was the height of the winter for that fearful journey over the mountains, the last days of the old year, but Boniface forced the pace, and Charles II was forced to accompany the caravan: the king, this time, in the suite of the pope. On January 23, 1295, Boniface was crowned, with all possible pomp, as though to drive home the lesson that the Church by no means refuses, in its mission, to make use of that world it is appointed to save by ruling it.

The first task was to bring together the kings of France and England, now furiously at war. For his legate to France Boniface chose his one-time adversary, the cardinal Simon de Beaulieu. It was misplaced generosity. Simon's rancour had survived, and his mission to the court of Philip the Fair (May 1295) was one starting-point of the schismatical manoeuvres that were the French king's most ingenious instrument to lever the pope into submission. Cardinal Simon laid bare to the French all the weaknesses in the pope's position: the discontent of some of the cardinals at this would-be Innocent III's ambition for his own family, the theories that he was not lawfully elected, the possibilities of the Colonna coming out in opposition to him, the latent menace of the innumerable followers of Abbot Joachim; in brief, the welcome news that at Rome all the material for a control of the pope lay to hand for whoever could organise it. Philip's response was to despatch to Rome the Prior of Chezy, to sound the disaffected and weld them into a party.

While the Prior of Chezy was busy at Rome undermining the new pope's position, reports and complaints were beginning to come in from France of taxes levied on the clergy without their consent, and of sequestration of Church property when payment was not made. The war with England had already drained the meagre resources of the crown, and knowing well the uselessness of asking Rome to grant Church moneys for a

merely national war against another Christian prince, Philip the Fair defied immemorial custom, and his own pledge given in 1290, and imposed one tax after another upon Church properties. The like necessity was, at this very time, forcing Edward I of England to adopt similar measures, and the English king also was meeting with opposition from the clergy. [] The bishops of France, indeed, made no protest, but from the clergy and the religious orders bitter complaints now went to Rome that evil counsellors were misleading the king, but "no royal judgment," it was urged, "can destroy canonical rights." The bishops were showing themselves dumb dogs that had forgotten how to bark, and "no one any longer dares freely to defend the Church against the powers of this world." Will not the pope come to their aid?

As in England and in France, so also was it in Italy, and the petition from France found Boniface already considering the problem. His interest was not lessened by a new turn of events in Sicily, [] and the certainty of an active renewal of the war and therefore of the Holy See's needing all the ecclesiastical revenues it could gather in.

To levy taxes on all the inhabitants of a country has been, for generations now, one of the most obvious rights of all states; and taxation is a permanent feature of public life everywhere. There is never a time when every citizen is not paying taxes regularly, and as a matter of course, to the government of his country. It is only with an effort that we can realise that this is a comparatively recent institution, that for our ancestors the normal thing was that governments paid their way without need of such permanent assistance from the general body of the people, and that taxes were only lawfully levied when some extraordinary crisis -- a just war, for example -- arose. Moreover, taxes were the outward sign of servitude. Nobles were in many cases immune from them; so too were the clergy. A new theory of taxation was indeed beginning to be heard at this very time, namely that equity demands that all shall contribute to the cost of what profited all []. But, as yet, this was a new and novel idea. the pope only followed the then classic opinion that related taxes to servitude when, in answer to the complaints of the clergy of France and elsewhere, he published his new law. This is the bull *Clericis Laicos* (February 24, 1296). It is written in challenging confident style, without any attempt to argue the

reasonableness of the now violated clerical immunity, or to make allowance for the possibility that this was at times abused. The laity -- so it opens -- it is well known, have always hated the clergy. Here is a new proof of this, in the extraordinary new financial oppression of the Church. So the pope, to protect the Church against royal rapacity, enacts the new law. Unless the Holy See had authorised the king to levy it no cleric must pay any state tax levied on church revenues or property. Those who pay such unlawful taxes are to be punished by suspension and, if they are bishops, by being deposed. Rulers who levy such taxes without leave of the pope, are to be excommunicated and their kingdoms placed under interdict. []

The law appears all the more severe when it is studied through the storm of conflict which it provoked. But there is every reason to think that the opposition was a surprise to Boniface, and that nothing gave him more genuine and painful surprise than that the opposition came from Philip the Fair. It was a general law, and Boniface had not in mind a particular attack on any prince -- least of all on the King of France. For what now occupied the pope, almost to the exclusion of all else, was the war in Sicily. No prince was at this moment more necessary to him than Philip, and throughout the following months favours continued to descend upon the French king from Rome, while the papal diplomacy was active in restraining the emperor from joining in the French war as Edward I's ally.

Nor did Philip the Fair, for months, give any sign of displeasure at the bull. He first learned of the bull when the Archbishop of Narbonne begged not to be pressed for taxes due, since a new law made by the pope forbade him to pay them (April 1296). The king was in no condition to begin a campaign against Boniface; the war with England was going against him. So, for the moment, he merely noted the fact and was content not to force the archbishop to pay. Later on, in that same year, he came to an arrangement with the emperor which saved him any need of papal protection on his eastern frontier and he now began to work upon the French bishops to petition the pope to withdraw the bull. The king's anger was such, they wrote to Rome, that the most terrible things would happen to the Church in France if he were not appeased.

And then (August 17, 1296) as part of the emergency regulations

called for by the war, Philip did something that touched the pope vitally. This was to enact a law forbidding the export of munitions of war, horses, gold and foreign exchange, and expelling all the foreign bankers from France. This was done at the very moment when certain funds belonging to the Holy See, but actually in France, were about to be transferred to Spain, to pay the expenses of the King of Aragon's at last arranged visit to Rome. This, of course, was no ceremonial journey but a highly important move in the papal diplomacy. For the king was going to Rome in order to persuade, or force, his brother, the King of Sicily, to come to an arrangement with the pope. And much diplomacy, it may be understood, had had to be used to bring the King of Aragon to consent. Now, at this crucial moment -- and not without knowledge that the moment was crucial -- the King of France had given his answer to the pope's new law about clerical taxation. It is one of the oddest coincidences that so far was Boniface, even yet, from suspecting this enmity that, on the very day almost of Philip's edict, he wrote to France ordering the legate now to publish the bull. And he wrote on the same day the like instructions to the legate in England. The benevolence to France still continued. This last act was part of it. To publish the bull in France and in England, simultaneously, would be to cut off supplies from both the contending parties, and thereby end a war that was running against Philip. On the same day the pope wrote a third letter to support his pro-French intervention, to the emperor this time, warning him not to attack the French.

The whole action of Boniface during all these months does indeed prove "the confidence with which the alliance with France inspired him." [] His bitterness when the news of the French edict undeceived him was all the greater. It took shape in the letter *Ineffabilis Amoris*, [] a menacing if fatherly lecture addressed to the king, telling him that *Clericis Laicos* is a law which Philip, as a good Catholic, must obey. How foolish of him to choose such a moment as this to quarrel with Rome, when everywhere in Europe the French are hated ! The pope is the king's one friend. Let him dismiss his evil counsellors, the real authors of that aggressive policy that has antagonised all the Christian princes. Will he now, in a final blunder, force the pope to become their ally, or make the Holy See his principal enemy? Let him disregard the lie that the pope's new law is meant to forbid the clergy to help the state in its necessities. This was not

ever the pope's meaning, as the pope has already made clear to the king's ambassadors.

This letter was known in France by the November, and in the next two weeks two very noteworthy commentaries on it began to circulate, the Dialogue between a Knight and a Clergyman and the tract which begins Antequam essent clerici. Both were anti-papal, shrewdly conceived, [] well written, the work of the lay scholars in the king's entourage. To make his reply to the pope, Philip sent to Rome once more the Prior of Chezy; part of that "reply" was to work up the Colonna and "soften" the pope's defences in preparation for a new French aggression.

The winter months of 1296-7 were, in fact, a critical time for Boniface. The King of Naples -- a principal ally in the Sicilian business -- had taken up the case which the Colonna were preparing. These last were not the only cardinals dissatisfied with the pope's Italian policy, and the great rival of the Colonna, Napoleone Orsini, was hoping, through the King of Naples, to persuade Philip the Fair to undertake the salvation of the Church from the pope ! Then the King of Aragon's visit was a failure. He agreed to the plans proposed, but his ideas about the money that would be needed seemed to Boniface astronomical. The pope had not anything like such sums -- unless he could recover his money from France and also what the Cistercians and Templars (also in France) were willing to give.

And then gradually, slowly, the pope began to yield to the King of France. A new letter went to Philip [] that was a milder version of the Ineffabilis Amoris and still more explicit in its statement that Boniface had in no way meant to control the king's right to take all necessary measures for the safety of the realm. But Philip should be more careful and precise in the terms of his edicts, lest he chance to infringe on the rights of others. The lines of the compromise are already evident, the formula to be devised to save face on both sides when both return to the status quo ante. A second, private, letter of the same date promised Philip a continuance of the old favours, and new ones also. The cause of Louis IX's canonisation was now complete -- the ceremony would be a pleasant ending to the contest. And a third bull, Romana Mater, also of the same date, practically suspended the Clericis Laicos so far as it concerned France. The principle of that bull, indeed, remained untouched;

but a system of general exceptions to the law was announced. Its most important feature was that it was now left to the king to define what was a national necessity, and so a lawful occasion for imposing taxes on the Church without consulting the Holy See.

At the same time the legates in France were notified that, should Philip not allow the transfer of the pope's moneys out of France for the Sicilian war, they were publicly to declare him excommunicated. Boniface had not, by any means, wholly surrendered. And he gave signs of this in another, public, declaration only a few weeks later. This was a letter to the bishops of France allowing them to vote subsidies from Church moneys to the king, now in the first crisis of the revolt of Flanders. The pope is lavish in expressions of sympathy for France. He is most willing that the bishops should aid the king, and he gladly allows them to do so. But it is evident, from the letter, that the pope interprets the petition from France as an acceptance of the principle behind the Clericis Laicos, the right of the Holy See to decide whether church revenues shall be used to aid the state.

The French king was, however, very far from any such surrender as this and, as if to show it, he now worked upon the University of Paris to debate the question, already so much canvassed wherever Boniface had enemies in Italy, whether a pope could lawfully resign; and to publish its decision that he could not do so. As Celestine V was dead it followed that there was now no pope, and this declaration from what was the most influential centre of Christian learning, was an immense encouragement to the various enemies of Boniface.

The chief of these were, by now, the Colonna, and the pope's policy of checking them by increasing the power of his own kinsfolk drove the Colonna, in May 1297, to open rebellion. One of the clan attacked a convoy and captured papal treasure en route for Rome. The pope gave the cardinals of the family four days in which to restore the money, to surrender all the family fortresses and submit themselves. They ignored the command and were thereupon deposed from their rank. Whereupon, a day later, from their stronghold of Longhezza, they issued a manifesto denouncing the crimes of "Benedict Gaetani who styles himself the Roman Pontiff". Celestine V had no power to

resign, they declared, and the election of Boniface was no election; a council must meet to put things right, and meanwhile the pope should be considered as suspended from his office. To this they added the accusation that Boniface had murdered his predecessor.

The pope was by no means to be intimidated. He excommunicated the whole faction of the Colonna as schismatic, and made a solemn declaration of the validity of his own election which, for three years nearly, the Colonna cardinals (who had voted for him) had fully and freely recognised. This was a telling blow; and it gained force when all the other cardinals set their signatures to a special statement which told the story of the conclave that elected Boniface, and declared that they wholly concurred in the excommunication of the rebels. The answer of the Colonna was to appeal to their allies in the University of Paris (15 June). Again they demanded a General Council, and denounced Boniface as a man whose sole aim was to amass a fortune. Bishops everywhere, they said, were appointed for a price, and the idea behind this centralisation of power was a hierarchy so dependent on Boniface that they would not dare to question his legitimacy.

It was with Italian affairs in this critical state that Philip the Fair now sent to the pope a mission headed by the chief of his professional lay counsellors, the legist Pierre Flotte. The Colonna had appealed to Philip to keep the promises of support made through the Prior of Chezy and now, on his way to Orvieto, Flotte assured them that his business there was to denounce the pope's crimes and solemnly publish the appeal to the General Council that should judge him: in which, as will be seen, Flotte lied -- but successfully, for, because of his assurance, the Colonna remained in the field and, prolonging the crisis, secured for the French that atmosphere of anxiety and alarm at the papal court in which they could best wring from Boniface the new concessions they had in mind.

In the diplomatic duel now engaged, the Frenchman, from the beginning, had the upper hand. For Boniface was in a weak position; the Colonna were still active and evidently confident, the French possibly willing to aid them, and, what was infinitely more serious, threatening to support a movement that denied him to be pope at all, and so initiate a schism. The danger here

was deadly, and under the threat of it the pope gave in at point after point. The surrender was set out in a series of bulls -- sixteen in all. It amounted to a wholesale withdrawal of Clericis Laicos, a very serious modification of the clergy's immunity from arrest and trial in the king's courts, and grants of church money; and a well-timed threat of excommunication to the King of Aragon should he fail in his word to France. "In exchange for the imaginary document which had kept the Colonna in rebellion and Boniface in a crisis of anxiety, the ambition of Philip had won immensely important advantages, positions for future development." [] From now on, for the best part of four years, Boniface VIII would be no longer the independent chief of Christendom but "an obliging agent for the schemes of Philip the Fair". [] It was at the conclusion of these negotiations, and as a final gesture of good will to Philip, that the pope published the already decided canonisation of the king's grandfather, Louis IX. Through what a world of revolution had not French -- and papal -- policy passed since the saint's death, twenty-seven years before.

The history of the three years that followed the pope's capitulation at Orvieto to Pierre Flotte, makes the least pleasant reading of the reign. During the rest of that summer of 1297, and the autumn, the war continued to go well for the French in Gascony, in Brittany and in Flanders; while Edward had to face a new leader in Scotland, William Wallace, to suffer defeat from him and then find his own barons resolutely opposed to the whole war policy. It was as one result of a constitutional crisis at home that Edward, in the closing weeks of the year, sought a truce, and when it was made a condition that he should agree with Philip to submit the whole difference to the pope's arbitration he gladly agreed (18 February, 1298).

The French king knew well what he was about, and that he could count on having the pope, by the time the peace talks began, in such a position that France would control the decision. The months that had seen the French position grow so strong while Edward's so weakened, saw Boniface VIII ever more feeble in face of the Colonna rebels and Sicily. The rebels still flouted his demands for unconditional surrender, and with the aid of such brilliant lampoonists as Jacopone da Todi they kept up a very successful anti-papal propaganda among the many friends of the Franciscan Spirituals, the visionaries, and the Ghibelline

politicians of the towns. When they proposed a league with the King of Sicily, the pope was at the end of all his resources. His only hope lay in the Kings of Naples and Aragon; these would not move without a certainty of money supplies, and Boniface was all but bankrupt.

As a last alternative to surrendering to rebels and schismatics Boniface now proclaimed a crusade against the Colonna (27 November, 1297). To fight against them was as good an action -- and as munificently rewarded in spiritual favours -- as to travel to Jerusalem and fight the Turk. Everywhere legates were sent out to preach the crusade and to gather in alms. But response was slow, and the pope's anxiety had hardly lessened when, towards the end of March 1298, the Flemings and the English came into Rome for the arbitration.

The French followed some weeks later, and from the moment they arrived they had it all their own way. First they refused to take for arbitrator the pope as such: he must judge the case as Benedict Gaetani merely. And the pope agreed to this. Then they hinted to the pope that the English and the Flemings stood to them as the Colonna stood to Boniface -- they were rebellious feudatories. And Boniface, only a few weeks ago so grateful to the Flemings for their wholehearted support, now deserted them. And when the Flemings consulted their English allies-pledged not to make terms without them -- these advised them heartily to accept whatever the pope had in store for them. The English indeed had not much more to expect. The arbitrator's sentence was published on June 30, 1298. It carefully refrained from any decisions on the matters that had caused the war; it established a peace between the two kings, to be confirmed by a double marriage, and it provided for a mutual restoration of captured goods; the territorial questions were postponed. The whole decision had been inspired by one thing only, the pope's desire to please the King of France.

The papal arbitration of 1298 seems a singular mockery of the high claim to supervise the affairs of princes in the interests of justice. It marks the very nadir of the international action of the medieval papacy. But the same months which saw Benedict Gaetani so lend himself to the French king's game, were also those in which Boniface VIII, in the tradition of the greatest of the canonist popes, promulgated a great measure of law reform,

completing and bringing up to date the first official code published in 1234 by Gregory IX.

The sixty years since that great event had seen the two General Councils of Lyons, both of them notable for a mass of new legislation. They had seen the reigns of a dozen popes, among them Innocent IV, "the greatest lawyer that ever sat upon the chair of St. Peter", [] and Clement IV, one of the great jurists of his day. Boniface himself was no unworthy successor to such popes in professional competence as a lawyer. A host of new laws had been made, some to meet special emergencies, others for permanent needs. Until some official collection and arrangement was made of all this mass the law must, in very many matters, remain doubtful and uncertain. Nowhere was the harm of this state of things better understood than at Bologna, the university which was, for Law, what Paris was for Theology. Boniface was no sooner crowned than Bologna besought him to remedy the disorder.

The pope immediately set himself to the task in masterly professional fashion. Four canonists [] were named and given extensive powers to review the whole mass of legislation since 1234, to suppress what was temporary or superfluous, to resolve contradictions, to abridge, to modify, to correct and to make whatever additions were needed to make the law's meaning clear beyond doubt. Their work was not to be incorporated in the five existing books of Gregory IX's arrangement; but to form a separate, sixth book of decretals -- hence its name, the Sext. In its own framework the Sext -- in its divisions and subdivisions, and in the headings for all these -- is a replica of Gregory IX's book. Thus the Sext is first divided into five "books", each corresponding to and bearing the same name as the several books of the larger collection. In each "book" of the new work, in the same order and under the same headings, are the chapters (capita) which represent the laws of the intervening sixty years. In all the Sext contains 359 chapters arranged under 76 titles, the greater part of these new laws (251) taken from the decretals of Boniface himself. As an appendix there are the Regulae iuris, 88 in number. The commission took three years to complete its task, and on March 3, 1298, it was officially despatched to Bologna, with the bull promulgating it, as law for the schools and for the courts. This, and this alone, of the legislation enacted between 1234 and 1294 was henceforth

law. In its opening words the bull declares once more the traditional divinely-given primacy of the Roman See over the whole Church of Christ, and it does so with that easy serenity that never deserts the bishops of that see whenever they refer to this fundamental truth: *Sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae quam imperscrutabilis divinae providentiae altitudo universis, dispositione incommutabili, praetulit ecclesiis, et totius orbis praecipuum obtinere voluit magistratum regimini praesidentes.* . . . [] it also makes an unmistakable reference to the pope's claim to be really, on earth, King of Kings.

At last the tide of war began to turn in Boniface's favour. In October (1298) the Colonna lost their last stronghold, their own "home-town" of Palestrina, to the papal army. And then the rebels gave themselves up. The two cardinals appeared before the pope; kneeling before him, they abjured their wicked manifesto of Longhezza, and acknowledged him as the lawful pope. "Father I have sinned against heaven and before thee," said the older cardinal to Boniface, "I am not now worthy to be called thy son."

It was at Rieti that Boniface received their submission, and he was still resident there when the famous earthquakes of Advent Sunday, 1298, shook the little town to its foundations, and set the whole population in flight to the fields and hills around. The pope had been about to begin a solemn pontifical mass, surrounded by all his court, when the shock occurred. He seems to have behaved with the coolness which all stories of him indicate as a leading characteristic and, with the impatience that was no less characteristic, he snubbed the suggestion of a pious cleric standing by, that perhaps this was the beginning of the end of all.

There were, however, hundreds of pious folk for whom the earthquake was a special revelation of the divine opinion about Boniface and his policies. Rieti lay in a district where every valley had its hermitage of Franciscan Spirituals. Not so far away was Greccio, hallowed for all time by its memories of the great Christmas night when St. Francis set up there the first crib. Down to this time it had continued to be a chief centre of the Spiritual movement. There, for more than thirty years, almost to the time of Boniface's election, had been the refuge of John of Parma, the great Spiritual who had been general of the order

until St. Bonaventure displaced him (1257), and who, at the very end of his life, [] barely ten years ago, had been summoned out of his retirement to advise the cardinal James Colonna. In no part of Italy was there more pious resentment against Boniface, and the coincidence that the pope was sojourning in the midst of it when a thing so unheard of as the earthquake happened, was the clear judgment of God on the surrender of the protectors of the Spirituals to the false pope who had persecuted these holy men.

To the Spirituals Boniface was no pope at all, for he had been elected in the lifetime of the last lawful pope, and the only pope to befriend their movement, Celestine V: and, his succession to Celestine apart, the party had known Boniface for years as a leading enemy. The election of Celestine had, in fact, followed very closely upon the return to Italy of a group of leading Spirituals, allowed by a rare Minister-General of the order who favoured the party to go as missionaries to Armenia. They presented themselves to the hermit pope, explained that they were the only true followers of St. Francis, that they desired only to live according to his rule and spirit (which they alone interpreted faithfully) and to be freed from persecution by the Franciscans now living a bogus Franciscan life according to a caricature of his rule. Celestine saw in them nothing more than men whose way of life recalled his own ideal. He seems not to have realised that, impliedly, to accept this version of the complicated disputes was to call in doubt a whole chapter of his predecessors' legislation; nor to have been aware of the heretical, Joachimite, strain that affected the whole of the Spiritual movement. Without any investigation, or qualifications, he accepted their story and allowed them to form themselves into a new order with Peter of Macerata at its head. They would, however, not be called Friars Minor but "The poor Hermits of Celestine V". []

Never had the hopes of this exalte revolutionary party been so high as at this pontifical decision. Peter of Macerata marked well how it could be interpreted when he changed now his religious name and called himself Fra Liberato. From all parts the zealots flocked in to join his order. And it was, seemingly, the realisation what an immense service Celestine had unwittingly rendered to the prestige of the heretical fantasies of these poor fanatics, that brought Benedict Gaetani to abandon his isolation at Perugia

and join the pope at Aquila in the September of 1294.

For Benedict Gaetani knew all that was to be known about the great Franciscan question. He was an expert authority on all its phases since the time when, in 1279, Nicholas III had called him to take part in the long discussions out of which came the bull *Exiit qui Seminatus* that gave an authoritative ruling about the Franciscan way of life; it was Benedict Gaetani, indeed, who had written the text of that famous decretal. In those weeks during which Nicholas III and his experts, and the leading Franciscans, had set aside all other business to find a solution for these troubles, the future Boniface VIII learned what he never thenceforward forgot, the invariable tendency in those who clung to the Spirituals' interpretation of the Franciscan ideal to cling no less firmly to the mad theories of Joachim of Flora. []

It is not surprising that, once elected pope, he revoked Celestine's rash concession to the Spirituals, nor that he removed from his high office Raymond Gaufredi, the Minister-General of the Minorites who had favoured them, and imposed on the order a superior of his own choice who would resolutely track down these zealots. A last touch to this unpleasant work of correction was a bull [] that denounced the Spirituals as heretics and listed their several errors and offences. Henceforward it would be for the Inquisition to deal with them.

Nothing was, then, more natural than that the story of the earthquakes at Rieti, as the Spirituals interpreted it, should spread rapidly throughout Italy. The pope was soon threatened with a new crisis. [] His reaction was to set the Inquisition to work, and soon there was a steady exodus of the Spirituals towards the Adriatic coast and across the sea to Greece and to that church of Constantinople which Joachimite prophecy pointed out as the last refuge of true spirituality. One tiny group - - five men and thirteen women -- passing through Rome, and finding themselves conveniently in St. Peter's, elected one of their number pope.

There was one leading centre of this anarchic religiosity where for years the pope's writ had ceased to run, namely the island of Sicily; and one effect of this latest revival was to stiffen Boniface still further in his determination to expel the Aragonese and to re-establish normal relations with this most important fief of the

Holy See. The pope's latest ally, the King of Aragon, had for five months been vainly besieging his brother Frederick in Syracuse, and in his demands for money he outdid even Philip the Fair. Boniface, driven to the last extremity, had to put himself into the hands of the Florentine bankers and the Jews; and as he descended to these humiliations, his rage against the Colonna, to whose patronage he attributed the latest Franciscan ebullition, poisoned his judgment. They were still at Rieti, interned, with all the misery of an indeterminate fate hanging over them, and when the pope now (June 1299) ordered the total destruction of their town of Palestrina as a warning to all future time, and commanded the very site to be ploughed up and sown with salt, despair seized on the Colonna, and breaking out of prison, they fled across the frontiers, to be active centres of opposition as long as Boniface lived, and to nurse a revengeful hatred that would afflict his memory for many years after he was dead. The King of Aragon chose this moment to desert (1 September, 1299) and the pope's sole support now was Florence.

It was now that the complicated manoeuvres of papal and anti-papal factions in the Tuscan capital brought into conflict with Boniface the greatest man of all this generation, one of the world's supreme poets, Dante Alighieri. In his verse, Boniface was to live for ever, the object of undying hate as a man and as a ruler, and, then for his last broken hours, the object of Dante's pity as a symbol of that defeat of the spiritual by its own which is the eternal tragedy of the history of the Church. The great poem still lay in the distant future, but in this crisis of papal history Dante set his talents as scholastic and legist to a vigorous attack on that theory of the supremacy of the spiritual power in temporal affairs which had long been current in official ecclesiastical circles, the theory of which Boniface was about to show himself a most uncompromising exponent. []

While Pierre Flotte had been successfully exploiting his hold on the pope to the advantage of France abroad, he had used these same years of what we may perhaps call the pope's servitude to consolidate at home the royal victory over ecclesiastical jurisdiction. There was not any attempt to enact anti-clerical laws: the crude mistake of our own Henry II enforcing the Constitutions of Clarendon was carefully avoided. But the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the layman was

fettered as much as possible, hindered by every restraint which administrative genius could devise; and everywhere the lay lord was encouraged when he came into conflict with an episcopal suzerain. Soon there were bitter fights in many French sees. And Flotte was planning a new attempt to restore the Latin empire in the East, with a French prince reigning at Constantinople, with Venice and Genoa (reconciled at last and in alliance) supporting him. Italy too would be remodelled, after the plan accredited to Nicholas III, but this time with French princes on both the new thrones of Lombardy and Arles. It was to be a French dominated Christendom, of the kind Pierre Dubois was about to describe in his famous memorandum and, the pope playing his part, Tuscany and Florence would be added to the papal state.

The year which followed the pope's arbitration between the kings of France and England was hardly a time when Boniface VIII could flatter himself that it was principally his ideas and will that regulated the public life of Christendom. The year was to end, however, with a great demonstration of the role of the papacy in the interior life of its subjects, in the system of the believer's relations with God; a demonstration at once of the pope's understanding of his spiritual power and of the Church's faith in it and eagerness to see it exercised.

As the new year 1300 approached there was, to a very unusual degree, all that popular interest which greets the coming of a new century, the usual vague expectation of coming good fortune, but this time heightened -- no doubt very largely through the recent revival and popularisation of the prophecies of Abbot Joachim.

The numbers of the pilgrims bound for Rome began to increase, and when they arrived they showed themselves clamorous for the expected, extraordinary, spiritual favours. Once every hundred years, some of them were saying, by a special act of the divine mercy, not only were a contrite man's sins forgiven, but (upon appropriate penance done) the punishment his guilt deserved was also remitted. Boniface VIII does not, by any means, seem either to have created this spirit of expectation or to have exploited it at all in the service of his public policy. [] Apparently he did little more than fulfil what, spontaneously, Christian piety was expecting of the Roman See when, by the bull of February 22, 1300, he instituted the Holy Year of Jubilee.

It is, in effect, a grant "to all who, being truly penitent, and confessing their sins, shall reverently visit these Basilicas [of St. Peter and St. Paul] in the present year 1300. . . and in each succeeding hundredth year, not only a full and copious, but the most full pardon of all their sins." []

The news of the great concession brought pilgrims to Rome by the hundred thousand, and from every part of Christendom, as a mass of contemporary literature testifies; [] and this novel and unmistakable evidence of what the papacy's spiritual power meant to the Christian millions seems greatly to have affected Boniface VIII.

To the pope too, it has been argued, the Jubilee was a year of special graces. The spring of this Jubilee year saw a joint embassy to Boniface from Philip the Fair and the new emperor Albert of Habsburg, and it saw also an anti-papal revolution at Florence: events that were the occasion, and the opportunity, for a reawakening in Boniface of his natural spirit of independence. But the enthusiasm of the hundreds of thousands of pilgrims did more than put new heart into the pope now approaching his seventieth year. This concrete demonstration of universal faith in his supernatural office recalled to him in overwhelming force his first duty to be the father and shepherd of all Christian souls -- so it is argued. [] The whole burden of Benedict Gaetani's case against Celestine V had been that the pope was too weak to defend the Church's freedom against the princes. But what else had Boniface VIII done, for years now, but surrender to princes? []

At the audiences given now to the French ambassador, the pope made no secret of his suspicions of Flotte's designs. Tuscany, he declared, was the pope's by right. The very empire itself was the creation of the Holy See, "All the Empire's honour, pre-eminence, dignity, rights" being, as he wrote at this time to the Duke of Saxony, "derived from the liberality, the benevolence and gift of this see." As popes have set up, so they can tear down. Tuscany is a centre of discontent and hate, and so "for the honour of God, peace of Christendom, of the Church, of his vassals and subjects," the pope has determined to bring it once more under the rule of the Church. The authority of the apostolic see suffices for this. The Florentines were reminded of the same truths. The pope is the divinely appointed physician of all men's

souls and sinners must accept his prescriptions. To hold any other theory is folly, for any other theory would mean that there are those in this world whom no law binds, whose crimes may go unpunished and unchecked.

Full of this new strength, Boniface brushed aside now the attempt of the French ambassadors to bully him with tales of what his enemies were saying about his private life and his faith, and taking up the complaints that came in from France about the attacks on the jurisdiction of the bishops, he sent to the king the letter Recordare Rex Inclyte (July 18, 1300). [] This is a remonstrance after the style of the letter -- Ineffabilis Amoris -- which had so roused the king in 1296. Boniface, as though that storm -- and the defeat it brought -- had never been, now told the king roundly that his usurpation of jurisdiction was seriously sinful, and that God would surely punish him for it did he not amend. The pope had, indeed, shown himself patient, but he could not be dumb for ever. In the end he must, in conscience, punish the king if the wrongdoing continued; and the tale of that wrong -- doing is mounting up in the files. As for Philip's advisers, these are false prophets: it is from God's grace alone that his eternal salvation will come.

From the stand taken in this letter Boniface never retreated, though it was to bring him within an ace of violent death.

Philip was too busy with the last preparations for the conquest of Flanders to make any retort, but when Flotte went to Rome in the following November (1300), the atmosphere of the court was very different from what it had been at Orvieto three years earlier. "We hold both the swords," Boniface is reported as saying, and Flotte as replying, "Truly, Holy Father: but your swords are but a phrase, and ours a reality." But there was no break of relations, and the French sent Charles of Valois into Italy to help in the double task of subduing Florence and Sicily. What brought the break was Philip's arrest of the Bishop of Pamiers in the summer of 1301. Serious charges were of course made against the prelate; he was lodged in the common prison, then taken under guard to Paris to stand his trial before the king's court. But his innocence or guilt was a detail beside the real issue, the right of the king to try him, and the fact that the king could trample down with impunity the most sacred of all clerical rights in public law. There is no doubt that this was a

deliberately engineered cause celebre, whose success would mark a new era for the expanding royal jurisdiction, and greatly discredit the ecclesiastical world before the nation. [] And mixed up with the charges against the bishop there was a quarrel about the jurisdiction of the Inquisition, in which prominent Franciscan Spirituals attacked the Dominican inquisitors, and in which it was made very evident that in Languedoc the Albigensian movement was still a power under the surface of life. It is one of the several ways in which Philip the Fair recalls our own Henry VIII that now, while leading a life of blameless Catholic orthodoxy, he was secretly patronising and encouraging these heretics and rebels against the Church as an obvious move in the business of bringing pressure to bear on the pope.

Dom Leclercq, also, notes how "the analogy between the methods employed in the trials of Boniface, of the Bishop of Pamiers, of the Templars and of Guichard de Troyes, reveals a single manoeuvring mind at work. . . [features that] give a family likeness to a set of trials which, actually, are very individual things. Another trait in which they are alike is that, in all cases, it is difficult to bring legal proof that the charges are false. The crimes faked in Nogaret's imagination are all crimes done in secret." H.-L., VI, pt. i (1914), p. 578.

It was late October (1301) before the trial of the Bishop of Pamiers came on. It went well for the king until, in November, the Archbishop of Rheims made a strong, formal protest, in a Provincial Council, held at Compiègne, against the whole business of the bishop's arrest. The council, indeed, laid an interdict on all who, in contravention of the canon law, arrested a cleric. If a cleric so arrested should be transported to another diocese, the diocese in which he was arrested was "interdicted", and the domains of the authority responsible for the arrest. A certain amount of skilful juggling by the king's legists and the more subservient of the French bishops did indeed soon find a way through this law. But the moral effect of the declaration of Compiègne was very great, and nowhere was it more welcome than at Rome. It was indeed the first real check to the king from the French bishops for many years, the first unmistakable sign to the pope that there were bishops in France on whom he could rely.

But Boniface had not waited for this sign before taking the offensive. Flotte had written him a lying account of the trial, [] but it crossed a packet from the pope with a whole batch of strong, decisive letters for France. The revelations in the Pamiers case that the king was backing the Spirituals and the Albigenses, attacking the Inquisition, and that the mass of the French bishops were looking on indifferently at a most spectacular attack on the rights of their order, lifted the pope above the mere diplomatic game. From now on his action has the grave, apostolic quality of Hildebrand himself.

In these letters, written in the first week of December 1301, the pope demands that the Bishop of Pamiers be set free and allowed freely to make his way to Rome. [] He suspends all those privileges granted to Philip in the matter of clerical taxation and church property. [] He summons all the bishops of France to a council, to be held in Rome (in November 1302) where the whole question of the state of religion in France, and of the king's government of the country, will be examined; to this council the king is also invited, either to come in person or be represented there. [] Finally there is a letter, a confidential letter, for the king. This is the bull Ausculta Fili, 5 December, 1301, [] which as handled by the French, played a most important part in the events of the next eighteen months.

In many ways this letter hardly differs from the remonstrances which Boniface had already sent to the king. It tells him that his sins, as a Catholic ruler oppressing the rights of the Church, are notorious and a bad example to all Christendom. It lists these acts of usurpation and adds the crime of debasing the coinage. It again warns the king against his advisers, and points out that the whole of France is restive under their harsh, oppressive rule. The king cannot make the ministers an excuse for his sins: and the pope urges him to take part in the coming council. If he does not appear, its business will go forward without him. But all this somewhat familiar lecture acquires a new gravity from the opening passage of the letter, in which there is an extremely clear statement of the king's subject-status in relation to the pope, a statement in which we may read yet a further contribution to the controversy now engaged in which Dante, Pierre Dubois and the two great Augustinian theologians, Giles of Rome and James of Viterbo, are playing leading parts. The Church has but a single head, Boniface reminds the king, and

this head is divinely appointed as a shepherd for the whole flock of Christ. To suggest, then, that the King of France has no earthly superior, that he is not in any way subject to the pope is madness, is indeed, the prelude to infidelity. This doctrinal note is to appear again, and still more strikingly, in the controversy.

Ausculda Fili was not a manifesto nor a public state paper, but a confidential letter sent privately to the king: and therein lay Flotte's opportunity. The bull was no sooner read than destroyed, and a tendentious summary of it drawn up, to be the basis of a most effective, national, anti-papal campaign. This summary -- called Deum Time from its opening words -- Flotte first submitted to a conference of theologians and legists. It adapted the teaching and claims of the first part of Boniface's letter to cover power and jurisdiction in the temporal sphere. The pope is now skilfully made to appear as claiming to be, because pope, the king's feudal overlord; the pope's consent is needed, then, for the validity of all such acts as sub-infeudation, and all the grants made so far for centuries must be invalid; also the king, as vassal to the pope, is liable for aids to the pope in all his wars.

This preparatory work done, it now remained to ask the nation's opinion on the papal claim as thus stated. The setting for this was the famous church of Notre Dame in the capital where, on April 10, 1302, representatives of the clergy, the nobles and the towns came together in the presence of the king. Flotte made a great speech, in the king's name, expounding the thesis of Deum Time, adding that the pope's citing the king to appear before him at Rome was a sample of what all had now to expect, the crown of all those usurpations of the Church of Rome on the Church of France under which, for years now, true religion had been withering away. The King of France had no superior as a temporal ruler; he stood out as the real champion of religion. And Flotte ended with an appeal to the nation to support Philip.

In the debate which followed, the suggestion was made that Boniface was a heretic and the nobles set their seals to a letter which, ignoring the pope, recounted to the college of cardinals all the charges made against Boniface, to whom they only referred as "he who at the moment occupies the seat of government in the church"; and, an incendiary statement surely, they say that "never were such things thought of except in

connection with anti-Christ." Unanimously the laity pledged their support to the king.

The clergy were not so ready. They first asked for time to think it all over. It was refused them; they were told that opposition would only prove them the king's enemies. So they promised obedience to the king as vassals and asked leave to obey the pope, as they were bound, and to go to the Roman council. This also was refused them. And then they wrote to the pope, an anxious letter telling him that never had there been such a storm in France, never had the Church been in such danger, and begging the pope to abandon the plan for a council.

It was not until ten weeks later (24 June, 1302) that the delegates from the national assembly reached the pope with these letters. They were received in full consistory at Anagni, and two addresses were made to them, one by the Cardinal Matthew of Acquasparta and the other by the pope himself. The cardinal explained that the Ausculta Fili was the outcome of many weeks' deliberation between the pope and the cardinals, and he denied absolutely the interpretation put upon it in France. It was a purely pastoral act of the pope who makes no claim in it to be the king's superior judge in temporal matters but who, all men must allow, is the judge whether those whose office it is to exercise temporal power do so in accordance with morality or not.

The pope spoke most vigorously. He reprobated the chicanery which, evidently, had falsified for the public his message to Philip. He denounced Flotte by name as the real author of the mischief and with him Robert of Artois and the Count of St. Pol; they would, he prophesied, come to a bad end. Once again he gave warning that the French were hated everywhere; all Europe would rejoice when the hour of their defeat arrived. The king seemed not to realise it, but the facts were that he was on the brink of disaster. As for the council -- this to the clergy -- it must take place and, severely rebuking the cowardice of the bishops, the pope threatened the defaulters with deposition from their sees. []

The cardinals sent a written reply to the letter from the nobles and in it they severely reproved their neglect to give the pope his proper style, and their reference to him by "an unwonted and

insolent circumlocution".

Drama was never lacking at any stage of this long-drawn-out controversy, but now it touched the heights. While all France was being rallied to the support of the king against the pope, the French invasion of Flanders had begun. Philip had now to meet, however, not merely the feudal levies of his rebellious vassal the Count, but the enraged craftsmen of the towns. And before the envoys to Boniface had returned with the news of the pope's lurid warnings, barely a fortnight after the scene in the consistory, the French army suffered one of the greatest defeats Or its history, outside the walls of Courtrai, at the hands of Peter de Koninck and his weavers (Battle of the Golden Spurs, 11 July, 1302). And among those slain were the three men whom the pope had singled out by name, Flotte, Robert of Artois, and the Count of St. Pol.

Philip the Fair was now in full retreat, and not alone from Flanders, now lost to the French crown for ever. He no longer sounded defiance to the pope, but allowed the bishops to explain, apologetically, that they could not leave their sees at such a national crisis; and he sent an embassy to represent him at the council, an embassy which made full recognition of Boniface as pope (October 7, 1302).

Of what passed at the council we have no knowledge, but nearly half of the French bishops took part in it (39 out of 79). The pope had so far softened towards the beaten king that there was no repetition of the events at Lyons, sixty years before, when a council had tried and deposed the emperor Frederick II. There was no trial of Philip the Fair in 1303, nor sentence or declaration against him. The solitary outcome of the proceedings was a general declaration to the whole Church, the most famous act of Boniface's career, the bull Unam Sanctam (November 18, 1302). But there was not, in this, any reference to the points at issue with France, such as the list in the Auscultati Fili a twelve month before; these difficulties were now to be dealt with privately, through diplomatic channels, and as his envoy to Philip the pope chose a French cardinal, Jean Lemoine

"The dramatic context" of the bull Unam Sanctam [] says Boase, [] "gave it pre-eminence over all statements of papal power," and, we may think, has been largely responsible for the

extraordinary interest in the bull ever since. For the more that is known of the detailed history of the struggle between Boniface and the French king, the less dramatic does the famous bull really appear. Two distinct -- though related questions have been in hot dispute for now nearly two centuries, namely the canonist's question about the pope's authority as pope over the temporal affairs of the world, and the theologian's question of his authority as pope to correct what is morally wrong in a ruler's conduct of temporal affairs. The bull deals chiefly with the second of these, but it also touches on the other.

Throughout the dispute with Philip the Fair, Boniface VIII has denied that he is putting into force any claim to interfere with the king as a temporal ruler, ill the way for example that the king's suzerain (were there such) would have had the right to interfere. One thing alone has moved the pope throughout -- it is Boniface's constant assertion -- namely his duty to warn the king of sins he has committed in the exercise of his kingly office.

From this point of view *Unam Sanctam* does but continue the series in which *Ineffabilis Amoris* and *Ausculata Fili* have their place. But, unlike these, this last declaration is not addressed to the French king at all. It makes no mention of any particular ruler, but exposes the pope's case in general terms, reminding the Church in general of the nature of the pope's authority over all its members, and of the superiority which an authority of this kind must inevitably possess over every other kind of authority. And, after a certain amount of citation from Holy Writ -- none of it new -- and from Christian writing, to confirm the theory as it is explained, the document ends with the solemn definition, that for every human being it is part of the scheme of salvation that he be subject to the authority of the pope.

The general theme of the bull is that there is but one Church of Christ, a single body with but one head, Christ and his own vicar, Peter first and then Peter's successor. This scheme of things is not a human invention. It was God Himself who so arranged, when He commissioned Peter to feed God's sheep -- not these sheep, or those sheep, but all the sheep. It is by God's will that over His flock there is but a single shepherd. As for those who say they are not placed under the rule of Peter and his successor, they only confess thereby that they are not of Christ's flock, for there is but this one flock of Christ.

At the disposition of this one Church of Christ there are two kinds of power -- two swords, as the Gospel teaches us -- spiritual power and material; and the pope explains, following traditional lines, how the Church herself wields the spiritual authority, and when necessary calls upon kings and soldiers to wield on her behalf the material power. Of these two powers, the spiritual is the superior, in this sense that it is the business of the spiritual to call the material authority into existence, and to sit in judgment upon it should it go astray. Whereas the spiritual power -- in its fullness, that is to say (i.e. as realised in the papacy) -- is not subject to any judge but God. For although those who wield this spiritual power are but men, the power itself is divine, and whoever resists it strives against God. Whence it follows that to be subject to the Roman Pontiff is, for every human being, an absolutely necessary condition of his salvation: which last words -- the sole defining clause of the bull -- do but state again, in a practical kind of way, its opening phrases, "We are compelled by the promptings of faith to believe and to hold that there is one holy Catholic Church, and that the apostolic church; and this we do firmly believe and, unambiguously, profess, outside which church there is no salvation, nor any remission of sins. . . "

The bull Unam Sanctam then is a document which contains a definition of the pope's primacy as head of the Church of Christ; it is a reply to the claim, made by all parties to the anti-papal coalition, that their opposition is religious and Christian; it is a re-statement of the reality of the Church's divinely-given right to correct the sins which kings commit as kings; but the bull does not set out this right in detail, nor, though it states the right in the forms common to similar papal documents for now a hundred years and more, does it define this right in those forms, or indeed define it at all, except in so far as it is included in the general definition with which the bull ends.

The ultimatum sent through the legate to Philip -- for it was nothing short of this -- was dated November 24, 1302. It appears to have been delivered during the national assembly called for February-March of the new year. Philip's reply is embodied in his edict of March 18, 1303. The pope had noted that, seemingly, Philip was already excommunicated and the legate was given power to absolve him if he made amends. The misdeeds noted

in Ausculda Fili were recalled once more. Should the king disregard this last admonition, the worst would certainly follow. The king was too shrewd to ignore the message; nor, though diplomacy had greatly improved his position since the disaster of Courtrai, did he make any sign of open defiance. He preferred to say now that his actions had been misinterpreted; and where he did not deny the charges he was evasive. If the pope was not satisfied with the answer, the king would willingly re-examine the case. It was hardly the kind of reply that would suit the pope in his new mood, nor did it at all convey the king's real mind. This public ordonnance, indeed, masked the greatest scheme yet of violence and blackmail.

While the king was playing before the assembly the part of the misunderstood champion of right, William de Nogaret, who since Flotte's death seems to have been the chief of his counsellors, was given a vague and all-embracing commission for some secret work in Italy (7 March, 1303). On March 12 he appeared before the king and his council and made a striking protestation. Boniface VIII was no pope but a usurper; he was a heretic and a simonist; he was an incorrigible criminal. Nogaret formally demanded that the king call upon the cardinals and bishops to assemble a council which, after condemning this villain, should elect a pope. Meanwhile Boniface, being no pope at all, should be put under guard, and this should be the king's care and duty; and the cardinals should appoint a vicar to rule the Church until it had once more a real pope. The king listened to this impassioned harangue with all due attention, and then solemnly consented to take on himself this serious duty. And Nogaret left to play his part in the scheme in Italy!

While he was busy there, knitting together all the forces and interests that hated Boniface, the public duel between pope and king went forward. For the pope did not leave unnoticed Philip's reply to the ultimatum. He wrote to his legate that it was equivocal, evasive, insulting, contrary to truth and equity, and sent a new summons to Rome to the regalist bishops. On both sides the decks were being cleared for action. Boniface at last recognised Albert of Habsburg as King of the Romans and emperor-elect and authorised the princes of the middle kingdom to do him homage. Most significantly of all, the pope brought to an end the long twenty-years-old Sicilian war by confirming the peace, made nine months before, [] between Charles of Naples

and his Aragonese rival, in which the Aragonese conquest of the island was recognised. And Philip made peace with England.

When Boniface's letters and instructions to the legate reached France, the king held them up and, once again, summoned the whole nation to hear his case against the pope. It was at the Louvre that they met, bishops, nobles, commons (13 June, 1303) and the scenes of the Easter meeting of the previous year were repeated. This time the mask was fairly off and the language more violent. The pope, it was said, was a heretic, an idolator, a man who worshipped the devil. There was something to suit each of the many interests represented, and the assembly called out for a council which should judge Boniface and demanded that the king see to its summoning. And Philip, with a great protestation of love and respect for the Holy See, accepted the task. Of the twenty-six bishops present all but one set their names to the protestation and appeal. Just a week later the doctors of the University of Paris came together in the king's presence and made common cause with him, and on June 24 there was yet a third meeting, for the whole populace of Paris, in the gardens of the king's palace. The king was present, and his sons, the ministers, the bishops, the clergy. There was a harangue by the Bishop of Orleans, another by a Dominican and a third by a Franciscan; and with enthusiastic shouting and cheering, the people acclaimed the royal policy of emancipating religion from the rule of Boniface. There followed a purge of the foreign religious who stood firm for the pope, and commissioners were presently touring the whole of France, summoning everywhere meetings after the model of Paris, where the king's case was put and signatures gathered in support of it. Everywhere this organised propaganda of schism succeeded; nowhere did anyone oppose it.

In all these three months no news had come from Nogaret and on August 15 the Prior of Chezy was despatched on the last of his sinister missions to Italy. He was to find Nogaret and commission him to publish, to the pope's face if possible, the charge of heresy and the appeal to a General Council. But, by the time he reached his man, all was over.

The news of all the exciting events in Paris had leaked through the king's censorship and, on the very day the Prior of Chezy received his instructions, the pope replied to the king's attack in

five letters which suspended, until Philip had submitted, all elections to vacant sees, all nominations to benefices, and the conferring of all degrees by any university. The Archbishop of Nicosia, the chief of the ecclesiastical traitors, was put under interdict, and finally there was a blistering manifesto that at last exposed the king, and defended to the world the reasonableness of the pope's action.

The French king, Boniface noted, [] had never questioned the pope's orthodoxy while papal favours were lavished on him. His present criticisms arose from resentment that the pope had dared to remind him of his sins. This is the whole reason for his charges against the pope. The king makes them in bad faith, hoping to escape the need of amendment by blackmailing the superior whose duty it is to correct him. The pope cannot submit to this. "What will become of the Church, what value will remain to the authority of the popes, if kings, princes and other powerful personages are allowed such a way out as this? No sooner will the pope, successor of St. Peter and charged with the care of all the flock, propose to correct some prince or magnate, than he will be accused of heresy or taxed with notorious, scandalous crime. Redress of wrong will be altogether impossible, the supreme power will be wholly overthrown." How could the pope possibly grant this French demand that he summon a General Council and submit himself to its judgment? How could a pope lend himself to the spread of such a demand? Far from assenting to it, says Boniface, the pope will, in his own time, and despite any such disingenuous appeal, proceed against the king, and his supporters too, unless they repent their now notorious crimes.

Boniface immediately proceeded to that further action he threatened, and began to draft the bull solemnly excommunicating Philip and threatening his deposition if, within a fixed time, he had not submitted and sought absolution. It was arranged that the bull should be promulgated in the cathedral at Anagni, where Boniface then was, on September 8. Nogaret learnt of what was in preparation. He realised that, at all costs, the publication of the sentence must be prevented. With a mixed troop of soldiery, gathered from half-a-dozen neighbouring towns hostile to the pope, with one of the Colonna at his side, and the standard of Philip the Fair in the van, he made for Anagni. On the eve of the appointed day he arrived before the

little hillside city. Treason opened a gate for his force and after a short, sharp battle, he and his men, to the shouts of "Colonna! Colonna!" were in the papal palace and presently in the papal presence. They found the old pope prepared for them, robed and clasping his crucifix. Nogaret demanded that he withdraw the excommunication and surrender himself for judgment. He replied that he would rather die. Sciarra Colonna offered to kill the pope. The cooler-headed Frenchman held him back. Then Colonna struck the old man in the face.

The outrage was the end of Nogaret's success, however. While he parleyed with the pope, and while the Italian soldiery plundered the palace -- all they wanted and were fit for, Nogaret noted -- the fighting began again in the town, and shouts of "Death to the French!" filled the streets. It would have ruined the French monarchy to kill the pope; it was not practicable to carry him a prisoner to France through an aroused Italy. Indeed, unless Nogaret speedily fought his own way out of Anagni, he would hardly survive to tell France what he had accomplished. Within twenty-four hours he and his band were well away on the road to the north.

But the shock of this terrible Sunday was more than the pope could endure. His rescuers found a broken old man, muttering desires and threats, incapable now of thought or decision. The cardinals persuaded him to return to Rome, and within three weeks he was dead (October 20, 1303).

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



5. PHILIP THE FAIR'S LAST VICTORY, 1303-1314

Ten days after the death of Boniface VIII the cardinals went into conclave. They chose one of the late pope's most loyal supporters, the one-time Master-General of the Order of Preachers, Nicholas Boccasini; and they chose him on the first ballot. This pope was no Roman of noble family, but a poor man's son from the Venetian provinces. He was not a canonist but a theologian; and if a skilled and experienced ruler of men, he was, first of all, an excellent religious, a priest with a pastoral mind. As Master-General, Boccasini had kept his order obedient to the pope in the crisis of 1297, and he had been at Boniface's side in the hour of his last ordeal. But he had had no part in the struggle that opened with *Ausculta Fili*. During the last two critical years of Boniface's reign he had been away from Rome, serving as legate at the court of Albert of Habsburg. It was possibly because he was the one cardinal whom the late struggle had not touched that he was so speedily elected. Here was a man whom none hated because of any share he had had in that struggle, and a pope who would be able to devise policies free from the strain and fury of the late crisis. And his first gesture as pope gave a clear sign, that, while he would be loyal to the past, he would be loyal in his own way. The disciple of Benedict Gaetani did not call himself Boniface IX; with a nuance that only emphasised his substantial loyalty, he announced himself as Benedict XI.

Benedict XI was in a strong position, able to be generous, therefore, towards Philip the Fair, and so resolved. The policy he proposed to adopt was simple, delicate and firm. Nogaret, still in Italy and faced with the perplexing problem of a new pope who was, too, a saintly man, with whom worldly motives would be of no avail, was again meditating the threat of schism -- the Colonna cardinals had had no share in the conclave, therefore the election was not valid. But Benedict XI passed over this new intrigue for the moment; making, from the beginning, a careful distinction between the various personalities responsible for the outrage of Anagni. The case of each should be separately decided according to the past mind and future intention of each. The chief culprit, the one most culpable from his rank, was of course the King of France. If he made a movement of

submission Benedict would take it as sincerely meant, and would show himself the representative of Him who called himself the Good Shepherd. And when the pope forgave he would save the position his predecessors had declared themselves bound to defend, and the reality of the forgiveness, by saying outright in what spirit he was acting. But Philip must first of all make his move towards the pope. Benedict was no "appeaser", diplomatically angling for submission by a timely announcement that the terms would be easy and the gesture nominal.

No official notice, therefore, of the new pope's election was sent to Philip, nor any copy of his first inaugural letter. The pope treated the king for the excommunicate he was, and was careful to remind the world of this by a renewal of the sentences of his predecessors, that all those are excommunicated who hinder free communication between the Holy See and the bishops. The deadlock did not last long. It was conveyed to Philip that the pope did not desire revenge; that forgiveness awaited him if he would submit; that the pope would only be inflexible about the principle of free communication with the Church in France: in this matter satisfaction would certainly be demanded, liberation also of all the clerics imprisoned, and revocation of the royal edicts.

Meanwhile, the Colonna cardinals had come out from their hiding places, to throw themselves at Benedict's feet and beg for mercy. He showed himself generous, although "for the moment" he did not restore them to their dignity or their benefices and possessions. The same determination to make peace in a truly priestly spirit moved Benedict to send a legate to Florence, in the first weeks of 1304, with very extensive powers to settle differences and to reconcile the forces so hostile to the Holy See since the "pacification" of the town by the pope's champion, Charles of Valois.

The embassy from Philip the Fair reached Rome in March 1304. It was, by the fact, a submission; and yet a submission craftily prepared, by accepting which the pope would give the French a basis to argue in the years to come that Benedict's pardon was an implicit condemnation of Boniface. Nogaret, returned now to the French court, was as influential as ever and no less dangerous. But Benedict cut through the snares by pardoning

the king without any discussion of conditions, and stating that he did so as a loving father will always forgive a repentant child. The bargaining which Nogaret had planned, and which would have made the resultant absolution from excommunication seem an act in a kind of treaty or compromise, did not take place. The pope's simple directness turned the diplomatist's schemes with ease. Philip was absolved because he had repented, and because to forgive the repentant is the pope's first duty -- and all Europe would know this from the bulls. And when the King of France, his position as a Catholic prince restored, raised the question of Pope Boniface's actions towards him, renewing the demand for a council to judge this, Benedict put him off without discussion or comment of any kind.

A few weeks later, from Perugia, whither the pope had now moved, further bulls took up the detail of the settlement, and firstly the problems raised by the law Clericis Laicos. The pope did not retreat from the principles then laid down, but he did the cause of the monarchy a great favour and, very skilfully, he did this by virtue of those very principles. The penalties of Clericis Laicos against lay oppressors of Church revenues were maintained, but those which awaited the clerics who submitted to such oppression were modified, so that they no longer fell automatically on such transgressors. And to help France in the desperate state to which debasement of the coinage had reduced the country, the pope allowed the clergy to pay a tithe for two years and the first fruits of all benefices coming vacant during the next three years, the moneys to be used for the restoration of the coinage (13 May, 1304). About the same time a series of decisions proclaimed what was in fact a general amnesty for all those who had fallen under excommunication in the more recent crisis following the bulls Ausculta Fili and Unam Sanctam. Whoever would repent, the pope would forgive, because he was the pope, and on terms fixed by himself -- namely the sincere repentance of the culprit.

One group was however excepted, and by name, from this generous act of reconciliation. Not even Benedict XI's charity could presume that Nogaret had repented his share in these acts, or that he was likely to do so. At this very moment he was still actively manoeuvring for the council that should degrade the memory of Pope Boniface, and striving to form a party among the cardinals. Nogaret was still, in fact, the principal

force at the court of France, influential, determined, ruthless; and the new pope, in the action he now took, showed unmistakably that it was not any fear to strike or any lack of strength that had prompted his willingness to be reconciled with the enemy. A special bull -- *Flagitiosum Scelus* -- denounced by name Nogaret, Sciarra Colonna and fifteen others for their share in the outrage at Anagni. They were summoned to appear, in person, by the coming feast of St. Peter, June 29, to receive the sentence their crime had merited. To this citation they paid no attention; but before the pope could proceed to the next act against them, he was no more. Benedict XI died, very suddenly, at Perugia on July 7, 1304.

The sudden disappearance of Benedict XI was such good fortune for the policies of Nogaret that, not unnaturally, the rumour spread that the Frenchman had had him poisoned. The Church had lost that rarity, a pope who was a saint, [] and a saint who had in perfection the ruler's gift of prudence; and how real the tragedy was now brought home to all as, for a long eleven months, the factions in the conclave wrangled and fought.

The majority of the cardinals -- ten of them -- were strong for a pope who would resist the French, and exact some reparation for the outrage on Boniface VIII. But there was a pro-French minority of six, the party which Nogaret had influenced during the last pope's brief reign. Eleven votes were needed to elect, and as both sides held firm the deadlock was complete. On the French side there were threats of schism unless someone friendly to Philip the Fair were chosen. "If any anti-Christ usurped the Holy See," said Nogaret ominously, he must be resisted. On both sides the cardinals began to consider candidates outside the Sacred College. Finally, the intrigues of Cardinal Napoleone Orsini gathered a bare two-thirds majority for the Archbishop of Bordeaux, Bertrand de Got, and on June 5, 1305, he was elected, [] Pope Clement V.

From many points of view it must have seemed an admirable choice. Clement V was well on the young side of fifty; he was by birth a subject of the English king, and yet on friendly terms with Philip the Fair. He was brother to that Cardinal Berard de Got who had been one of Boniface VIII's chief diplomatists, [] and had himself been employed by that pope in important diplomatic

work in England. In the furious months that followed the Ausculda Fili the Archbishop of Bordeaux had been loyal to the pope, and he had gone to Rome for the great council which preceded the Unam Sanctam. His technical qualifications were high, for he was an accomplished canonist, a competent administrator and a skilled negotiator. The most serious drawback, perhaps, was his health; for, although this was not yet known, he was ravaged by a terrible cancer of the stomach. Again and again during his reign, for weeks and months at a time, his sufferings were to withdraw him entirely from all contact with affairs, and finally, after nine years, to bring his life to a premature end. He is spoken of as a man naturally kind and goodhearted, but vacillating, lacking the energy to make final decisions in policy, or to stand by them when made, increasingly at the mercy of his fears, and bound to be the tool, or the victim, of that pitiless cunning and determination which, for years now, had characterised the action of Philip the Fair.

Clement V, as pope, never left the soil of France. He is the first of a series of French popes who lived out their reigns in France, the so-called Avignon popes. But with Clement this novelty of ruling the Church from outside the Papal State and Italy seems to have been the outcome of a series of accidents rather than of settled policy. He hoped to arrange a final definitive peace between France and England and, inviting both the kings to his coronation, fixed this for the (then) imperial city of Vienne on the Rhone. Later, to please Philip, he decided on Lyons and there, in Philip's presence and that of the ambassadors of Edward I, he was crowned, five months after his election, 14 November, 1305.

It was no doubt one of the misfortunes of history that Edward I was not present at Lyons, for in a critical hour the French king carried all before him. It was, in fact, after this first famous interview with Philip that the pope gave up his idea of an immediate journey to Rome and, in the consistory of December 15, he gave a sign of what was to come by creating ten new cardinals, of whom nine were Frenchmen.

The leading motive of the French king's policy was, of course, to win from Rome a formal renunciation of all that Boniface VIII had claimed, and a revocation of that pope's anti-regal acts. These hindrances to the establishment of a real royal control of the Church were to be removed by the only power that could remove

them -- the papacy itself; and to bring this about the methods once employed so successfully with Boniface were once more to be put into operation. Pressure would be more easily applied if the pope were established nearer to Paris than Orvieto, or Anagni. And to detain the pope yet awhile in France -- and at the same time to excite such real alarm that he would yield more easily to the demand for a condemnation of his predecessor -- the king had ready a prepared scandal of the first magnitude. This was the question of the religious and moral condition of the great military order of the Knights of the Temple. To the newly-crowned pope, Philip the Fair, in the talks between them at Lyons, made known that for some time complaints of a most serious kind had been made about the Knights. They were, it was said, secret infidels who, on the day of their reception and profession as knights, explicitly and formally denied Christ and ceremonially spat upon the crucifix; the centre of their religious life was an idol, worshipped in all their houses; their priests were always careful to omit the words of consecration in the masses celebrated within the order; the knights practised unnatural vice as a kind of ritual and by prescription. An enquiry was urgently necessary.

The pope was sceptical. The malevolent gossip about an order hated and envied by many rivals left him unmoved, as it had left unmoved the King of Aragon to whom the "revelations" had first been made. But the French king, and Nogaret, set themselves to produce yet more evidence. They found witnesses in ex-Templars languishing, for one crime or another, in the king's prisons. They introduced spies into the order itself. And then, in the spring of 1307, at a second meeting with the pope at Poitiers, the king repeated his demands.

Clement, at first, refused. Philip then raised anew the question of the condemnation of Boniface VIII. Already, twelve months earlier, the pope had, with certain reservations on the principles, withdrawn the two great bulls of his predecessor, *Clericis Laicos* and *Unam Sanctam* (1 February, 1306) [] and the king had, thereupon, ceased his demand for the dead pope's trial. Now, as Clement showed fight about the Templars, the ghost of Pope Boniface was made to walk once more -- and effectively. For the curia proposed a compromise: the pope should quash all the anti-regalist acts of Boniface VIII, and the king should leave the question of the condemnation of Boniface entirely in the pope's

hands. But the king refused all compromise. And then, August 24, 1307, Clement gave way and signed the order for a canonical enquiry into the accusations against the Templars. It was to be an enquiry according to the Canon Law -- as was only right where it was a religious order that was accused; and, also, the enquiry was ordered at the petition of the Templars themselves, eager to disprove the calumnies.

This, of course, was not the kind of enquiry the French king had looked for, with the accused condemned beforehand. He took his own line and suddenly, in the early morning of October 13, all the Knights Templars of France were arrested by the royal order. Next, amid the consternation caused on all sides, Nogaret launched a campaign of anti-Templar "publicity"; France was flooded with proclamations and speeches that explained what criminals the Templars were, and how the pious king, on the advice of his confessor, careful of his duty as champion of the Catholic religion, had ordered their arrest, after consulting his barons, and the pope.

The next few weeks were filled with the examination of the Knights -- examinations by the king's officials and, of course, under torture, whose object was to induce the accused to admit their guilt. Everywhere the unhappy men broke under the strain, and soon the king had, from the lips of the Templars themselves, all the evidence he needed that the order merited suppression and that its wealth should be confiscated -- if such avowals, and known to be obtained by such means, are indeed evidence. It sufficed to bring conviction to the pope that, at any rate, there was something seriously wrong in the order, and he ordered all the princes of Christendom to arrest the Templars and to place their property under sequestration (November 22, 1307).

This hideous business of torturing men accused of crime was, by the time of Clement V, part and parcel of the routine of trials wherever the Roman Law influenced criminal jurisprudence. From the spheres influenced by that law it had passed, nearly a hundred years before this, into the procedure of the Inquisition. The canon lawyer was as familiar with the use of torture as his civilian brother, and as little likely to question its morality. Short of being a few hundred years before his time -- or a few hundred years behind it -- no canonist of Clement V's generation would

have seen any objection to using the hostile "evidence" procured by Philip the Fair's torturers from the accused Templars.

The pope had not indeed let Philip's vigorous coup succeed without a strong protest (27 October, 1307). The king had violated the immunity of clerics from the lay power of arrest, and this despite his knowledge that the pope had reserved the whole affair to himself. The pope had demanded, therefore, that Philip surrender his prisoners and their property to two cardinals named as the pope's commissioners. [] But Clement had done no more than this, and when the "confessions" were placed before him had admitted them juridically.

The Templars now passed into the care of the Church and immediately, fancying themselves free of the royal torturers, solemnly revoked all their confessions. Whereupon the pope took the whole affair out of the hands of all lower tribunals and reserved it to himself. []

Philip the Fair's reply was to call up once more the ghost of Boniface VIII, and to launch a campaign of slander against Clement. All that had ever been said against Boniface, against his administration of the Church and against his private life, was now laid to the charge of Clement. [] The scenes of 1302 began to be repeated; there were declarations that if the pope neglected his obvious duty, the king would have to see to it, and, for the sake of the Church, act in its name; there was a great meeting of the States-General at Tours (11-20 May, 1308) and the assembly declared the Templars worthy of death. And, finally, Philip descended with an army on Poitiers. Once more, Clement -- who had attempted to escape out of Philip's dominions, but, discovered, been forced to return -- was lectured and threatened to his face, and bidden to act quickly, or the nation, whose indignation no king nor baron could restrain, would take the law into its own hands, and make an end of these enemies of Christ. And the pope was told that prelates who covered up crime were as guilty as those who committed it.

This moral siege of the pope at Poitiers, where the king met him with an immense array of nobles, bishops, legists, soldiers, lasted for a month (26 May-27 June). But the pope's courage did not yet fail. He did not believe the Templars' guilt proved, and he

refused to condemn the order. The king thereupon made an official surrender of the whole case to the pope and shipped off to the Papal Court a picked band of seventy-two Templars, ready to swear to anything as the price of future royal favour or of pardon for past crimes. It was the testimony of these men, many of whom Clement himself examined, that finally broke through the pope's scepticism, and for the trial of the order throughout the Church he entirely remodelled the whole Inquisition system [] (July 1308). In these same weeks of the conferences at Poitiers, the pope was again summoned to condemn Pope Boniface. Celestine V -- so the French king urged -- must be canonised, the victim of Boniface VIII; and Boniface's corpse dug up and burnt (6 July, 1308). This time Clement had to make some show of acquiescence, and as he had consented to put the Order of Templars on trial, so he now set up a commission to judge his predecessor (August 12, 1308), and fixed a date for the first hearing, a fairly distant date, February 2, 1309.

The pope's scheme for the trial of the religious was elaborate. Two enquiries were to function simultaneously throughout Europe. The one, a pontifical commission, its members nominated by the pope, was to examine the charges against the order as such: the other, an episcopal enquiry, to judge the individual knights, was to be held in each diocese where the Templars had a foundation, and in this tribunal the judges would be the bishop with two delegates of his chapter, two Dominicans and two Franciscans. These diocesan findings would be reviewed by a council of all the bishops of the province, who would decide the fate of the individual Templars. As to the order, the findings of the pontifical commissions would be laid before a General Council, summoned to meet at Vienne for October 1, 1310, and the council would decide what was to be done with the order.

The pontifical commission in France was far from hasty. [] It did not hold its first session until August 1309, and the real work did not begin until the following November. The prelates who sat as judges were, all of them, devoted to the policies of the French king; its president, the Archbishop of Narbonne, was one of the Templars' chief foes. And, contrary to the law by which they judged, the commissioners allowed the royal officials to assist at the trials, and to have access to the depositions confidentially made to the court by the accused. This paved the way for some

of the most tragic scenes in this terrible story. For when the Templars appeared before the pontifical tribunal, many of them immediately revoked the confessions of guilt they had made. Publicly they now described the tortures which had been used to make them admit their guilt. "If the like torture is now used on me again," said one, "I will deny all that I am now affirming: I will say anything you want me to say." Something like 573 knights stood firm in this repudiation and in testimony that the charges against the order were calumnies. But the chiefs of the order wavered: they understood, better than the rest, the peril in which such retractation would involve them. The immense scale of the retractations, and the contrast presented by the miserable character of the outside witnesses produced by the royal officers against the order, were building up a popular feeling that it was innocent. And, lest he should lose the day, the king again intervened with force. The order as such might be winning its case before the pontifical commission: the king's opportunity lay with the machinery set up to judge these men as individuals. His instruments were the bishops of the provincial council of Sens, to which, in those days, the see of Paris [] was subject; upon whose judgment, by Clement V's decision, the fate of these knights as individuals depended. Their retractation, before the pontifical commission, of their confession of heresy was a relapse into heresy, and the punishment for this was death.

So the Archbishop of Sens summoned his council -- he was Philippe de Marigny, brother of Enguerrand de Marigny, one of the king's chief ministers -- and without any further hearing the council condemned to death fifty-four of the Templars who had retracted their confession (11 May, 1310). The next day they were taken in batches to the place of execution and all of them burned alive, protesting to the last their innocence of any crime. Four days later there was another execution, of nine, at Senlis.

This atrocious deed had the effect hoped for. The condemned men, still under the jurisdiction of the pontifical commission, had begged its intervention. The only answer given by the president was that he was too busy, he had to hear mass, he said, or to say mass. Nothing, it was evident, could save a Templar who did not admit all the crimes laid against him, and so provide evidence to justify the destruction of his order. Henceforth the courts had all the admissions they could desire. The speech of one of the knights to the papal commissioners,

made the day after Philippe de Marigny's holocaust, has come down to us. "I admitted several charges because of the tortures inflicted on me by the king's knights, Guillaume de Marcilly and Hugues de la Celle. But they were all false. Yesterday, when I saw fifty-four of my brethren going in the tumbrils to the stake because they refused to admit our so-called errors, I thought I can never resist the terror of the fire. I would, I feel, admit anything. I would admit that I had killed God if I were asked to admit it."

The pontifical enquiry in France now speedily came to the end of its business. It had henceforward no more exacting work than to take down confessions, and by June 5, 1311, it had finished.

When we turn from the bloody scenes which took place wherever Philip the Fair had power, the contrast in what the trials of the Templars produced is striking indeed. In these islands, councils were held, as the pope had ordered, at London and York, in Ireland and in Scotland. But nowhere was there found any conclusive evidence against the order. So it was in Spain also. No torture was used in England until the pope insisted on it; [] but torture was used in Germany, and despite the torture the pontifical commissioners found the order in good repute and publicly declared this. All tended to show that, when the General Council met, the order would find defenders everywhere except among the bishops subject to Philip the Fair. That the council would vote the destruction of the order was by no means a foregone conclusion.

While the Templars were going through their ordeal at Paris before the pope's commissioners, the pope himself, at Avignon, was also suffering duress. For on March 16, 1310, the trial -- if the word be allowed -- of Boniface VIII had at last begun in his presence. To accuse and revile the dead man's memory, all the cohort of Philip the Fair's legists had appeared, Nogaret leading them. Boniface had been a heretic; he had been a man of immoral life, in his youth (sixty years ago now) and through all his later years. He had been an infidel, an atheist, an idolator. He had never been lawfully elected, he had murdered his predecessor after tricking him into a resignation that was void in law. All the malevolence amid which Boniface had pursued his difficult way was now given free reign; and Clement, fearful of provoking yet new savageries from the French king, knowing,

nevertheless, that he could never deny the principles for which Boniface had fought, could do no more than delay the proceedings by every expedient which practised finesse could suggest to him.

At last the international situation played into his hands. The emperor, Henry VII, had just received at Milan the iron crown of Lombardy (6 January, 1311) and, with Robert of Naples, he was planning the reconstitution of the kingdom of Arles. The possibility of the whole of the lands east of the Rhone passing for ever beyond the influence of his house was more than Philip the Fair could allow. He was driven to seek the pope's good offices, but Clement, realising that this was his hour, received him coldly. The French cardinals advised the king that the cause of Boniface VIII was about to cost France more than it could ever be worth. And so, while the Templar commission at Paris was slowly coming to an end, pope and king came to an understanding. The king agreed that the accusers of Boniface should withdraw, and that the fate of the Templars should be left to the council: the pope, in a series of bulls, without condemning Boniface, or adverting at all to the vile charges made about his faith or his character, quashed all the papal acts against the king made from November 1, 1300, by Boniface or by his immediate successor, Benedict XI. He ordered, moreover, that all record of these various bulls should be erased from the papal registers. Nogaret was absolved, and with him Sciarra Colonna and others of the conspirators of Anagni. Finally, Philip the Fair was publicly praised for the zeal he had shown, and his good intentions in his anti-papal strife were officially recognised (27 April, 1311). [] It was a heavy price to pay for the cessation of the king's attack on Pope Boniface and, through him, on the reality of the pope's jurisdiction. And, like all similar surrenders, it did not really succeed. For the king was to threaten to renew the attack at a critical moment of the coming council, and so once more gain his way. Two years after this "settlement", Clement canonised the pope who had abdicated, the "victim" of Boniface VIII. But he was careful to canonise the saint not as Celestine V but as Peter di Murrone, and in the bull of canonisation to attest the validity of Celestine's act of abdication (May 5, 1313). []

The Council of Vienne, summoned for October 1310, actually met just a year later, October 16, 1311. Its principal business

was the settlement of the affairs of the Order of Templars; and to consider the report of the various commissions a special committee of the bishops was appointed. To the pope's embarrassment -- with the ink hardly dry on his recent arrangement with Philip the Fair -- the committee, by a great majority, reported that the Templars ought to be heard before the council in their own defence (December 1311). The pope, characteristically, set the report aside, and offered for consideration schemes -- much needed schemes -- of Church reform, and plans for a new crusade. And the French king, raising the memory of his "injuries" at the hands of Pope Boniface, came himself to Vienne, to try all that blandishment and threats could do with the obstinate majority. He was, horrible to relate, entirely successful, and on March 22, 1312, the committee reversed its decision of the previous December and, furthermore, by a majority of 4 to 1 recommended that the Order of Templars be suppressed.

The next solemn session of the whole council was fixed for April 3, twelve days later. Would the bishops have accepted this recommendation had they been free to discuss it? It is an interesting question; but the pope forestalled all possibility of trouble by imposing silence under pain of excommunication, and instead of deciding the fate of the order the assembled bishops had read to them the pope's own sentence and decision. Without judging the order, or condemning it, Clement simply suppressed it as an administrative action [] and not as a punishment for any crime. And next, despite enormous efforts on the part of Philip and some of the bishops, the pope transferred the possessions of the order to the kindred military order of the Hospitallers, except in Spain where the new possessors were the military orders who fought the Moors. The individual knights the pope left to the judgment of the provincial councils.

The trial of the Grand Master and the chief superiors Clement reserved to himself, and eighteen months after the closing of the council he named a commission of three French cardinals to judge them (22 December, 1313). They were found guilty, on their own previous admissions, and on March 18, 1314, before the main door of Notre Dame, in the presence of an enormous crowd, they were sentenced to life imprisonment. And now, once again, tragedy crowned the proceedings in very terrible fashion.

The Grand Master and one of his brethren, free of the prospect of a death sentence, their lot definitely settled at last, renounced their confessions and protested that the order had been gravely calumniated. "We are not guilty of the crimes alleged against us," they said. "Where we are guilty is that to save our own lives we basely betrayed the order. The order is pure, it is holy. The accusations are absurd, our confessions a tissue of lies." Here was an unexpected problem for the three cardinals, and while they debated, uncertainly, how to deal with it, Philip the Fair acted. That very day he decided with his council that here was yet another case of relapse into heresy. The two knights, without more ado, were hurried to the stake and that same evening given to the flames, proclaiming to the last their innocence and the innocence of the order.

Was the order indeed innocent? The controversy has raged ever since it was brought to so cruel an end. It is safe to say that the controversy is now over, and that it has ended in agreement to acquit the knights. [] The order was the victim of Philip the Fair's cupidity, and the pope was, in very large measure, the king's conscious tool in the wicked work.

The suppression of the Templars, and the associate villainy of the "trial" of Boniface VIII, are events so monstrous in scale that all else in the nine years of Pope Clement's unhappy reign is dwarfed beside them. Certainly these events were, for seven of those years, his chief anxiety and his almost daily care; and they were the chief obstacle to the realisation of his never wholly abandoned intention to live, like his predecessors, the normal life of a pope within the Italian Papal State. For the papal establishment at Avignon, that was to last for some seventy years, was not -- it seems certain -- due to any one definite act of policy, based on a Frenchman's preference for life in his own country. Clement V had been pope for nearly four years before he so much as saw Avignon. It was only when he realised, in the summer of 1308, after the second Poitiers meeting with the French king, the gravity of the imminent crisis, that the pope determined on Avignon as a more or less permanent place of residence (August 1308). To return to Italy while such menace hung over Catholic affairs in France would have been unthinkable. Avignon was on the French frontier and yet no part of Philip's dominions; the surrounding territory -- the County of Venaissin -- had been papal territory for now thirty years. In the

circumstances, to set up the curia at Avignon was an ideal solution; and it is simple matter of fact that during the seventy years of what has been called, too easily, the Babylonian captivity, the papal action was far less hindered by civil disturbance not only than in the seventy years that followed the return to Rome of Gregory XI (in 1377) but than it was hindered in the seventy years that preceded the election of the first Avignon pope.

It was in March 1309 that the pope took up his residence at Avignon -- a very modest establishment in the priory of the Dominicans -- and had sent to him from Rome the registers of letters for the two last pontificates, and a certain amount -- not by any means the greater part -- of the papal treasure. There is no reason to doubt that Clement, had he lived, would, once the General Council had settled the double crisis in France, have passed into Italy. But he was already a man marked for death by the time that council ended. Once more he left Provence and, in the desperate hope of improvement, set out for his native country of the Bordelais. But he had gone no farther than Roquemaure, on the Rhone, when just a month after the terrible end of the Grand Master of the Templars, death claimed him too (April 20, 1314). Six months later Philip the Fair, still on the young side of fifty, followed him into the next world. The Church had lost one of the weakest popes who has ever ruled it, and religion had been delivered from the menace of one of its most insidious foes.

In two respects Clement V set a new and a thoroughly bad example which was to become a papal fashion through all the next two hundred years. He found places for a host of relatives in the high offices of the Church; and he spent the treasure of the Church lavishly for their enrichment. No fewer than six of his family he made cardinals -- at a time when the total number of the Sacred College rarely exceeded twenty. Others he named to well-endowed sees, while for those who were not clerics he created well-paid posts and sinecures in the temporal administration. It was now that there began what must be judged the most evil part of the Avignon tradition, the excessive preoccupation of the curia with fees. And with the new interest in lawful fees there developed, inevitably, a regime of graft and jobbery where all, from the highest to the lowest, expected bribes and demanded them, a regime which the popes in the end

became powerless to change. Cardinal Ehrle has calculated, from the papal accounts of the time, that Clement V was able to save nearly one half of his immense annual revenue. The treasury at his death amounted to over a million florins. Of this he left to friends and relations 200,000 florins, and to a nephew, pledged to equip a troop of knights for the crusade, half as much again. Clement V also inaugurated the Avignon tradition of filling the Sacred College with Frenchmen. He created twenty-four cardinals in all; one was English, one Spanish; the rest were all Frenchmen, and of the twenty-two, six, as has been said, were closely related to him by blood. []

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 2: 'THE AVIGNON CAPTIVITY', 1314-1362

1. CRISIS IN THE WORLD OF THOUGHT *i. The Problem of Church and State*

WITH the death of Philip the Fair, in the autumn of 1314, the assault of the French monarchy on the papal claims came to a sudden end. The regime of co-operation between the two powers was resumed, if not in all the friendliness of former days, at any rate with an equal practical effectiveness; the peace, such as it was, would not be broken until the very eve of the Reformation, two hundred years later. "Such as it was", for not only had the issue between Boniface VIII and Philip not been decided, despite the surrenders of Clement V -- so that it remained a possible source of further disaster through all those two centuries -- but there was a permanent memorial of the controversy in the literature circulated by both parties during the fatal years. The issue was practical, it was important, it was urgent -- and it has never ceased to be so. "The pope's imperative intervention in French affairs was not anything merely arbitrary and suddenly thought up, that can be explained by the pope's ambition, or excused by the king's tyranny. It was bound up with a body of teaching, with the supremacy of the spiritual power as the Middle Ages had known and practised it, a supremacy in which the Church still saw a lawful and necessary function of the mission she held from God." []

Both king and pope realised fully that the fight was no mere clash of personal temperaments. That the temperamental weaknesses -- and worse -- of the contending potentates had their influence on the course of the struggle is evidently true, but these were not its most important elements; they can, by comparison, be disregarded in a study of the fight and its consequences, as we can disregard the slander and invective of the controversialists. But the controversialists dealt also with other things than slanders: on both sides, theories were set out and defended, and the best writing of this sort was carefully preserved, armament for future like conflicts, and -- this is true of the anti-papal works at least -- carefully translated into French, so that others besides the priest and the legist could

see how right it was for the king to challenge the pope. [] As this literature remained and grew, in the course of two hundred years, to become a formidable menace to Catholic unity, something more must be said of it and of how the "grand differand" between Boniface and Philip continued to poison Catholic life for generations after them. []

With this in mind we may go on to note the attitude of the writers on the papal side as an affirmative answer to the question "Did Our Lord mean the Pope to be the Lord of the World?" This answer meant, in practice, that the Church's mission towards the state included "not only the consecration of kings, but also the verification of their title, and the control of their administration. . . the right and power to judge and correct their conduct [i.e. as rulers], to invalidate their acts and, in extreme cases, to pronounce their deposition." []

Kings, of course, did their best to escape the exercise of such powers and, as they grew more literate, they began to raise doubts whether they were indeed lawful powers. So Frederick II, in 1245, had denounced his excommunication as "a misuse of priestly authority"; and he had gone on to declare to the princes of Europe that "nowhere do we read that by any law, divine or human, has power been given to the pope to punish kings by depriving them of their kingdoms, or to pass judgment on princes." Such a situation would be ridiculous, said Frederick, "the claim that he who as emperor is loosed from all laws is yet himself subject to law." []

The emperor here is evidently setting up the law of ancient Rome against what the pope claims of him as a disciple of Christ; but his contention is also a reminder of another factor of the struggle that must be ever before the mind of those who perhaps stand amazed at the immensity of the papal claim. This is the fact that nowhere, in these centuries, is it a question of conflict between the papal claims and some royal scheme of a balanced distribution of royal and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. From the moment when these fights first began in the time of St. Gregory VII (1073-1085) was always between two claims to be absolute. These popes who, reforming the Church, slowly drew Christendom back from the depths, found their greatest obstacle in the actually existing, all-embracing, imperial and royal absolutism which had all but merged the Church in the state. If

the pope was not to be all, [] then the king would be all; the pope must be all, or the Church would be nothing. The alternative before Christendom was the supremacy of the Church over the state, or else Caesar, to all intents and purposes, the pope. The popes, with remarkable faith -- and courage -- did not shrink from choosing; they dutifully climbed the heights and thence proceeded to judge the world.

Did our Lord mean the pope to be the Lord of the World in this sense? Canonists, by the time of Boniface VIII, had been saying so for a long time, and saying it in such a way that they seemed to claim still more. Hostiensis [] for example who died in 1271, one of the greatest of all the eyes of his contemporaries, declared that it is the pope who is the true source of all the state's authority; and that the state, indeed, in all its actions, is really deputising for the pope; the emperor is no more than the pope's vicar for temporal affairs. For there can only be one Lord of the World, namely Christ, Our Lord; and the pope alone is Christ's vicar, Who "committed all things to Peter", giving him not a key, but the keys; "two keys" says the cardinal, by which are signified the two fields of papal supremacy, to wit, the spiritual and the temporal. And this strong doctrine is no more than a reflection of what an equally eminent master in the law had proclaimed to all Christendom when, having become pope, he was engaged in a life and death struggle against the absolutist schemes of Frederick II. This was Innocent IV (1243-1254) [] and against the emperor's claim to incorporate the Church into the State, this canonist pope set up his own, "We exercise the general authority in this world of Him who is the King of Kings, who has granted to the prince of the apostles and to us a plenitude of power to bind as well as to loose upon earth, not only all persons, but all things whatsoever." We have seen Frederick's scornful comment on this language. But the emperor's rejoinder was as barren, apparently, as his military genius or political power. The pope, in this particular conflict, was victorious and his high conception of papal duties and powers seemed more firmly established than ever.

When, fifty years later, the papacy, in the person of Boniface VIII, next called up for judgment a powerful ruler, the spirit and tone of the intervention was, if possible, more "Innocentian" than Innocent IV himself ! but this time the royal rejoinder was far indeed from fruitless. And Christendom saw the popes suddenly

compelled to lower their tone: the contrast between the actions (and the language) of Boniface VIII and Clement V, less than ten years later, was something to marvel at. Phaethon, it would seem, had fallen from his car. And, whatever the rights of the question, the rebel responsible for the catastrophe had not only gone unpunished, but had been lauded by the victim for his good intentions. Here, surely, was mischief indeed, grave scandal in the most literal sense. The crisis had produced a stumbling block for Catholics over which many would continue to trip until the Catholic state disappeared from the political world.

For Philip the Fair's challenge, whether the popes really possessed such authority, was now set before the mind of Catholic Europe so forcibly and so clearly, that the debate about it never really ceased thereafter. In the two hundred years and more during which that authority had been claimed, exercised and generally acknowledged, it had come to be one of the fundamentals of the Christian political system, of the Christian-religion-inspired civilisation of Western Europe. Revolt here was revolt indeed, and when, from such a revolt, the Church failed to emerge victorious and able to punish the rebel, its prestige suffered a defeat that was irreparable. Never again does the Church dominate the conflict from above; henceforth the popes too, are in the arena, and if the high papal tone persists (as naturally it does, for the popes do not immediately understand that the former things have passed away) it serves as an additional aggravation to the world. Gradually the popes came to abandon this position so long defended by the great medieval canonists, this theory which had been the Church's defence against the all-invading state; and it may be well if, to avoid confusion, and the better to understand the tragedy which accompanied the slow changeover, we remind ourselves what was really -- in the mind of the popes -- the nature of the power they had claimed, and the kind of arguments by which they had defended it. " It was in its source an authority that was spiritual, and it made no claim, therefore, to absorb the authority of the state; but it was a power that extended to the furthest boundaries of the moral order, and which, as an inevitable consequence of this, included the right to survey the conduct of rulers and to call them to account for their behaviour as such, to correct them, to pass sentence on them if they were at fault, and even to depose those who prove recalcitrant." [] The popes

never claim that they may administer France or Spain as though it were their own Italian Papal State. But they do claim authority to correct the rulers of these lands for sins committed in ruling, as they correct all other delinquencies in the flock placed under their charge; and they claim the right to correct rulers in a particular way, by excommunicating them and declaring them to have forfeited the right to rule. Boniface VIII's bull *Unam Sanctam* is nothing more than an official statement of this theory and claim.

What of the standing of this papal claim to punish kings by deposition? Whether it be true or not it " has never, in any way, been proposed as a doctrine of the Church; but, nevertheless, it certainly won the assent of many popes, and, in an especially grave moment of history, it coloured the traditional background of the papal claims, namely in the solemn document that expresses the distinctive views of Boniface VIII." [] Perhaps it is here, in the association of a theory peculiar to a particular age with a definition of general Catholic duty, that we must look for the source of the most serious part of the ensuing and mischievous misunderstanding. What was really defeated may indeed have been no more than a "personal system", that is to say, a theory and policy really " personal " to a succession of popes, but hitherto everywhere taken for granted. But this "personal system" had now been defeated and defied at a moment when it was set out in the closest association with a solemn definition of essential Catholic duty. If the one was defied the other could not but appear compromised. Henceforth the first was always on the defensive and acceptance of the second might suffer accordingly.

The debate between the canonists and legists had, then, revealed the whole deep chasm that separated these antagonistic views of public life. It had also produced that third theory from which the ultimate true solution was one day to be developed, and had thereby thrown into high relief the deficiencies in the canonists' argumentation and the exaggerations in the claims they made. These exaggerations produced, naturally enough, an exaggerated reaction that carried the canonists' lay opponents to a denial of papal prerogatives and rights (in spiritual matters).that were beyond all question. It is, for example, from this time that the appeals from the pope to a General Council first begin to appear with

anything like frequency, a new tendency that grows steadily through the next sixty years, and which the opportune disaster of the Schism [] then so fosters that, at the Council of Constance, an effort is actually made to give this abuse force of law. [] Again, the canonists have quoted Scripture in support of their assertions, but Scripture understood metaphorically. For example, two actual swords had once been brought to Our Lord by the Apostles for his defence: [] the canonists had read the act allegorically, and used that allegory to justify a theory. Now, a critical attack was made on this method of using Scripture -- an attack which could be supported by the new, clear, strong teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, that arguments about doctrine can only be based on the literal sense of the sacred text. [] Once this mentality developed, a whole host of arguments, classic with the canonists for two centuries and more, would simply disappear overnight. [] And much else would disappear too -- the prestige of the theological scholar, for example, with that new educated lay world which is the peculiar distinction of this fourteenth century, the age where the greatest figures among orthodox scholars are Dante and Petrarch, and where no cleric writing theology attains to eminence and yet manages to keep entirely orthodox.

The latest historian to study the conflict of ideas that underlay the crisis, analyses the works of some seventeen polemicists. [] There are, first of all, the antagonists who set out and defend the rival theories: on the papal side two Augustinian friars, Giles of Rome [] and James of Viterbo []; on the king's side the authors of the treatises called *A Dialogue between a Cleric and a Knight* and *Rex Pacificus*. Next there is a group of nine writers whose aim is to find some middle way in which to reconcile the rival jurisdictions. Working from the papal side towards this are the Dominican John of Paris and the authors of the gloss on the bull *Unam Sanctam*, and the treatise called *Quaestio in Utramque Partem*: on the other side are six writers the best known of whom is Dante? whose *De Monarchia* here comes under consideration. Finally, there are considered four "practical" schemes. It is hardly possible in a work of this kind to attempt anything more than to list all these, and to refer those interested to the long analysis of them (180 pages) in Riviere's authoritative work. But something must be said of John of Paris -- as a critic of the papal apologists -- for it was with his theory that the future lay; nor can Dante be merely mentioned.

What the canonists held about the relation of the pope to Catholic princes, considered as princes, has already been described. In the controversies of 1296-1303 the two great theologians, Giles of Rome and James of Viterbo, Augustinian friars both, strove to give these theories a still greater prestige. The temporal ruler, they held, was strictly subjected to the spiritual ruler; the pope, because the vicar of Christ, was the source of all law and of all earthly power and authority; the governmental action of pnnces was subject to the pope's control; and these themes were, for Giles of Rome and James of Viterbo [], part and parcel of the Catholic faith. It is the first merit of John of Paris that, in the very hour when this inconveniently favourable apologetic was born, he provided the needed theological criticism.

The work in which the Dominican thus corrects the Augustinian -- Kingly Power and Papal Power [] -- was written apparently in 1302, just before the publication of the Unam Sanctam. Its author is not a partisan, but well aware of the controversy -- as a lecturer in the University of Paris could not but be aware of it; but he explicitly detaches himself from the rival schools of thought, and sets himself to the search for a via media. With all due submission he makes his own analysis and he sets out his ideas as a hypothesis.

In his view there is not -- as the Waldenses continue to say -- any inconsistency between the true Idea of the Church of Christ and a concern with power in temporal matters. Nor -- as the theologians he criticises assert -- is the Church's power in temporal matters a consequence of its spiritual authority. It does not follow that because the Church possesses authority over men in spiritual matters that it also possesses authority over them in temporal matters -- an authority which it allows the state to exercise as its vicar. Wherever the Church does in fact enjoy authority in temporal matters, this is the outcome of some grant made by the State "out of devotion". The two entities Church and State -- though unequal in dignity -- are co- ordinate in the exercise of authority. Both originate in the divine plan. The State derives its authority from God no less really than does the Church. The spiritual power is indeed the superior of the two, but it is not superior in everything. The pope, though truly Vicar of Christ by Christ's appointment, is not in fact heir to the

totality of Our Lord's universal royalty over men and kings. In its own order the State is, under God, sovereign.

Has the spiritual power, then, no authority to regulate the temporal? It has indeed; for the purpose of the spiritual power is a higher thing than the purpose of the temporal, and the lower purpose is subordinate to, and for the sake of, the higher. But -- and here again lies the really great importance of John of Paris -- the Dominican insists that the pope is to exercise this control by instructing the conscience of the prince, and, if the prince fails, by administering correction that is spiritual. The pope instructs the prince, he says, *de fide* and not *de regimine*; [] the only instrument of the Church's empire over the prince is its charisma to instruct the Christian mind in things of faith and morals, and its moral authority over the Christian conscience. []

The presence of the great name of Dante among the parties to this discussion, is a useful reminder that the quarrel's importance was by no means merely French. [] Again, while Dante is a layman, he is a layman who is not a legist; and, like John of Paris, he has no official *locus standi* in the quarrel. He is moreover a layman who, in refuting the papal thesis as the canonists propound it, makes use of their own chosen method of argument, and uses this to deny the validity of their use of Scripture. All this is extremely interesting; we have here one of the first appearances of the private lay citizen in the public life of the Church. And he appears as not only a most orthodox believer, an undoubted "good Catholic", but as the author of a theologico-political treatise directed against currently accepted ecclesiastical theories, and written to promote the revolution that will save the Church's soul.

Nevertheless Dante is to be classed with John of Paris; for he, too, is looking for the *via media*. This has not, indeed, always been clear to the readers of his treatise *De Monarchia*. [] The general theme of that well-known book is that a universal monarchy is essential if civilisation is to survive and humanity to make lasting progress. Dante's arguments in proof of this build up a conception of monarchy so high that only when a saint was the monarch would the system really work: or so we might think as we read. But for Dante that ideal monarchy was actually in existence. It was the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation, and all that was needed for the millennium to

arrive was to convince the world of the duty of all princes to accept the emperor's superiority. The greatest hindrance was nationalism, and for nationalism -- "the nations that so furiously rage together, the peoples that imagine a vain thing" [] -- Dante has strong, religiously-phrased condemnation. How shall the universal monarch accord with the universal pope? In the first place, he is politically independent of the pope; and Dante, attacking, not indeed the papacy, but the canonists who have devised the theory of the papacy's supreme political authority, systematically reviews -- and denies -- all the " spiritual" proofs these are wont to adduce: proofs from the sun and moon, the two swords, Saul's deposition by Samuel, Our Lord's promise to St. Peter, all this is rejected as beside the point.

So far there is nothing to distinguish Dante's thought from that of other contemporary writers -- not even the almost religious tone of his language about the empire is personal to him. It is in the closing chapter of the third book that he makes his own contribution, and that very briefly. If the empire is independent of the Church -- and since it existed before the Church this must be so -- and if the Church's power is wholly spiritual, then the emperor's authority derives immediately from God. The electors merely indicate the man who shall lawfully wield this power. But the emperor yet remains in some way subject to the pope "since mortal happiness is in some way established with a view to immortal happiness." [] What is this way? and what, in hard detail, does this relation involve, for both pope and emperor? Dante does not tell us. But he says that the emperor receives from the pope "that light of grace by which he may rule more virtuously"; and he lays it down that the emperor shall act towards the pope "as a first-born towards his father, so that radiating the light of the father's grace, he may the more virtuously shine in all that world over which he has been set by Him Who alone is governor of all things spiritual and temporal."

This, it may be thought, is little enough and disappointing in its generality. Yet it is a statement of principle. Dante conceives the State as politically independent of the Church, and yet the temporal power as subordinate to the spiritual; and he conceives it as possible that these two realities -- independent, and yet the one subordinate to the other -- can so co- exist. And it is on this note that the treatise ends.

This, it is true, is not the aspect of Dante's political thought that has chiefly attracted attention. What has been chiefly regarded is his idealistic exaltation of the empire and his protest against the medieval claim that the popes enjoyed, as popes, a primacy in political matters; and his championship of the State's independence of such ecclesiastical tutelage. In his own time also it was this which made the great impression and Dante's *De Monarchia* suffered the reception which received opinion inevitably gives to the pioneer! When, after his death, during the war between the popes and the schismatic emperor Lewis of Bavaria, these themes again became practical politics, there was even for a moment the danger that Dante's bones would be dugged up and burnt as those of a heretic! []

It cannot but be reckoned as a great misfortune -- even if perhaps an inevitable misfortune, given that human nature influences scholars too -- that, despite these artificers of the *via media* between the contending absolutisms, it was the extreme theories of the canonists, given theological form by the genius of Giles of Rome, which continued to shape the mind of the papal champions; and that these theories maintained their hold all through the next most difficult centuries, through the time of the Schism and the Conciliar controversies, and the Reformation, until the great spirit of St. Robert Bellarmine restated and determined the issue. The great Jesuit doctor recognised John of Paris as a distant ancestor of his own thought; and a modern, somewhat disgusted, commentator -- a very great scholar indeed -- has presented Dante as being not much better than Bellarmine. It is always a loss to base a good case on poor argument -- and that was the loss which champions of the papacy, often enough, suffered in those centuries. It was an additional loss that, by their proscription of the theorists of the middle way, the writings of this school passed into the armoury of the enemy, and the obiter dicta of John of Paris (for example) became the foundation of more than one useful plaidoyer for Gallicanism. [] ii. The Problem of Faith and Reason

One of the most serious consequences of the duel between Pope Boniface and the French king was, then, something quite unpredictable; namely, that a considerable body of Catholic thought was now permanently roused, not indeed, as yet, against any Catholic doctrine about the papacy, but against a

principle of administration which, for generations, had been almost as sacred as doctrine, a principle with which the prestige of the papacy was most intimately linked. Here, for the future, there was a great division in Catholic thought. And, unfortunately, it was not the only division. Already, only fifty years after the death of St. Thomas Aquinas, Christendom was beginning to suffer from the failure of its thinkers to rally to his thought, and most of all from their failure to accept its supreme practical achievement, the harmony he discerned between the spheres of knowledge naturally known and of that which we know supernaturally, the true character of the relations between reason and faith. The story of philosophy among Catholics in these fifty years is, in that respect, one of steady deterioration. Already, by the time John XXII canonised St. Thomas (1323), the work was well begun that was to sterilise the movement which was the glory of the previous century, to dislocate the teaching in the theological schools (not the faith of the theologians indeed, as yet, but their scientific exposition of it), to destroy the theologians' confidence in philosophy and the pious man's confidence in the theologians, and to leave the ordinary man, in the end, "fed up' with the whole business" [] of speculative theology.

What is the end of a society that ceases to have any use for thought, or any confidence that thought can produce certitude? Pessimism surely and despair, a flight to the material in compensation, or else to a wrong -- because unintelligent -- cultivation of the mystical life of devotion, to superstition thereby and to worse. For to this must devotion come once it disinterests itself from that explanation of revealed truth which true theology is, and once the mystic is tainted with the fatal error that considers theology as mere scholarship, the professional occupation of the theologian, whereas it is an essential condition of healthy Catholic life; and for the mystic, especially, is it important that theology should flourish and good theologians abound, for in the guidance which objective theology supplies lies the mystic's sole certainty of escaping self-illusion.

All of these calamities were to develop in time. Not all of them came at once, nor within a few years. But it is now that the seeds of much lasting disaster are sown, through the new philosophical theories of leading Catholic thinkers. The two

greatest names associated with this movement away from the positions of St. Thomas Aquinas are John Duns Scotus and William of Ockham, Franciscans both of them, and teachers of theology at Oxford.

Before we consider how they came to build up their new critical theories of knowledge, let us note, what we cannot too much insist upon, namely, that the problem which all these thinkers were trying to solve, about the nature of faith and of reason, and about the relations between the two, is one of the permanent practical anxieties of mankind. Upon all men, sooner or later, the hard experiences of life force the issue. Are the relations between faith and reason such that a reasonable man can continue to have faith without suppressing, or ignoring, the activities of his reason? Here is the difficulty from the side of the philosopher. Is theology -- the body of knowledge whose first principles are truths known by God's revelation -- really a science? i.e. is it a matter fit for, and capable of, scientific treatment? Is it really a field for the exercise of the reason? Or is not philosophy (where the reason has the field to itself), the exercise of the natural reason, a thing to be feared by theology, the sphere of the natural reason being so separated from the sphere of revealed truths that the introduction of reason into this last cannot but be as harmful as it is, scientifically, illegitimate? Here is the dilemma from the side of the theologian.

St. Thomas had so understood faith and reason that he was able to explain how, of their own nature, they are harmonious; they are means of knowledge independent, indeed, the one of the other, but not antagonistic; they are productive of distinct spheres of knowledge, but spheres which are yet in contact, so that man's intelligence can thereby be satisfied that to believe is reasonable, and be satisfied also that faith is not a mere vicious circle in the mind.

This teaching of St. Thomas left man's mind at peace with itself. Man was delivered from doubts about his power to know with certitude natural reality external to himself; he was certain that he could know with certainty, by the use of his reasoning intelligence, not only facts but also general truths of the natural order. Beyond this sphere of the natural truths lay that other sphere of truths, about God as man's final destiny, unattainable by the merely finite, reasonable intelligence. Many of these other

truths had been made known to man -- revealed -- by God, and these truths man also could know with certainty, through his belief in the divine veracity and his knowledge that God had revealed them. Between these two ways of knowing -- by reasoning out the truth from truths already known, and by acceptance of the word of God revealing truths - - there was no conflict; nor was there any conflict between what was known in the one sphere and in the other; there could not, from the nature of things, be any such conflict. And the two spheres were connected and interrelated, so that man's reasoning intelligence could make with the sphere of faith that contact without which man could never be satisfied, and at rest, about the reality of belief, in that intellectual part of his soul whose activity is the very foundation of all his life and happiness. The means of this contact, the delicate all-important nexus, the medium of the thinker's hold on the fact of that higher sphere's existence, was reason's power to arrive, by its own natural operations, at the sure knowledge that there is a God Who is the cause of all else that exists, and at an equally sure knowledge about several of the divine attributes.

Such a theory as this, about faith and reason and their interrelation, is an evident aid for philosopher and theologian alike. It is even a necessity, if philosophy is not to degenerate into scepticism or if theology is not to become a mere psittacism. It guarantees the integrity of both the sciences and the right of each to use the methodology natural to it. The philosopher is saved from the temptation to infidelity, and the theologian from reliance on rhetoric and emotion. Now it was the unfortunate effect of the great thinkers who followed St. Thomas that their theories of knowledge destroyed the all- important nexus between the spheres of reason and faith, when they denied the power of reason really to prove the existence of God.

John Duns Scotus and William of Ockham were, both of them, Franciscan friars; they were Englishmen, and they taught theology, the one after the other, in the university of Oxford. We are now assisting at the very early appearance of what has been a recurring phenomenon of history -- the confection in England of revolutionary doctrines fated to pass across the Channel and to be productive, in the different mental climate of the Continent, of really significant upheavals. The University of Oxford had, from the beginning, very marked particular characteristics.

While Paris was, and continued to be, the first home of pure speculation, the philosophers at Oxford, from the beginning, were particularly attracted to the study of the physical universe. To one of the earliest of these Oxford teachers, Robert Grosstete. we owe a whole corpus of thought related to the theory of light. With another, Adam Marsh, it is mathematics that colour his speculation. And the pupil of these two doctors was the still greater physicist Roger Bacon. []

Roger Bacon, too, was a Franciscan, and, like all the thinkers of his time, he was first of all a theologian. It is theology which is the mistress-science, but philosophy is needed if theology is to be explained. Bacon -- like his great contemporary, and superior, St. Bonaventure, Minister-General of the Franciscan order -- holds that a divine illumination of the mind is the beginning of all knowledge. He explains how all knowledge, of natural things as well as of what is sacred, has descended to us through the ages from a first divine revelation. The Hebrew prophets and the Greek philosophers played similar roles in the divine plan. The philosophers were the successors of the prophets, they were themselves prophets. Nay, Roger Bacon is a prophet too, and conducts himself as such, whence doubtless not a little of the sufferings he had to endure from his brethren. He is a fierce critic of all his contemporaries of the university world, and no less fiercely he contests the prestige allowed the teachings of the great men of the past. Aristotle, unexamined, is a superstition; the only way to certain progress in knowledge is to return to the actual sources, and to make experiments. [] Knowledge of the ancient languages then -- no one should rely on translations -- of mathematics [] and physics, and the capacity and habit of experiments; these are the first things necessary in the formation of the true philosopher. There is no natural certainty to equal the certainty produced by experiment; indeed, by all internal and spiritual experiment we may come to the highest flights of the mystical life. The use of experimental method will reveal in time all the secrets of the world's natural forces. The Church ought to foster such researches. Their fruits will be invaluable to the Crusaders, for example, and also in the approaching struggle with Antichrist that is at hand: for this hard-headed critic of the superstition of Aristotle-worship was, in many things, a fiercely faithful believer in the fantasies of Abbot Joachim.

By the time Duns Scotus came to Oxford as a student [] his confrere, Roger Bacon, was nearing the end of his very long life. The university was still filled with the disputes caused by the Franciscan criticism that the differences which characterised St. Thomas's philosophy were not orthodox. [] The Dominican criticism of that philosophy, of which also Oxford had seen a great deal, had been ended, in 1287, by the instruction of the General Chapter of the order that the brethren were to follow St. Thomas's teaching. But with the saint's chief Franciscan opponent, the passionate John Peckham, still Archbishop of Canterbury, his teaching was hardly likely to be favourably regarded at the English university.

John Duns Scotus, indeed, was well acquainted with it, and in two ways he shows himself a kind of product of the Thomist revolution. For Scotus is an Aristotelian, breaking away and taking the schools of his order with him, from the Augustinian theories dear to St. Bonaventure; and he is so preoccupied with St. Thomas that his own major work is a kind of critical commentary on the saint's achievement.

It is an erroneous and very superficial view that sees in Scotus a conscious revolutionary, a turbulent Franciscan set on to vindicate the intellectual superiority of his order against the Dominican rivals. Duns Scotus has all the calm and the modesty and the detachment of the theologian who daily lives the great truths of which he treats. Always it is to the judgment of the Church that he submits his proffered solutions; the spirit in which he presents his teaching could not be more Catholic, more traditional. But it is not with the great Franciscan as a theologian that we are now concerned, but with his philosophical teaching, more particularly with his theories of knowledge and what follows from them.

More than any other of the scholastics Scotus is preoccupied with the problems of logic. It is not surprising that so studying logic in the scientific and mathematical-minded university of Oxford, and in the order that was the especial home of these studies, Scotus was most exigent in his idea of what is needed to make a proof that is really conclusive. We can argue to the existence of things either from their causes, or from their effects. The first kind of proof is the better, St. Thomas would say -- when we can get it; the second kind, though inferior, is yet

conclusive and so useful. But for Scotus, only the first kind is really a proof.

And so there disappears a whole celebrated series of proofs from reason of the existence of God: and with them go the rational proofs of the providence of God, and of the immortality of the human soul. The human reason cannot, by its own powers -- it is now said -- arrive at certitude here. These are truths indeed, but truths only to be known by faith. Theology is their true home, the learning which deals with truths rationally unprovable. So, then, there disappears that middle ground where philosophy and theology meet, the all-important nexus between natural and supernatural know] edge; and there disappears with it the notion that philosophy and theology have in common to give to man speculative knowledge: for theology is now rather a source of practical direction for life than a science. Philosophy and theology are no longer in contact. The day will come when they are conceived as necessarily opposed. []

Duns Scotus also moves away from St. Thomas, and again by what at first sight may seem only a nuance of method, in that his philosophy makes its first contact with God not in answering the question, Whether God exists? but this, Whether there exists a Being who is infinite? The truth of God's infinity is, in fact, central for Scotus: it is for him God's "essential" attribute. [] And in association with this characteristic approach there is to be noted the place the Franciscan gives to the divine will. It is here, so he teaches, and not in the divine intelligence, that the cause of things being what they are is to be sought. A thing is good because God has willed it as it is. Had God willed it to be otherwise, then it would equally have been good. Law is right in so far as law is acceptable to God. From the point of view of St. Thomas, this is a topsy-turvy way of regarding the matter: and in its ultimate logical consequences it is, of course, far more serious than that. Those consequences will in the next two hundred years be worked out to the full.

Scotus, it may be thought, had a different kind of mind from that of the great Dominican. His tendency to develop his thought through an analysis of ideas already known, and to rely on such analysis as the only way, are in great contrast to the versatility of St. Thomas. But in this chapter we are merely considering the

Franciscan doctor as the first in time of the thinkers whose critique of the philosophico-theological synthesis of St. Thomas did so much to prevent the general acceptance in the Catholic schools of that metaphysical teaching which later generations of Catholics have seen as a *conditio sine qua non* of sound theology. [] To know Scotus in this role alone is, of course, to know him barely at all. His theological teaching was to form the piety of his order for centuries, under the active patronage of many popes, and especially was it to be the inspiration of the three great saints who revived the order in the dark days that followed the Schism, St. Bernadine of Siena, St. John Capistran and St. James of the March. The teaching of Duns Scotus on the Incarnation, and the spirituality which flowers everywhere in it, are one of the permanent treasures of Catholic thought. Most famously of all, Scotus is the first great doctor to set out, as we know it to-day, the mystery of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception and in one office for the feast Duns Scotus is described as another St. Cyril, raised up to defend this doctrine as St. Cyril was raised up to defend that of the divine maternity.

John Duns Scotus was a holy man, venerated as a saint. and perhaps one day to be officially recognised as such. Canonisation is a distinction that no one has, so far, proposed for William of Ockham. Of Ockham's early life we really know very little. He was younger by a generation than Scotus, [] born somewhere about 1285. [] He joined the Franciscan order and he studied theology at Oxford, where, however, he never proceeded to a higher degree than the lectorate, i.e. the apprentice stage where the graduate taught under the doctor's supervision It was at Oxford that Ockham's career as a teacher began. He never, it would seem, taught at Paris, and he was still busy with his lectures at Oxford on the *Liber Sententiarum* of Peter Lombard (the classic occupation at this stage of the theologian's career) when, in 1324, on the eve of his doctorate he was summoned to the papal court to defend the orthodoxy of his views. He had, in fact, been denounced to the pope as a heretic by the chancellor of the university, John Luttrell,

Ockham's many writings are all extant, and the most of them have been in print since the end of the fifteenth century. [] And, since 1922, we possess the report of the Avignon Commission appointed by the pope to enquire into his orthodoxy. [] Ockham's influence was undoubtedly as mischievous as it was

extensive. It is the mind of Ockham which, more than all else, is to dominate the university world from now on to the very eve of the Reformation, but it would be rash, [] in the present state of our knowledge, to attempt to trace the pedigree of his ideas. But Ockham was certainly anti-Scotist, in full reaction, that is to say, against the super-subtlety and multitude of the new distinctions which mark that system.

Perhaps the readiest way to make clear the nature of the harm Ockham did, is to review the Avignon report, and to note [] how Ockham's misunderstanding of the nature and limitations of the science in which he excelled -- logic -- led him to deny the possibility of metaphysics, to divorce completely the world of natural reasoning from that of supernatural knowledge, and to colour even theology with the baneful theory that all our knowledge that is not of singular observable facts is but a knowledge of names and terms. In a curious subtle way the reality of theological truth is thus dissolved, while the appearances (and the terminology) remain the same. Ockham's nominalist theory about the nature of our intellectual knowledge is far more radical than that of Abelard; for him "general ideas cannot correspond to anything in reality," [] a philosophical position which is not consistent with the Faith. And he revealed himself as a philosophical revolutionary of the first degree in the new classification of knowledge which he proposed. There is a kind of knowledge which is self-evident, intuitive knowledge Ockham calls it; this alone is certain knowledge, and this alone enables us to say whether things exist or not. This alone can be the foundation of scientific knowledge. All other knowledge -- of images, of memories, of ideas -- abstractive knowledge, he names it, is not really knowledge at all. [] It is not the business of this book to demonstrate where Ockham's mistake lay -- this is not a treatise of philosophy. But if Ockham were right, our knowledge would be no more than a mere system of useful mental conventions with no objective justification. We should, necessarily, from the nature of things, be complete sceptics about everything except our own physical sensations.

Given such a conception of knowledge, there can hardly be any common ground between reason and faith; and the two spheres are indeed, for Ockham, entirely out of contact. So little can what goes on in the one be related to the activity within the other, that faith may even assure us of the existence of what reason tells us

is impossibly absurd. This separation of faith and reason was the greatest mischief of all. []

Ockham, like Scotus, is fascinated by the truths of God's omnipotence and of the divine infinity. For him, too, it is the will which in God is all important. And he is thence led into developments that far surpass the novelties of Duns Scotus. Even the divine command to love God could, thinks Ockham, equally well have been the command to hate Him; and God could, if He chose, damn the innocent and save the guilty. The whole of our knowledge could be an illusion, God causing us systematically to see and feel as existent things which actually do not exist, and this without any reflection on the divine veracity, or trustworthiness: our sole certitude that God does not so act lies, not in any belief that God is Truth itself but in this that miracles are not part of the ordinary machinery of the divine ruling of creation. One day, what these subtly argued theses posit as possibilities will, without any of Ockham's delicate argumentation, be crudely stated as the fact, and God be hailed as an arbitrary tyrant who must therefore, paradoxically, be merciful to man his victim. From Ockham to Luther is indeed a long road, and the Franciscan's thought doubtless suffers many losses as it makes the journey along it. But it is a road whose trace is unmistakable, and the beginning of that road needs to be noticed. From one point of view Luther has a claim to be regarded as the last in the long line of Catholic theologians of the scholastic decadence. It is not an unimportant point of view.

From this time onwards -- from the middle of the fourteenth century -- it is Ockham's system that dominates the minds of Catholic thinkers. And this, strangely enough, despite the discovery of all its latent mischievousness by the officials first appointed to judge it, and despite the still more evident fact of Ockham's open rebellion against the pope, and the subversive literature of propaganda in which he justified this to all Europe.

The Avignon Commissioners noted in Ockham's philosophy the opinions which might lead to errors in theology -- especially his theory that the object of our knowledge is not reality but an idea of reality only -- with special reprobation and alarm. They condemned his agnostic notion that we cannot know anything more of God than the concept which we form of God: this they declared was manifest heresy. His special dialectical method

they found to be " subversive of philosophy and of theology alike." They had faults to find with his criticism -- as he applied it to the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity -- of the current philosophical teaching about relation. And, finally, they signaled for condemnation a number of theological errors that were to have a great fortune in the future, for they were to appear prominently in the theological foundations of the new Protestant religion. For example, Ockham's notion that, after justification, sin and grace can coexist in the soul; his theory that the merit which a soul has in God's sight is really wholly due to God's acceptance of man's actions as meritorious, and in no way to any worth possessed by the act itself; moral guilt, again, for him, is not so much a reality that inheres to the soul, as a blameworthiness that cries out for punishment; [] and although Ockham does not deny the defined teaching that Our Lord is present in the Blessed Sacrament by transubstantiation, he declares that "consubstantiation" -- the theory that the bread and the wine remain after the consecration -- would be a more suitable theory.

Why, it may be asked, did there not follow upon this report a strong, and even violent, condemnation of the English friar? Perhaps his sudden flight to the schismatic emperor, and the new crisis that followed upon this, first delayed that condemnation; and then, later, the need for it was obscured by the resounding excommunication of Ockham for other heresies. Certainly the pope, John XXII, had no doubts about the quality of Ockham's Oxford work when he described him in a letter to the King of Bohemia (July 27, 1330) as "a heresiarch who publicly taught many heresies, and had composed writings full of errors and heresies." On the other hand, Ockham does not always set out his ideas as proven true, but often puts them forward as suggestions and hypotheses. And he had, of course, a master mind, and the competence that goes with such, in his special gift of dialectic. No doubt, in the long four years he debated with the commissioners, he put up a good defence. Even so, whatever be the reason for it, the escape of this system in 1326 from the needed condemnation is something that still surprises the historian. Certainly the alleged tyranny of the clerical system over the mind of the medieval thinker seems at the moment to have been functioning badly. []

But Ockham's philosophical novelties did not by any means go

entirely uncondemned. If the papacy had other aspects of his career to occupy its energies, the university of Paris, the capital of theological studies, was immediately active against these. Ockhamism was gaining a hold on the younger masters and a decree of November 25, 1339, forbade the use of his books and the teaching of his theses in the faculty of arts. The next year saw a still stronger condemnation of that teaching, as definitely erroneous, and a ban on the use of the new dialectic in argumentation in the schools. Then, in 1346, came the papal condemnation of Nicholas of Autrecourt [] for teaching which is distinctly Ockhamist, and the university's condemnation of two others of the sect, Richard of Lincoln in 1346 and John of Mirecourt, a Cistercian, in 1347. But, in the end, it was Ockhamism that prevailed at Paris. More and more the great names are, all of them, his disciples, Buridan, Marsiglio of Inghen, Peter d'Ailly and John Gerson. By the end of the fourteenth century Paris is, indeed, the chief stronghold of what is now called the *via moderna*, of its logic, its metaphysics and its theology.

It may be asked why the antiqui proved so powerless against the novelties? -- the followers of St. Thomas and Duns Scotus. So far the answer to this natural question is not fully known. One part of it, perhaps, is that the two schools were, increasingly, more interested in fighting about their mutual differences than in continuing to study reality. They contracted something of that fatal preoccupation with mental processes for their own sake which is the characteristic vice of the fourteenth century, and began to "philosophise about philosophies." [] Had they, in truer imitation of their first begetters, given their attention to the new problems of the new age, dealing less with St. Thomas and Duns Scotus as antagonists, and more with what had been the cause of their activities as thinkers, they would have discovered, amongst other things, that they had more in common than they supposed. [] Had they realised how, very often indeed, St. Thomas and Duns Scotus complement and complete each other, the easy victory of the followers of Ockham would scarcely have been possible.

But while Thomists and Scotists were thus locked in a chronic state of sterile warfare, it was the new Nominalism that took up the new problems raised by the new developments in the knowledge of nature. These new truths could not, of course,

cure the radical ills of the nominalist philosophy; but in the association of those who discovered these truths with the adherents of a philosophy more and more at odds with Catholic theology, we may already see signs of the great characteristic of later ages, the assumed necessary antagonism between religion and science. St. Thomas had indicated the true starting point for the harmonious development of natural knowledge and theology; and with this he had exemplified the spirit in which the philosopher and the theologian should work. Neither was to be regarded as the lucky possessor of an armoury of solutions and recipes for all possible problems that the future might throw up; but as a thinker, ready to investigate everything, with a first hope always of assimilating novelties, that derived from a passionate conviction of the unity of all truth. Once that true starting point was lost, and that spirit fled, there was no future for thought.

And this is what had happened round about the middle of the fourteenth century. Henceforth there was stagnation in orthodox circles, and elsewhere a steadily increasing disruption in the life of the spirit. Once the Catholic mind had ceased to think, the faith of the multitude, deprived of its natural protection, would be a prey for every vagary of idea or sentiment. []

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



2. THE TROUBLED TIMES OF JOHN XXII i. The Friars Minor

Twelve days after the death of Clement V, the twenty-three cardinals met to choose the new pope in the palace of the bishop at Carpentras, [] the temporary seat of the curia (May 1, 1314). To elect the pope sixteen votes were needed, according to the law of Alexander III, [] but the college was so divided that no party commanded this needed two-thirds of the whole: there was a Gascon party -- the friends, relatives and fellow-countrymen of the late pope -- ten in all; there was a "Provençal" party of six, that included two Normans; and there were seven Italians, by no means united but continuing in France the hereditary feuds of unhappy Italian memory. For twelve weeks these groups steadily maintained a deadlock, Italians and "Provençaux" supporting an admirable candidate, Cardinal Guillaume de Mandagout, the Gascons resolved to have none but a Gascon. Presently there were quarrels, riots next, and then, July 24, armed bands of free soldiers, under the command of the late pope's nephew, raided the town, massacring what Italians they found, clerics and bankers, and pillaging the goods of the Italian cardinals. A blockade of the conclave seemed likely, and the Italian cardinals, with the troops clamouring for their lives, fled from the city. For the Gascon party this was their chance to remove to Avignon, and thence to declare themselves the conclave and to announce that whoever they elected would be the lawful pope. But a timely manifesto from the Italians checked this manoeuvre; and then, for nearly two years, the two groups, refusing to meet, gave themselves to endless and sterile negotiations.

It was the future Philip V of France who, in the end, induced them to come together, at Lyons in March 1316. He had sworn not to use any violence against them, and to leave them free to enter into conclave when they chose. But when, in June, his brother the King of France (Louis X) died, and Philip left Lyons for Paris, his lieutenants disregarded the sworn engagement, and forced the cardinals into conclave, telling them that locked up they should remain until they found a pope (June 28, 1316). For six weeks there was again a deadlock, until three Italians joined with some of the "Provençaux" and the whole Gascon party to elect the Cardinal-Bishop of Porto, Jacques Duese

(August 7). He took the name John XXII.

The choice was singular, for Jacques Duese, a man of conspicuous administrative ability, and long episcopal experience, of exceptional legal talent, and sternly upright character, was a frail old man of seventy-two. He was, however, destined to last out another eighteen years of vigorous life, after escaping in the first months of his pontificate an attempt to get rid of him by arsenic and witchcraft, in which two bishops and one of the Gascon cardinals had a share. Whenever the constitutional history of the Church comes to be written, John XXII will be one of its greatest figures, for he is one of the chief architects of that centralised administrative and legal system through which, for centuries now, the popes have exercised their divinely instituted primacy. But " incomparable administrator " as he was, John XXII was no less a vigorous ruler, dealing as strongly as subtly with the host of problems that awaited him; and he was, above all else, a most militant defender of the traditional rights of the papacy. With this election the initiative in the affairs of Christendom passed once more to the pope, and to one of the strongest of all his long line. The first problem to which he set his hand was how to bring peace to the much troubled order of the Friars Minor.

It has been told [] how as the companions of St. Francis grew, within a few years, to be numbered by the thousand, the simple informal "rule" that had served for the saint and his score of friends inevitably proved to be insufficient. If a movement that now extended half across Europe was to survive, and with it the special approach to the service of God that was the personal gift of St. Francis of Assisi, the ideal would need a carefully-devised protective code of legislation; and it has been told how the imposition of the new rule in 1223 left many sore hearts among those whose Franciscan life went back to the first early days. Such tragedies as these, when idealism has to face the cold air of reality and either develop a protective covering or die, are not infrequent in human history. Only an infinity of charity can, when they occur, save the ordinary idealist from ruin.

But with the Franciscans there was one change especially which, from the moment it was made, caused very much dissatisfaction indeed among this little group of "primitives," for it seemed to them to affect the most characteristic of the new

order's virtues, poverty. Religious poverty -- the renouncement of ownership, of the right to own property and the right to acquire it henceforward -- had been part and parcel of the monastic life from the beginning. From those first days in the deserts of Egypt, the religious who owned -- or who wanted to own -- anything had been regarded as highly unfaithful to the life to which he had consecrated himself. But when this first fashion, of solitary religious life in deserts, had given place to that of a common life lived in monasteries, although the individual monk -- whatever his rank -- continued to be a monk through religious poverty as well as through religious obedience, some proprietor there had to be for the monastic buildings, the lands which the monks worked, the woods, the farms and the like. That proprietor was the abbey or the order.

It was the desire of St. Francis -- and the special characteristic of his religious ideal -- that not even the community of his brotherhood should own. The order as an order should profess, and practise, religious poverty. This was an ideal easily realised while the order was no more than a few groups of friars, making their way through the Umbrian countrysides that were their native home, preaching their simple exhortation to penance, begging the elements of sustenance at the first door to which they came, sleeping under hedges and in barns; beggar-men who were apostles, apostles who cheerfully lived the life of beggars. But as the numbers grew, the mission of the brotherhood expanded. Soon it had before it a much more complex work than this simple apostolate. And as a code of rules was called for, and courses of study, so too were stable centres where the brethren would live. There had to be buildings, no matter how simple, and land on which they were built. Who was to own all this?

One important complication was the appearance, within the very lifetime of St. Francis, of Brother Elias, a friar with a genius for making the order "a going concern" and a "real success"; here was the practical man, who knew how to gather in the money, and how to spend it, and who rose indeed to the highest place in the order. His sad spiritual end strengthened the hands of the party called "the Spirituals" -- who wished for the impossible restoration of the order's first days. The Spirituals had much to say of the inevitable effect of deserting the first rule, and, no doubt truly, they could point to many friars, in these later days

of elaborate organisation, who reminded men of nothing so little as St. Francis. But the zeal of the Spirituals did not stop here. They could see no good at all in any way but their own way, and they bitterly denounced, along with such friars who really were disgracefully unfaithful, the great mass of the order, the brethren who had settled down to live according to the popes' official interpretation of the mind of St. Francis. It is sad, but not surprising, to record that the poverty of these militant Spirituals was often only surpassed by their lack of charity in judging their fellows, and by their determined insubordination towards those very superiors to whom, for the love of God, they had vowed away their wills in religious obedience.

The first great organiser, charged by the popes with finding a way out of this chaos, and so preserving the great ideal, was the seventh Minister-General, John of Fidanza, whom we know as St. Bonaventure (1221-1274). He served the order, humbly and patiently, as its head for seventeen years (1257-1274) and for his success in devising a way of life, faithful to the ideal of St. Francis, accessible to the man of average good will, and suited to the extended mission of the order, he has merited to be called its second founder. [] The solution which his long experience devised is set out -- often in St. Bonaventure's own words -- in the decretal bull published five years after the saint's death by Nicholas III. []

The problem how an order was to continue to exist that had no right to own, and of how religious pledged to so rigorous a view of poverty were to be faithful to it, and yet be able to accept from the faithful all that was needed to keep the community alive, the decretal solved by the device that the Holy See became the owner of whatever was given to the Friars Minor. In all their use of whatever was given for their use, the Franciscans were not their own masters; they were dependent on the good will of the Holy See. Nor need this have been the mere legal fiction which it has, very superficially, been made to seem. A truly conscientious man uses in a very different spirit and way the things that are his own and those which he has borrowed. The friars were still forbidden even to handle what St. Francis -- the wealthy merchant's son -- held in peculiar abhorrence, money. Not even through a third person, was any friar to use money for his own profit. But he was not bound to refuse, of what was given him, all beyond what sufficed for his own immediate

personal necessity. It was lawful, for example, for the monastery to lay in a store of food. But always, and in all things, the friar was supposed, and commanded, to make such a use of this power of using as would accord with the high ideal of St. Francis. Martin IV, in 1283, added a practical detail to this system by appointing an official (called syndic) to act for the Holy See as a protector of the temporalities in every town where there was a Franciscan house.

These were the years when the war of the Sicilian Vespers was bringing upon the Holy See the succession of disasters already described, and it has been noted how a revival of Joachimite fantasies now developed and how, as in an earlier generation, the Franciscan Spirituals were again prominent in that revival. [] The system set up by the decretal of Nicholas III was, in Italy and in southern France, rudely shaken before it could well settle. Next came the advent of the hermit pope, Celestine V, in whom the Spirituals saw, not only a holy man who had led their own kind of life for sixty years and more, but the papa angelicus foretold by Joachim, as they were the new religious order which the prophet had seen. One of the few personal actions of this hermit pope's short pontificate was the permission granted to the Italian Spirituals to form themselves into a new order, on the model of Celestine's own institution, a kind of Benedictine foundation, and with the Celestinian rule. This solution Boniface VIII had revoked. Moreover, Celestine's scheme had left untouched the problem of the Spirituals outside the mountain lands of central Italy. And the stormy reigns of Boniface VIII and Clement V went by to the accompaniment of violent anti-papal agitation from this turbulent Franciscan minority.

The division in the order was by this time (1311) one of the papacy's chronic troubles, a perpetual menace to the general peace, and, given the vast expansion of the order, a potential threat to the general unity of the Church. [] And side by side with this fresh trouble within the order, there was a steadily developing trouble from without, the complaints -- true or false -- from every part of Christendom about the friars' abuse of their privilege of exemption from the authority of the local bishop and the parochial system. Hence Clement V, once the meeting of the General Council of Vienne was decided, appointed a commission to review the whole Franciscan problem. Its findings could be studied at the council and a lasting decision

then be taken.

But that decision -- given in Clement's bull *Exivi de Paradiso* [] -- was so even and so nuanced that both Spirituals and Conventuals -- so their opponents were coming to be called (the common party, the party of the conventus) claimed a victory. The trouble was thus barely appeased and when, after Clement's death two years later, the Holy See remained vacant for two and a quarter years, it had ample time to break out in all its old fury. In more than one city of Tuscany and Provence feeling ran so high that the Spirituals, throwing off their obedience, drove out the Conventuals after riots and fighting. To add to the trouble the Minister-General now died, and by the time the long vacancy of the Holy See was ended these provinces of the order were in a state of anarchy. To reduce that anarchy was one of the first of the tasks to which the new pope, John XXII, set his hand.

The new pope was a professional legist, a trained and experienced administrator. His sense of order, his well-earned name as a strong and capable administrator, his acute legal mind can have left no one doubting how he would solve the problem. But long before John XXII had finished with the troubles of the Friars Minor, even his tenacity and native toughness must have felt the strain. In a bull [] of 1317 he excommunicated and summoned to an unconditional surrender, the rebellious Spirituals from Tuscany who had now made Sicily their headquarters, and he gave characteristically strong support to the new Minister-General, Michael of Cesena, [] who offered the same terms to the insubordinate friars of Provence. After a hearing in his own presence, where both parties were represented, the pope ordered the Spirituals, under pain of excommunication, to abandon their claim to wear a different kind of habit, and to accept it as good Franciscan doctrine that it was lawful for the convent to take the normal measures to secure that there was food enough for the brethren.

But the sequel had its tragic side. All but twenty-five of the Spirituals gave in; these twenty-five were handed to the Inquisition. They were not only disobedient in a grave matter, defying even excommunication, but, it was ruled, heretics also, for they had expressly declared that the ground on which they refused obedience was that the pope had no authority to alter the rule of the order. Of the commission of theologians

responsible for this example of "constructive heresy," the Minister-General was one. The "heretics" were condemned to the stake, and four of them who held out to the end were actually burnt at Marseilles (May 1318). Thereupon an uneasy peace settled upon the friaries of Provence.

Four years later the affairs of the Friars Minor again troubled the pope. It was not now the small band of Spirituals whom he had to bring to heel, but the whole order; and this in a matter of such importance that, by the time the dispute was over, John XXII had made the order into a different kind of thing.

In the bull [] which marked the final defeat of the Spirituals the pope had warned them that great as is the virtue of poverty, it is not the greatest of virtues. The new dispute turned precisely on this point, namely the theoretical or doctrinal point of the exact value of religious poverty as the Friars Minor conceived this. A Franciscan had been denounced to the Inquisition in Provence for stating in a sermon that, like the Franciscans, Our Lord and the Apostles had neither owned anything as individuals nor as a body. Among the judges was another Franciscan, and he declared that so far from this being heresy, it was the Church's own teaching. This was towards the end of 1321, and within a few months the dispute was occupying the whole attention of the papal court. From the beginning the Franciscans made much of the fact that in the decretal which was the Magna Carta of the order's ideals, *Exiit qui Seminatus*, [] Nicholas III had not only declared that the friars in giving up all things were showing themselves true followers of Our Lord, but had forbidden, under pain of excommunication, any further reopening of this question. John XXII now suspended this prohibition, and soon a tremendous theological tourney was in full swing.

The Franciscans argued for the consecration as Catholic doctrine of the theory that their own way of life was exactly that of Our Lord and the Apostles; that Our Lord was, as one of them actually said, a Franciscan in all but the habit. The other orders, resentful of the suggestion that the Franciscan way was a more perfect following of Our Lord than any other, joined with the secular clergy to oppose them. The air was filled with the extravagances of the rival parties, and all the charges ever made against the Friars Minor were now vindictively renewed. Then, while the question was still *sub iudice*, the General Chapter of

the order, meeting at Perugia, declared, in a public manifesto, that it had been for many years part of the Catholic faith that Our Lord had lived in the utter poverty of St. Francis, and they appealed to the pope to support them and to renew the law, and the prohibition, of his predecessor Nicholas III.

The rash public action of the General Chapter raised a second question that went beyond the simple question of fact (i.e. whether Our Lord had indeed lived in this way), the question namely whether it had ever been declared that all Catholics must believe this as a part of their faith.

The pope proceeded, in orderly fashion, to answer both questions, in two decisions given 8 December, 1322, [] and 12 November, 1323. []

The first decision does not touch the question of doctrine at all. It is a practical ruling as to how the ideal of poverty must be carried out by the Friars Minor, and it is an argued reply to the contentions of their agent at Avignon, Bonagratia of Bergamo. This friar, a highly-skilled theologian and lawyer, had examined the question, What is ownership? from all points of view, seeking to show that no matter what theory of it one adopted, the Franciscan contention was right. The pope followed him point by point in careful refutation; [] and, developing the point he had made against the Spirituals six years earlier, he laid it down that religious poverty does not of itself constitute perfection, using here that teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, on charity as the essence of perfection, which had preserved the other great medieval order from disputes of this sort. The pope noted -- a good fighting jab that Bonagratia had not looked for -- the singular fact that the Franciscan order, so anxious to bear this distinction of a peculiarly absolute poverty, was, as a matter of fact, more anxious to acquire property than any of the other orders. The plan of Nicholas III, that made the friars users only and the Holy See the owner, had worked out badly. It was to be abolished and henceforth the Franciscan order would be, as an order, on a footing similar to the others. [] All the subtle argumentation by which Bonagratia had endeavoured to show that the friars did not only not own even the food they put to their lips -- an ownership which would have sufficed to disprove the absoluteness of poverty they claimed -- but could so use (and thereby destroy) it without having that right to destroy

which is a mark of ownership, the equally argumentative pope routed with ease. Henceforth the Franciscans must be content to be poor, [] in the same way that the other orders were poor, however much they might continue to make poverty their speciality.

The chiefs of the order did not take this decree calmly. Bonagratia replied to the pope with a violence and contempt that earned him imprisonment. He no doubt saw that the revolution now commanded in the practical way Franciscan poverty was lived, foreshadowed a judgment no less drastic on the doctrinal question.

This matter seems to have been most carefully considered during the ensuing months, and all parties were heard. Then came the decision, [] 12 November, 1323. To declare that Our Lord and the Apostles were not owners (i.e. had not a right to use the things they used, a right to sell them, to give them away, to use them in order to acquire other things) is heresy.

The order, before this solemn and serious adverse judgment, was silent and submissive; but a few months later the condemned ideals found an unlooked-for champion in the emperor, Lewis of Bavaria. He had, for a long time now, been openly at war with the pope, and recently -- 23 March, 1321 had been excommunicated. And he found it a useful thing, in the new defiance that was his reply to the pope, to cry out to all Europe that John XXII was a heretic, whose wickedness spared not Christ nor His mother nor the saints. Seven popes, said the emperor, have approved the rule of St. Francis, and Christ by the stigmata of the saint has sealed it with His own seal. And now this enemy of God, and so forth.

But still the order as a whole did not move against the pope: it remained obedient and loyal. The pope, however, replying to the emperor, undertook [] to reconcile his direction for the Franciscan way of life with that of Nicholas III, and thence sprang a new controversy, for here the pope was dealing with something less privileged than dogmas and heresies. At the General Chapter of 1325 [] Michael of Cesena had to remind the brethren not to speak disrespectfully of the pope. And then Michael himself fell.

The pope had summoned him to Avignon. There were rumours (August 28, 1327) [] that he had come to an understanding with the emperor, and that he was to be the expected imperial anti-pope. Michael arrived at Avignon in December of that year, and spent some months making certain changes in the administrative staff of the order at the pope's command. Then, on April 9, 1328, there was a tremendous scene in open consistory when the pope's anger at the Minister-General's dissimulation broke all bounds and overwhelmed him, John blaming him for the declaration at Perugia in 1323 that had been the source of so much trouble. Michael did not deny his responsibility and now, so he tells us, resisted Peter to his face. He was placed under open arrest, and a few weeks later, with Friar Bonagratia, he escaped from Avignon. Outside the city a guard was waiting, sent by the emperor for their protection, and at Aigues Mortes there was a ship to take them to Lewis at Pisa.

At Avignon Michael had found one of his subjects who was also in difficulties with the pope. This was Ockham, so far indifferent to these public questions that were rending his order. But Michael now showed him how John XXII was a heretic, contradicting the "faith" as Nicholas III had taught it. And when the General fled to Pisa, William of Ockham accompanied him. It is at this moment that the Englishman passes into the history of European politics, and its literature; and the Franciscan problem ceases to be a major problem troubling the harmony of Catholic life. A few faithful followers went out with Michael into the wilderness, as the remnants of the Spirituels had already done, to form yet another element in that underworld of religious rebels which everywhere seethed below the surface of medieval life, devoted, narrow, fanatical, apocalyptic, and ineffective as all tiny groups must be which are wholly cut off from the life of their time. ii. The Last War with the Empire, 1314-1356

At the moment when the Franciscan chiefs, and their English brother with them, threw in their lot with Lewis of Bavaria, the emperor's fortunes in his war with Pope John XXII were mounting to their highest point.

It was now nearly four years since Lewis had first defied the pope; in all that time -- the same years that saw John XXII's troubles with the order of the Friars Minor -- the war had never slackened. From the emperor's point of view it was a war of

independence; to the pope it was a crusade. The question that divided them was the old, old question yet once again, what rights had the pope, as pope, over the empire. Although the protagonists did not know it, this was to be the last of these great conflicts. Lewis was indeed to end broken and defeated, like many an emperor before him, but the cause he defended was, this time, to win through, and in less than ten years from his death be tacitly given *droit de cite* by the papacy.

The wisdom of John XXII's successor -- Innocent VI -- tacitly granting that right when he ignored a new "provocation" by the successor of Lewis in 1356, no doubt neutralised much of the mischief to religion which such struggles as these inevitably caused. But, like that earlier fight, between Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair, this contest too had its literary side; and the two chief writers who supported Lewis, Marsiglio of Padua and William of Ockham, were not only publicists but, as political thinkers, adversaries of far greater weight, and more permanently dangerous, than any the popes had yet had to face. Against them the popes might publish condemnations and sentences of excommunication, but, on the Catholic side, there was no thinker equal to them. Their anti-papal, anti-clerical, anti-religious writings survived the condemnations, to be studied more and more, in university circles, slowly infecting Catholic life everywhere, to become indeed the first great literary source and reasoned justification of that "laicism" which the modern popes never cease to denounce as the deadliest foe of religion. In these centuries between St. Thomas and Luther there is no more powerful agent of disintegration than the work of Marsiglio and Ockham.

To understand something of the German situation as the newly-elected John XXII faced it, [] the history of papal- imperial relations during the previous eight years must be recalled, the results of the election as emperor, in 1308, of the Count of Luxembourg, Henry VII.

His short reign (1308-1313) was almost wholly taken up with an active military intervention in the complicated politics of Italy. The then pope -- Clement V -- suspicious of imperial schemes that would give new life to the anti-papal party in every Italian state and city, sought an ally in his vassal the King of Naples -- Robert the Wise. Henry strove to form a league against Naples,

incurred excommunication by the attack he made, and then, as he marched south from Siena, he was suddenly carried off by fever (August 24, 1313).

Clement V understood to the full the opportunity that had now fallen to him. The late emperor had ignored his formal commands about Naples, and had disregarded the conditions set by the pope for his coronation at Rome. The pope now announced that, during the vacancy, the Holy See would administer the empire. He explained that the oaths sworn by Henry VII (at his coronation) were real oaths of fidelity to a suzerain, [] and acting as suzerain he quashed [] the sentence of deposition passed by Henry (April 26, 1313) on Robert of Naples. The terms of this papal declaration are all one might expect from a pope so versed in the traditions of the canon law: it is "In virtue of the undoubted supremacy which the Holy See enjoys over the empire, of the right which the head of the Church possesses to administer the empire when there is no emperor, and by that plenitude of jurisdiction which the successor of St. Peter has received from Jesus Christ, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords" that he annuls the emperor's sentence.

Clement V soon followed the emperor out of this world (April 20, 1314) and it was not until six months after the pope's death, and while the Holy See was still vacant, that the German princes met to elect Henry VII's successor. They made a double election: five of them voting for Lewis, the Duke of Bavaria, and two for Frederick of Habsburg (October 19, 1314). Each was acknowledged as emperor by his own partisans and both were crowned, and on the same day, though in different cities. As the cardinals continued to keep the Holy See vacant for the best part of another two years, the situation in Germany had time to harden. By the time John XXII was elected (August 7, 1316), a miniature civil war was in progress, and the Italian princes (the papal or Guelf part of them) were suggesting that here was the pope's opportunity to end the noxious institution which the empire continued to prove itself, to Italy, to France, and to the Church.

But John XXII refused to be drawn into this plan. He was inclined to a policy that would protect the independence of religion by balancing the forces of the contending princes; the central point

of the policy was the idea that there should be no prince in Italy so powerful that he dominated the whole peninsula. So of the rivals in Germany he supported neither, calling on both to submit their claims to a peaceful arbitration. Then, in 1317, he announced that he considered the empire as vacant; and acting as its administrator, he appointed Robert of Naples imperial vicar in Italy.

For the next five years there was no change in the situation, until, at the battle of Muhldorf (September 28, 1322), Lewis overwhelmed his rival, and took him prisoner. Then the pope, after an interval of some months, in which Lewis asked for recognition, stated his terms, in the spirit of Clement V's intervention in 1313. Lewis refused to ask the empire as a gift from the pope and thereupon the new war began.

It may be asked how far this new war was necessary, a war -- as it proved -- singularly disastrous for religion. Had John XXII not been the fiery-tempered old man he was; had he shown the awareness of, say, Innocent VI, that a new world had come into being since the fall of the Hohenstaufen, a world in which the empire was so little more than a shadow dignity that it was folly to fight a war about one's rights over it, and still more mischievous to link up the cause of religion with those rights; had the pope been something younger than a man of eighty, could this catastrophe not have been averted? John XXII's temperament cannot, it is true, be discharged of much heavy responsibility for many of the troubles of his reign and their long-lasting consequences.

But, it must also be considered, Lewis of Bavaria was, at this moment, and had been for a considerable time, a most helpful ally to those Ghibelline foes in Italy with whom, for the last five years, the pope had been at war; a war intended to make Italy really safe for the papacy by destroying the Ghibelline power wherever found. [] The pope, in the spring before Muhldorf was fought, had called in, against the anti-papal party in Italy, the aid of Lewis's rival. Now that Lewis was victorious in Germany there was every reason to believe he would pass into Italy as the Ghibelline leader. That he brushed aside the condition by which the pope designed to protect the papal interests against him, confirmed this suspicion. In April 1323 Lewis's envoys in Italy demanded the withdrawal of the papal armies from before Milan;

in May they won over to Lewis, Mantua and Verona, at the very hour these were making their submission to the pope. In July Lewis sent a force to assist the Ghibellines of Milan, a small force it is true, but sufficient to relieve the city. The whole situation in northern Italy, lately so favourable to the pope, was in six months, and by the emperor's action, wholly reversed.

These are the very months, it will be remembered, in which the pope has remodelled the order of Friars Minor; [] he is about to destroy a cherished Franciscan opinion about the peculiar relation of their order to Our Lord; [] and Lewis, in the Declaration of Sachsenhausen (May 22, 1324), will denounce the pope as a heretic for these actions, and take the order under his protection in the hope that throughout Germany, and especially throughout Italy, he will now be possessed of a whole army of enthusiastic propagandists.

On October 8 of that same year, 1323, then, the pope warned Lewis to cease to act as emperor within three months, or excommunication would follow. Lewis, playing for time, secured a delay of another two months; but finally the blow fell (March 23, 1324); just eighteen months after the victory of Muhldorf had made him master, in name, of the German world.

The next event in the war belongs to the history of political science; it was the appearance on June 24, 1324, of Marsiglio of Padua's great book The Defender of Peace. [] The empire, it was here argued, was something wholly independent of the Holy See; the prerogatives invoked by a succession of popes were mere usurpation. There was much other revolutionary doctrine in the work, as will be seen, and presently its authors [] fled from what awaited them in Paris to the court of the emperor.

Lewis, on July 11, was once more excommunicated and deprived now of all right ever to be elected emperor. Against him the Habsburg party in Germany now combined with the King of France (Charles IV, 1322-1328) to elect, with the favourable support of the pope, a more suitable kind of emperor. But Lewis countered this by freeing his old rival Frederick of Austria, also a Habsburg, and coming to an arrangement by which Frederick should rule in Germany while Lewis would remain emperor and be master of Italy. And now Lewis, with the aid of Marsiglio's advice, began to prepare for the Italian expedition.

The great affair opened with a kind of congress at Trent (January-March 1327), where the purpose of the expedition was announced, a war for religion against "the priest John" who is a heretic; it was a procedure very reminiscent of Philip the Fair's national assemblies against Boniface VIII. [] In March Lewis marched out of Trent. He was crowned King of Lombardy at Milan (March 31) and then slowly made his way from one city of northern Italy to another. The misfortunes of Henry VII, and the military mistakes that had caused them, were carefully avoided. By October Lewis had gained Pisa and in the first week of the new year (January 7, 1328) he was at Rome and in possession of St. Peter's, where enthusiastic services of thanksgiving marked this first fruits of triumph.

And now began a series of highly-spectacular happenings. The emperor, reconciled by their apparent usefulness to the most revolutionary of all Marsiglio's political theories, and as though he had never opposed to the papal claims his own theory that he was emperor by God's direct institution, now consented to appear before the world as the elect of the *populus romanus*. On January 11, 1328, at a great assembly, "the People" voted him the imperial crown; and, moreover, chose four proctors to invest him with it. Six days later Lewis was anointed as emperor, with the usual ritual, by two bishops, and then crowned by one of the proctors: this proctor was no less a personage than Sciarra Colonna, the assailant of Boniface VIII at Anagni a quarter of a century before.

John XXII had not, of course, looked on idly at the invasion of Italy. While the crown of Lombardy was still a fresh joy to Lewis the pope declared him deprived of his hereditary states, [] and about the time that Lewis entered Pisa the pope condemned him as a heretic for his patronage of the Franciscan Spirituals and also of Marsiglio. [] In that same bull the *Defensor Pacis* was also condemned. Then, in January 1328, the month of Lewis's new "election" as emperor, the pope had declared the war against him to be a crusade, and had ordered it to be preached everywhere as such; and in Germany, brushing aside the Habsburg claim because the party would not submit it to his judgment, the pope, acting as the vacant empire's overlord, had summoned the electors to a new election. They obeyed, and met: but were not able to come to any agreement.

To all this papal activity Lewis replied by allowing Marsiglio to persecute those who, in Rome, dared to stand by the pope. But as the weeks went by, shows still more bizarre were prepared. Three times within a month, "the People" were summoned to exercise, in full assembly, their sovereign rights. On April 14 they solemnly presented John XXII for the emperor's judgment, accusing the pope of heresy; four days later, at another assembly, Lewis, crowned and bearing the imperial insignia, delivered sentence on the pope for his "heretical" declaration about the nature of Our Lord's poverty, and for the treason of his attack on the emperor; the sentence was, of course, deposition. Then on May 12, Ascension Day, a new pope was presented for "the People's" approval. He was, of course, a Friar Minor, Brother Peter of Corvara. The assembly approved him with acclamations, three times in all, and Lewis thereupon invested him with the fisherman's ring. On Whit Sunday following Peter was consecrated and crowned in St. Peter's as Nicholas V. [] There is about all this that note of naive comedy which never, somehow, fails to be absent from solemn anti-clerical incursions into the realms of liturgy and ecclesiastical ceremonial.

It was just six days after Peter's coronation that the Minister-General of the Friars Minor made his escape from Avignon, bringing out with him, for the emperor's service, that still greater power -- as yet unsuspected -- William of Ockham.

At this very moment of triumph, however, Lewis of Bavaria's good fortune left him, never to return. He was to live for another nineteen years, in all that time to claim to be emperor, and to attempt to enforce his claims by what arms he could gather, and by diplomacy with a succession of popes. But never again was he to achieve a victory of any kind, and only the failure of his many enemies to combine saved him, as he drifted helplessly through these years. Only three months after the grandiose installation of "Nicholas V" the emperor was forced out of Rome; his army shrank to little more than a bodyguard; every city in Italy closed its gates against him; by the close of 1329 Lewis was once more in Germany.

The anti-pope, of course, fared no better than his master. Never had he exercised any power except in those rare districts of Italy where Lewis could command obedience, and nine months after

his coronation "Nicholas V" issued his last bull (March 4, 1329). He had left Rome with the emperor, hissed and booed by the most treacherous populace of all the Middle Ages, and thereafter, for some time, he had followed in the imperial suite. But to Lewis he was not worth the trouble of transporting into Germany and, left behind, he disappeared from sight, until John XXII's agents discovered him. A public confession of his follies might be serviceable to the papal cause, and a generous pardon was offered to induce him to submit. So, clad in his friar's habit, with a halter round his neck, Brother Peter at last made his ceremonial submission to the pope (Avignon, July 25, 1330), to disappear thereafter from history. []

For the short remnant of John XXII's long reign, it was the policy of Lewis to seek reconciliation. But John was inflexible in his demand for an unconditional surrender: whatever happened Lewis was never to be acknowledged as emperor, a new election should choose in his stead someone more suitable. In 1333 [] all the parties came to a complicated agreement, one part of which was the emperor's resignation. But this plan, so it seemed to the King of Naples, would make France too powerful in Italy, and he combined with the schismatic Franciscans at the Bavarian court to persuade Lewis to withdraw his assent. []

Five months later John XXII died. [] From the new pope, Benedict XII -- a theologian where John had been a canonist, a man of peace where John had been a fighter, conciliatory and not intransigent -- Lewis had, seeming] y, much to hope. The seven and a half years of Benedict's short reign were filled with negotiations between the two. Benedict never repelled the emperor, he was not over-exacting; Lewis continued to be his weak and vacillating self. But the negotiations never came to anything. Always the King of France, unwilling to see pope and emperor reconciled, managed to influence the pope and to delay the settlement that ever seemed so near. Benedict XII knew well what the French were at, though he seems not to have known how to defeat their diplomatic finesse: he had none of the political gifts. Edward III of England was, in these years, preparing to open the long Hundred Years' War with France, and looking for allies on the Continent. Benedict foresaw what would happen. " The Germans," he said, " will understand, in the end, where the real cause of all these delays lies, and they will make common cause with the English." Which, of course, came to

pass; [] and with the beginning of the war all communication between Lewis and Avignon ceased.

But in the next few years two things happened in Germany that foreshadowed the new age, which, all unsuspected as yet, was surely approaching. All these wars between pope and emperor, that had gone on with so little interruption for now nearly two centuries, had necessarily had a most brutal effect upon the daily religious life of the unhappy peoples of Germany. Sooner or later, in all these wars, the emperor was excommunicated, and thereupon all who sided with him would share the terrible sentence which deprived a man of all right to receive sacraments and which cut him off from the divine life that enlivens the members of the mystical body of Christ. And, as often as not, there would follow upon this excommunication the sentence of interdict, local or general, which closed all the churches, often for years at a time., depriving the whole people of the mass and indeed of all sacraments but those for the newly born and the dying. []

Would the generality of mankind, understanding the policy behind the interdict, co-operate with the pope by accepting it in a spirit of religious humility, and, associating themselves with it penitentially, offer up these grave spiritual inconveniences in a kind of reparation, embracing the very interdict as an opportunity to deepen their own private spiritual life? Such expectations could only be nourished by those whose optimism could see in the average man and woman a soul obviously called to serve God in the high perfection of some strict religious order. The enforcement of the interdict meant in practice -- not necessarily, of course, but as things usually are -- a grave falling off in the liveliness of faith and in morality: while to disobey it entailed, of course, sacrilege each time the forbidden religious rite was performed.

And to add to the chaos there was, very frequently indeed, what amounted to a kind of schism, the activity of the two factions, pro-pope and pro-emperor, which everywhere divided sees and parishes, monasteries and religious orders. While the scholar was hesitating (in another matter) between Thomas and Scotus and Ockham, the ordinary man -- if he really cared about religion -- was wondering which of the rival clergy he knew was telling the truth, or knew what the truth was.

Here, in part, are some of the causes of that decline in religion which the contemporary preachers and mystics describe so luridly, and against which councils are forever legislating, and which has its reflection in the tales and poems of the new vernacular literatures, where -- very significantly -- it is not so much matter for reprobation, or shocked surprise, as it is unconsciously supplied as part of the natural background of the story's action.

Germany, by the year 1338, had suffered nearly fifteen years of spiritual chaos, and the prelates and princes now besought Lewis to be reconciled with the pope, and petitioned the pope in the same sense. To this appeal the pope appears not to have made any reply; and in the July of that year, the prince-electors, meeting at Rense, made a joint declaration on oath that they would defend the rights and freedom of the imperial dignity, which they declared was not the creation of the pope but derived directly from God; the man whom they elected was, they asserted, emperor by the very fact; no papal confirmation or approval was in any way necessary for the lawfulness of his acts. They declared, moreover, that John XXII's various sentences of excommunication passed on Lewis were unjust, and they threatened the pope to his face that they would provide remedies of their own should the Holy See not withdraw these sentences.

Was it the genius of Marsiglio of Padua that shaped such declarations? He certainly had a share in the next innovation, a very foolish intervention by the emperor in the discipline of the sacraments. For Lewis, in 1342, of his own imperial authority, declared null (on the ground of the man's impotence) the marriage between John of Bohemia and Margaret, the heiress of the Tyrol. He wanted Margaret (and the Tyrol) for his own son, another Lewis, and since these two were doubly related within the forbidden degrees, the emperor now issued dispensations from the impediment of consanguinity. And Marsiglio wrote a treatise to justify him.

When the austere, but somewhat unpractical, Benedict XII died (April 25, 1342) the cardinals chose [] in his place the Cardinal Archbishop of Rouen, Pierre Roger, as near an approach to Aristotle's magnificent man as the order of St. Benedict has ever

known. Clement VI -- so he chose to be called -- was a personage far too experienced in public life to waste any time over the debris of the emperor's hopes and chances. Lewis was bidden, somewhat in the manner of John XXII, to cease to style himself emperor; and his position in Germany, where his incompetence was now regarded as the main hindrance to peace, was by this time so desperate that he made a very humble submission to the pope and offered to abdicate (September 18, 1343).

The pope's first inclination was to accept this surrender. But once again, while he debated, other influences prevailed, the combination of the emperor's many foes in France, in Italy and in Germany. Clement stiffened the terms of submission -- only to find that he had now roused all Germany against him. [] But it was not in favour of Lewis that the German princes moved, for a few days later they decided on the man whom they would like to see in his place, Charles of Moravia, the son and heir of the blind King of Bohemia who had been Lewis's great enemy in Germany. [] Lewis had all but ruined Germany, they thought, and "No more Bavarians" was their answer when he ventured to plead for his own line.

And now, at last, the pope shook himself free of his political tutors. The French king preferred to see Lewis acknowledged rather than Charles elected. But Clement VI, this time, ignored the French. He again declared Lewis no emperor (April 13, 1346), and called upon the prince electors to fill the vacancy. This they did, two months later, electing Charles: three of his five electors were prelates, the pope supported him, and so Charles IV has come down as "the priests' emperor." The gibe was no more than a last flicker from the party of Lewis. He died of apoplexy (October 11, 1347), and when his successor died soon after (June 14, 1349) Charles IV's troubles from the house of Wittelsbach were at an end.

" The priests' emperor " had succeeded in great measure because of the pope's powerful aid; and the pope had first used every care to make sure that Charles was really his man. The emperor-to-be, French by his upbringing and Clement's one-time pupil, had appeared at Avignon and had sworn cheerfully to accept all manner of restrictions on his authority. Once securely elected he did not even trouble to ask the pope's confirmation.

He did not, indeed, break his promise not to enter Italy until the pope had confirmed the election. But so long as he would not ask such confirmation, Clement would not give the desired permission for his coronation at Rome. The peace was never broken, but the deadlock endured as long as Clement VI reigned.

Charles found the next pope -- Innocent VI [] easier: leave was given for the expedition into Italy and Charles was crowned, by the papal legate, in St. Peter's, on April 5, 1355. And now, secure of his position, and certain that there would be no resistance from the pope, he published on January 13, 1356, the famous "Golden Bull" which regulated anew the constitution of the Holy Roman Empire. In this it is declared that the election of the emperor is a matter for the prince- electors alone, and that during vacancies the Elector of Saxony is to act as imperial vicar for the north and the Count Palatine for the south. Of all the great papal claims, so resoundingly set forth (and exercised) for centuries, and were, so recently, the occasion of a twenty years' war, there is not a single word. They are not denied, but simply ignored, treated as though they had never been.

Here truly is a sign that a new age has begun; and this, not only in the definitive secularisation of the imperial dignity by the unilateral act of the emperor, but, even more, in the tacit acceptance of this act by the pope. For Innocent VI, who had known, for months beforehand, what was in preparation, remained silent. He could not approve, but he did not condemn. True enough, there was in the bull substantial compensation for the papacy. The empire as such is, henceforth, to mean Germany only. The fatal ambition to realise imperial rights through an actual domination of Italy was thereby cut out forever from the imagination of the German imperial mind. When next a Holy Roman Emperor plays any part in Italian affairs it is because he happens to be, at the same time, the hereditary King of Naples. [] But that claims so great were allowed by the papacy to fall so silently [] -- this was surely a great event, and it marks a real turning point in history. iii. Marsiglio of Padua

The surrender of Innocent VI to the fait accompli of the Golden Bull of the Emperor Charles IV is still more striking when it is set beside the contemporary theories of Marsiglio of Padua, as to the proper place of the Church in the Christian State, set out in the Defensor Pacis; [] theories which, as yet, were mainly

important by reason of Marsiglio's position among the counsellors of Lewis of Bavaria. Lewis had indeed been badly beaten where "the priests' emperor" was now, in 1356, victorious; but it was, none the less, the patronage and protection of Lewis that had preserved Marsiglio, and his book, despite the massy condemnation of John XXII. The Defensor Pacis, so preserved, was now to take on a new lease of life; its doctrines to become yearly more "actual," and more and more infect the world of Catholic thought, and to influence the political advisers of Catholic princes until the book became, in fact, what its author intended it to be, " one of the strongest implements of war ever imagined against the social action of the Church." []

For in Christendom, as Marsiglio proposed to reorganise it, the pope was not merely fettered in his function, as the legists would have fettered him: he was not to function at all. It is the peculiar and lasting mischief of Marsiglio that he creates, for the controversy, an entirely new politico-religious atmosphere, where the problem of Church and State is treated in all its generality. No longer is it any particular right or claim of the Church which is called in question; what is now attacked is the very idea of the Church as an institution. And the layman's desire to throw off the cleric's control of social life is now itself made the basis of a kind of religious teaching.

About the life of Marsiglio we know very little. One of the rare facts is that in 1312-1313 he was rector of the University of Paris. We do not know at what university his student days were passed, nor what he studied. He is, not impossibly, the Marsiglio de Maynandrino to whom John XXII, in 1316, provided a canonry at Padua; and the " Italian named Marcillo " of whom the same pope complained, three years later, that he had gone to the future Charles IV of France (1322-1328) as an envoy of the Italian Ghibellines. We meet him again, seemingly, as a witness to the profession of faith, made, at the demand of ecclesiastical authority, by the Averroist philosopher of Padua, Peter of Abano; and a set of verses by another fellow citizen, Albertino Mussato, describes Marsiglio as hesitating between a career in the law and medicine, and also as seduced from his medical studies by the lure of a military life in the service of two of the great condottieri of the day, Matteo Visconti and Can Grande della Scala.

Marsiglio was, very evidently, a man of parts, and in his great book the student will find, turn by turn, the influence of very varied tastes and accomplishments. He is the passionate Italian patriot; he is religiously anti-Catholic; but he is never the legist, never the philosopher. Aristotle is indeed his master, Aristotle idolised as the Averroist tradition did idolise him; [] but Marsiglio's interest in the Philosopher was scientific, not philosophical. He was, very evidently, not of that elect company possessed of the metaphysical intuition of being and this, inevitably, vitiates his understanding of that part of Aristotle's work upon which he concentrated his vigorous militant mind, the social philosophy of the Politics. As the strongest part of the Defensor Pacis is its main section, that which deals with the nature and role of the Church, so the weakest is the political introduction where Aristotle's theories are discussed, and his formulae used, by a mind that is not metaphysical but positivist, not interested really in natures and causalities, and which therefore is prone to overlook the profound ideas that lie behind simple and seemingly obvious terminology. Marsiglio is not a philosopher, in the strict sense of the term. [] Nor is he a jurist, although he is familiar (as an educated man might be who has frequented the company of jurists) with the legal aspect of the social questions that interest him. Nor is Marsiglio at all a theologian, and what religious ideas he has are akin to those of the Waldenses. Finally, there is every probability that Marsiglio knew, and had been in personal contact with, the group of French legists who, led by Nogaret, had waged the last stages of Philip the Fair's war on Boniface VIII; and he was an active Ghibelline. Considering all these elements in his formation one by one, it may be thought there could hardly be a better recipe from which to prepare the genius who was to devise the most mischievously anti-Christian work of the whole Middle Ages. []

Marsiglio's objective was nothing less than the social influence of the Catholic religion, exercised through popes and bishops and clerics generally upon the whole life of the time. This he proposed to destroy by explaining to the Catholic world what the State really is, and what is the true place of the true religion of Christ within the State rationally constructed. It is, then, necessary to say something about each part of his elaborate argument; and first, about his theory of the State and its powers.

Marsiglio's master, Aristotle, sees man as an animal which is social and political by its nature; and Aristotle's great commentator St. Thomas, understanding that problems about natures are metaphysical problems, and being himself no mean metaphysician, draws from Aristotle's principle a whole corpus of sociological teaching. But always St. Thomas relates his ideas to this first idea of what man's nature is. So, for example in discussing the great questions, What exactly are States? What kind of authority is it that they exercise? How does the citizen stand, relative to the State? What are the right and duties of each? it is to a truth about human nature that St. Thomas, each time, returns. It is by a theory built on a consideration of what natures are, that he answers such questions. How do there come to be States? Why, because it is the nature of men to live in a multitude, "and so there must be in men something by which the multitude is ruled": [] and the saint speaks of the natural impulse [] of men towards the State, which State came into being through human action originating in that urge of human nature.

The importance of seeking the beginnings of any understanding of human political action in such a fundamental as a nature, quite escapes the non-metaphysical Marsiglio. His thought remains on the surface; and he interprets the Aristotelian teaching in the light of a conjectured historical beginning, where the gathering of men in a community is due to circumstance alone, physical or economic. What ultimately, in his view, decides the new move to live in ordered groups is the fact that to form such a group is the choice of the majority. The State is, essentially, nothing more than this "collection" of individuals; and its only unity is that which comes from the imposition upon this multitude of a single will, to which all their individual wills now conform.

In the State -- as Marsiglio conceives it -- force is thus not merely an instrument by which the ideal of Social Justice overcomes whatever hinders its accomplishment, but it is an essential constituent of Law. Law is the imposition of the State's will upon the citizen; [] where there is no force there is no legal obligation, and wherever, in that will, there is force, there is force of Law. Law that does not conform to the objective standard of justice, St. Thomas roundly says, is not Law at all; rather it is mere wickedness. [] But Marsiglio explicitly

contradicts this -- wickedness too is Law, if only it is commanded under legal penalties.

This same defect, that makes the goodness and badness of actions derive from something outside the act -- from laws, for example -- vitiates Marsiglio's theory of public authority. For the ruler's authority, in his view, originates in the expressed intention of these who make him the ruler. Whatever he does in accordance with that intention is good, whatever he does against it is bad; and the ruler so acting in accordance is the pattern for all his subjects' acts, their rule indeed and their measure.

Whence comes this designation of any particular individual to be ruler? Who is it that confers on him this extraordinary kind of power? Here we come to the best known feature of Marsiglio's theory, namely, his teaching about the sovereignty of the people. The source of all authority in the State is the will of the people. The proof of this, apparently, does not lie in any truth about the nature of man, but in the practical consideration that such "consultation" of the people must make for future harmony in the government of the State; and a wise ruler will also "prepare" the people, before he submits any matter to their judgment. Also, a most important consideration, it is the whole body of the people, assenting to the sanctions that accompany laws, which gives to laws that which really makes them laws: it is the whole people that can alone impose what obliges universally. "Sanctions: in this consists the whole being of law, and the people alone has the power needed for the imposition of sanctions. In this is summed up the whole theory of Marsiglio." []

This is, of course, no more than a very general summary of an elaborate discussion that runs to far more pages than there are here lines. And the discussion may seem remote enough from Church history, whose business is to record the fortunes of the Gospel. But some familiarity with Marsiglio's leading notions is necessary in order to understand what is by no means remote, the character and scale, that is to say, of his attack on the traditional Catholic theory of the Church. For it is with the aim of producing an ecclesiastical revolution that Marsiglio has constructed his version of Aristotle's Politics.

The great source of all the evils that afflict the age, he says, is the hold which the clergy have secured on religious life. One main instrument of their power is the false notion of the Church which they have devised. For the Church, like any other "society," is really no more than the aggregation of the individuals who compose it; it is "the ensemble of faithful believers who invoke the name of Christ." All such believers are equally "of the Church"; the distinctions which now obtain between, for example, clergy and laity are secondary, not essential, and produced by human authority merely. The Church, in the traditional sense, has no real existence, nor ever had any.

In Marsiglio's sense the Church has only one divinely instituted function, the administration of sacraments. The power to say mass, to forgive sins, to ordain priests is indeed of divine origin, and belongs only to priests themselves duly ordained. But with these essential liturgical functions clerical activity ceases. It is not for any clergy to decide who it is shall be ordained, nor in what part of the Church and in what capacity, and under what conditions the priest shall exercise his priesthood. Everywhere in the primitive history of the Church -- as Marsiglio reads it -- the determining factor at every stage of the evolution of Catholicism has been the action of the generality of the faithful. Here is still the true source of religious authority, the guarantee of fidelity to Christ's teaching. It is from this source that general councils derive what authority they possess, from here that the right to designate to particular offices derives, and also the right to inflict the supreme sanction of excommunication. In such a scheme there is obviously no place for episcopal authority, nor for the universal primacy of the pope. This last, particularly, is a flagrant usurpation

We never go far in studying such schemes before we are halted by inconsistencies, and by unresolved, and unresolvable, contradictions. For example, the question soon suggests itself whether these faithful, collected together in the Church, are an authority, a religious sovereign, distinct from themselves as the sovereign people of the State. Is this -- seemingly -- democratic Church independent of the -- seemingly -- democratic State? We would hardly expect it to be so; and indeed, by carefully thought out distinctions, Marsiglio shows how all the powers of ruling the Church which he denies to the clergy really belong to, and

should lawfully be exercised by, the civil ruler. The Church is, indeed, no more than the religious aspect of civil society, the reflection of what that society feels, at any given moment, about religion.

Not only, then, may the civil ruler lawfully exercise all authority in the Church: to do so is, for him, a primary duty. For example, nothing is more fatal to the State, as Marsiglio conceives it, than the clear distinction between the legality of what it ordains and the intrinsic goodness (or badness) of these acts. It is therefore highly important, in practice, that there should never be any moral criticism of legislation. But, for centuries now, the Church of the popes has had the inconvenient habit of making such criticism; it is indeed one of the popes' chief activities. Laws have been denounced as tyranny because contrary to justice; rulers have been lectured, warned and punished for enacting laws declared to be unjust; subjects have been told that they need not, indeed must not, obey such laws. The State of the future must, then, see to it that no pope or bishop or other cleric is ever suffered to put into action a doctrine so treasonable, destructive indeed of the very basis of civil authority. The spheres of conscience and of obedience to civil authority are distinct, separate, and independent. Activities proper to the first must never be allowed to overflow into the second, or the most terrible confusion will follow and the peace and unity of the State be forever endangered.

" Unity within the State" -- here is an ideal very close to Marsiglio's heart. Therefore, within the State let there be one single authority, one single jurisdiction, no privileged bodies, no immunities. To introduce a second jurisdiction, to seek immunities for a particular section of the citizens (judicial immunities, legislative immunities, fiscal immunities) is treason to the State in the highest degree. The ruler must then, in simple duty to the peace of the State, destroy the privileges of the clergy. Also, in those matters where the divine law needs human agents for its execution, it is the State which must be that agent; for there cannot be two coercive jurisdictions operating over one and the same people. Only thus will the State become, what it needs to be, the real ruler of all its citizens. Law is, as it were, the atmosphere of a particular country -- all who live in that country must breathe the same air. Nothing, Marsiglio argues, with undisguised bitter passion, has been more noxious to the

peace of states than that immunity of the clergy from the prince's jurisdiction which the popes have championed for so long; and in a kind of parody of the concluding phrases of Boniface VIII's *Unam Sanctam* [] he declares his own gospel, that for its own well-being the Church, all the faithful people of Christ, must be subjected to the civil ruler, his laws and his judges.

The needed subjection of the Church to the State will not, however, be achieved by such merely negative acts as the destruction of clerical privilege. A more continuous, positive, action upon the Church is needed, and this is in fact vital to the welfare of the State. Here Marsiglio -- like all his followers ever since, down to our very contemporaries -- flings consistency to the winds, and having first divorced morality from the business of ruling, he now proclaims that to foster morality is one of the State's gravest duties; the State, undoubtedly, has moral and even spiritual functions. The secularist patriarch enlarges on them with evident and conscious unctiousness.

There is, for example, the State's duty to promote among its citizens the practice of virtue and of all the duties which God's revelation has made known to us, which last (we note) is not only necessary if man is to save his soul, says Marsiglio, "but is also useful for the needs of this present life"; and so the state must appoint learned men to teach religion and to organise divine worship. There is nothing spiritual, he says, that does not somehow affect the welfare of the body politic. Therefore the State must control the spiritual. It ought, for example, to regulate the lives of the clergy, determining the standards of their conduct, their fasts, prayers, mortifications and so forth. It must decide the nice question whether they will not be better clergy if they do not possess property, but if, instead, surrendering all right to be owners, they throw themselves -- for maintenance -- on the generosity of the State, as God's agent, once they have committed all their care to Him: evangelical poverty imposed by the State on all the clergy will be yet another means of control. Finally it is the State's duty to take into its own hands the whole vast business of education, of forming, controlling, directing the literate class of the future, and of so shaping it that it will be yet another willing instrument of State policy.

The *Defensor Pacis* was completed on the feast of St. John the

Baptist, 24 June, 1324. While its author was planning the new venture of setting up as a lecturer in theology, his book was denounced to the Church authorities. Marsiglio and his ally, the notorious Averroist, John of Jandun, saved themselves by flight (1326). They joined Lewis of Bavaria at Nuremberg and thenceforward their history is one with his; their influence upon his action alternating curiously with that of the emperor's other anti-papal allies, the Franciscans Michael of Cesena and Ockham. The first papal condemnation of the book, which does not, seemingly, name its author, is a bull of 1326 which has not survived. [] The next year, April 3, 1327, a second bull, [] addressed to Lewis, upbraids him for his patronage of these two "sons of perdition," but even yet the full text of the book does not seem to have reached the papal court. But by the date of the next bull, October 23 [] of the same year, the pope is more fully informed, through the bishops of Germany. In this bull five of the six propositions which the bishops sent on as resuming Marsiglio's leading ideas, are condemned after a most understanding criticism. The pope went directly to the heart of the subversive doctrine, and set in the broad light of day the mischievous principles that underlay the mass of subtle argumentation, satire and bitter, passionate rhetoric. The condemnation was, indeed, one of the most characteristic and masterly acts of John XXII's long, eventful reign.

The Defensor Pacis -- appearing in the midst of a war between pope and emperor -- naturally made a sensation. It was translated into French (1330) and into Italian (1363). In Germany especially it was a success. Nevertheless, it seems certain that there were but a few copies of the original in circulation before the time of the Schism (1378). It is not without interest to note that the so-called "democratic" theories of Marsiglio appear to have caused no comment at all. What, everywhere, roused attention was his application of them to the Church. How ruinous this was to traditional belief was immediately understood on all sides. Lewis of Bavaria himself cuts a somewhat comical figure, earnestly striving to dissociate himself from such scandalous ideas and explaining, in 1336, to Benedict XII that he has no head for these matters and has never really understood what Marsiglio had in mind.

But whatever the scandal caused by the Defensor Pacis to the mind of Catholic Europe, it remained unanswered, save for the

papal condemnation. [] Was it indifference, on the part of theologians, to a work which, in its new "positivist" approach to a theological problem, was an offence to current scholastic good form, and which, thereby, classed itself with all the rest of the new scientific knowledge of the fourteenth century? It is surely strange, and disconcerting, that Marsiglio's attack did not stimulate some Catholic to produce, not merely a controversial rejoinder, but a new constructive statement of traditional doctrine. Be that as it may, when the ideas of Marsiglio came alive again, in the last years of the fourteenth century, they met no contradiction from Catholic learning. His influence is evident now in France, in John Wycliff, and in the heresies that from this time begin to dominate Bohemia. We find no less a person than Gerson recommending the book, and it undoubtedly played a part at the General Council of Constance. [] It was more and more copied in the fifteenth century, more and more eagerly read, as the breakdown of Christendom drew nearer. The first printed edition appeared in 1517, the year of Luther's first appearance as an innovator, and the publication of an English translation, in 1535, was one of the earliest moves of Thomas Cromwell, then busy with the publicist strategy that accompanied the creation of the Church of England as we know it to-day. [] iv. The End of John XXII

Marsiglio's adversary, John XXII, was harassed by trouble and crisis literally to the very end of his life. For his last hours, ere he passed from this world, at ninety years of age, were given to a theological controversy, and one which his own act had begun. In this controversy, about the state of souls in the interval between death and the General Judgment of mankind at the end of the world, the pope took a line that went against the general body of received opinion and tradition. The peculiar ideas which he championed were set forth in three sermons, preached at Avignon on All Saints' Day, 1331, on December 15 of the same year and on the following January 5. In these sermons John XXII declared that the souls of the just do not enjoy the intuitive vision of God (in which consists their eternal heavenly reward) until, after the last day, they are again united with their bodies; and also that neither the souls of the lost nor the devils are as yet in hell. but will only be there from after the last day.

These sermons of the aged pope astonished the theological world, at Avignon and elsewhere. The startling news of this

papal innovation, in a matter belonging to the sphere of doctrine, was speedily conveyed into Bavaria by the cardinal Napoleone Orsini, who had long been secretly planning and hoping for John's deposition. There, Ockham and his associates gladly fashioned it into a new weapon against the pope. He had already, they said, repudiated one point of the Christian faith, to wit the belief in the absolute poverty of Our Lord and the Apostles: now, he was repudiating a second. It was the very way heretics had always acted; little by little they came to deny the whole body of traditional belief. John, now obviously heretical to all the world, could not any longer be regarded as pope.

The pope's own attitude to the controversy he had occasioned is of the greatest interest. Significantly, he made no attempt to use his pontifical authority to support what he had said in his sermons. Quite the contrary: as one who had been doing no more than express an opinion which he considered to be as good as any other, and who, quite evidently, is surprised at the chorus of dissent, he now set theologians of various schools to examine the whole question and to report. Notable among them was the Cistercian cardinal, James Fournier, one day to succeed John as Benedict XII. He was an extremely competent professional theologian, and without difficulty he clearly showed that the opinion of John XXII had scarcely any support and that the body of tradition was firm against him; on the other hand, in the controversy against those who, like Ockham, were beginning to denounce the pope as a heretic, Fournier noted first of all that, so far, the Church had never expressed its mind on the question by a definition, and next that in these three sermons John XXII had made no claim or pretence whatever to be doing anything more than preach a sermon to the particular congregation which at the moment filled the church; the pope had spoken simply as any bishop or priest might have spoken, as a private theologian, and not as the pope laying down a definition of doctrine for the assent of the whole Christian Church.

But the controversy continued to rage for all the short remainder of John's life. The new head of the Friars Minor, the successor of the excommunicated Michael of Cesena, with sycophantic misunderstanding of the situation, became a most enthusiastic advocate of the pope's unusual views; and, unfortunately for himself, declaimed them at Paris, where he immediately fell foul

of the greatest body of theologians in the Church. The university discussed the theory, found it contrary to the general teaching, and as such reported it to the pope. Then John XXII fell into his last illness. On December 3, 1334, from his sick bed, he made a public explanation, and a submission of what he had said to the teaching of the Church. He believed, he said to the assembled cardinals, that "the souls of the just, separated from their bodies, but fully purified from sin, are in heaven, in paradise, with Jesus Christ, in the company of the angels, and that, according to the common law, they see God and the divine essence face to face, clearly, as far as the state and condition of a soul separated from the body allows this." But this qualified retraction the pope explicitly submitted to the Church's decision. And the next day he died.

Benedict XII closed the controversy by the bull *Benedictus Deus*, of January 29, 1336, in which he defined, as the teaching of the Catholic Church, that the souls of the just (i.e. the souls of those who leave this world with no stain upon them that needs purifying, and those souls also which, after death, have been purified in purgatory) immediately after death (or on the completion of such purification) see the divine essence by an intuitive and even facial vision, and this before they are reunited with their bodies, before the general judgment. Moreover the souls of the lost are in hell from the moment of death. []

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



3. THE AVIGNON REGIME i. The Centralised Administration

The seven Avignon popes were a singularly competent line. Rarely indeed has there been, in the papacy, such a continuous succession of administrative ability. No less unusual -- in its medieval history -- was another feature of the regime, namely, that for as long as seventy years the papacy was established in the one place. Nowhere, in fact, had the popes -- from the time of St. Gregory VII (1073-1085) at least -- been less at home than in Rome; and for three-quarters of the century that divides the reign of Innocent III from the establishment at Avignon, the curia had wandered from one town to another of the papal state, settled anywhere rather than at Rome. Now, from 1309, that vast establishment was for seventy years stably fixed; and three successive generations of Catholics saw, as a new thing, what has, ever since, been so much the rule that it appears to us in the very nature of things, namely the pope and the great administrative machine through which he works permanently, and as it were immovably, placed.

To say this of the Avignon papacy is to say that conditions then favoured, as never before, all that conscious development of a centralised papal government of the universal Church, which had been so notable a part of the papal policy ever since St. Gregory VII had discerned in it a mighty means of reform and a strong defence of reforms accomplished. More than ever, then, this is a period which sees the translation of rights and law into the fact of a regular bureaucratic administration; the fixing into hard tradition of the ways of administrators, financiers, judges. The Corpus Iuris Canonici is now, at last, really to begin to come into its full supremacy, not merely as an instrument which men use, but as that greater thing than any of these individuals, a law which they all serve; and it is to produce the most competent, completely centralised system of government -- i.e. on a very great scale -- which the Middle Ages knew. [] Perhaps more than any individual pope of the next two hundred years it is this system which is to matter. In an age when theology declines, the canon law flourishes -- as does its twin sister, the Roman law as the Middle Ages knew it; it is now that the Roman law receives a new birth in the genius of Bartolo. It was but the justice of history that, when the great catastrophe of the sixteenth century

arrived, the canonists should come in for some of the blame. "Holy Father, it is the teaching of the canonists," so the report begins of the cardinals whom Paul III, in 1537, commissioned to examine the causes of the new revolt. []

The pope's chief agents in the ruling and administration of the affairs of the Church universal continued to be the college of cardinals. Its numbers were still restricted, by comparison, that is, with the standards of the last four hundred years: [] in the conclaves of this period (1305-1378) the number of electors fluctuates between eighteen and twenty-six. But never, after Boniface VIII, did the college shrink to the dozen and less, which was all that it counted in the great thirteenth century. []

The importance of these high dignitaries in the life of the universal Church -- in origin they are but the more prominent of the clergy of the local Roman Church -- goes back, of course, to the decree of Nicholas II in 1059, which constituted the cardinals the sole electors of the pope. The Avignon period is most important in their history as a college because they now, very definitely, begin, as a college, to aim at influencing, and even controlling, the action of the pope. Here, and not in the universal episcopate, is the beginning of the dangerous movement to reduce the traditional administrative supremacy of the pope. The cardinals are few, they are wealthy, they all reside in the curia -- for, as yet, in the rare event of the hat being conferred on a diocesan bishop, he leaves his see to live in the curia -- and they are organised. Their pressure on the papacy is constant. At every vacancy, from the end of this century, they make election pacts to ensure their own enrichment and to fetter the action of the future pope. It is the bad will of the cardinals -- if not their bad faith -- that is primarily responsible for the Schism of 1378. They play the traitor to Urban VI in 1378, and -- so general by now is the idea of their independence -- in 1408 both sets of cardinals betray their masters, the rival pontiffs Gregory XII and Benedict XIII. At every crisis throughout the fifteenth century, and down to the very eve of Luther's revolt, the pope's first anxiety is how the cardinals will behave. Not until the coup d'etat of Leo X, who, in 1517, swamps the opposition. by creating thirty-one cardinals in one act, are the popes really free of their factious collegiate interference.

Meanwhile their importance could not be greater. It is in the

consistory that the main acts of Church government take place, where each cardinal has rights of speech and of opposition. The pope needs their consent for many acts and, very notably, before creating additional cardinals -- and to new creations the college is, almost by instinct, habitually opposed.

In the consistory there is also transacted much political and international business. This makes the cardinals objects of great interest to the different Catholic princes -- an interest that increases steadily as the great states of modern times, and the new permanent international rivalries, take shape in the fifteenth century. But already, at Avignon, it is beginning to pay the princes to be on good terms with the cardinals, to attach particular cardinals to their interests, to make them handsome presents, to dower them with pensions.

Not that the cardinals are necessarily poor men otherwise. Far from this, they are in the fourteenth century a byword for wealth, pomp and luxurious living; Petrarch in Italy and Langland in England speak here a common tongue. By law they have a right -- that is to say the college -- to divide equally with the pope the taxes called *servitia comunia*. [] In the eighteen years of John XXII, pope and cardinals thus shared more than a million gold florins. They enjoyed the revenues of the numerous benefices which it was now common form should be heaped on each of them, parishes, canonries, abbeys and diocesan sees -- benefices they never saw, where the work was done by a deputy at a fixed salary, while agents farmed the revenues for the absentee cardinal titular. Then there were the gifts made by the popes at fixed occasions, on their election for example, and on its succeeding anniversaries. So John XXII, in 1316, and Benedict XII, in 1334, divided up 100,000 florins between the cardinals. Clement VI, in 1342, gave them 108,000; Innocent VI, 75,000 in 1352; Urban V, ten years later, only 40,000.

The princely style in which the cardinals lived brought them bitter words from Petrarch -- somewhat ungratefully, for he had his share of it in his time. And it brought, also, frequent reproof from the popes. Cardinals began to be most unpopular figures in the Church. The feud between them and the bishops deadlocked, and nearly wrecked, the Council of Constance. Continually, for the next hundred-and-fifty years, whenever projects of reform take practical shape the first item is usually

that the cardinals shall diminish their households, dismiss the horsemen, the jesters, the actors, and all the varied paraphernalia of their courts, that they shall take for their service only clerics, and that these shall be dressed as clerics and live as clerics, and so forth. But all will be in vain, for all that time, until the day comes when the Dutch reforming pope, entering his States on his election, will need to have it explained to him that the gaily-caparisoned princes who salute him are indeed the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church.

One last word about the college under the Avignon popes -- it is almost wholly French. The seven French popes of this time created between them 134 cardinals; 111 of them were French, there were sixteen Italians, five Spaniards, two Englishmen. It will be noted there was none from Germany, the perpetually unsolved problem of the papal administration. But this was not merely because these popes were French. There had been no German cardinal in the sixty years before the "Captivity" began. Nicholas of Cusa, created cardinal in 1448 by Nicholas V, was well-nigh the first German cardinal for two hundred years.

Like every other system of government, the papacy had had to create a highly-organised department where all state documents were prepared, and whence they were despatched: grants, licences, monitions, and appointments of various kinds; this was the Chancery and at its head was the vice-chancellor. In its archives copies were preserved of all the documents despatched, and also the original petitions from which so many had originated. Here was a vast secretariat which put into writing, in the appropriate form, the day-to-day decisions of the pope and saw to their transmission to the interested parties. But for matters of conscience which touched the private lives of individuals there was a special office called the Penitentiary. [] Here, under the direction of the cardinal grand penitentiary, a host of experts in theology, and canon law, dealt with such matters as requests for dispensation from the innumerable impediments to marriage; or for the removal of excommunications, interdicts and suspensions; or for power to absolve from sins reserved to the pope. This department had its own staff of clerks, and also a staff of eighteen penitentiaries who sat in the churches of the city to hear the confessions of all comers, with special faculties to absolve from sins reserved and also from reserved censures.

Another feature, common alike to the government of the Church and of states, was a system of law courts. Here the Avignon popes were great innovators. Their predecessors had devised the practice of naming judge-delegates who did all that was necessary in a lawsuit save to give the sentence -- this being reserved to the pope and, generally, his personal act. But the number of cases which came in to the pope for decision increased so enormously, from the beginning of the fourteenth century, that the popes now began to grant, to the judge-delegates whom they appointed, power to give a definitive sentence. Alongside these new methods the old permanent tribunals continued to function: the consistory, and the court that came to be called the Rota.

The consistory was the whole body of cardinals present in curia, with the pope in person presiding. it was the primitive, omnicompetent, engine of the ecclesiastical system; the pope's cabinet, his council, his tribunal for any case it cared to hear; where all kinds of business was transacted, spiritual, political, administrative, international; where ambassadors were heard and treaties signed. And during the Avignon period it remained the principal instrument of government as before.

The origin of the court which, about this time (1336), came to be called the Rota is obscure. It is really the "court of audience for causes of the Apostolic Palace, " and its competence extends to all cases sent to it for judgment by the pope or the vice-chancellor. [] But its principal, and indeed usual, employment is to hear and decide suits arising out of presentations to benefices. This is the period, as will shortly be explained, when the papal centralisation reaches to such a height that almost every clerical appointment may come within reach of the papal curia. What hordes of petitions, and cross-petitions, pour in to Avignon from now on can easily be guessed. The judges of the Rota-the auditors, there are eight of them ill 1323 -- hear and decide these disputes. From their sentence there is no appeal. But the elaborate law of procedure gives the litigant a rich variety of means to delay the sentence, or to hold up the trial. When the canons of Hamburg and the citizens of the town brought their disagreements before this court, the ingenuity, first of one side and then of the other, dragged out the case for as long as sixteen years. [] So many were the pleas for delay,

and so great an opportunity was thereby offered to legal chicanery, that the popes set up a special court to examine the expedients brought in to delay discussions. This was the court of "audience of disputed letters" (audientia litterarum contradictarum), more usually called "the public audience." [] It seems not to have been notably successful, and, in the end, only added yet another complication to the already complicated system.

There were also courts where the various cardinals were judges. But these were courts that only functioned when commissioned by the pope to judge a particular case. For the most part, they undertook the preliminary enquiries needed to bring out, for the pope or the consistory, the real facts at issue in the suit. Clement V greatly simplified their procedure; but there were two serious inconveniences? always, for those who made use of these courts. The one was that, since cardinals were liable, at any time, to be despatched on missions abroad, there was great uncertainty when the case before them would finish; and the other was the extent in these courts of what is best and most expressively described as "graft," if not for the cardinal's services, then for those of his household and his officials.

The law administered in all these courts, [] to which suitors came from every diocese in Christendom -- they were indeed the only courts that could hear suits between sees in different ecclesiastical provinces [] -- was the canon law as this was promulgated in the great compendium of 1234, [] to which Boniface VIII had, in 1296, added a sixth book [] and John XXII, in 1317 [], the laws of his predecessor, Clement V -- the Clementines. It was a law made up of the decrees of councils, and decrees and decisions of earlier popes; some of these had been enacted for the generality of the Church, and others were decisions given in particular cases but establishing a general doctrine of law, and henceforward given force of law universally.

The first legal foundation of this massive, and -- by this time -- scientifically organised, instrument of government was the collection of disciplinary canons of the earliest councils of the Church, as far as these were known, and of what rules of discipline could be found in the history of the earliest popes. Much of the more ancient part of this lore -- whatever its legal usefulness, or its intrinsic truth -- was, historically, mere

apocrypha, the -- as yet unsuspected -- invention of ingenious ninth-century forgers, anxious to produce new and most convincing evidence in support of beliefs and practices long traditional.

These forgeries, which we know as "the False Decretals, " [] added nothing to the substantial foundation of the corpus of the canon law. Much more important was the influence upon that corpus, in its critical nascent years, of the contemporary revival of the study of Roman law. Like all the other early medievals, the first professional practitioners of the canon law (whether they functioned as legislators or in the ecclesiastical tribunals) could not have escaped -- even had they so wished -- the far-reaching influence of this great creation of legal thought. It is not so much that here is a code of laws ready made for a variety of occasions; but here is law as a body of coherent thought; here are legal principles and doctrines, laws seen as the fruit of law; and also a most remarkable, technical, legal language. [] The first founders of the canon law, as this appears from 1234 in the papal books, were no less skilled in the Roman law, the civil law, as it is also called; and in the legal procedure thence onwards built up by papal legislation, the influence of the Roman procedure in law is everywhere apparent. Roman influence is apparent elsewhere too, in more than one canon-law doctrine, and also in the spirit in which the canonists develop the administrative machinery by which the popes rule the Church divinely committed to their supreme authority. []

It was not, however, the canonist who was the leading figure at the Avignon curia. The pope's most confidential adviser, the official whose word was necessarily most weighty, was the cardinal placed at the head of the finances, the Camerarius. []

And here something must be said of a new practice -- not the invention of the Avignon popes indeed, but one which' they developed enormously, namely the reservation to the Holy See, and its use in practice, of the right to present to benefices throughout the universal Church. Here is the most striking act of the centralised papacy of the Middle Ages. It began forty years before the "Captivity" when Clement IV, in 1268, by the famous decretal Licet, declared that for the future the popes would keep in their own hands the nomination to all benefices vacant by the death of their holder while at the Roman curia. The principle set

forth was speedily developed by succeeding popes. Boniface VIII, in 1296, extended "at the Roman curia" to mean within two days' march of the Roman curia. Clement V's extensions, and those of John XXII, as codified in the constitution *Ex debito*, bring within the papal reserve all benefices vacant through the deposition or privation of the last incumbent, or through his election not being confirmed, or by his resignation made to the pope, or vacant by the incumbent's acceptance of a new benefice through papal provision or papal translation, and a host of other ingenuities. Further extensions followed until, by the end of Gregory XI's reign, almost every benefice in the Church was at the pope's disposal.

This new development inevitably increased the work and importance of the Camerarius. At every nomination, or concession of a provision, there were fees to be paid. At every death of a beneficiary nominated by the pope there were certain rights due to the pope. The Camerarius needed to have agents in every diocese of Christendom, and, because of the wide range of his department, no officer of the curia was so much in touch with the universality of the papacy's problems. By his office, too, it was the business of the Camerarius to know all about the rights and privileges of the Holy See everywhere. In political crises he was, for this reason, an extremely important person; and, financial transactions on his imperial scale necessarily involving contacts with governments, the Camerarius was, at all times, the pope's chief agent for the day-to-day business with the Christian princes; the political correspondence of the Holy See was done through his clerks; and his collectors -- who are already by this time the regular source of the Holy See's information about the state of Europe -- will one day develop into the nuncios who, with the Secretariat of State, to-day make up the papal diplomatic service.

The Camerarius had also his own system of courts -- with a special bar -- to hear and decide the inevitable, and innumerable, disputes about assessments and payments. He had a special prison at his disposal, and he controlled the papal mint.

The vast engine of collectors which the Camerarius controlled is, perhaps, to students of the vernacular literature of these times, to readers of Chaucer say, or of Langland, the best known, indeed the most notorious, feature of the "Avignon

Captivity." It was, from the papal exchequer's point of view, a most admirably devised machine. Never before had so much milk been got from the cow. The system of taxes and charges was twofold; one series was payable at the curia itself, while the other was collected in the taxpayer's own diocese. In all cases it was a taxation of Church property and of Church revenues only.

All bishops and abbots paid, on appointment, one third of the annual assessed income of their see or abbey, and also a second tax which varied in amount from one twelfth to one twenty-fourth of this income; the receipts from the first tax (servitia communia) were divided between the treasuries of the pope and the sacred college, those from the second went to officials and to the officers of the cardinals. If the prelate was an archbishop he had pallium fees also; and if he were actually consecrated at the curia (or blessed) there were additional fees amounting to a sixth of what he paid as servitia communia. From these fees only those were exempted whose revenue was less than, say, £500 a year, present (1946) value. [] At fixed intervals bishops were bound to make, personally or through an agent, a pilgrimage "to the threshold of the Apostles" to report on the state of their dioceses, and to pay a special ad limina tax. There were of course, as in all governments, taxes and fees at every stage of the concession of privileges, licences, appointments; another source of revenue lay in the money payments to which vows and penances were at times "commuted." And there was also the tribute, paid annually by the vassal kings of Naples, Sicily, Aragon and England. []

More familiar to the generality of Christians, however, were the taxes gathered by the small army of officials sent from the curia into every part of the Church. These taxes were of two kinds. First of all there were taxes levied for special occasions; the tithe for example, that is to say one tenth of the income of all benefices as this had been officially assessed, and the "loving aid" (subsidia caritativa). [] This last was, originally, a voluntary contribution made by a benefice holder in response to an urgent general appeal from the Holy See. But by the time of the Avignon popes it had ceased to be voluntary; the collector fixed the amount due, and delay was punished (as everywhere in the system) by excommunication.

The permanent taxes were, of course, a much more serious

matter. The most profitable was that called Annates, the first year's revenue of every benefice after the appointment of a new incumbent. It was Clement V who devised this system, first of all for England only, in 1306, and for benefices vacant by the death of their holder while at the curia (apud curiam Romanam). Twenty years later this tax was extended to the whole Church for all benefices to which the Holy See had nominated. The number of benefices where the Holy See reserved to itself the right to nominate grew steadily all through the fourteenth century, and by 1376 hardly any see was exempted from this extremely heavy tax.

A second principal permanent means by which the popes drew on the resources of the clergy anywhere and everywhere was the right called "spoils." From the custom of pillaging the household goods of a dead bishop or abbot, there arose the retaliatory practice of the bishop or the abbot pillaging in the same way when beneficiaries died who were under their jurisdiction. As the Holy See became, more and more, the universal collator to all benefices of any value, it took over this right of spoils, and under Urban V it was extended to the property of all benefice holders whatsoever, regular or secular, wherever they died. The local representative of the papal collector entered into possession. He paid all debts due for work that had profited the Church or the benefice, and he paid off the servants. The dead man's heirs were given his books and all else that had been bought either with his private fortune or from the fruits of his own industry. The church ornaments and plate the collector left undisturbed (unless he could prove these had been bought out of benefice revenues in order to defraud the pope) and he did not take the food, wine, cattle and tools. But the rest he sold up. These sales of the moveables of dead bishops often brought in vast sums. Their best vestments and church plate the popes often kept for the papal treasury; and they also kept the valuable books. So, between 1343 and 1350, their library at Avignon was the richer by no fewer than 1,200 valuable works. []

As the popes now claimed the first year's revenue of the newly-appointed holder of a benefice, so they also began to demand all the revenue for the time the benefice had lain vacant. A final, general, permanent charge on sees was that levied for dispensations for procurations. A "procuracion" was the amount

of money which a bishop had a right to receive when he made the visitation of a benefice. Originally this was no more than hospitality for himself and his suite. But, gradually, it had become a money payment and in 1336 the maximum amount was fixed by a law of Benedict XII. The practice now began that bishops begged the Holy See for the right to exact the procuration even though they had not made the visitation, and the popes began to grant such petitions, on the understanding that the bishop paid to them a fee that varied from a half to two-thirds of the sum he himself received. The bishops next endeavoured to recoup, by a diocesan tax, the sums they had been compelled to disgorge to the curia, but here the popes intervened and a law of Urban V, in 1369, forbade the practice.

How far did the system really work? What sums of money did it bring in? The accounts of the central exchequer, and of the collectors dispersed through the different sees of Christendom, survive in very large part and they have been extensively studied. [] From them we can trace the financial history of the Avignon popes through fifty years of fluctuating solvency to a final state that borders on chronic bankruptcy. For expenses always outran receipts, and it was upon a papacy that had exhausted its own resources, that had scarcely any effective hold on its own territories, and that had severely tried the patience of Catholics everywhere, that the terrible crisis of the Great Schism fell.

On the death of Clement V (1313), there was a sum of something more than 1,000,000 golden florins in the treasury. But the dead pope's generosity to his heirs left his successor, John XXII, little more than 70,000 of them. It is this pope who was the chief architect of the system just described. The new taxes which he devised, and the system of collecting them, raised the revenue to an annual sum of 228,000 florins. Expenses, however chiefly due to the wars in Italy -- topped receipts throughout his long reign, and John XXII would have died insolvent but for loans and timely legacies. As it was, he left to the new pope, Benedict XII, a fortune of 750,000 florins. Under this Cistercian pope drastic economy ruled, and the Italian wars slackened; Benedict was even able to remit taxes (including the highly profitable first fruits) and to manage on a revenue of less than a fourth of what his predecessor had enjoyed. At his death (1342) the treasure, nevertheless, amounted to more than 1,100,000 florins. But

Clement VI, to whom all this came, was the most princely of all these popes in his way of life, a pale but sinister forerunner of the Medici and della Rovere of the next age. As his expenses mounted, the taxes mounted too. Soon the revenue was 188,000 florins, threefold what it had been under Benedict XII. But, even so, it did not nearly suffice, and the pope was forced to borrow. To Innocent VI, who succeeded him in 1352, Clement VI yet managed to leave 300,000 florins. The next ten years are the last in which the financial situation is even tolerable. Taxes contrive to mount indeed, and the annual revenue rises to a quarter of a million florins, but the war in Italy is once more raging violently and it eats up all this and more. The Holy See falls now into a chronic state of debt; and under the last two of the Avignon popes, Urban V (1362-1370) and Gregory XI (1370-1378), though the hold on benefices is pushed to the extreme limit and the taxes are crushing, the financial history of the Apostolic See is one long misery.

The discontent which the system caused was general and it was immense. Where did the money go? To judge from the discontent, as the new popular literature expresses it, the complainants, naturally enough, saw it as the life blood of the princely style in which the Avignon popes lived, the means by which they maintained one of the most splendid courts of the time. But modern study of the accounts has made it clear beyond all doubt that the amount spent on the court was small indeed compared with the sums swallowed up by the endless wars waged in Italy for the recovery and defence of the papal states. The total revenue received by John XXII, for example, in the eighteen years of his reign, amounted to 4,200,000 florins. [] The household expenses for one year that we know (1329-30) were 48,600 florins []; if this were an average year the total on this account would be in the neighbourhood of 875,000 florins; but the Italian wars cost this pope no less than 4,191,446 florins. [] Nothing so swallows away the riches of a government as war.

We do not, however, need to turn to the poets, the novelists and the satirists of the time for evidence of the immense discontent, nor to the papacy's foes. We can find it in the outspoken comment of such personages as St. Bridget of Sweden and St. Catherine of Siena, and, even, in the very account books of the collectors. And were there no evidence at all, given the facts of human nature, we could surely take it for granted; at no time

would men ever have continued to suffer such a yoke in silence. In France the royal officials systematically did all they could to hinder the functioning of the system -- and it was in France that the business was best organised, for there were as many collectors for France as for all the rest of Christendom together. In Germany the collectors were frequently attacked and imprisoned, and at times the clergy banded together in non-payment leagues, taking oath to stand by one another if penalties were inflicted. In England the joint business of the taxation of benefices [] and the extension of the papal right to collate, raised a very great storm indeed.

England, since King John's surrender in 1213 to Innocent III, had been subject to the Holy See in temporal matters too, that is to say as a vassal to its suzerain. But this had never hindered the English bishops from protesting strongly against the popes' provision of foreign clerics to English benefices; and the barons -- speaking for the lay patrons whose rights were thus, at times, curtailed -- were more vehement still. The one personage in England whose action was always uncertain, and ever seemingly inconsistent, was the chief patron of all, the king. Whatever the king's personal resentment at new extensions of the papal claims to collate and to levy taxes, he had usually too great a need of the pope's aid in the complexities of international diplomacy to allow his resentment free play. From the time of Edward I (1272-1307) onward England offers the interesting picture of laity eager to protest against this papal policy and to check it, of clergy willing to connive at the protest, and of the crown seeking to use this situation as a means whereby to coax, or coerce, the pope in other policies.

The first anti-papal, parliamentary event to have any lasting effect was the debate in the Parliament of Carlisle in January 1307, the last parliament of Edward I's reign. Here all the grievances of the time were set out in a petition to the king: complaints about papal provisions as an injury to the rights of patrons, about papal claims to first fruits. The king listened to the petition but it was not allowed to mature into a law. The one law certainly made in this parliament [] is a prohibition against monasteries which owe obedience to foreign superiors paying taxes and tributes to them or lending them money.

Edward I died within six months of the Parliament of Carlisle,

and in the twenty years' anarchy of his successor's reign -- Edward II -- there is more than one protest from the clergy against the double taxation to which they were now beginning to be continually subjected: the popes taxed them for papal purposes, and the kings taxed them -- with the popes' permission -- for national purposes. Edward II, like his father before him, seized the priories subject to alien superiors and confiscated their revenues for a time; and in 1325 a royal writ ordered the bishops to ignore all papal bulls unless the king had given leave for their introduction into the realm. []

But the events of 1307 bore no real fruit until the reign of the next king, Edward III (1327-1377). Once Edward III had begun the great war with France (1338) it could not be long before the English kicked hard against the French popes. Not only were the French legates these popes employed unpopular, but by the papal hold on appointments, and their taxation of English clerics, good English money was now flowing, via the papal treasury, into the war fund of the national enemy. [] In 1343 a bill was introduced into parliament to make it a penal offence to bring into the country any bulls from the pope, any provisions to benefices, or reservations, and forbidding the acceptance of such provisions; also, clergy who, on the basis of such provisions, brought suit, either against the patron of a benefice or against the incumbent whom the patron had presented, were also to be punished. In 1344 the penalty of outlawry, perpetual imprisonment or exile was proposed against those violating this law; also, a most significant addition, the same penalties were to be enacted for those who appealed in these matters from the royal courts to the Holy See. Neither of these projects passed into law. For the moment the king held back the indignation of his subjects. The barons, in May 1344, sent a petition of grievances to Clement VI, but the pope answered evasively. In 1347 the barons made a new attempt to enact the bills proposed in 1343 and 1344. They were again not successful. These hints to the papal officials, threats of what might be done, were wholly without effect at Avignon, and the king at last consented to allow the enactment of a statute. So there was passed, in 1351, the first Statute of Provisors. [] This famous law begins by telling the story of the Carlisle petition of 1307, and makes its own the complaint of that document that the papal policy of granting English benefices to foreign clerics -- who are always absentees -- is doing serious harm to every kind of religious activity. Now,

in 1351, the mischief is worse than ever. English kings are bound, by law and by their oaths, to provide remedies for it. So, with a statement that the legislation of 1307 has never been repealed, it is now enacted that all elections of bishops and abbots are to continue to be freely made by the various chapters, and that all ecclesiastical patrons are freely to present to the benefices in their gift, and that where the Roman curia "in disturbance of the free elections, collations or presentations aforementioned" has made provision of a benefice, the presentation is, for that occasion, to fall to the king. Anyone who, fortified with a papal provision, presumes to disturb the person presented by the king or by an ecclesiastical patron, [] is to be arrested and, on conviction, imprisoned until he pays a fine left to the king's discretion, makes satisfaction to the party aggrieved and also gives security that he renounces his claim and that he will not prosecute his suit or make any appeal in the pope's court. If the provisor cannot be found he is to be outlawed.

Two further acts of parliament supplement the Statute of Provisors and, thereby, perfect this new instrument of royal control of Church affairs; they are the Statute of Treasons (1352) [] and the Statute of Praemunire (1353). [] The first of these was enacted in order to state with precision what those offences were which amounted to high treason, and one clause of the statute declares that all who procure from the papal curia any provision to a benefice fall outside the king's protection; they are outlaws and whoever finds them may do as he wills with them. This is only incidental to the main purpose of the act, but the papal jurisdiction in matters of benefices is the very subject of the second statute. This first Statute of Praemunire does not indeed make any mention of the pope or his courts. It declares that many of the king's subjects complain that they are cited abroad to answer in a foreign court for things cognizable in the king's court, [] and also that appeal is made to "another court" from decisions in the king's court. This is a manifest injury to the king's authority and to the common law. So it is now enacted that whoever, bearing allegiance to the king, thus draws another out of the realm, or who sues in another court to defeat a judgment given in the king's court, shall be given two months and a day to answer personally in the king's court for this contempt. If he comes not -- and here follows the penalty known henceforward as a Praemunire, and still good law for various

offences -- he is from that day outside the king's protection, the whole of his property is forfeited to the king, and when found he is to be imprisoned for as long as the king chooses.

Papal presentations to benefices in England are, from this time onward, by English law, null. It is a crime to procure them, and a crime to make any appeal to the pope's courts to bring about the execution of the pope's provision -- and indeed a crime to make any use of the pope's court for matters where the king's court claims jurisdiction. Here is the most ingenious instrument so far devised by which a nation can check the pope's universal power of control over the Church. The interesting thing is that the kings made almost no direct use of this instrument. The next forty years saw many conflicts between the English and the popes; in 1364 the penalties of Praemunire were renewed in an act of finer mesh that brought in all those accessory to the offence of using the pope's courts; in 1366 the whole nation repudiated for ever the papal suzerainty; in 1369 the alien priories were seized once more, and their monks finally banished in 1377; strong complaints were made in parliament in 1376 about the heavy papal taxation of English benefices and the luxury in which the collectors of these taxes lived -- and also of the way in which the best of the benefices went to absentee cardinals of the papal curia. The Statute of Provisors was evidently not in operation -- even as a threat it was hardly effective; and there was thus no occasion for the Statute of Praemunire to be put into force. The fact was that the king continued to find the pope useful, and had no desire to begin a major quarrel on such a general issue as underlay these English statutes. In the Concordat of Bruges, of 1375, neither side raised the issue of principle; and both agreed to annul actions which contravened the legal arrangements made by the other, and to remit the penalties incurred. But in 1390 the Statute of Provisors was re-enacted, [] and in 1393 the Statute of Praemunire. []

To accept a benefice in contravention of the law entailed, from now on, banishment for ever; and the same penalty was decreed against whoever harboured those so exiled. Also all who brought into the realm any summons, sentence or excommunication affecting those who put the Statute of Provisors into execution were liable to capital punishment. The new Praemunire law declares its motive to be the recent acts of the pope. [] He has excommunicated English bishops who, in

accordance with English practice, have instituted to benefices the presentee declared to be such by a decision of the king's court; and he has planned to translate bishops from one see to another, without their consent and without the king's consent -- which translations go against English law, and to acquiesce in this policy would be to submit the crown of England to the pope. At the suggestion of the Commons the king has put the matter to the Lords temporal and spiritual. The barons, like the Commons, agree to stand by the king. The bishops and abbots will neither deny nor affirm that the pope can so excommunicate or translate bishops, but they agree that such excommunications and translations are against the king and his crown. And it is thereupon enacted that all who have any share in such excommunications or translations "or any other things whatsoever which touch our lord the king, against him, his crown, and his royalty or his realm" incur from now on the penalties of Praemunire.

The effect of all this legislation -- against which, in 1426, Martin V protested strongly but in vain -- was to make the king so far master in his own house that, although the popes continued to name and provide to benefices, and Englishmen to accept the provision, in contravention of the law, none was named to whom the king had any objection; and to bishoprics the popes always provided the man the king named to them. Not until the closing years of the fifteenth century was any foreign absentee cleric named to an English see, and then it was done at the king's request, the cleric provided being the king's ambassador at the papal court. [] The laws brought about a tacit understanding between the papacy and the crown -- so long as pope and king continued to be friendly the laws might as well not have existed. But the instrument lay by, ready for service whenever crisis came. Thanks to these laws, long before Henry VIII's new invention of the Royal Supremacy the English were well habituated to a very great measure of royal control in religious affairs. It is no more than the bare truth to say that Henry's Catholic ancestors had furnished him, not only with an armoury of useful precedents, but with more than one of the main instruments his policy called for. []

In the end, the curia broke down these alliances of princes and people against its claims, by the simple policy of offering to the prince a share of the tax; and by a system of agreement as to the

candidate to be provided to the vacant sees, it gained the princes as allies against the discontented chapters now deprived of their right to elect.

But to the last the papacy remained powerless, comparatively speaking, in Germany, where the bishops were themselves sovereign princes. Here the chapters -- close corporations with their membership reserved to aristocratic and princely families -- steadily ignored the system of papal provision and elected their own candidates. There are stories of the canons, arms in hand, driving out the papal nominees; and one Bishop of Wurzburg even forbade, under pain of death, that anyone should bring into his jurisdiction a papal provision. To assert their rights, in the face of such opposition, and to avoid at every vacancy conflicts which would never end, the popes were reduced to the miserable expedient of first quashing the election (as invalid) and then themselves nominating to the see the man whom the chapter had elected.

Gradually, however, the system of papal provision established its hold almost everywhere, and it is one mark of the new state of things that prelates now begin to style themselves, "Bishop of X by the Grace of God and the favour of the Apostolic See."

It was once a thesis largely taken as proved that one thing alone had produced this system of papal provision, to wit papal greed for power and money, libido dominandi. Certainly abuses now began to flourish as never before; and it was perhaps the immense fact of the abuses that distracted the attention of scholars from the question why the popes came to construct and to extend this system of reserving benefices to their own appointment. There is a world of evidence [] that the elective system had, by the fourteenth century, so broken down that, in one see after another, it led to double elections, to doubtful elections, to disputes, riots, feuds, and even to schisms. It is also becoming certain that the popes were really alarmed at the fact that, in Germany, religious life was passing into the control of a laicised clerical aristocracy, whose power they were resolved to break by destroying their right to co-opt others of their kind as their successors. A very high proportion of the opposition to the system of papal provisions -- as distinct from the opposition to abuses in the system -- came from that lay aristocracy whose hold on religion the popes had been steadily

fighting ever since the days of Gregory VII. It is only in recent years that a study of the actual process of Provisions as a working system has begun to reveal these all-important elements of the question. []

They are, indeed, all-important elements, because the terrible abuses which, in the end, accompanied the system everywhere did more than anything else to bring about that indifference of Catholics to the cause of the Church as such, which is, perhaps, the chief single cause of the collapse of Catholicism in the sixteenth century. For with papal reservations the systematic practice grew of giving papal dispensations for the same man to hold more than one benefice -- the grave abuse called pluralities; an easy way for popes to reward (or to maintain) high officials to whom they could not pay a sufficient salary. [] With the appearance of pluralities as an ordinary feature of high ecclesiastical life, there came simultaneously the inevitable, related abuse of absentee pastors -- bishops or parish priests -- who drew the revenues while some deputy did the work (in his fashion) for what stipend the titular could be compelled to pay. Here are the seeds of incredible scandals, of sees left for generations without a resident bishop, and of bishops appointed to sees solely for the sake of the revenue they will draw from them, bishops who do not so much as trouble to seek consecration, nor even ordination as a priest. It is now that the hideous ulcers begin to form which disfigure the Church of those later years in which were born such iron reformers as St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Charles Borromeo. And over it all there begins to be noticeable the stench of accretions of immense ecclesiastical wealth, [] of wealth acquired or wealth desired; wealth that comes according to law and by lawful dispensation; wealth that comes against all law, in ways no dispensation can legitimate -- by simony. It is one of the greatest sources of all these evils that the benefice -- an ecclesiastical office that carries with it a right to a sure, ascertained income -- comes more and more to be discussed as a property (which of course, in part, it is) and that considerations of Canon Law rather than Pastoral Theology inspire the discussions.

The main problem of the Church in this century of the Avignon popes is, of course, the eternal problem, how to keep men good, how to keep them up to their obligations and their professions. It was one great, and inexplicable, weakness of these popes of the

later Middle Ages that they never devised a system of training adequately the parochial clergy. Laws of clerical behaviour there were in plenty; on every possible occasion they were proclaimed anew, and when opportunity offered they were stiffened up enthusiastically. But none of these popes seems ever to have taken stock of the problem as a whole, to have proposed or considered such a reconstruction as, for example, John XXII introduced as a solution for the disorders that for so long had vexed the Friars Minor. Denunciation of sins there is indeed in plenty, but nowhere a constructive policy that will affect, as well as the causes of sin, the circumstances that serve to assist these causes. The "State of the Church" problem begins now to be chronic, and to the official ecclesiastical world it is in danger of becoming an inevitable element of Christian life. Officialdom never ceases to protest against abuses, nor to call for amendment; but it never effects any substantial lasting improvement. The day comes, at last, when the whole framework begins to fall apart. By that time the papal control of the whole initiative of Christian life has been, for centuries, a fact known to every Christian man; it is not possible so to take on the burden of a universal administration and to remain untouched in the hour of disaster. The papacy was to feel the full force of the storm, and nowhere more than in the collapse of men's faith in the divinity of its origins; and in that same day it would be seriously suggested as a necessary measure of reform, that the totality of the religious orders be abolished. ii. The Popes, 1334-1362

John XXII had survived to the great age of ninety. He was active and mentally vigorous to the end, and in some respects his death seems to bring to a close a whole age. It was not merely that the pope was so old that he could recall the momentous pact between the great French pope, Urban IV, and the crown of France from which had come the destruction of the Hohenstaufen (and also the new menace of the Angevin princes); nor that, in him, there had been active a personality formed as long ago as the age of St. Louis IX. But John XXII was the last of the series of popes whose genius created the canon law; with him there was finally brought to completion the work that had begun with Gratian's own pupil, Alexander III. For a hundred and seventy-five years now the genius of that first great papal jurist had dominated the public action of the papacy. In all that time the great popes -- with scarcely an exception -- had

been great canonists, churchmen who had viewed their world, and worked for its betterment, through the medium of this new great instrument. It was then a striking reversal of history that John XXII was succeeded by a pope who was a theologian and a monk, and that in this pope, Benedict XII, there reappeared for the moment the kind of pope who had characterised not so much Gratian's age, but rather the age that had produced Gratian, the golden age of those monastic popes who, from the time of St. Gregory VII, had pulled the Church free of the slough of the Dark Ages.

Benedict XII was still, at the time of his election, a faithfully observant Cistercian, after nearly twenty years spent in public life. Inevitably he was a reformer. There was already much to reform; it is now indeed that we first begin to meet, as an acknowledged feature of Christian life, the "State of the Church" problem. Benedict XII -- it is his great glory -- gave himself wholeheartedly to its solution. Though he was still some months short of fifty when he was elected, he reigned for little more than seven years, but in that time he laboured to restore or remodel every one of the greater religious orders. To this fruitful activity the Bullarium is a simple and striking witness, where Benedict's decrees occupy three times the space taken by the acts of the longest-lived pope of all this period. []

The Cistercian pope came to the supreme charge with an enviable record as a good, competent and hard-working bishop in the two poor country sees he had occupied. [] He seems to have been especially successful in his work against the heretics -- Vaudois and Cathars -- who still lingered in those mountainous regions. This was, however, hardly the career to train a man for the first place in the government of Christendom. The monkpope's inexperience of diplomatic business, and of general politics, was to cost him many a reverse, and a certain narrowness of outlook was to give some of his monastic legislation a rigidity of detail that would not stand the strain of practice. But Benedict has the great merit that he recognised the nature and the scale of the evil of monastic decay, and much of what he did remained until the Council of Trent -- and has remained even to our own day -- the basis of the organisation of the great religious orders. []

The pope began early, sending home from Avignon, only a

month after his election, the innumerable bishops who had deserted their sees to live there in expectation of favours to come. In May 1335 he abolished the iniquitous system of granting abbeys to non-resident abbots (who, often, were not even monks) to be held in commendam, and in December of that same year he revoked all grants made of the next appointment to benefices. The system of papal provisions he maintained, but showed himself most conscientious about the qualifications of those to whom they were granted -- so conscientious, in fact, and so personally concerned, that the system began to break down, the pope keeping places vacant for months until he found a man thought really suitable. He was a striking exception to almost all the popes of this and the following century in his horror of nepotism, and he was almost as exceptional in his disregard of the wishes of ruling princes about appointments.

Something has already been said about Benedict XII's share in the remodelling of the Curia Romana. He showed himself a deadly enemy to the systematic jobbery that disgraced it, and in the first month of his reign there was a general flight from Avignon of guilty officials anticipating discovery and punishment. The history of the papal finances during this century shows how Benedict XII was able to carry through the work of building the great palace of the popes at Avignon, and yet leave the treasury in good condition, despite a generous surrender of fruitful sources of revenue. This was due in part to the pope's careful administration, but also to his resolute abandonment of the war policy of his predecessor. At the very outset of the reign Benedict XII declared explicitly that he would not resort to war even for the defence of the territories of the Church. The Church, he declared, could in the long run only lose by using such a means. []

Benedict XII secured peace also in the heart of the curia, in the delicate business of the pope's relations with the Sacred College. For he habitually worked with his cardinals, discussing all matters fully with them, and labouring to win their consent to his plans. He was sparing in his creations, adding only seven to the college, in the consistory of 1338, of whom all but one were French, and four were religious. In the next conclave there would be eighteen cardinals, fourteen of them Frenchmen.

The work of Benedict XII as a restorer of the life of the religious

orders began with an attempt in the bull *Pastor Bonus*, [] to check an evil from which none of them was free, the presence all over Europe of monks and friars who, on one pretext or another, had taken to live outside their cloisters. Superiors were urged to find out where their missing subjects had gone, and were given new powers to compel their return. They were also to work for the return of those who, without proper authorisation, had made their way into other orders, and to make provision for the return of those who had abandoned the monastic state altogether -- the apostates in the technical language of the canon law. To make the path of these last unfortunates smooth, the superiors were authorised to lighten the penances due for this offence, and indeed Benedict urged upon them that clemency was a duty.

Next the pope took up the reform of the several orders, Cistercians, Benedictines, Franciscans, Dominicans and Augustinian Canons-Regular. In every case he took the superiors of the order into his confidence, and -- with the exception of the Dominicans -- they all agreed to, and accepted, the reforms he proposed.

Two abuses, the Bull *Fulgens*, 12 July, 1335, suggests, lie at the root of the Cistercian decay, namely the abbots' disregard of the monks in their administration of the monastic properties, and the growth of new customs which have destroyed all real community life. The pope, in great detail, now forbids abbots to alienate property, to grant leases, or to contract loans without the consent of their monks. Abbots are to take an oath to observe this law, and their officials also. The bursars of the monastery, who are to be appointed by the abbot and the senior monks, are to render a quarterly account. Abbots are henceforth to be fined who refuse, or neglect, to attend the general chapter of the order -- that mechanism whose good functioning is the condition sine qua non of Cistercian well-being; and new powers are given to the superiors of the order to punish those abbots who neglect to pay their quota to the order's general fund, which fund is to be collected and administered according to rules put beyond the chapter's power to alter. The order is sternly recalled to its first austere ideals, by decrees that forbid all use of silver plate, and that limit to a single companion the train of abbots en voyage. There are to be no more dispensations from the rule of perpetual abstinence from flesh meat, and those hitherto granted are revoked. Breaches of this rule are to be punished by

three days of bread and water, and a flogging. [] Abbots and monks alike are to wear the same simple habit. All are to eat the same food, in the one common refectory, and all are to sleep in a common dormitory -- where cells have been built they are to be destroyed within three months, under pain of excommunication. There are to be no more arrangements to divide revenues as between the abbot and the community, and concessions of this sort are revoked. Abbots who break this law are to be deposed, and the monks imprisoned. A long section which forbids the abuses by which monks have, in fact, become owners, says much, in its carefully detailed prohibition, of the general decay that has come upon the fundamental monastic ideal of voluntary poverty. Finally, there is a careful provision for monastic studies. In every abbey a master is to be engaged who shall teach grammar, logic and philosophy to the young monks; and every year monks are to be sent -- in the proportion of one for every twenty monks in the monastery -- to the various universities, Paris, Oxford, Toulouse, Montpellier, Salamanca, Bologna and Metz. Monks found suitable for university degrees in theology are to be left to complete their course, but none are to study canon law, the science which is the high road to ecclesiastical preferment and a standing temptation to the monastic vocation.

The bull in which Benedict XII sets his hand to the restoration of the classic monachism of St. Benedict is one of the longest of all. [] It repeats very largely the provisions in the Cistercian reform about care for monastic property, for a revival of the life in common, and for study. It recalls the famous decree of 1215 which imposed on the Benedictines the Cistercian invention of provincial chapters, and it went a step further in the same direction by now grouping the Benedictine houses of the various countries into provinces, thirty-one provinces in all. []

The same defects in the community life are legislated against, yet once again, in the long bull that remodels the Augustinian Canons. [] The abbeys and priories of this rule were, seemingly, establishments on a very much smaller scale than the Benedictine or Cistercian monasteries. Special reminders are given that the canons are not to go hunting, nor to carry arms without the leave of their superiors; and again that conspiracies, and sworn pacts amongst the brethren, are to be sternly put down.

Benedict XII did not wait to be crowned before he publicly expressed his opinion on the state of the order of the Friars Minor -- still, it may be supposed, unsettled by the late tragedy of Michael of Cesena and Ockham. In the Advent Consistory of 1334 the pope reproached the Franciscans with their tendency to heresy, their scorn for the hierarchy, their relaxed discipline and their revolutionary turbulence. Two years later the bull *Redemptor Noster* [] prescribed appropriate remedies. The tone of the bull is extremely severe. Yet once again, all tendencies towards the "Spiritual" movement are condemned; the friars are bidden to take more seriously the duty of the choral recitation of the Divine Office, all are to be present at it, and there is to be no levity in carrying it out. Once again there are special laws to restore a common table, with silence and reading during meals. The brethren are to be given sufficient food; and all are to have the same food, clothing and sleeping quarters -- superiors and subjects alike -- so that none may have excuse to live lives of their own outside the community. The greatest care is to be taken as to what friars shall preach outside the convents. None is to be sent unless of mature years and formed character; and even so, he is not to go unless with a kind of passport that states exactly what his mission is, and until what date he is lawfully outside his friary. [] One very necessary condition of good preaching is theological knowledge, and Benedict XII is here most insistent. In addition to the studies made in the convents of the order; he decrees that every year three friars are to be sent for theological studies to the university of Paris, three to Oxford and three more to Cambridge -- all of whom must first have read the four books of Peter Lombard with the commentary of approved doctors. [] The pope goes out of his way to insist that all friars thus engaged in studies are to be treated with special care and respect by their brethren, and lays down that each convent shall be plentifully supplied with books of grammar, logic, philosophy and theology. Also, there is to be a careful censorship of new publications.

The Minister-General of the order is to visit personally, within ten years of his election, all the provinces -- except Ireland, Greece and the Holy Land, to which remote territories he is allowed to send a deputy. Finally -- a most important innovation -- novices are to be sent for their training to a special house, under the care of a special "master of novices"; and until they

reach the age of twenty-five the professed friars also are to be under the rule of a "master of the professed."

When Benedict XII publicly lectured the Franciscans in 1334, he held up to them as a pattern of life their great rivals, the Friars-Preachers, even saying that St. Dominic headed all the orders. It is a curious irony that with the Dominicans alone the pope's efforts at reform failed, and even produced a violent struggle, that only ended with the pope's death.

Benedict XII died, all too soon, after a short seven years and a half, before he had had time to do more than promulgate his many schemes of reform. His austerity and his reforms gained him enemies everywhere, and especially among the courtiers and humanists. He died one of the most reviled of all the popes. Yet if there is any other of the long line whom this great Cistercian brings to mind, it is the Dominican, St. Pius V, the one undoubted glory of the Counter Reformation. So great then was the effect of a saint upon the papal throne, when a saint did finally appear there, that even his naturally easy-going successor was compelled to a faithful continuation of his work. Benedict XII was less fortunate. Those who had chafed at the new rigour had their way in the conclave which followed his death. [] His successor, Clement VI, was also, it is true, a monk; he was a brilliant man of affairs, and an experienced administrator, but one who, by the prodigality with which he scattered dispensations of all kinds, ruined much of his predecessor's work. The next ten years' reign was indeed a time "du laisser-aller et des largesses." []

The crowd of needy clerics that had lately fled Avignon now returned, at the new pope's express invitation to send in their petitions within two months. To satisfy them, and as a means to put into execution his own express declarations that "no one should leave a prince's presence discontented," and that "a pope ought to make his subjects happy," Clement extended the reservations of appointments to cover the whole field of benefices. When complaints were made of this prodigal use of his authority, he had but one word, "My predecessors did not know how to be popes." Whether these sayings are really authentic, they undoubtedly describe the spirit which reigned at Avignon for the next six years -- when the Black Death suddenly descended and carried off half the population. []

Clement was liberality itself to his own innumerable relations and to the French kings, [] and to his princely neighbours, lending them huge sums of money. He completed the great palace that Benedict XII had begun, and it was he who, in 1348, finally bought from its lord the city of Avignon. Upon Clement VI there lies the main responsibility for the chronic bankruptcy in which the popes henceforth laboured. In many respects Clement VI is an unique figure among the Avignon popes, and it is of him alone that the conventional picture of an Avignon pope is true. The fourteenth century was a time when ways of life were rapidly growing more luxurious, and that clerical life -- the life of the clerical aristocracy -- reflected this is, of course, yet another evidence of religious decay. "The pope," says M. Mollat, examining critically the charges brought against the Avignon popes, "regarded himself as a king, and as a king he surrounded himself with a magnificent court where the cardinals took the position of princes of the blood-royal. . . . In the fourteenth century no power, not even one essentially spiritual in kind, could dominate the world, if its means of action were not based on territorial property, on moneyed wealth, and above all on that pomp and circumstance which simple folk have always looked on as the characteristic evidence of wealth and authority. . . . The example given by the pope became contagious. . . . The clergy began to dress sumptuously, wearing the check silks and long-toed shoes which were then the height of fashion and, what went contrary to all ecclesiastical custom, with their hair allowed to grow its length." [] That a pope who chose to live in such a style -- a pope who was still in the prime of life -- should be accused of grave moral offences is not surprising. Petrarch, especially, has piled up against the memory of Clement VI "un requisitoire accablant." [] But Petrarch is far from being a disinterested witness, and a very different kind of testimony must be adduced before Clement VI can be condemned for this also.

Clement VI's reign was marked by two great catastrophes, the effective opening of the Hundred Years' War between England and France, and the Black Death. The immense upheaval caused by the war in the social life of both countries is a commonplace of general history. In that general deterioration -- and from that deterioration -- the religious life suffered too, as it must, when such calamities come upon a generation where religion is

already failing and lacking zealous and competent leaders. []

The Black Death is the special name given to the great plague which, between 1348 and 1350, visited every country of Europe in turn, carrying off from all of them between a third and a half of the population. The witness of the contemporary writers in all these various countries is roughly concordant. In the proportion of dead to survivors which they give their accounts tally, as they do in the description of the symptoms and course of the disease. What the effect -- the immediate effect, first of all -- was of this sudden appalling catastrophe on the general spirit of the age, on its religious organisation and life, on its social and economic history, no one has yet worked out in detail, with the full contemporary documentation which the proof of any thesis about the matter must call for. The old theory that the Black Death wrought an immediate revolution in modes of land tenure, and was the cause of an immediate social upheaval, no longer has the universal approval of the historians. And the readiness of apologists to lay to the score of this great plague all the ills which manifestly afflicted religion a hundred and fifty years later, has bred an equally unscientific tendency -- in people who are not apologists -- to speak as though it were impossible that the unprecedented calamity could have had any really important lasting effects. []

It was in the early weeks of 1348 that the disease first appeared in the West, at Genoa, brought thither by a ship from the Genoese colony of Caffa in the Crimea. Thence it rapidly spread to Venice, where 100,000 died, and down through central Italy, to Florence, where again 100,000 is given as the number of the dead, and to Siena, where 80,000 died, four-fifths of the population. Sicily was especially its victim. At Marseilles, where the disease began to show itself in the same month it arrived at Genoa, 57,000 died in a month -- two-thirds of the population -- with the bishop, all his canons, nearly all of the friars. The ravages at Narbonne and Arles and at Montpellier -- the seat of the great medical university of the Middle Ages - - were just as severe. Avignon suffered still more severely, losing more than half its population in the seven months the plague raged. As the year wore on the contagion gained the north of France, 80,000 falling victims at Paris, and in July it reached the south coast of England, whence it spread, during the next eighteen months, over the whole of the country.

No part of northern and western Europe escaped. The plague ravaged Spain in 1349 and, crossing the Alps from Italy, it passed through Switzerland and the valley of the Rhine to Germany and to the Low Countries, and by Denmark to Sweden and Norway. The ease with which the infection was taken, the speed with which death followed, the seeming hopelessness of the case once the disease took, caused everywhere the most terrible panic and, with the general fear, a general feeling of despair that showed itself in wild outbreaks of licentiousness.

At Avignon the luxury-loving Clement VI rose to the occasion, organising what scientific knowledge was at his command, sanitary services and medical aid; and, when the horror and the terror found an outlet in a furious burst of anti-Semitism -- the Jews had caused it all by poisoning the streams and wells -- especially in the Rhineland cities, the pope intervened to denounce the calumny, and threw open his own state to the persecuted fugitives.

Gradually, in the winter of 1349-1350, the plague wore itself out, and the survivors slowly took up the task of reconstructing their social and political life. Ten years later the disease appeared again (1361), to ravage France and England once more, and more severely than any plague, except that of 1348. Who shall reckon the extent of the moral disaster of these visitations? Did they indeed, coming at a time when spiritual resistance was already low, take the heart out of the Middle Ages?

Certainly the Black Death was not the sole begetter of the complication of spiritual evils under which the medieval organisation of religion ultimately went down. But in many respects life was never the same. The population seems never to have climbed back to its earlier density, the elan of the earlier time was never recovered, the note of despondency, of pessimism. in religious writers is now hardly relieved, the spring has indeed been taken out of the year. One particularly heavy loss ought to be mentioned. The Church, considered as a great organisation of human beings, finds itself henceforward faced with the insoluble problem of staffing its innumerable conventual institutions from the depleted and less generously-spirited population. The thousands of its great abbeys depend, ultimately, for their spiritual effectiveness on the diligent

performance of the Opus Dei, the daily round of solemn liturgical prayer. If in an abbey, over a long period, there are not monks or nuns enough to ensure this as a matter of course, its end as a spiritual power-house is inevitable; and not only does the semi-derelict abbey cease to be useful to religion, it is a parasite, an active source of new serious weakness. And more and more this now came to pass. Very few indeed were the abbeys which, after the plagues of the fourteenth century, ever regained the full number of religious needed for the fullness of healthy community life. From such a situation there was but one way out -- the suppression and amalgamation of the depleted houses, retrenchment until better times should come. It was not taken. The great monastic reforms of Benedict XII were thus, at the outset, seriously checked by the social catastrophe that fell so soon after they were decreed, and then by the ensuing development, within the world of monasticism, of an entirely new situation.

Innocent VI, who succeeded Clement VI in 1352, was, in ideals and intention, another Benedict XII. But he was already a very old man, vacillating and despondent, and from the outset depressed by the immensity of the task his lighthearted and prodigal predecessor had bequeathed to him.

The conclave which elected him lasted little more than a day, but the cardinals found time to draft the first of those election pacts -- called capitulations -- which are an eloquent sign of new anti-papal tendencies, even in the Sacred College, and which were from now on to be the bane of pontifical activity. This pact, to which all the electors swore, bound the future pope in such a way that he would be little better than the chairman of a board of governors. There were, for example, never to be more than twenty cardinals, and no more cardinals were to be created until the present numbers had fallen to sixteen, nor should anyone be made a cardinal without the consent of the cardinals. Similarly, without their consent the pope would not depose a cardinal, lay censures upon him, or deprive him of any rights or properties. Again, before alienating, or granting in fief, any province, city or castle of the dominions of the Church, the consent of two-thirds of the cardinals would be required; and the consent of the same majority must be sought for any appointments to the chief places in the curia. The future pope would not make grants of money to princes without the consent of the cardinals, and for

the future the papal exchequer would pay over to the treasury of the Sacred College one half of all the revenues. As though somewhat doubtful of their right to make these conditions, the cardinals had attached to the pact a restrictive clause, "If and in so far as this is according to law." []

Innocent VI, for all his age and his weaknesses, was still too much the famous lawyer he once had been [] not to find a way out of the pact. Six months after his election he declared it null, as being contrary to the conclave laws of Gregory X and Clement V, which forbade the cardinals to busy themselves in the conclave with anything else than the choice of a new pope.

Once again a more rigorous spirit informed the curia, the legal qualifications for benefice holders ceased to be a matter of form, and there was an exodus of idle clerics from Avignon. Innocent VI had his troubles with the Franciscans, and his severity towards the remnants of the old "Spiritual" group drew down on his memory terrible words from St. Bridget of Sweden. [] It was before this pope that so much of the enmity of the secular clergy against the friars found vent in the famous speech of the Archbishop of Armagh, Richard Fitz Ralph (November 8, 1357), a new quarrel which the pope stifled by imposing silence on all parties. The condition of the Friars-Preachers, that Benedict XII had vainly endeavoured to improve, had, in places, been seriously worsened by the Black Death, and now the Master-General of the order had no choice but to call in the pope to aid him in his work of reform. Once more the proposed reforms seemed likely to split the order; by a majority of four the definitors voted the deposition of the Master-General; but, after a papal enquiry into the charges against him, Innocent restored him to office.

Innocent VI's reign ended miserably -- not through any fault of the pope. He was never able to make good the financial disasters of his predecessor, and finally he was compelled to sell off paintings and other art treasures, jewels and church plate. To add to his distress the truce of 1357 between France and England, and the definitive peace of Bretigny three years later, set free thousands of hardened mercenary troops, and these descended on the helpless Papal State. Only at the last moment was the pope saved, by a general rally of new crusaders from Aragon and southern France, and even so it cost him

thousands to bribe the mercenaries to leave his territories and betake themselves to the wars in Italy. Then, in 1361, came a renewal of the plague, and in three months 17,000 people died of it at Avignon, including a third of the cardinals. By the time Innocent himself came to die, September 12, 1362, all the glory of the Avignon papacy had gone, never to return.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



CHAPTER 3: THE RETURN OF ST. PETER TO ROME, 1362-1420

1. *INFELIX ITALIA, 1305--1367*

WITH the death of Innocent VI in 1362 and the election of Urban V to succeed him, a new stage begins in the history of the "Avignon Captivity." There now comes to an end the only time when the papacy can really be said to have seemed stably fixed there. At no time was it any part of the policy of these Avignon popes to establish the papacy permanently outside of Italy. What had kept the first of them -- Clement V -- in France throughout his short reign was a succession of political accidents and crises. His successor, John XXII, strove for nearly twenty years -- as will be shown -- to make Italy a safe place for popes to return to and to dwell in. But he failed disastrously. And it was upon that failure that there followed the long central period of the Avignon residence -- the reigns of Benedict XII, Clement VI and Innocent VI -- when for the popes to return to Italy was something altogether outside the range of practical politics. It is this period, [] of enforced stable acquiescence in the exile, which the election of Urban V brings to an end. For with this pope the idea of the return to Rome now begins once again to inspire papal policy, and in 1367 Urban V actually realised the idea.

Now, whatever the personal preference of any of these popes for residence in his own country, and whatever the pressure exercised over their choice by the various French kings, there was another, permanent, factor, beyond any power of the popes to control, which, throughout the period, was, time and again, a final deciding consideration against any movement to return. This factor was the political condition of Italy. The anxious dilemma which these popes had to face was not of the* making, although -- it can hardly be denied -- by every year of the* absence from Italy they increased the difficulties that stood in the way of the* return. It was, in essence, the dilemma as old as the Papal State itself, and indeed older still. How was the central organ of the Christian religion -- the papacy -- to be securely independent of every other power in the exercise of its authority

as teacher and spiritual ruler of the Christian Church? The papacy would not be regarded as free in its action if the popes were subjects of any particular prince. Therefore the popes must themselves be sovereigns. But once the popes are sovereigns, there is not only created a state where the ruler is elected but -- because of that state's geographical situation -- an elective sovereignty whose policies have a vital effect on all that international Mediterranean life which, in those days, is the Western world's very centre. Control of the papacy, once the pope is sovereign, is indeed a prize; and inevitably, with the establishment of the Papal State, the competition begins among the noblesse of the Papal State to capture the prize for their own families. Inevitably, too, one extra-Italian power, the emperor, is never indifferent to this competition. Constantly he intervenes -- to protect the papacy from its barons, and to seize the prize for himself, in order to make the papacy an organ of his own government. Never, for nearly three hundred years after the first establishment of the Papal State (754), are the popes so strong as temporal rulers that they can control their own barons without that assistance from the emperor for which they, yet, must pay by some new surrender of freedom.

Then the great series of monk -- popes, of whom Hildebrand -- St. Gregory VII -- is the most famous, finds a way out of the dilemma. In a spirit of wholly unworldly zeal for the restoration of the spiritual, these popes denounce the protecting emperor's encroachment on their spiritual jurisdiction as a sin; they reject it, and defy him to do his worst. Thence come the first of the mighty wars between empire and papacy that fill the next two centuries (1074-1254).

These popes of the Hildebrandine restoration are first of all monks and apostles; and, because they are men of holy life, moved to action by horror at the universal degradation of Christian life, they manage to use the temporal arm without prejudice to the wholeness of their own spirituality, and without any such scandal emerging as the encouragement of clerical ambition disguised as zeal for the gospel. [] Their successors, if good men and fighting for the best of causes, are yet not saints. They are not sufficiently careful about the purification of the means they need must use -- law, diplomacy, the military arts, their financial system, their own characters, the characters of all their subordinates, and of their allies. And by the time when they

too achieve victory over the would-be temporal lord of the world of religion, the ecclesiastical character shows evident signs of grave deterioration.

The most serious sign of this in the papal action would seem to be that, as though the Church were a great temporal state, it is in the natural, political and military arts that the popes now chiefly put their trust. There is a difference in kind between the spirit at work in the wars of St. Gregory VII against Henry IV, and in those of Boniface VIII against Philip the Fair, or those of John XXII against Lewis of Bavaria. The golden key to the eternal dilemma, found by St. Gregory VII, has indeed, by these later successors, been dropped in the dust; and once more the Church suffers because the popes are victims of the dilemma. Are they to go back into Italy and to Rome? Then they must be certain that they can live there safe from the rebellion of their own barons and the Roman mob, and so be strong that no foreign prince will think of assailing them. There must be security that Anagni will not be repeated. The Papal State must, for the future, be something like what all states are from now on to be, a strong kingdom, in every part of which the prince really rules. Before the pope can go back to Rome a whole world of anti-papal Italian turbulence must first be conquered. There is now no other way in, but by a victorious war.

At the time when the election of Clement V began the series of Avignon popes (1305), it was more than eight hundred years since Italy had been effectively united under a single political authority. The name was, quite truly, no more than a geographical expression. The island of Sicily formed, since 1302, the kingdom officially styled Trinacria; the southern half of the peninsula was the kingdom called, now and henceforth, Naples; an irregular central Italian territory formed the Papal State, over the greater part of which the papal rule had never been much more than a name; the rest -- Tuscany, Lombardy, Liguria, the ancient March of Verona -- was, for the most part, still the territory of a multitude of city states. Some of these communes were still republics, the great trading and maritime states of Venice, Genoa and Pisa for example, Florence again and Lucca; others had already become the prize of those great families whose names are household words, at Verona the della Scala, at Milan the Visconti, at Ferrara the Este, at Mantua the Gonzaga; and these last states were despotisms, where the

princes' whims were indeed law. In the north-west corner a group of states survived of the kind more general in western Europe, feudal in their organisation, the marquisate of Montferrat, the marquisate of Saluzzo and a border state -- as much French as Italian -- the county of Savoy.

The history of the relations of the exiled papacy to the seething political life of an Italy so divided is far too complex to be intelligible, unless the story is told in a detail which the scale of this book altogether forbids. Briefly it may be said that Sicily and Naples play very little part in that history; the King of Naples is, usually, the pope's more or less inactive ally throughout. The main problem for the popes is, first, to recover control of the Papal State that has, in effect, fallen into a score of fragments, each the possession now of the local strong man, or of some lucky adventurer; and then, simultaneously with this, to regain the old papal influence in the leading small states to the north of the Papal State, most of which are now dominated by the anti-papal, Ghibelline faction. So long as the papal faction is not dominant in these city states (whether they are still republics or, like Milan, ruled by a "tyrant") the popes can never hope for peace in their own restless frontier provinces, and especially in Bologna, the most important of all their cities after Rome.

The turning point of the story that begins with Clement V, in 1305, is the despatch to Italy, as legate, of the Spanish cardinal Gil Albornoz in 1353. Until that great man's appearance on the Italian scene, the story is one long tale of incompetence and disaster. It is Albornoz who makes all the difference. It is the ten years of his military campaigns, and of his most statesmanlike moderation as ruler, which at last make it possible for the popes to return to Rome as sovereigns.

The tale of disaster is simple enough to tell, in its essentials. The first chapter is the military action of Clement V in defence of his rights over the city of Ferrara and its surrounding hinterland. When his vassal, Azzo d'Este, died in 1308, it was found that the dead man had bequeathed the succession to his natural son. But Azzo had two brothers, and they disputed this son's right. Whence came a civil war and an appeal, by both sides, to "the foreigner": to Padua by the brothers, to Venice by the son. The son was victorious and Padua, deserting the brothers, went over to him. The brothers appealed to their overlord the pope.

Clement thought he saw his chance to recover the old direct hold over Ferrara, always a highly important strategic point in Italian affairs, and now not unlikely to become more a Venetian possession than papal. Venice had, in fact, already won a concession of territory from her Ferrarese protege and ally. So, in August 1308, a war began between the pope and Venice which was to last for a good five years. The pope was finally victorious, and, it is important to note, in the war he used the spiritual arm at least as effectively as the temporal. For he excommunicated the Venetians, put their lands under interdict, and declared the war against them to be a crusade; all who joined in against Venice were, by the fact, enriched (supposing, of course, true contrition for their sins and reception of the necessary sacraments) with all those spiritual favours once only to be had by the toilsome business of fighting the Saracens in the Holy Land. The small states that for years had hated and feared the great republic eagerly joined the alliance. Soon Venetian commerce began to feel the effect of the boycott, and a peace movement began. But the pope inexorably demanded unconditional surrender, and at last Venice had to yield. The republic gave up all the rights it had acquired over Ferrara, agreed to pay the costs of the war, and to surrender many of the commercial advantages and treaty rights which had been one great source of its power in the north.

The pope had won -- and now he had to provide for the government of a singularly turbulent city. The chronic weakness of these French popes showed itself immediately. Clement would trust none but the French -- until, after four years of bloodily inefficient rule under French administrators, the state of affairs at Ferrara compelled him to withdraw them and to offer the rule of the city to the King of Naples. This semi-French administration fared no better than the other; and in three years the Ferrarese had driven out the Neapolitans and recalled the Este. Except for the huge cost of the war to the papal finances, and the huge mass of anti-papal hatred in Ferrara, things were now, in 1317, where they had been before the war started.

Clement V was as ill-advised in beginning the war of Ferrara as he was ill-starred in his victory. But at least he had for a reason the solid fact that a valuable possession of the Church was threatened -- something that was actually his, and valuable from the point of view of the independence of the Papal State. The

next war, however -- of John XXII in Lombardy and Emilia -- originated in a claim of the pope that since there was no emperor he had the rights of the emperor, and so the right to interfere in the internal affairs of Milan (that was never a papal city at all), and to demand of its anti-papal ruler, Matteo Visconti, that he surrender to the pope the one-time pro-papal ruler of Milan whom he had long ago displaced and since held in prison. The demand was refused, and there followed eighteen years of war.

The pope looked round for allies but, this time, they were not forthcoming. Then he declared the war against the Visconti a crusade (1322), and presently Milan -- which the pope had laid under an interdict [] -- forced out its excommunicated leader. Next, when John seemed on the point of victory, Lewis of Bavaria intervened on the Visconti side (1324), as has been told already. [] In 1327, however, the pope was once more master of Bologna, and he planned to make this his headquarters, and to transfer the curia from Avignon. But first the Ghibelline hold upon northern Italy must be really destroyed. The King of Bohemia [] now, in 1330, came to the pope's aid, and John XXII, taking up a great scheme that went back to the days of Nicholas III, [] proposed to carve out for him in Lombardy a new hereditary kingdom, to be held in fief of the Holy See. The Sicilian experiment was now to be renewed in the north, Italians again to be ruled by a foreigner under the papal suzerainty, for the benefit of the Papal States and the freedom of the Church (1331). But upon the news of this new combination, all parties, Guelfs and Ghibellines in all the cities, came together. Twice in the one year (1333) the papal armies were defeated; the King of Bohemia abandoned the enterprise; Bologna revolted and drove out the papal government and then, in March 1334, John's legate, at the end of his resources after these many years of struggle, fled the country. With his return to Avignon, in the spring of 1334, the last hope for John XXII's great scheme disappeared. "The return of the Holy See to Italy, bound up so closely with the annihilation of the Ghibellines, remained, for the time, all but impossible." [] And the war had absorbed the totality of the very high papal revenue of John's long reign. []

Pope John did not long survive this last of his Italian catastrophes. His Cistercian successor, Benedict XII, was wholly a man of peace. There was no attempt to reinforce the papal

armies, nor to renew the war. The pope explicitly declared that not even to recover his states would he go to war. Peace -- of a sort -- was indeed achieved; but it was the local tyrants who, everywhere, really reaped its fruits and now consolidated their usurpations. The rot continued all through the next reign also, city after city in Romagna and the Marches falling into the hands of such powerful -- and notorious -- families as the Malatesta.

Then, at the eleventh hour, Clement VI intervened (1350), and once more a papal army marched across Italy to assert the papal rule over the last of what remained to the pope of the Romagna. The expedition failed, as badly as such expeditions had ever failed. The Visconti, from Milan, took a hand and, in October 1350, Bologna received them as its masters. Next the pope's general, failing to receive from Clement the money to pay his troops, disbanded the army. Whereupon the Visconti immediately hired it. As of old, excommunications and interdict were decreed against the Milanese ruler, but this time they were totally ignored. Clement applied to Florence for aid, but Florence was not to be moved. Whereupon the pope reversed the policy of generations of popes, and, in a mood of anger against Florence, admitted the Visconti claims, acknowledged him as the lord of Bologna and planned with him a league against Florence, September 1352. Where this terrible series of blunders would have led no man can say, but luckily the death of the pope (December 6, 1352) ended the crisis.

The next pope, Innocent VI, had this great advantage over his predecessors, that his own personal glory was in no way bound up with the fortunes of the Italian War. Also the Visconti was, first of all, alarmed by the possibility that the Emperor Charles IV might enter the field, and he was eager to make peace with Florence to leave his hands free for a projected attack on Venice. It was not difficult for the papal diplomacy to reconcile Florence and Milan, and Florence and the Holy See. Within four months of his election Innocent VI, by the Treaty of Sarzana (March 31, 1353), had skilfully extricated his cause from a really dangerous entanglement. And, for the task that still remained, of recovering his hold upon the states of the Church, the pope found to hand, at Avignon, the ideal agent -- churchman, statesman, and soldier at once -- the Spanish cardinal Albornoz.

Gil Alvarez Carillo Albornoz, the greatest ecclesiastical figure of

his generation, was at this time a man in the early fifties. He was a Castilian, and descended from the two royal families of Leon and Aragon. From an early age he had been destined for a career in the Church and, his university studies ended, he was named to a post at the court of Alfonso XI of Castile (1312-1350). In 1338, while still on the young side of forty, Albornoz became Archbishop of Toledo, Primate of Spain, and Chancellor of Castile. He showed himself, as archbishop, a capable and intelligent reformer of Christian life. When the war against the Saracens of Andalusia was renewed he was appointed papal legate to organise the crusade, and in a critical moment of the great battle of Tarifa (1340) it was Albornoz who rallied the wavering army of crusaders and turned defeat into victory. This was the beginning of a new career. He played a great part in the siege of Algeciras in 1342, and in the siege of Gibraltar seven years later. Then, in 1350, Alfonso XI died. His son, Peter the Cruel, promptly disgraced all his father's friends and Albornoz left Castile for Avignon. Clement VI received him generously, and at the consistory of December 1350 created him cardinal.

Albornoz was commissioned as legate just three months after the Treaty of Sarzana was signed, and on August 13, 1353, he left Avignon for Italy. For the next ten years all turns on his action; and the result of that long activity -- though compromised more than once by the weakness of the sovereign he served -- was to make the popes' authority over their state more of a reality than it had ever been before. It was at last possible for the popes to feel secure from violence within their own frontiers. Not even the long crisis of the Schism that was to come, so shook the work of Albornoz that it needed to be done anew. To few of its servants has the papacy been more indebted than to this great Spaniard, who, very truly, was the second founder of its temporal power. []

Albornoz entered Italy with the design of recovering territories long lost, in hard fact, to the popes. His first care was to secure that no Visconti hostility should either block his communications with Avignon or sow fresh trouble by knitting alliances between the defiant usurpers of papal territory and the host of petty tyrants along the neighbouring frontiers. His diplomacy at Milan was entirely successful, and in 1354 he passed on to the first part of his task, the recovery of Rome and the province called the Patrimony, [] the centre and first nucleus

of the popes' state. Here conditions were worse -- politically -- than in any other part of Italy. The French officials whom the French popes had obstinately continued to send as their agents, had been tyrannous, corrupt, and incompetent. Civil war between the various cities was continual, a Ghibelline was master of Rome and busy with the conquest of the rest of the province. The war went on until June 1354, when the Ghibelline, Giovanni di Vico, yielded and by the Treaty of Montefiascone (June 5, 1354) accepted the legate's terms. The Patrimony was henceforward undisputed papal territory. Albornoz proceeded to reclaim the Duchy of Spoleto, and by the end of the year, here too he had been successful.

In 1355 he crossed the Apennines to face the more difficult work of subduing the ever-restless cities of the Marches and Romagna. There was a victory in the field in April at Paderno, and a great siege of Rimini. Fermo too was taken, and Ancona. The chief of the tyrants -- Galeotto Malatesta -- made his submission and the Parliament of Fermo, June 24, 1355, marked the definitive pacification of the Marches.

But now Albornoz came up against the greatest difficulty so far -- Ordolaffi, the tyrant of Forli in the Romagna. Here, in July, the papal army was beaten in a pitched battle. A crusade was proclaimed against Ordolaffi, and in the first months of 1356 reinforcements of supplies and men came in to Albornoz. Nevertheless, he still failed to take his enemy's stronghold of Cesena, and through the rest of 1356 Ordolaffi successfully held his own.

And now the cardinal began to suffer something worse than checks from the enemy. The great successes of these last two years had roused the fears of the Visconti. The hold they had established, in Clement VI's time, on Bologna was in danger; and soon, at the papal court, they were busy undermining the pope's confidence in his greatest man. Already there had been serious differences between Innocent VI and his lieutenant. The pope thought Albornoz dealt too leniently with the rebels he overcame. For the cardinal -- far more of a statesman than the pope, a realist who knew men where the pope remained in many respects what he had been most of his life, a professor of canon law -- strove always to ensure that his late enemy should become his ally, and the faithful servant of the papacy. Never did

he utterly crush any of them. When they surrendered, and abandoned all their claims, Albornoaz appointed them to govern, as papal officials, a part at least of the territories they had once claimed for their own.

The intrigues of the Visconti were, in the end, only too successful. Albornoaz received orders to negotiate with the rebel in Bologna the cession of the city to the Visconti. This, giving his reasons, he refused to do, and in March 1357 the Abbot of Cluny was sent out to supersede him. The abbot's diplomatic manoeuvres at Bologna failed, as Albornoaz had known they must fail, and when it was clear that the pope's policy was to reinstate the Visconti in this key city, the cardinal asked to be recalled. Innocent was sufficiently disturbed to beg him to remain until Ordolaffi -- now besieged in Forli -- had been subdued. In June Cesena was taken at last, but Ordolaffi still held out, and in August Albornoaz handed over his powers and sailed for Avignon. The last great act of his administration was the promulgation, at the Parliament of Fano (29 April-1 May, 1357), of the Constitutiones Aegidienses which were to remain for nearly five hundred years [] the law of the Papal State.

Twelve months of disaster under the incompetent Abbot of Cluny determined the pope to reappoint Albornoaz, and in the last days of 1358 the cardinal once more made his appearance in the Marches. Within six months he had overcome the formidable Ordolaffi, whom he treated with his habitual generosity. He visited the Patrimony to arrest the beginnings of new trouble, and then, in 1360, he approached once again the problem of regaining Bologna. Again the Visconti marched to its assistance, and for a good four years the steady duel was maintained. Albornoaz took it; the Visconti besieged his conquest (1360); at the approach of an army of Hungarian crusaders they raised the siege, only to renew it the next year (1361). In June 1361 the Visconti forces were heavily defeated at Ponte Rosillo, and what was left of their army fled to Milan. But Albornoaz realised that this was an enemy altogether too strong for his resources. He therefore negotiated an anti-Visconti league, in which the della Scala, Este, Gonzaga, and Carrara joined forces with him, and 1362 saw the war renewed more hopefully.

And then, September 12, 1362, came the death of Innocent VI, to throw the alliance into momentary confusion and uncertainty.

No one could tell which of the cardinals would be elected -- it so happened that none of them were, for the new pope was chosen from outside the Sacred College -- nor what a new pope's policy would be. The Visconti, naturally, were ready at Avignon to persuade whoever was elected, that peace, at any price, was a pope's first duty. But Innocent's successor -- Urban V -- resisted the intrigues, and, for the first year of his reign, gave Albornoz strong support. A new crusade was preached against the Visconti; they were once more defeated in battle at Solaro (April 6, 1363); and when the vanquished sought again to win by intrigue what they had failed to hold by force, the pope again stood firm. But this holy pope was no match for the wily Visconti leader. Urban V's great ideal was the renewal of the Holy War against the Turks, masters, by this, of all the Christian lands in Asia Minor and now, for the first time, possessed of a territory in Europe also. [] The pope dreamed of uniting against them the hordes of savage mercenaries -- the free companies -- who, no longer employed in the Hundred Years' War, were now ravaging at will through France and Italy.

It was easy to persuade such a man that the needed first condition for the crusade was peace in Italy, and that it could not be bought too dearly. Albornoz was superseded (November 26, 1363) at the very moment when such strong forces from Germany, Poland and Hungary were coming in to him that the final victory seemed certain. Three months later -- March 3, 1364 -- the Visconti restored to the pope all the cities and fortresses they had occupied in his states, and the pope, in return, agreed to pay them the immense indemnity of half a million florins.

The treaty was a signal victory for the wily Visconti over the political simplicity of Urban V. All the fruits of Albornoz's diplomacy and military skill through four hard years were thrown away. The pope had more confidence in the word of his treacherous enemy than in his own legate and general. Once more the incompetent Abbot of Cluny was named legate for the north of Italy, and Albornoz -- who had asked to be recalled -- was urgently begged to remain in Italy as legate to the Queen of Naples. Cut to the heart by the pope's disastrous failure to support the real interests of the Holy See in his own dominions, Albornoz yet continued his work for the suppression of the free companies. He fell seriously ill at the end of 1365 and then Urban, accepting as true charges of corrupt handling of public

moneys, without hearing the cardinal, deprived him of his authority in the Romagna. Again Albornoze demanded his recall; accusations of this sort, the multitudinous hates amid which he was living, he said, were too much for him in his old age (he was now well over sixty) and he had a strong desire for more leisure for the care of his soul.

But he was much too useful to the papacy in Italy for the pope to be willing to agree. Publicly, in the consistory of January 30, 1365, Urban declared him innocent of all these calumnious charges, and he besought the cardinal to continue as legate in Naples. Luckily for the pope, and for the papacy, the great cardinal rose above the immense disappointment of seeing his work scrapped for the profit of the Church's enemies. He remained at his post, and it was his continued skilful diplomacy, and military success against the companies, which, by the end of 1366, made at least the Patrimony of St. Peter and Rome a territory to which the pope and the curia might safely return.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. THE POPES LEAVE AVIGNON, 1362-1378

The conclave of 1362 that followed the death of Innocent VI [] was one that produced many surprises. There were twenty cardinals to take part in it and the strongest group was that of the Limousins, compatriots of the last two popes. They were not indeed a majority, but the remainder had nothing to unite them except their determination that there should not be a third Limousin pope. The first vote was taken before there had been time for any prearrangement; and, in the hope of delaying the election until some profitable combination had been devised, each cardinal followed his own instinct to vote for the least likely man. But these chance-inspired votes happened to fall, in the required two-thirds majority, on the same cardinal; he was a Limousin; and the brother of the last pope but one, Clement VI. The disappointment of the cardinals was general, and unconcealed. But the pope-elect, the cardinal Hugues Roger, preferred to decline the high office, and thence onwards, in the ballots that followed, the cardinals were so careful about their votes that it soon became evident that no one of them stood any chance of gaining the votes of as many as two-thirds of his colleagues.

It was, then, upon the name of an outsider that agreement was at last reached (September 28, 1362), and the cardinals elected the Benedictine monk Guillaume de Grimoard, Abbot of St. Victor at Marseilles; a man fifty-two years of age, and at the moment papal nuncio in the kingdom of Naples. He was a man of very holy life, whose monastic spirit high offices, and years of external employment as nuncio, had never in any way diminished. He reached Avignon a month after his election, chose the name Urban V, and was crowned on November 6, privately, in a purely religious ceremony, within the walls of his palace, resolutely putting aside all the apparatus of secular magnificence that was now the rule. As pope he contrived to lead the life of a monk, never wearing any dress but his religious habit, and keeping faithfully all the monastic fasts and austerities.

Urban V was a most industrious worker, and scholarship owes him many acknowledgments. Like all these Avignon popes, he

was a very real patron of learning. He founded new universities at Orange, at Cracow and at Vienna, and a school of music at the existing university of Toulouse. He restored his own university of Montpellier, and he found the means to support as many as fourteen hundred students in different universities. It was made a reproach to him at the time, and it has been held against him since, that his liberality and charities were a serious burden on the papal resources. For, as has been said, [] the finances had now settled down into something like chronic bankruptcy. But, it will be admitted, there have been less deserving reasons for financial embarrassment, and it was ever Urban V's own justification to his critics that to promote true learning -- whether the student persevered in his clerical calling or returned to secular life -- was the best investment any pope could make who regarded the Church's future. []

It has also been laid against Urban V that he had little skill in the arts of ruling, and was too easily the victim of political roguery, and that he failed as a religious reformer. But all these defects -- very real, of course -- shrink beside the double glory that he continued to live his own holy life in surroundings of which St. Catherine of Siena could say that they stank like hell, [] and that, at the first opportunity, he left Avignon, and, despite all the opposition, took the papacy back to Rome.

It was in September 1366 that Urban V made known his intention. Immediately, and from all sides, good reasons to the contrary rained upon the pope. The King of France sent special embassies to explain that nothing but the presence of the pope could heal the feuds that were destroying his kingdom. Was the pope to show himself a hireling, by flight? The cardinals, all but unanimously, opposed him. Albornoz, of course -- still in Italy -- welcomed the decision. He considered that the return of the pope, at this moment, when in Rome and the Patrimony his authority was secure and order re-established, would consolidate the work of restoration.

Urban held firmly to his resolution. He disregarded a last threat from his cardinals that they would leave him to make the voyage alone, and on April 30, 1367, left Avignon. By May 6 he had reached Marseilles; there was a long wait for favourable weather, and then the great fleet, the papal galleys and an escort provided by all the maritime states of Italy, made its leisurely

way along the coasts of Provence and Liguria. Toulon, Genoa, Pisa and Piombino in succession saw the convoy that bore such precious auguries. On June 3 the pope landed, in his own states, at Corneto. Albornozy was there to meet him. Thence he passed to Viterbo, where he remained for four months, and here he had the great misfortune to lose Albornozy, for the great cardinal died on August 22. [] And at Viterbo the old rioting now broke out again. For three days the city was in the hands of the mob, and there were cries of "Death to the Church, long live the people. " But the pope remained unmoved, and on October 16 he at last entered Rome.

For a time all went well. The return of the papal court was a beginning of new prosperity for the city. There were visits from reigning princes -- the Queen of Naples and the Emperor Charles IV -- that brought crowds of visitors, and once again new trade and wealth. The ruined churches began to be restored, and the old permanent traffic between Christendom and its natural centre took up its wonted course. For the hot Roman summer the pope went to live at Montefiascone, forty miles to the north, on the shores of Lake Bolsena. It was during his stay there, in 1370, that the papal city of Perugia rose in rebellion, and the Romans came to its aid. Urban took refuge at Viterbo and there he was presently besieged by the rebels, who had now hired one of the most notorious of the "free companies" led by the Englishman Sir John Hawkwood. The pope had no choice but to surrender the town. And now the forces of the Visconti crossed into Tuscany, making for the Patrimony. Urban appealed for help to the emperor, and to the King of Hungary. But they were deaf to his needs, and, finally, he decided to return to Avignon. Though the Romans outdid all former shows of loyalty, and though St. Bridget of Sweden prophesied to the pope's face that his return would be followed by a speedy death, Urban was now as resolute to depart from Italy as he had previously been resolute to leave Avignon. On September 5, 1370, he sailed for France. He arrived at Avignon on the 27th and there, three months later, as had been foretold to him, he died (December 19, 1370). []

But the unfortunate ending of the great venture attempted by Urban V did not -- as might have been expected -- sterilise, for yet another generation or so, the ideal which inspired it. His successor, Gregory XI, made it clear, from the beginning of his

reign, that it was his intention also to take the papacy back to Rome.

Gregory XI was one of those rare popes elected unanimously by a conclave that lasted only a matter of hours (December 30, 1370). This last Frenchman among the popes -- Pierre Roger de Beaufort -- was a Limousin, the nephew of Hugues Roger, who had been elected eight years before but had declined, and of Clement VI, elected in 1342. It was this papal uncle who had made Pierre Roger a cardinal, at the age of nineteen. The young prelate had shown immediately the manner of man he was, when he deserted the splendid opportunity of worldly fortune and enjoyment thus opened to him, and returned to his study of law at Perugia, then the centre of a real transformation of legal learning, with the great Bartolo teaching Roman law as the development of principles and thereby founding a new science, and with his pupil Baldo de Ubaldis infusing a like new life into the understanding of the canon law. Under such masters the youthful cardinal became an accomplished canonist, with a really deep knowledge of law and with great gifts of judgment. And he grew up to be a man of prayer. Gregory XI was not yet forty-two when he was elected pope, but his health was frail, and he was already tending to be a permanent invalid.

From the first winter of his reign the new pope had determined that, with him, the papacy would return to Rome. And from Rome itself there now came, to urge this upon him as his first duty, the voice of that veteran admonitrix of the popes, St. Bridget. Through her, so she now declared to the pope, Our Lady sent him a message that was at once a command, a promise and a warning. Gregory was to go to Rome by April 1372, and if he obeyed, his soul would be filled with spiritual joy. Should he fail, he would assuredly feel the rod of chastisement; and his young life would be cut short. The pope, who had stood at his predecessor's side when, only twelve months before this, St. Bridget had prophesied to Urban V that his return to Avignon would be followed by a speedy death, was sufficiently moved to order his legate in Italy to ask further explanations of her. What the saint told the legate is not recorded, but we do know the message she sent for the pope's own ear. "Unless the pope comes to Italy at the time and in the year appointed, the lands of the Church, which are now united under his sway and obedience, will be divided in the hands of his enemies. To

augment the tribulations of the pope, he will not only hear, but will also see with his own eyes that what I say is true, nor will he be able with all the might of his power to reduce the said lands of the Church to their former state of obedience and peace. " []

This message was apparently sent to the pope in the first months of his reign. Nearly two years later, on January 26, 1373, the saint had a second vision that she was bidden transmit to him. This time it was Our Lord who appeared to her, and told her that the pope was held back by excessive attachment to his own kinsfolk, and coldness of mind towards Himself. Our Lady's prayers for the pope would, in the end, the saint was told, overcome these obstacles and Gregory would, one day, return to Rome.

Then, in February of that same year (1373), came a new vision, in which St. Bridget beheld the pope standing before Christ in judgment, and heard the Lord's terrifying speech to his vicar. "Gregory, why dost thou hate me? . . . Thy worldly court is plundering My heavenly court. Thou, in thy pride, dost take My sheep from Me. . . . Thou dost rob My poor for the sake of thy rich. . . . What have I done to thee, Gregory? I, in my patience, allowed thee to ascend to the supreme pontificate, and foretold to thee My will, and promised thee a great reward. How dost thou repay Me? . . . Thou dost rob Me of innumerable souls; for almost all who come to thy court dost thou cast into the hell of fire, in that thou dost not attend to the things that pertain to My court, albeit thou art prelate and pastor of My sheep. . . . I still admonish thee, for the salvation of thy soul, that thou come to Rome, to thy see, as quickly as thou canst. . . . Rise up manfully, [] put on thy strength, and begin to renovate My Church which I acquired with My own blood. . . . If thou dost not obey My will, I will cast thee down from the Court of Heaven, and all the devils of hell shall divide thy soul, and for benediction thou shalt be filled with malediction -- eternally. . . . If thou dost obey me in this way, I will be merciful to thee, and will bless thee, and will clothe thee with Myself, so that thou wilt be in Me and I in thee, and thou shalt possess eternal glory. []

Gregory was sufficiently shaken to send his legate yet once again to ask the saint for some definite sign. In July 1373, a few days only before her death, [] St. Bridget sent her last word to him, and it was a word of practical counsel about the latest

difficulty that had arisen to hinder Gregory's departure -- the new war with the Visconti. The pope is bidden to make peace at all costs "rather than so many souls perish in eternal damnation." He is to place his trust in God alone and, heedless of the opposition, to come to Rome for the establishment of peace and the reformation of the Church; and he is to come by the following autumn. []

And now, soon after the death of the Swedish saint, Gregory XI made his first contact with a still more wonderful woman, Catherine Benincasa, the child of a dyer of Siena, sister of penance in the third order of St. Dominic. St. Catherine of Siena -- for it was she -- was at this time in her twenty-seventh year, and since her very babyhood not only had she been, manifestly, a child of special graces and divine attentions, but one around whom the marvellous and the miraculous flowered as though part of her natural course through life. Prayer; a life of charitable activity; corporal austerity; solitude without churlishness in the midst of a busy family life -- a family where she was the twenty-fourth child; a refusal of marriage, but no desire for the life of a nun; the direction of the friars of the neighbouring Dominican church; visions; colloquies with the saints, the Blessed Virgin and Our Lord; the great wonder of her mystical marriage in sign of which He set on her finger the ring she thenceforward never ceased to see there; the stigmata; and the great vision in which -- so she always believed she had really died, and been sent back to life for the purpose then divinely made known to her; such was the saint's life through all these years, in which she had never left her native town and hardly even her father's house, or her own little room in it. But never was any saint to fulfil more exactly in the Catholic Church the role assigned to the prophets of old, to appear suddenly in the public life of the time, to correct rulers -- the highest ruler of all, the very pope -- and, divinely commissioned, to offer them guidance back to God; and never did any saint offer better illustration of the doctrine traditional in her order since St. Thomas Aquinas, that in the highest form of contemplation the activity flows over into a charitable apostolate and care for all mankind. Already, in Siena, Catherine was a power, and the radiance of her unearthly personality had gathered around her a most extraordinary band of followers, men and women, friars, tertiaries, poets, artists, noble and plebeian, married and single, the most of whom she had converted, all of whom she instructed, and who were one

great means of the apostolate of peace that was now her life.

It was, of course, in the midst of war that St. Catherine of Siena's life was passed; of the bitterest wars of all, the bloody feuds that were the life of all the fourteenth-century city states in Italy. In Siena, as in Florence and in a host of lesser towns, there was blood everywhere, as the never-ceasing cycle turned of revolution and counter-revolution; oppression, conspiracy, arrests, torture, executions, revolts, a new regime and then oppression and the rest yet once again; an age of horrible cruelties, of which the terrible savagery that accompanied our own Wars of the Roses is only a pale reflection. And in St. Catherine's many letters, and in her great mystical book of Christian teaching, the Dialogue, -- it is not surprising -- the thought of the Blood, and the word is rarely absent from a single page, of the Blood of Christ shed in love to save sinful man.

St. Catherine had already, early in 1372, written to Gregory's legate at Bologna, Cardinal d'Estaing, bidding him make charity the foundation of all his acts, "Peace, peace, peace! Dearest father, make the Holy Father consider the loss of souls more than that of cities; for God demands souls more than cities. " [] This was to be the keynote of her apostolate to the popes. When Gregory himself sent to ask her advice, the saint had no other message but that he should turn from his nepotism, his tolerance of bishops who were "wolves and sellers of the divine grace, " and reform the Church: "Alas, that what Christ won upon the hard wood of the Cross is spent upon harlots. " []

The pope, however, continued in his own way, pressing the Visconti hardly in the field, diplomatically waiting for the opportune moment to do the will of God as he saw it, and especially waiting for the Visconti to be conquered before finally defying the universal opposition at Avignon and setting his course towards Italy and Rome. It is a nice question -- hardly a historian's question -- what ought Gregory XI to have done, or, better, what did he think God wanted him to do? The messages from St. Bridget had clearly left him uneasy. But, so far, his neglect of them and his use of the natural means, of arms and diplomacy, and his preoccupation with the affairs of France and England, had not brought upon him the judgments which St. Bridge. had seemed to foretell. On the contrary, the pope's good offices, for which the two kings had begged, and for the sake of

which they had both besought him to delay his journey to Rome, had resulted in the Truce of Bmgés (June 27, 1375) and a year's truce with the Visconti, made in that same month, seemed about to bring peace to Italy too. All was now ready for the voyage to Rome, but the pope's innumerable relatives won new delays from him. Twice within a month the decision to sail was countermanded, and then, on July 28, the expedition was put off until the spring of the next year (1376).

But, in the autumn of 1375, the storm broke in central Italy. and all that St. Bridget had foretold was speedily fulfilled to the letter. At the heart of the storm was Florence's fear of what a papal-Visconti alliance, with a French pope again at Rome, French legates and governors through all the papal cities along her frontiers, might hold in store for her. The summer was busy with efforts to knit together an anti-papal league. A general rebellion was successfully engineered in the pope's own territory. By the end of the year (1375) eighty of his cities had gone over to the league. In March 1376 Bologna, too, joined it. This was about the time that Gregory had finally hit upon for his journey to Rome. Instead, he was once more caught up in the full business of war, and on March 31, putting aside all Catherine's counsel to rely on love, to work for peace alone, and her pleas for leniency, the pope put Florence to the ban. Interdict, excommunication, and a general command to Catholics everywhere to join in the war against her -- if only by confiscating Florentine property wherever found. So began the most bitter struggle of the pontificate.

" Sweet Christ on earth," St. Catherine now wrote to Gregory, "let us think no more of friends and kinsmen, nor of temporal needs, but only of virtue and of the exaltation of spiritual things." And in June the saint made her appearance at the pope's court, envoy of the Florentines, driven near to desperation by the losses to their commerce and the ruin that seemed at hand. But a change of government in Florence destroyed the saint's usefulness as an intercessor. "Believe me, Catherine," the pope said to her, "the Florentines have deceived and will deceive thee. . . if they send a mission it will be such that it will amount to nothing." [] In part he was right; but it was also true that the pope's own excessively harsh terms held up the negotiations. It was hard for the saint to ask mercy for the Florentines, now, as repentant children, when they had

disowned her in order the better to prepare a new campaign.

Catherine turned to the greater matter of the pope's return to Rome. In one of her first audiences she spoke openly of the wickedness in the curia, and of Gregory's tolerance of it, and when the pope asked for her advice about the matter of Rome the saint finally convinced him that she spoke in God's name, for she told him what none but himself knew, how, in the conclave of 1370, he had secretly vowed to God that, if elected, he would return to Rome.

From about this time (July 17, 1376) preparations really began to be made for the voyage, and then for two months the saint fought the cardinals for the soul of the pope, one only of them all -- d'Estaing -- supporting her. They used all weapons against her, among them the very subtle one of a "revelation" through a holy man that contradicted Catherine's own message. But this time there were no further delays, and on September 13,

1376, the last of the French popes left the great palace by the Rhone, stepping manfully over the last obstacle of all, his old father, who threw himself down at the threshold in a last desperate argument.

The voyage was stormy and disastrous. At Genoa there was even a consistory to discuss whether it was not now obviously God's will that Gregory should stay at Avignon. But Catherine also was at Genoa; and the pope, too fearful of his cardinals to receive her publicly, went to her by night, in disguise, to be strengthened in his purpose. On October 29 he sailed from Genoa and, at long last, on January 17, 1377, the pope landed from his galley in the Tiber before the great basilica where lies the body of St. Paul.

"Come like a virile man, and without any fear. But take heed, as you value your life," the saint had once written to Gregory XI, "not to come with armed men, but with the Cross in your hand, like a meek lamb. If you do so, you will fulfil the will of God; but if you come in another wise, you would not fulfil but transgress it." [] Side by side with the preparations for the great return, however, preparations had also gone forward for the renewal of the war against Florence. A papal army -- mercenaries from

Brittany and England in part -- was raised, and set under the command of the cardinal Robert of Geneva. As part of the campaign against the great key city of Bologna they ravaged and burnt right up to the city walls. Then (July 1376) they were defeated at Panaro. Bologna still held firm. Next -- a fortnight only after Gregory's arrival in Rome, and a week after his refusal to lower his terms to Florence -- there took place the horrible massacre of the civilian population at Faenza, for which Robert of Geneva must bear the blame. All through the summer of 1377 the negotiations for peace dragged on, and the war of skirmishes continued. The pope rejected St. Catherine's plans "useful for the Church if they had been understood," [] -- but, at his wits' end for money to pay his troops, he again sent the saint to Florence in the hope of inducing a surrender. Florence too was desperate, and presently a congress had been assembled at Sarzana to discuss a settlement. It had hardly begun its work when the news came of Gregory's death, March 27, 1378. He was still two years short of fifty.

Twelve days later the cardinals chose to succeed him an Italian, Bartolomeo Prignani, Archbishop of Bari, who took the name of Urban VI (April 8, 1378). Six months later these same cardinals, who had been steadily drifting away from Urban since a fortnight or so after his election, declared him no pope, and in a new conclave, at Fondi, elected Robert of Geneva. He took the name of Clement VII. The division of Christendom into two allegiances, to the popes of rival lines at Rome and at Avignon, which then began, lasted for close on forty years.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



3. CHRISTIAN LIFE, MYSTICS, THINKERS

The names of St. Bridget of Sweden and of St. Catherine of Siena, coming upon every page of the critical story of the last two popes, are a reminder -- should we need one -- that, beneath that history of the Church which we see as a dramatic pageant, there lies another history, the real and truly vital history of the Church, the history of the inner life of each of the millions of Christian souls. To the actuality, and to the paramount importance indeed, of this other history the saints are, at all times, the standing witness, and it is never an idle criticism of any account of Christian history to ask "Where are the saints?" The presence of saints in the public life of the Church, and the reception given to them, is indeed a kind of touchstone by which we may judge the tone of that life in any particular age.

In this interior history of the Church -- in its fullness known only to God -- there is no distinction or rank, save that which comes from the use of opportunities accorded. Here all are equal. Popes, bishops; religious, clergy; kings, nobles; scholars, merchants; peasants, townsfolk, beggars -- what more are any of these but souls equal in their need of salvation, equal in their utter inability to achieve salvation by any power of their own? And all the vast apparatus, at once as simple and as complex as man himself, of theology, of ritual, the divinely-founded Church, nay the sacred humanity itself of God the Saviour, what are all these but means to that single end, the salvation of man, the return of the rational creature to his Creator for the Creator's greater glory?

Although we cannot ever know more than mere fragments of such a history as here is hinted, this history is a fact never to be lost count of as the more obvious maze of visible activity is explored and all that it holds assessed. For example, the one sole business for which popes and bishops and clergy exist is to lead man back to God Who is man's sole happiness. All popes have known this, all bishops, all clergy; and therein lies, not only the basis of the most terrible judgment that can ever be passed upon them, but the reason for the horror which failure on the grand scale in this primary pastoral duty caused to the serious-minded among the contemporaries of such sinners, and also the

source of our own incredulity, as, to-day, reading much of their history, we remind ourselves with an effort that these men were indeed popes, bishops, religious, priests.

What has chiefly occupied this history, so far, is the story of the ruling of religion, of the administration of the *bona spiritualia*, and the care of the ruling authority to defend the greatest of these, the freedom of religion, from forces that would destroy it in the interest of civil government; it has been, also, a history of thinkers, of priests and of religious. Something has been told of the success of all these eminent personages; of their mistakes also; of their failings and their sins; and of their never-ceasing struggles. It has been very largely the history of the Church teaching and ruling, rather than of the Church taught and ruled, the story of the shepherds rather than of the flock; and when the flock has been glimpsed it has been, very often, at a moment when in hostile reaction against its shepherds. For with whom else, in this constant battle, are the popes ever engaged but with Catholics, their own spiritual children? It is important to see history from the point of view of these also at whose expense history is made. *Quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi*, and Church History, too, has its Greeks; of whose lives we do not by any means, as yet, know nearly enough to be able to call our story complete. What of their spiritual history in these years of continual warfare between the sacerdotium and the imperium? Much of it is written -- sometimes indeed between the lines -- in the lives of the contemporary saints.

It must already be evident, even from the summary account which is all that a general history can attempt, that during the hundred years between Gregory X and Gregory XI (1276-1370) the pastoral sense in high ecclesiastical authority had suffered grievously. From the point of view of that internal history of which we have been speaking this might seem the most important fact of all. But it is not the only fact; and against it we need to set all that can be reconstructed of that inner history. "It is the spirit that giveth life" and, lest we falsify by omission, something needs to be said of those for whom attendance on the Spirit is the main business even of earthly life. For this century, that saw in the public life of the Church so many victories of the world over the gospel, is also the century of the first great attempt to popularise the mystical life by a literary propaganda that describes its joys and analyses its processes;

it is the century of Eckhart and Tauler and Suso, of Ruysbroeck and Gerard Groote, of St. Luitgarde and St. Lydwine, of Angela of Foligno as well as of Angelo Clareno, of St. Catherine of Siena and St. Bridget of Sweden, of our own Richard Rolle, of "The Cloud of Unknowing" and of Mother Julian of Norwich; it is the century also of the "Theologia Germanica", of heretical mystical Beghards, Beguines, and others innumerable; and it is the century in which one of the greatest of English poets set out in his Vision of Piers Plowman the whole theory of the life with God as St. Thomas Aquinas had elaborated it, an achievement complementary to that of Dante, and comparable with it. []

What then of the saints of the time? Who were they, and in what corps of the militant Church did they come to sanctity? What of the role of these many celebrated pioneers of the literature of mysticism? And what other new manifestation of the spirit does the century offer, whether in religious orders, or devotional practice? []

During the hundred and four years which this book has so far covered (1274-1378) there appeared, in one part of Christendom and another, some 130 of those holy personages whom the popes have, in later times, found worthy of public veneration, 27 as saints and 103 as beati. [] Sixteen of the 130 were bishops, (four of these popes); fourteen came from the old monastic orders; five were secular priests; twenty-one were laymen; and seventy-four belonged to the new orders founded since the time of Innocent III. The share of the new orders is really greater still, for of the sixteen bishops eleven were friars, and of the twenty-one layfolk sixteen were members of the various third orders. It would, no doubt, be rash to say that the number of canonised, and recognisably canonisable, personages alive at any given epoch is an index of the general tone of the life of the Church. There are, it may be supposed, many more souls, whose holiness is known to God alone, than there are those whose repute brings them to the ultimate testimony of canonisation. On the other hand, sanctity, in the technical sense, involves the practice of all the virtues in the heroic degree and this is not only a marvel so rare that it can hardly long escape recognition, but it is the fruit of such extraordinary supernatural action in the soul that it may almost be taken for granted that the subject of that action is meant by God to be recognised as such. Without, then, any desire to propose a few comparative statistics as a

new, rapid and infallible guide by which to assess in any given age the force of the mysterious tides of grace given to man, we can perhaps agree that there are times when saints abound and times when they are rare, and examine with something more than curiosity the distribution of these 130 personages over the century or so in which they "flourished. "

The richest period of all is the first third of this century, the last generation to be born in what has been called, with some excuse, "the greatest of the centuries. " [] Between the second Council of Lyons (1274) and the election of the first Avignon pope (1305) we can note as many as eighty-eight "saints. " [] In the next generation (1305-1342) they are fewer; thirty-seven of these eighty-eight have died, and only seventeen new " saints " appear to fill the gap. In the thirty years that follow next the lifetime of St. Catherine of Siena -- the "saints" are fewer still; of the sixty-eight "saints" active between 1305 and 1342, forty-five have died and only twelve new " saints" appear. These thirty years, from just before the Black Death to the Schism of 1378, are, in fact, the most barren age of all. The actual period of the Schism -- the forty years 1378-1418 -- reveals itself however, as a time of revival; twenty-three of the thirty-five "saints" of the previous generation have died by 1378, but they are replaced by no fewer than thirty-five new "saints"; more new "saints, " in fact, in forty years than in the previous seventy.

If we examine the list of those new " saints " whose appearance relieves the sombre history of the disastrous fourteenth century so far as we have traced it -- they are twenty-nine in all -- we notice among them three bishops (one a Benedictine, [] two Carmelite friars []); there are two others from the older orders, namely the canon regular, John Ruysbroeck and a second Benedictine; [] and there are eleven more friars [] and the founder of a new order, the Jesuati. There are, also, six nuns (who came, all of them, from the new orders), one layman and five laywomen. The high direction of ecclesiastical affairs is, evidently, no longer a nursing ground for saints, nor do saints any longer appear among the princes of Christian thought. The most striking changes, by comparison with the figures for the thirteenth and twelfth centuries, are the greatly lowered number of saints among the bishops, [] and the reduction to vanishing point of the saints from the old monastic orders, from the Benedictines and the Cistercians especially.

It is the spirituality of the new orders of friars that gives to the sanctity of this period its special characteristics; and the special character of the vocation of the friars, and the new way of religious life which they have constructed in order to carry out their special work, are far-reaching indeed in their effect upon the whole interior life of the Church. The friar is, almost by definition, a religious who lives in a town. The life of the vows, with its foundation of the divine office chorally celebrated, its discipline of fasts, vigils, enclosure and other austerities, was now brought before the daily notice of every Catholic. And as with the friars -- whose foundations ran easily into tens of thousands by the beginning of the fourteenth century -- so was it with the new orders of women associated with the friars from the very beginning; their convents, too, were in the towns. And around these numerous new town churches -- Dominican, Franciscan, Augustinian, Carmelite and Servite churches -- whose very *raison d'être* was the sermon, churches of a new architectural type, great preaching -- halls in fact, [] there speedily grew up the great militia of the orders of penance: associations of layfolk who really formed part of the new religious order, who continued to live their ordinary life in the world, but in the spirit of the order, according to a definite rule and under the guidance of the order's priests. St. Dominic's new invention of the priest-religious who was an active missionary, and for whom the monastic life was but the designed means to this apostolic end, transformed the whole business of the management of a Christian life; and in nothing did this show so powerfully as in the sudden appearance of a whole new literature treating | of this matter, a literature in which, for the first time, the most learned of theologians and the most mystical of contemplatives said their say in the vulgar tongue. The life of devotion -- *la vie devote* -- now became the main business of thousands and thousands of lay men and women also, and the immediate consequence was a great multiplication of pious books. The Bible especially -- in translations -- was the popular devout reading, book of this multitude, such classics too as St. Augustine's *City of God*, St. Bernard's sermons, St. Gregory's collection of the marvellous lives of the saints of old, and the meditations on the 'Life of Our Lord' still -- and for centuries yet to come -- ascribed to St. Bonaventure, meditations in which the imaginative art of the writer developed, above all else, the terrible reality of the human agony of the

divine Redeemer. Such a book -- well in the new, Franciscan tradition and the kindred works of the Dominican Ludolf of Saxony, [] gave new life (and a new direction) to the popular devotion to the sacred Humanity; and these books were among the main sources of those many forms of prayer to Our Lord in His passion which are the best-known feature of the last two centuries of medieval piety. In the statues and the painted windows and the pictures of the time there is, from now on, no subject more frequent, nor any more lovingly wrought. The same influence is to be seen in the countless brotherhoods spontaneously formed to foster and to practise these devotions, and it received a powerful aid in the Book of Revelations written by St. Bridget of Sweden about the detail of the sacred passion, and in the sermons and writings of the German Dominican, B. Henry Suso.

Of new religious orders there is but one of any importance, that founded by St. Bridget. This was an order for men and women, consecrated to devotion to the passion of Our Lord. The nuns were strictly enclosed, but the monks were preachers, itinerant missionaries. The monasteries were subject to the bishop of the diocese where they were founded, and, in honour of the Blessed Virgin, they were ruled by an abbess. The first foundation was at Vadstena, in Sweden, in 1371. The order grew slowly. By 1515 there were twenty-seven houses, thirteen of them in Scandinavia. [] But everywhere the spirit of Christian charity is seen active in foundations, now, of hospitals and refuges of various kinds, in the organisation of companies of nursing sisters and brothers, a movement that is summed up in the great figure of St. Roch, the patron of the poor and needy sick, whose cult, from the day of his death in 1350, has never ceased.

The outstanding feature of all this new birth of the spirit is the avidity for news about the life with God -- unmistakable everywhere, in all ranks of society -- and the literature which this need created. From this literature we may gather some notion of the perfect life as it was presented to the Catholics of these last generations before the catastrophe of the Schism unchained the forces of anarchy; and we may also read there signs of future development and, alas, of future disintegration. For the life of devotion is not a thing antithetical to the life of Christian thought, but, rather, closely dependent on it. Mysticism and scholasticism are not alternative ways of arriving at the one

goal; [] and in some of the new spiritual exercises now devised, and proposed to Christians as the way to union with God, we meet the last, and the most ruinous consequence, so far, of the failure of the Catholics of this century to rally to the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas.

To-day the word "mystic" is used for so many purposes that it has almost ceased to have any recognisably definite meaning beyond that of emotional sensitiveness to the non-material. But for our purpose the mystic is the man whose main interest and care in life is to unite himself in mind and will with God. It is for men and women of this kind that the monastic life was devised, as providing the ideal setting for those activities to which they had chosen to devote themselves. And now, in the fourteenth century, the kind of people we thus call mystics had, largely through the activity of the various orders of friars, come to be a very notable element of the public life of the Church. The new literature of mysticism had developed in order to provide this new mystical public with matter for its prayerful meditation, and with advice about the pitfalls of this high adventure; but it also studied the happenings of the mystical life so as to offer the mystic some means of checking his course, and from this it was an obvious next step to discuss the nature of mysticism, and especially the nature of the mystic's union with God, and the role and importance of the unusual happenings with which the lives of the mystics were, from time to time, studded. The mystics whose needs called forth this new literature were, as has been said, very largely the spiritual children of those new religious orders, and it was these orders which also had created the new scientific theology we call scholastic. That these corps of professional theologians should be attracted to the study of mysticism for its own sake, as one of the normal features of Christian life, was inevitable. Soon, the discussions about the nature of the mystical fact became a commonplace in theological literature. The solutions -- like the advice offered to mystics and the practical recipes -- varied as the theological colour of the different orders varied. There were to be controversies between the different schools about mystical questions, as there were controversies about so many other questions.

There are then, from this time, two kinds of mystical writing, that written for the use and help of the mystics themselves, and that

written to analyse and explain what mysticism is and how it all comes about. Among the writers of both types of book not only theologians are to be found, but others too, with minds not trained perhaps to orderly thought, or the saving niceties of technical correctness, but with a tale to tell of experiences that have transformed their lives, and driven by an apostolic charity to convey the glad news to whoever will hear it.

Who these first pioneers of popular mystical literature were, what story they had to tell, the different points of view from which they told it, the variety of explanations they offered, and the sources which -- often enough unconsciously -- influenced their mystical outlook, may be read in the well-known book of M. Pourrat, who has collected a list of some sixty or more writers active between the time of St. Thomas and Luther's revolt. [] What a general history, it would seem, needs to signalise as especially important in all this development, is the emergence of a really new school, after nearly a century and a half of the influence of the Friars; a school whose influence continued and developed until the very end of the period this volume studies. This is the school which produced the so-called *Devotio Moderna* and, as cautiously as may be, [] something needs to be said of the way in which some of its leading adepts regarded, not so much the theologians of their time, as the role of the theologian and the place of theology in the life of the spirit. And something must be said, too, of the way in which, ever since Ockham, theologians had been moving still further away from St. Thomas's conception that there is necessarily a harmony between faith and reason. For these two contemporary developments have the effect, ultimately, of converging forces.

The simplest way in which to understand what is meant by the *Devotio Moderna* is to take up again, and devoutly read, the *Imitation of Christ*: for this is the classic production of the school. What is there modern about it? how is it new? and who were the men that made up the school whence came the *Imitation* and many other works, now perhaps forgotten, of like character?

The *Devotio Moderna* was a product of the country we to-day call Holland, and the pioneer in the movement was a native of Deventer, Gerard Groote (1340-1384). He was a man of considerable education, bred in the schools of his native town,

of Aachen and in the universities of Cologne and Paris. He never seems to have proceeded beyond his mastership in arts, nor was he a priest; and for some years he led an ordinary worldly kind of life until, when he was about thirty-five, he was converted through his friendship with the greatest of all the Flemish mystics, B. Jan Ruysbroeck.

In the last few years of his life Gerard, [] who died an early death in 1384, gathered round him, in his native town, a group of like-minded associates and together they formed the " Brotherhood of the Common Life" (1381). The associates were not bound by any vows, but they met for regular exercises of prayer, and they gave their lives to copying pious books -- forming the equivalent, in that age, of a religious press association. [] A later development was the foundation and direction of schools for poor boys; the most famous of these, that at Zwolle, came to number 1,200 scholars. In their youth Thomas a Kempis, Nicholas of Cusa, Erasmus, and Luther too, came under the influence of the brothers in their schools. From Deventer some of the brethren passed to make a new foundation at Windesheim, but this group definitely went over to the religious life in the technical sense of the word, becoming canons-regular of the Augustinian type. The congregation of Windesheim flourished, and next eighty years (1384-1464) it came to number eighty-two priories. At Windesheim, and in the other priories, the spirit of Gerard Groote inspired all, and the priories also continued to be centres for the spread of spiritual books. The best known of all these Windesheim canons is the German, Thomas of Kempen, [] the most likely candidate for the signal honour of being the author of the Imitation; and known to his contemporaries as a calligrapher of unusual skill.

It was not in the minds of the pioneers of this movement that the brethren should themselves be authors. But gradually books began to grow out of the little addresses with which, within the seclusion of these Dutch cloisters, they exhorted one another to perseverance in virtue and prayer and recollection, and in fidelity to the life of withdrawal from the world and its occasions of sin. And all these books -- collections of sayings, or sermons, or set treatises on special topics -- bear an extremely close resemblance to each other. There is little sign anywhere of the diversity of personalities among the authors. But what is everywhere evident -- and immediately evident -- to the reader is

that the author is a man in whose life the loving communion with God is scarcely ever interrupted. And the reader can always understand what is written directly he reads. For the treatment of the great theme is concrete, and practical. With a most finished, albeit unconscious, artistry the writers set out their instructions in maxims, simply stated, with all the finality of proverbs or axioms; [] and always, the guidance offered is so perfectly related to what every man knows the better side of himself craves for, that as he reads, it seems rather as though he were actually listening to his own better self. From time to time the flow of the maxims in which the reader sees the better things, and once again professes them, is broken by touching colloquies between the soul and Christ Our Lord.

Once these books composed by the new religious began to appear, they made headway rapidly -- there was, of course, at work here, besides the quality of what was offered, the new immense advantage that to propagate such literature was the congregation's main activity. The earliest manuscript of the complete Imitation that has survived is of 1427; in another forty years the book was known, and used, and loved, all over Europe.

Criticism is always an ungracious task, and never more so, surely, than when the critic is set to examine coldly the elements of a work inspired by the love of God, and stamped in every line with generous dedication of self to God's service. The Imitation of Christ, for example, is a work that all humanity has agreed to call golden. This makes the historian's task hard, but nonetheless necessary. For this *Devotio Moderna* was not all-sufficient; and once it had passed beyond the cloisters where it was born, and had begun to flourish in a different setting, its insufficiency might, and did indeed, tell increasingly.

The most notable insufficiency was that almost nowhere, in the literature of this school, was piety related to doctrine, [] which is as much as to say that about much of it there is nothing specifically, necessarily, Catholic. It is a piety which, taken by itself, is, in the modern phrase, very largely undenominational; and, as everyone knows, the *chef d'oeuvre* of the school [] has for centuries been used as extensively by those outside the Church as by those within. The absence of any care to relate piety to those revealed doctrines which the Church was divinely

founded to set forth, is the more serious because it was deliberate. Not, of course, that these writers were indifferent to Catholic doctrine or hostile to it. They were, all of them, excellent Catholics, as whole in faith as in charity or in zeal; they would presuppose a dogmatic foundation, known and accepted. But they were Catholics in violent reaction against the fashionable spirituality of their time -- or rather, against its excesses -- and this had been a learned spirituality, very much occupied with theories about the mystical life, concerned to elaborate systems based on its theories, and interested, in some cases perhaps over-interested, in theological subtleties.

The great figure of this earlier movement had been the German Dominican Eckhart; and the Dominican priories and the convents of Dominican nuns in the Rhine provinces were the centres where it chiefly flourished. John Tauler and Blessed Henry Suso, also Dominicans, masterly theologians and great mystics, preachers and writers too, were the leading figures in the world of mysticism during the generation in which Gerard Groote grew up. Eckhart -- who had taught theology at Paris during the years when Scotus taught there, and who was involved in the controversies around the Franciscan's teaching -- was indeed a theologian of the very first class. [] But over the end of his long and active life there lies the shadow of the condemnation of many of his doctrines -- after his death -- as heretical. [] About the exact meaning of that condemnation scholars are now divided. The texts of Eckhart's work, as they have been known for the last three centuries, are far from trustworthy. It is only in the last few years, indeed, that any critical work has been done on his Latin writings. But whether Eckhart, the real Eckhart, was orthodox or not -- the gravest charge is that he was, in fact, a pantheist -- he is in these texts extremely obscure. This is by no means true of Tauler and Suso. Tauler was a master of spiritual direction, as learned in the workings of the human personality as in the ways of the Spirit, who had the rare gift of bringing home to the most workaday congregation the real importance of ideas. Henry Suso, no less learned in theology, and no less faithful, like a true Dominican, to the duty of associating piety with what can only be apprehended by the intelligence, namely truth divinely revealed, was a more passionate soul. In burning words he preached to all comers devotion to the divine intelligence, to the eternal wisdom of God. It was around this love for the second Person of the

Blessed Trinity that all spiritual life turned for Suso; and to the propagation of this devotion he brought -- what obviously the task requires -- deep and sure theological learning. Above all others his master is St. Thomas Aquinas, whose calmly-argued ideas break into flame once they make contact with Suso's ardent mind.

The effect of Christian doctrine preached in this fashion had been to produce a host of mystics of rare quality in the Rhineland, and especially among the nuns of the order from which these preachers chiefly came. The movement was not, however, confined to friars and nuns; for it was one of the special characteristics of this Dominican school to teach that the life of the mystic is open to every Christian; that it is not, in kind, a new life which is the special privilege of contemplative monks or nuns, but a simple extension of, and an intensification of, that Christian life inaugurated in every soul by baptism. Hence the care of these German Dominicans, as of Ruysbroeck, to preach -- and also to write -- in their native tongues; and hence also, what has often caused surprise, their preaching about these high themes to the ordinary congregations who filled their churches.

It is not hard to understand that, once out of the hands of men really masters of their task, really theologians as well as holy men, such an apostolate could easily go astray. The subtle explanations of the soul's mystical union with God could, and did, give rise to idle and mischievous debates among the less learned and the half-learned; the delicate business of the practical relation of the workaday moral virtues to the high theological virtues could be neglected, and men and women, who visibly reeked of pride, insubordination, injustice and intemperance of every sort, could ignore their sins while they busied themselves with the higher prayer. And, of course, the movement will not have been spared its host of camp followers, many times larger than the army of disciples -- infinitely noisier and much more in evidence -- whose main occupation was to exchange gossip masked in the phrases of high theological learning, to turn these into party slogans, and, in the devil's eternal way, accomplish to perfection all the complicated manoeuvres of the religious life while their hearts were wholly unconverted, their wills obstinately unrepentant.

The reaction of the brethren of Deventer and Windesheim against what has been called [] the speculative school of spiritual teaching, was, no doubt, very largely a reaction against the dangerous humbug into which this particular way of the interior life had tended to degenerate. But it was a reaction that went much further than a protest against abuses. For example, it was not merely the abuse of learning that was now decried in many sayings of the *Devotio Moderna*, but the idea that learning had any necessary part to play in the interior life:

"Henceforward," wrote Gerard de Groote in his rule of life, [] "no more benefices, no more learned titles, no more public disputations. . . . The learning of learning is to know that one knows nothing. . . the one research that matters is not to be sought out oneself." "Do not spend thy time," he also said, [] "in the study of geometry, arithmetic, rhetoric, dialectic, grammar, songs, poetry, legal matters or astrology; for all these things are reprov'd by Seneca, and a good man should withdraw his mind's eye therefrom and despise them; how much more, therefore, should they be eschewed by a spiritually-minded man and a Christian. . . the purpose of a degree is either gain or preferment, or vain glorification and worldly honour, which latter things if they lead not to the former are simply useless, empty and most foolish, being contrary to godliness and all freedom and purity." Only the carnal-minded could, he thought, be happy in a university.

Nearly a hundred years later than Gerard Groote the same spirit can be seen in one of the greatest teachers associated with the movement, [] John Wessel Gansfort (1420-1489), a friend of Thomas a Kempis and a pioneer in the business of systematic meditation. [] "There is a strong and weighty argument against universities to be drawn from the fact that Paul secured but little fruit at Athens, accomplishing more in the neighbouring city of Corinth and in Thessaly, which was then almost barbarous, than in the Attic city, at that time the fountain of Greek philosophy. It goes to show that liberal studies are not very pleasing to God." []

There is a sense in which the *Imitation*, too, can be called "a late medieval protest against the vanity of all philosophy," [] and indeed the best known of such, and the most influential. All the world knows the passages in the opening pages of the *Imitation*, "What doth it profit thee to discuss the deep mystery of the

Trinity, if thou art from thy lack of humility displeasing to the Trinity. . . . I would rather choose to feel compunction than to know its definition. . . . Vanity of vanities, all is vanity save to love God and serve Him only. . . . Have no wish to know the depths of things, but rather to acknowledge thy own lack of knowledge. . . ." That goodness matters more than learning, that it is the mistake of mistakes " to prefer intellectual excellence to moral" [] no one will ever contest; nor that the learned may need, even frequently, to be reminded of this. But of all forms of goodness truth is the most fundamental, and yet, while learning is the pursuit of truth, it is hardly deniable that the author of the Imitation -- and others of this school with him -- do continually suggest, at least, an opposition between advance in virtue and devotion to learning, even to sacred learning; and certainly the tone of such admonitions is far removed from the teaching of St. Thomas that learning -- even the study of letters -- is a most suitable ascetic discipline for religious. [] With these authors, however, learning, it is suggested, is for most men the highroad to pride and vanity -- "the greater part in knowledge than in virtuous living" -- and he who gives himself to the pursuit of holiness is in better case if he is not handicapped by any desire to know. "Quieten thy too great desire for learning, for in learning there is discovered great distraction and much deception." As for the learned generally: "those who are learned gladly choose to be regarded, and to be hailed as wise men. . . . Would that their life were in accordance with their learning, then would they have read and studied well." Again: "Happy is the man whom Truth instructs through itself, not through passing images and words, but as itself exists. . . . And wherefore should we be anxious about genera and species? He to whom the Eternal Word speaks, is set free from the multitude of opinions." Learning -- this is definitely said -- is not, in itself, blameworthy, that is to say "simple notions about things": it is indeed good, and part of God's scheme of things, but a good conscience and virtuous living is always to be preferred to it.

The facts are, however, that to all but a very select few, knowledge, even of truths about supernatural reality, only comes through the ordinary natural channels -- faith is by hearing. It is the natural human intelligence [] that must lay hold of the truths of faith and make the judgment that these are things it must believe. [] It is no part of Christian perfection to neglect the ordinary means of making contact with these truths

-- namely the teaching of those already learned in them -- and to trust for a knowledge of them to the possibility of the extraordinary favour of a special personal revelation. And although it is most certainly true that theological learning is by no means a prerequisite for sanctity, such learning remains, nevertheless, a necessary instrument for those whose lot it is to journey towards sanctity by guiding others thither. Hence when good men begin to suggest that the world of piety can manage very well -- if not, indeed, very much better -- without the presence of theologians acting upon it, there is surely something wrong; and when priests write books about holy living which suggest that the theologians are more likely to go to the bad through learned vanity than to save their souls through the deeper knowledge of divine truth that is theirs, there is something very wrong indeed. Once more we are brought up against the all-important role of theological learning as the salt that keeps Christian life healthy. And what theology is to piety, metaphysical truth is to theology; for it is the natural condition, the sine qua non of healthy intellectual certitude in the mind of the theologian. [] Once the direction of so delicate a thing as the *Devotio Moderna* passes into the hands of those unlearned in theology, all manner of deviation is possible. It can become a cult of what is merely naturally good, a thing no worse -- but no more spiritual -- than, say, the cult of kindness, courtesy, tidiness and the like. And what the master, unwittingly, is soon really teaching is himself; he is the hero his disciples are worshipping; there are, in the end, as many Christianities as there are masters, and chaos begins its reign.

Once it ceases to be recognised that there must exist an objective rule by which to judge the whole business -- theory and practice, maxims, counsels, exhortations, ideals, and criticism of other ways -- of the inner life and the business of the director with the directed, and that this objective rule is the science of the theologian, substitute rules will be devised to fill the absent place, rules which, there is every chance, will be no more than the rationalisation of a man's chosen and preferred activities. Someone, somewhere, must be interested in compunction's definition, or it will soon cease to be understood that there can be, and is, a certainty about what compunction is and what it is not; and if that certainty goes, very strange things indeed will begin to wander about, claiming the name of compunction in the lost land that once was Christendom. []

Let us turn from the defects, now so easy to be seen, in the *Devotio Moderna*, recalling only -- what will occupy us more hereafter -- how it is into one of the priories of the Windesheim congregation that, some eighty years ahead of the date our survey has reached, a pupil of the Brothers of the Common Life, and now an unhappy lad of eighteen, will be thrust to become, in spite of himself, a canon-regular, Erasmus Or Rotter (I am: in his career we shall surely see the shortcomings of the system hampering the greatest Catholic scholar of his generation, at a time when Catholicism is fighting for its very life. Let us leave the thought that Erasmus is the greatest witness to what the *Devotio Moderna* lacked, and consider now another group of pious men who, in this same late fourteenth century, are diligently sapping the foundations of men's intellectual certitude about the saving faith -- though of this they are utterly unconscious. These are the new theologians, products of the *Via moderna*, and they are, professedly, defending the faith. But their faith has gone awry; in this fact -- that they are wrongheaded and are fashionable -- as in the deficiencies of the spirituality of the pious Hollanders, we can read signs that are ominous. At the moment when certain mystics were beginning to hint that those who wished to advance in virtue had best leave theological problems alone, since ability to discuss them would lead inevitably to pride and vainglory, certain theologians were beginning to say that these same problems were insoluble, since no one could know anything at all with certainty, and that the only safe thing, for a Christian, was to cease to think about divine truths and to content himself with a faithful acceptance of them and a life of prayer. The influence of the mysticism that despaired of the theologian's salvation, was to be reinforced by that of theologians who now despaired of theology, and this because they had come to despair of reason itself.

There is, for instance, the revealing story of Nicholas of Autrecourt, a Parisian theologian, who has been called the Hume of the fourteenth century, [] in whose work Ockham's principles reach their last extreme consequences. Nicholas used the new dialectic to examine Aristotle, and he finds thereby that Aristotle did not really know -- that is to say possess certitude about -- any one of the basic metaphysical truths on which his thought is built: for these truths -- if truths, and they may be truths -- are not things that can be known. We do not know, and it can't be

known, that there are such things as substances, causes, ends, and the like. There is, says Nicholas, no "evidence" for their existence. "Evidence" is one of his favourite terms; "probable" is another, and this word "probable" sums up increasingly the mentality of the fourteenth-century thinkers. No philosophical truth is any longer certain: probability is all that human reason can attain. For example, Nicholas asks whether matter is eternal, and he answers that we cannot say with certainty that it is; but that it is eternal is more likely than not; it is probable. It is of course now, at this moment, that this is probable; what it will be, hath not yet appeared, and Nicholas, a devout ecclesiastic, conscious that thought (if this is all that thought really is) cannot offer itself as a way to truth, whether to Christians or to others, can only warn Christians of this and exhort them to stick more closely to the teachings of faith. He has, of course, if only by implication, suggested thereby to the Christian that reason and faith tend to contradict each other, that they can be in permanent opposition, [] after which it seems a poor way out, indeed, to advise the Christian to stick to the one rather than the other. For what is faith but an assent of the reason? and with what other reason can the Christian give his assent but with that which has already been described by Nicholas as necessarily incapable of certitude?

To study Aristotle is also, therefore, pure waste of time; and Nicholas says so, expressly. Then what of the great doctors whose minds fed so largely on him? St. Thomas, for example, and Duns Scotus. It is barely thirty years since Scotus died, and not yet twenty since John XXII canonised St. Thomas with the most resounding eulogy of his work; but for Nicholas (and the many whom he will influence) the mass of all this writing is but so much lumber. Advancing a stage from his great discovery, "scared," says Gilson, "by the conclusions to which his logic has brought him," this philosopher who is a good Catholic looks for a remedy, and finds it; and here his solo voice anticipates what a whole chorus of superficial simpletons [] will presently be bawling. What is needed, he tells us, are "spiritual men who will not waste their whole time in logical argument or the analysis of Aristotle's obscure propositions, but who will give to their people an understanding of God's law." [] It is the old final-wisdom-seeming sophistry of the "practical" minded that is still with us. And this first of such prophets is a man whose theories of knowledge "cut us off from the only ways by which we can

come to God." []

Nicholas of Autrecourt was a good man [] who proposed to make the world a safe place for Faith by showing the utter impossibility of thought. It was not long before this tragic aberration brought him to the notice of the authorities, and after Clement VI had condemned eighteen of his leading theses, [] he made a humble submission. [] Nicholas may seem an obscure personage, but the most astonishing part of the story is this, that forty years later a personage who was by no means obscure, a chancellor of the university of Paris, and one of the two brightest ornaments of the world of Christian thought in that day, was explaining that the real reason for the condemnation of 1346 was jealousy, and offering as proof of this the fact that these theses were now publicly taught in the universities. Such is Peter d'Ailly's superficial comment on this grave affair. [] The other glory of Paris, and of France and of Christendom, in this generation was d'Ailly's pupil and successor as chancellor, Jean Gerson, one of the holiest men of his time (1363-1429). He too was an Ockhamist, and he too sought in the cult of the interior life an escape from these difficult and urgent intellectual anxieties. " Lorsque la foi desespere de la raison, c'est toujours vers l'intuition mystique et la vie interieure qu'elle se retourne pour s'y chercher un plus solide fondement." []

The Christian mind, then, unable to think itself out of the impasse to which "thought" brought it, and mortally uneasy at the now unresolved fundamental contradiction that the teachings of Faith and the findings of reason may be incompatible, is bidden for its salvation resolutely to ignore the contradiction, to stifle reason, and to seek God in the interior life; again, to seek Him with what? With a mind accepting on Faith what it knows may be impossible? The eternal lesson recurs, that we cannot manage our religious affairs without true philosophy, however elemental; that true religion does not survive healthily unless philosophy flourishes. For without philosophy, or with a philosophy that is false, the educated mind [] turns to scepticism -- theoretical or practical; and assents to religious truth made by a mind that is sceptical about natural truth, produce in the end superstition: and from the educated mind the poison seeps down, until in time it corrupts the faith of the whole community. []

For the popular and fashionable philosophers and theologians Aristotle was now, at the end of the fourteenth century, finished; and the famous Thomistic alliance of thought and faith at an end. A further blow was dealt to the prestige of that older school -- a prestige bound up inevitably with the prestige of Aristotle -- by the appearance in these same years of the first non-Aristotelian physicists, of the critical work of Jean Marbres [] and, especially, of Nicholas of Oresme, [] Bishop of Lisieux. It was theological speculation that set these clerics to their radical reconstruction of Aristotle the physicist, Oresme writing, perhaps all the more damagingly, in his native French -- yet another of the many signs that a new age is at hand. From the Bishop of Lisieux' work came ultimately three great discoveries linked to three better known names, Copernicus' hypothesis of the movement of the earth, Galileo's theory of the law of falling bodies, and Descartes' invention of analytical geometry. Here are far-off medieval origins of important elements in our modern scientific knowledge; in the circumstances in which they appeared they served to give the coup de grace to Aristotle as a force to be reckoned with in the university world. And that world, in the fourteenth century, was in process of a remarkable extension. Nine new universities were founded in northern Europe between the years 1348 and 1426, [] and another nine [] between 1456 and 1506. In the better part of these it was the *Via moderna* that dominated the philosophical outlook.

And now it is that there befalls the Church one of the most fearful calamities of all its long history, the so-called Great Schism of the West -- a forty years wandering in a wilderness when no one knew with certainty who was the head of the Church, a forty years in which the unity of belief was indeed marvellously preserved, but in which administrative chaos reigned and in which there sprang up an abundance of new anarchical theories about the nature of the papacy and its role. That catastrophe came at the end of a century when the whole strength of the politicians had been exerted to compel the Church to retire from all concern with temporal affairs; in an age when thinkers would have had it retire from the field of thought, and mystics would divorce its piety from the pursuit of truth; the trader, too, will be pleased if religion will now abandon its claim to regulate the morality of exchanges, and Marsiglio's ideal is only slumbering that will satisfy all of these by making religion a matter of rites alone and of activities within a man's own soul. []

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



4. THE SCHISM OF THE WEST, 1378-1409 i. The Two Conclaves of 1378.

"This is milk and honey compared with what is to come, " St. Catherine had said, [] when the news reached her, in 1376, of the general rebellion of the Papal State against Gregory XI. Already the saint foresaw the Schism, the forty years during which two -- and even three -- "popes" simultaneously claimed the allegiance of Catholicism, which thereupon split -- geographically -- into several "obediences. "

Gregory XI died on March 27, 1378. Twelve days later the cardinals elected in his place Bartholomew Prignani, Archbishop of Bari -- Urban VI. Four months went by and then, on August 2, these same cardinals publicly declared that this election of Urban VI was no election; and on September 20 they proceeded to fill the alleged vacancy by electing as pope the cardinal Robert of Geneva -- Clement VII. Urban VI reigned until 1389; he was followed by Boniface IX (1389-1404), Innocent VII (1404-1406) and Gregory XII (1406-1415). Clement VII, meanwhile, reigned until 1394; and Benedict XIII, elected to succeed him, lasted for twenty-eight years more. Of these two lines, which were the real popes? To decide this we should first have to decide a question of historical fact; was Bartholomew Prignani, on April 8, 1378, really elected pope? or did the election take place in such a manner that it cannot be held a true election?

It is all-important, if the history of the Church in the next forty years is to be understood at all, to realise not only the fact of the ensuing division in Christendom, but the sincerity of the doubts and hesitations on both sides, and also the apparent practical impossibility -- especially once the generation passed away of those who, by their double election, had made the division -- of determining by any investigation of facts where the truth of the matter lay, the truth, that is to say, about the election of Urban VI. []

There exists an immense mass of information about that election from contemporaries, many of whom were eye-witnesses and participants in the great event. But the greater part of this evidence was set down after the second election,

that is, after the dispute had begun. Party spirit is already evidently active, and in these accounts flat contradiction about simple matters of fact is frequent. Nevertheless, despite the unsatisfactory nature of much of the material, it is possible to reconstruct with certainty [] the main events of the forty hours of crisis that began with the entry into the Vatican, for the conclave, of the sixteen cardinals [] then in Rome, on Wednesday, April 7, at about five in the afternoon.

From the moment when Rome learnt of Gregory XI's death, one thought alone, seemingly, possessed the whole city; at all costs the cardinals must be brought to elect a pope who would not return to Avignon, a pope, therefore, who was Italian and not French. All through the next eleven days the excitement grew, and very soon Rome was wholly in the hands of those who could rouse and manoeuvre the mob of the city. The nobles were driven out; guards were set at the gates to prevent any electors from escaping while the see remained vacant; the shipping in the Tiber was stripped of sails and rudders. Thousands of peasants and brigands were brought in from the surrounding countryside, and armed bands paraded the streets, escorting the cardinals wherever they went, advising them of the best choice they could make, Romano lo volemo, o almanco Italiano. . And when the day at last arrived for the conclave to begin the cardinals had to make their way to the Vatican through a crowd as numerous as the very population of the city. []

The guardians of the conclave had been careless in their preparations, and they showed themselves weak and ineffective once the cardinals had arrived. Some of the mob, armed, to the number of seventy, made their way in with the cardinals, impressing upon them to the last, with coarse familiarity, the importance of making a right choice. When these were got rid of, there arrived the heads of the thirteen regions into which Rome at that time was divided (the Caporioni), with their escorts, demanding audience. They too were admitted, and once more the cardinals had to hear what, throughout the night, the mob continued to shout and chant, Romano lo volemo and the rest. The cardinals managed to be rid of the Caporioni without any definite answer, and after pillaging what they could they too left.

The night was noisy. The mob had settled down to a kind of kermess, its revelling helped on by the feat of those who had

broken into the wine cellars of the palace. Just before dawn the cardinals were summoned to the first of two masses they were to hear, and while the second was in progress the mob wakened up to fresh activity. Presently the tocsin was heard to ring, and the bells of St. Peter's to answer it. While the senior cardinal was formally opening the proceedings the governor of the conclave sent in an urgent message. " Haste, for God's sake; elect an Italian or a Roman, or you will be massacred." Stones were indeed beginning to come through the windows, and axes to be plied against the doors.

Excitement flared high within the chapel where the cardinals, still isolated, were gathered. After half an hour they agreed to tell the mob that they would elect an Italian, and this was announced by the junior among them, James Orsini. On his return to the chapel this cardinal now suggested a mock election, of some Friar Minor who could be persuaded to play the part, be dressed in papal robes and presented to the mob -- what time the cardinals got away, to hold a real election elsewhere, later. But to this none would agree. And now it was that, within the conclave, the name of Bartholomew Prignani was first mentioned, [] by the Aragonese cardinal Pedro de Luna. A rapid consultation among the little group showed that two-thirds of them would vote accept him. The voting then began, by word of mouth, the Cardinal of Limoges casting the first vote for the future Urban VI. Three alone, of the sixteen, demurred; of whom, two, in the end, came to agree with the rest. Orsini alone held out to the last, declaring that in his opinion there was not sufficient freedom for the election to be valid.

Thus was Urban VI elected, towards nine in the morning of Friday, April 8, 1378. But not only was the elect not a cardinal: he was not, at this moment, within the palace, and between him and the news of his destiny was a city at the mercy of an armed and hostile mob. Until the archbishop accepted the election it could not be announced; and the first hint to the mob outside that the election had been made was the command from the cardinals to half a dozen Italian prelates -- of whom Prignani was one -- to come immediately to the Vatican.

It was, however, some hours before they came, and meanwhile the mob grew ever more violent and began to find its way into the palace. The six Italians arrived while the cardinals were at

their midday meal. They, too, were given a meal by the guardians of the conclave, [] who joked with them about the probability that one of the six had been elected, and made mock petitions for favours; and then, before Prignani could be summoned to hear of his destiny, the strangest scene of all took place.

Fear had now really invaded the minds of some of the electors -- fear that because Prignani was not a Roman the savages outside would resent the choice, and put the palace to the sack. When, after their meal, the cardinals met in the chapel, someone proposed that, since the mob now seemed less active, they should take advantage of the lull and re-elect Prignani. But "We all agree to him, don't we?" said a cardinal, and all present assented (thirteen of the sixteen who had taken part in the morning election). But by now the mob was at the end of its patience. It was the afternoon of Friday, almost twenty-four hours since the election had begun. This time nothing could halt the Romans, and by all manner of ways they poured into the palace and into the conclave itself, whose terrified guardians surrendered the keys. Some of the cardinals, the better placed, fled; others were arrested as they tried to leave. And to appease the mob -- supposedly enraged because a Roman had not been chosen -- other cardinals went through the farce of dressing up in papal robes the solitary Roman in the Sacred College, the aged Cardinal Tebaldeschi, hoisting him, despite his threats and curses, on to the altar and intoning the Te Deum. This exhibition lasted for some hours, and it was, seemingly, from the old man's protestations against this mockery - - "I am not the pope; it is the Archbishop of Bari " -- that Prignani, somewhere in the palace, and by this time hiding from a mob to whom all that savoured of prelacy was spoil, learnt that he had been elected.

The palace was, indeed, thoroughly pillaged, and at last the mob went off elsewhere. Night fell, and in the Vatican there remained two only of the cardinals, and the man whom they had all, twice, agreed upon as the pope, but found no time to notify of the fact.

Gradually, on the next day, Friday, April 9, the cardinals began to come in from their hiding-places in the city. It took the best part of the day to persuade the six who had gone to St. Angelo that they could safely emerge. By the evening there were twelve cardinals in the Vatican. They first met, themselves alone, in the

chapel of the election, and immediately sent for the Archbishop of Bari. They announced to him his election. He accepted it; and chose the name of Urban VI. Whereupon he was robed in the papal mantle, enthroned, and homage was done to him as pope by all, while the Te Deum was sung.

Two days later was Palm Sunday. Urban presided at the great liturgy of the day, and all the cardinals received their palm at his hands. They took their traditional places by his side at all the Holy Week ritual. On Easter Sunday he was crowned in St. Peter's (April 18) and took possession as pope of his cathedral church of St. John Lateran.

Urban VI at this moment was, to all appearances, as much the lawful pope in the eyes of the cardinals as ever his predecessor, Gregory XI, had been. How then did they come to abandon him, to denounce their own electoral act as invalid? and when did this movement begin? It is not easy fully to answer either of those questions.

What does seem certain and beyond all doubt is that from the very first day of his reign -- the Monday after his coronation - - Urban began to act so wildly, to show himself so extravagant in speech, that historians of all schools have seriously maintained that the unexpected promotion had disturbed the balance of his mind. He had evidently made up his mind that his first duty was to cleanse the augean stable of the curia, to banish clerical worldliness and impropriety, and to begin this good work by reforming the cardinals and the other major prelates. The first signs of the new policy given to the world were violent general denunciations of whoever appeared before the pope to transact ecclesiastical business. When, for example, all the bishops present in Rome came to pay their homage, Urban rounded on them for hirelings who had deserted their flocks. An official of the Treasury came in to make some payments of moneys due and was met by an imprecation from Holy Writ, "Keep thy money to thyself, to perish with thee." [] The cardinals were rated in consistory as a body, for their way of life, and singled out for individual reprobation; one was told he was a liar, another was a fool, others were bidden hold their tongues when they offered an opinion. When the Cardinal of Limoges appeared, the pope had to be held down or he would have done him violence, and the noise of the brawl when the Cardinal of Amiens came to pay his

first homage, filled the palace. Urban boasted that he could now depose kings and emperors, and he told the cardinals that he would soon add so many Italians to their body that the French would cease to count for ever.

This extravagance of manner was the more disturbing because it was utterly at odds with the habits of a man who was by no means a stranger to any one of his electors. Urban VI was, at this time, a man close on sixty, and he had been one of the leading figures in the curia at Avignon for nearly twenty years. Urban V had, long ago, made him assistant to the vice-chancellor, perhaps the highest post that could be held by one who was not a cardinal; then, in 1364, the same pope had given him the see of Acerenza and when Gregory XI returned to Rome he had brought Bartholomew Prignani back with him to be, in all but name, his vice-chancellor. Urban VI, then, had been for the fourteen months preceding his election the chief personage of the curia after the pope himself; and among the cardinals he had enjoyed, very deservedly, the reputation of an extremely competent and serviceable official. He was learned, modest, devout; and, from his long life at Avignon, he was, so they thought, if not a Frenchman, as near to it as any mere foreigner could hope to be. This pope whom the cardinals now beheld, daily "breathing out threats and slaughter," was not the same man at all as the peaceable Archbishop of Bari. They were consternated; and so was all the curia with them. And whether Urban had indeed gone somewhat out of his mind, or whether this was merely the excessive noise of the explosion of a good man's disgust too long repressed, it seems certain that it is in these extravagances -- now the order of the day -- that the beginnings of the general breakaway are to be found. Had Urban shown ordinary tact and prudence there would never -- it seems certain -- have been the second conclave and election of 1378, whatever the doubts about the legality of his election that may have existed in the minds of some of his electors; or, at any rate, that second election would never have so impressed the world outside -- for its impressiveness, when it came, lay in the fact that it was the act of the whole college of cardinals.

The chief architect of the Schism, so Urban VI declared, [] was the one-time Bishop of Amiens, Cardinal Jean de la Grange. This cardinal had not taken part in the momentous conclave; diplomatic business kept him at Sarzana during Gregory XI's last

illness, and long before he could reach Rome Urban had been elected. When he arrived -- already enraged that his colleagues had chosen an Italian -- he had a violent, unfriendly reception from the new pope, who publicly called him a traitor to the Holy See for his activities at Sarzana. This was somewhere about April 25, and from now on the palace of Jean de la Grange was a kind of headquarters where all whom the pope's methods antagonised could meet and plot. One of the cardinal's first associates was his colleague Robert of Geneva, the cardinal whom Gregory XI had made commander-in-chief, and who was responsible for the massacre of Cesena. Between them these two did much to encourage the French commander in St. Angelo not to hand over the fortress to Urban, and with it the papal treasure taken there, on the day of the election, by the camerlengo the Archbishop of Arles.

One by one the cardinals now began to leave Rome for Anagni, the reason first alleged being the increasing heat of the Roman summer. The first two left on May 6, and by June 15 all the French cardinals were there together. On June 24 Peter de Luna, the Aragonese, and the ablest man in the whole college, joined them. From Anagni they called to their aid the Free Company of Gascons that had served Gregory XI. At Ponte Salaro a body of Roman troops barred the way. There was a fight, but the Gascons won through, killing two hundred of the Romans (July 16, 1378). The cardinals, all the world could see it, were now a power beyond Urban's reach.

The pope was seriously alarmed. He had already sent three [] of the Italian cardinals to offer terms, promising better treatment in the future. But the only result of this was to enable the whole college to meet away from any influence the pope might exercise. At that meeting momentous decisions were taken; the cardinals agreed that the election made on April 8, was void, and means were discussed to rid the Church of the "usurper." For a time these three Italian cardinals, indeed, strove to be neutral, but in the end they made common cause with their brethren, who, on August 2, had issued a manifesto stating that the election made in April was void by reason of the pressure exerted upon the electors, that Urban, therefore, was not pope, and inviting him to recognise the fact and to cease to exercise the papal office. One week later than this, after a mass of the Holy Ghost and a sermon, an encyclical letter of the cardinals

was read aloud in which they solemnly anathematised Bartholomew Prignani as an usurper. From Anagni the cardinals moved, on August 27, to a refuge safer still at Fondi, just beyond the papal frontier, in the kingdom of Naples. Here the sovereign -- Queen Giovanna -- supported them, and it was now that their Italian colleagues, abandoning their neutrality, joined them. The address of the cardinals to the Christian world had gone out already, and their embassy to the King of France -- Charles V -- had won him to their view that the election made in April was null and void. The king's reply reached them on September 18. Two days later they went into conclave, and at the first ballot they chose as pope Robert of Geneva. He called himself Clement VII. [] The three Italian cardinals, although present in the conclave, did not vote; but they acknowledged Clement and did him homage at his coronation on October 31.

For the next nine months the rival popes confronted each other in Italy, separated by a mere sixty miles and their own armed forces. Urban, on November 29, excommunicated Clement and some of his chief supporters; and Clement, in December, held his first consistory, creating six new cardinals and appointing legates to the various Christian princes.

Clement's cause, indeed, at the beginning of the new year 1379, seemed the more promising of the two. If England stood by Urban, and most of Germany too, France was decidedly for the Frenchman, and the Spanish kingdoms had at any rate refused to accept Urban, while in Italy Clement had Sicily on his side and also the Queen of Naples. But the situation changed greatly once Urban managed to hire the army of the best Italian captain of the day, Alberigo di Barbiano. On April 27, 1379, the French garrison that still held out in Castel S. Angelo at last surrendered to Urban, and three days later Alberigo routed and destroyed Clement's army at the battle of Marino. Clement now made for Naples, where the Queen received him with great pomp (May 10). But the populace rose in indignation that, in Naples, a Frenchman should be preferred to a pope who was a Neapolitan, and three days only after his arrival Clement had to flee to save his life. If he was not safe in Naples he could be safe nowhere in Italy; his first -- and, as it happened, his main -- attempt to drive Urban from Rome had failed indeed; nine months to the day after his election Clement sailed for Avignon (June 20, 1379). ii. Discord in each 'Obedience,' 1379-1394.

These tremendous events had not gone by without comment from St. Catherine. At the moment of Urban VI's election the saint was at Florence -- whither Gregory XI had sent her -- and she was still there when, in July 1378, she wrote her first letter to Urban. It was a strong plea that his first care should be to reform the Church, and a reminder that for such a task "You have the greatest need of being founded in perfect Charity, with the pearl of justice. . . letting the pearl of justice glow forth from you united with mercy," and so to correct "those who are made ministers of the blood." [] The cardinals were, by this time, already leaving Rome, and the next letter of the saint to the pope which we possess is dated September 18 -- the very day, had St. Catherine known it, when the cardinals went into the conclave that was to make Robert of Geneva Clement VII.

When this news reached her the saint straightway wrote to Urban the warning that, more than ever, must he now be " robed in the strong garment of most ardent charity"; she also wrote to the Queen of Naples, and to the cardinals who had elected Clement. Already, when first the division between them and Urban was becoming known, St. Catherine had written to Pedro de Luna, then considered as Urban's main supporter and the principal cause of his election, reminding him above all "never to sever yourself from virtue and from your head. All other things -- external war and other tribulations -- would seem to us less than a straw or a shadow in comparison with this." How the saint wrote to the schismatic electors can be guessed, "men, not men but rather demons visible." It is not true, St. Catherine tells them, that it was through fear of death that they had elected Urban "and, if it had been, you were worthy of death for having elected the pope through fear of men and not with fear of God." Briefly, in a couple of sentences, the "case" of the cardinals is exposed and the real motives declared which had driven them to this new sin. "I know what moves you to denounce him. . . your self love which can brook no correction. For, before he began to bite you with words, and wished to draw the thorns out of the sweet garden, you confessed and announced to us, the little sheep, that Pope Urban VI was true pope." [] The saint was, likewise, under no illusion about Urban's own character as it was now showing itself. "Even if he were so cruel a father as to hurt us with reproaches and with every torment from one end of the world to the other, we are still bound not to forget nor

persecute the truth." To the Count of Fondi, under whose protection Clement's election had taken place, the saint wrote of the cardinals, "Now they have contaminated the faith and denied the truth; they have raised such a schism in Holy Church that they are worthy of a thousand deaths." []

At the beginning of November 1378, in obedience to Urban VI's command, the saint came to Rome -- with her usual accompanying escort of disciples -- and for the short remainder of her life gave herself ardently to the tasks assigned to her, to mobilise "the servants of God" in the cause of the true pope and to write ceaselessly, burning and passionate letters, to all whom it was thought she could influence. When St. Catherine passed from this world, April 30, 1380, the cause of the Roman pope lost the one saint it had enlisted, and the pope's own vices the only human check they were ever to know.

Once the great figure of St. Catherine disappears from the story of the Schism, it becomes, indeed, for many years no more, to all appearances, than the dreary, material strife of politicians, clerical and lay. Nowhere is the deterioration more marked, at this time, than in the character of the pope whom the saint had supported. Now that Clement had been forced away from Italy, it was an obvious move for Urban to strengthen his hold on the Holy See's vassal state of Naples, where alone in Italy his rival had found a sovereign to support him. So, in April 1380, Urban VI deposed the treacherous Queen Giovanna, and offered the crown to her kinsman, Charles, Duke of Durazzo. Charles -- flushed with recent victories in the service of his cousin, the Angevin -- descended King of Hungary, Lewis the Great -- came to Rome with his army in the August of that same year. Giovanna, anticipating the pope's move, had previously named as her heir a French prince, Louis, Duke of Anjou, a brother of Charles V of France (June 29, 1380). But her papal suzerain gave the crown to Charles of Durazzo (June 1, 1381), and, the following day, himself crowned the new king. []

To provide supplies and pay for Charles III's army, Urban strained every nerve, selling church plate and jewels and levying new taxes upon what clergy acknowledged and obeyed him as pope. The new king marched south and met with little opposition. His French rival was detained in France by the death of his brother, Charles V, whose heir, Charles VI, was a child of

twelve. The Urbanist king took Naples in August 1381, and captured Giovanna also, whom, ten months later, he seemingly had murdered (or executed). He was then, already well established when Louis of Anjou crossed into Italy at the head of one of the finest armies the century had seen. Louis also had been crowned King of Naples, by the pope at Avignon (May 30, 1382). The fate of the rival obediences was once more, it seemed, to be determined by the conflict of armed forces. But Louis, if a good soldier, was a poor general. He made no attempt to capture Rome, but marched on the kingdom that was his objective by the circuitous route of Ravenna and the Adriatic coast. When at last (October 8) he arrived before Naples disease had already begun to destroy his army. His rival had no need to do more than harass Louis in a war of skirmishes. Long before Louis' own death, two years later at Bari (September 20, 1384), he had ceased to be a danger; and then the broken remnant of his troops made their way back to France.

And also, long before this, Urban had fallen foul of his own chosen champion. History was repeating itself; the prince called in to protect the papacy by force of arms had no sooner conquered its foe than he openly gave all his energy to consolidate his own new position as king and, therefore, inevitably, to ward off any interference from his suzerain the pope. Indeed, by this time, the suzerain-vassal relation -- where the vassal was sovereign prince at least -- had become no more than a formality; and a suzerain so little experienced as to wish to make it a reality, risked, every time, the chance of serious war. Nor would the fact that this particular suzerain, being also the vassal's spiritual ruler, was able to use against him such spiritual weapons as excommunication and interdict, ever again be a serious consideration in the politics of a prince politically strong.

It was another grave weakness for the papacy that Urban VI did not go into this conflict with Charles III of Naples with an entire purity of intention. The pope had a nephew -- a worthless blackguard of a man -- for whom he was anxious to provide. Part of the price which Charles III had agreed to pay was to carve out a great principality for this nephew, to be held in fief of the King of Naples. In the summer of 1383 Urban, partly in order to press these claims of his nephew, set out with his court for Naples Six of his cardinals -- of the new cardinals, that is to say, created

since the debacle of 1378 -- had, it seems, already opposed this scandalous piece of nepotism. Urban was careful to take his critics with him. When, in October, he arrived at Aversa, in Charles's dominions, the king greeted him with all conventional respect, but Urban found himself in fact a prisoner; and it was in a kind of extremely honourable captivity that, in great pomp, he entered Naples shortly afterwards.

The war with the French claimant presently absorbed Charles III's energy, and Urban was allowed to go to Nocera. Here new trouble arose, with Charles's wife Margaret -- now acting as regent -- when Urban began to interfere with the government of the kingdom, alleging his rights as suzerain. Soon the pope found himself besieged in the castle of Nocera (summer of 1384). But the career of Louis of Anjou was now nearing its end, and Charles was free to give all his attention to the troublesome pope. He found willing allies in the six cardinals. They conspired, apparently, to hand over Urban to the king, or to have him placed under restraint, as incapable of ruling. But a traitor betrayed them. The pope had them horribly tortured to extract confessions of guilt, a Genoese pirate known for his hatred of priests being called in to organise the enquiry. And outside the torture-chamber Urban walked up and down reading his breviary and listening to their shrieks and cries. Amongst other things, the torture produced statements that the King and Queen of Naples were partners in the plot, whereupon Urban made the fatal mistake of citing Charles to appear for judgment. An unusually savage sentence of excommunication followed. But the king's only reply was to send an army to besiege the pope, upon whose head he set a price of 11,000 golden florins (January 31, 1385). The command of this army was given to one of Urban's bitterest enemies, and it is a comment on the hold which the world now had upon monasticism that this general was the Abbot of Monte Cassino. Urban held out, in the citadel, for five months after the town had fallen, going to the ramparts four times a day, with full liturgical attendance, to excommunicate anew Charles and all his supporters.

In July 1385, however, at the approach of a new Angevin army, the abbot abandoned the siege, and Urban put the sea between himself and his dangerous vassal, sailing to Genoa on August 19. He took his unhappy prisoners with him. One, the Bishop of Aquila, he appears to have had killed on the road when he was

no longer able to stand the pace of the journey. The six cardinals -- all but the Englishman, Adam Easton -- no one ever saw again. Officially they had " disappeared, " and Urban so spoke of them. Historians seem agreed that the pope had them thrown into the sea.

Was Urban VI wicked or merely insane? We shall never know. He stayed at Genoa for over a year (September 23, 1385- December 16, 1386) and when the murder of Charles III, in Hungary, relieved him of his most dangerous enemy, he slowly made his way south once more. He was at Lucca for nine months and thence, in September 1387, he went to Perugia to prepare an expedition against Naples, now, since June, in the hands of Clement VII's party. But Urban's soldiers deserted because he had no money for their wages, and the pope got no further than Rome. Here, too, his life was not safe; and here, on October 15, 1389, death ended his unhappy career.

During this first stage of the Schism (1379-1389) the observer has the impression of Christendom as made up of two spheres between which there is no contact save an occasional collision; and in each of the two spheres Catholicism, as all the fourteenth century had known it, continues in its habitual way. Such collisions were, for example, the Italian expedition of Louis of Anjou, while the struggle between Charles III and Urban was but a new instance of the troubles which any pope of the Middle Ages might expect at any time during his reign. And in the sphere from which Louis of Anjou's expedition set out, the sphere ruled from Avignon by the French pope Clement VII, the most prominent feature of the Church's public life was a renewal of the long-standing conflict in which the kings strove to subject the Church and make it an instrument of State policy, while the popes strove to resist them and to maintain the freedom of religion from State control. Sometimes - - as before now -- the popes were indeed ill advised in the methods they chose, and more than unfortunate in the spirit in which they waged the fight, but to fight against the stifling control of the State they never ceased. And this is as true of the French popes during the Schism -- whose legitimacy has never been more than doubtful -- as it was of the earlier popes whom all agreed were really popes; it is true, especially, of the second of these popes, Pedro de Luna (Benedict XIII), but it is true also of Clement VII. Whether Clement VII and his successor were popes or anti-popes, their

public action -- in the principles that inspired it, in the forms it took, and even in its errors and its blunders -- has always about it, curiously enough, the authentic papal note: interesting and significant testimony that this division of opinion about who was pope did not affect the unity of faith about the authority of the papacy, nor occasion any revolutionary novelty in papal practice.

Legend relates that when Charles V of France heard of the election of Clement VII he exclaimed, "Now, I am pope." If ever any such idea had possessed the mind of any of the princes who ruled France during the next forty years, they were surely soon disillusioned. This French papacy of the years of Schism was as much -- and as little -- under their control as had been the French papacy of 1305-1378, or the Italian papacy of the forty years before that. And not only did the Avignon popes of the Schism period act, always, with the traditional papal independence towards the king in all matters of principle, but from the very beginning of the Schism there was also active in France a strong and organised body of educated clerical opinion that was always independent of the crown and often in conflict with it. The consistent aim of these scholars and doctors, was not, ever, to establish successfully the claims of the Avignon line; but rather to bring to an end the terrible spiritual evil which the Schism was. The centre of this great body of opinion was the University of Paris, and its endeavours were ceaseless through all these forty years. No praise is too high for the long fidelity of these men. In very great measure they were the instruments of the subsequent reunion. But it is also the fact, unfortunately, that their theology was not equal to their good will; their zeal, because ill-instructed, produced new complications, and a legacy of new theories about the place of the papacy in the Church destined to harass religion for the next four hundred years, and to be, during the century that followed the Schism, a most useful arm for the Christian prince who wished to wring concessions from the Holy See.

No one doubts that, as a matter of historical fact, it was the determination of France to support Robert of Geneva's claim to be the true pope which gave his party, at the critical moment, whatever chance of survival it ever possessed. Did Charles V support the cardinals against Urban VI, and pledge himself to whichever pope they should elect, because he really believed in

their case, or was it mere State policy, the hope of power, which moved him? The question is still debated.

When the first envoys of the cardinals came to his court (September 1378) [] Charles V called a meeting of ecclesiastics before whom they stated their case. There were present to hear them thirty-six archbishops and bishops, a number of abbots, doctors of theology and of canon law, with representatives of the universities of Paris, Angers and Orleans; and, at a second session, lawyers also from the parlement. Their advice to Charles was to wait for more information before coming to any decision. But Charles privately wrote [] the letter to the cardinals at Fondi which encouraged them to go forward with their plan. They elected their pope on September 20 and in October the six cardinals whom Gregory XI had left in charge at Avignon went over to Clement [] and proclaimed his election. On November 16 the king called a second meeting to discuss the matter. This was a very different affair from that of September; it was much smaller, and was made up largely of the king's own "household" clerics; nor was the University of Paris represented. The result of this meeting was the king's public recognition of Clement as pope, and a royal order that he should be proclaimed as pope in all the parish churches of the kingdom. And Charles now strove, through special embassies to the various states, to win over other princes to recognise Clement.

The University of Paris was still not so sure. Two "nations," [] the English and the Picard, refused to recognise Clement, and the rector asked for more time. Six months after this, in April 1379, Clement sent as his legate, to win over the university, the Cardinal of Limoges, Jean de Cros, and it was now that the university definitely deserted Urban, the English and Picards still resisting. [] But they were not the only independent spirits. Charles V died in September 1380, and the university now approached the court to ask support for what it already thought to be the only way out of the impasse -- the calling of a General Council. But the court was hostile to the plan; the doctors who appeared before it were thrown into prison, and only released when the university agreed to recognise Clement VII as really pope. [] Four years later the university again approached the court, this time to beg the king to protect the clergy from the ruinous taxes levied by Clement VII to pay for the armies of

Louis of Anjou.

When Urban VI died (October 15, 1389), Clement VII immediately proposed to Charles VI that he should try, through diplomatic channels, to persuade the Roman cardinals to end the Schism by electing him, Clement VII. But the fourteen cardinals Urban had left behind moved too quickly for the Avignon pope. On November 2 they elected their pope, Pietro Tomacelli, a young man of thirty-three -- Boniface IX. Clement promptly excommunicated him; and Boniface excommunicated Clement. And Boniface also declared [] that the plan to end the division through a General Council was sinful.

But from this moment the political aspect of the Schism changed, and contacts began once more to be made between the two "obediences." Boniface IX was tactful and kindly; he soon won back the Italian states which Urban VI had estranged politically (though they had remained faithful to the cause of the Roman pope); and he gradually conquered the last few strongholds that held out for Clement in the Papal State.

In France, meanwhile, great plans were being worked out to bring down the cause of the Roman pope. Clement VII's plan centred round the heir of the ill-starred Louis of Anjou, a boy of twelve, another Louis. To finance a new expedition to Naples that should establish Louis II as king, Clement gathered the immense sum of 60,000 golden florins. On August 13, 1390, the little king and his army landed at Naples and for three years all went well, victory in the field, and town after town falling to the Angevins. Expenses of course mounted, as the months and years went by, and Clement tightened the financial screw. Boniface IX did the same on behalf of his own protegee, Ladislas, the son of Charles of Durazzo. The King of France planned to lead a new expedition against Rome itself and so re-establish the unity of the Church by force of arms. Clement VII was to go with him, and the date for the assembly was already fixed (March 1391), when the diplomacy of Richard II of England was set in movement by Boniface, and it effectively halted the scheme.

This was a serious blow to Clement. A second soon followed, a royal scheme for such a reorganisation of Italy that the French would control the whole country; Boniface IX would indeed be crushed, but the papacy installed at Rome with Clement would

be more openly dependent on the lay power than at any time since the days of St. Gregory VII. One of the chief elements in this scheme had Clement himself for its unwitting first author.

In the critical days of 1379, when there were still hopes of driving Urban VI from Rome, Clement, as a reward to Louis I of Anjou for his spontaneous offer of support, had carved out for him a kingdom in central Italy, that included almost the whole of the Papal State save Rome itself and the Patrimony, and to which he gave the name Adria. [] This kingdom was to be held in fief of the Holy See, and was never to be held by the ruler of the other papal fief to the south, the kingdom of Naples. Only a fortnight after this rash offer the battle of Marino put an end for years to Clement's chances of effectively shaping Italian kingdoms. And now, in 1393, the heir of the "King of Adria" was actually King of Naples. But the French court, none the less, now revived the scheme.

It was proposed to Clement that he should confer Adria -- on the same conditions -- upon another French prince, a younger brother of the King of France, Louis of Orleans; this Louis was also the son-in-law of Galeazzo Visconti, the ruler of Milan. If Louis of Anjou maintained his hold on Naples, and the new scheme also went through, the French thus would dominate all Italy. To induce Clement to consent, the French pointed out how the task of maintaining order within the Papal State, and of keeping it independent of the neighbouring states, had been for centuries a burden far too heavy for the papacy to bear; and how this crushing burden permanently hampered the popes in their real work of promoting the interests of religion throughout the Catholic Church. All of which, however true, did not alter the fact that in an Italy so reorganised the papacy would, more than ever before, be the sport of the Catholic princes. Clement VII -- a much wiser man after fifteen years of responsibility -- fenced off the offer. For reply he submitted his own terms, and then the negotiations began to drag.

And while, in the last months of Clement's life, he had thus to fight his less than disinterested protectors, the University of Paris, persisting in its view that the division of obedience was a scandal to be ended at all costs, began to renew its agitation; and in the statements it now put out [] the anxious Clement saw clearly, and was dismayed to see, the first signs of the

university's unorthodox theories about the place of the pope in the Church, theories which it adopted in order to justify its determination to end the Schism even though, to do this, it had to bring to an end the careers of both the rivals, of the lawful and the unlawful pope alike. []

Clement VII's reign ended, then, just as a new movement was beginning which, without being in any way more favourable to his rival, threatened him even more seriously than did his rival; for its first principles were a denial of the fundamental tradition *Prima sedes a nullo iudicetur*. The only way out of the scandal, the university was now saying, was for both popes to resign, and whichever of them did not do so was to be judged by the very fact as obstinately schismatical and a heretic, and therefore no pope. To gather the opinion of the university world, a locked coffer was set in one of the churches of Paris; whoever among the graduates had a plan was invited to set it down in writing and place it in the chest. When the box was opened it was found that 10,000 graduates had submitted their views (January 1394). Fifty-four professors were set to read and classify the suggestions. For the most part, so it appeared, they came to this that there were only three ways to solve the problem -- the popes should both resign, or they should appoint a joint commission whose verdict they would accept as final, or they should summon a General Council and leave it to this to decide. Meanwhile there were great religious demonstrations in Paris, processions to ask the blessing of God on the movement for reunion, and in these the king and all the court and a small army of clerics took part. Clement VII was so far carried along by this new enthusiasm that processions were ordered at Avignon too, and he had a special mass composed for the peace of the Church.

But the pope did his best to check the movement of new ideas before it could spread further. He invited some of its chiefs-- Peter d'Ailly very notably -- to Avignon to put their case, an invitation they were careful not to accept; and he sent a special envoy to Paris to work the court and university away from these dangerous schemes. The university indeed held firm, but Clement won over the court. When the university next appeared to plead before the king, the atmosphere had changed, and the university found itself forbidden for the future to busy itself with the dispute between the popes (August 10, 1394).

But, barely a month before this prohibition, the university had said its last word to Clement, a letter (July 17) that urged him to punish his legate at Paris, Peter de Luna, whose diplomacy, said the university, was wrecking the movement for reunion. The university also wrote to the cardinals, and the cardinals did not hide their sympathy with the doctors of Paris. Worst of all the cardinals began now to meet together, without the pope's leave, in order to discuss the new developments. No doubt Clement's mind went back sixteen years to the meetings at Anagni that had so speedily led to the conclave of Fondi. When the cardinals openly told him that the only thing to do was to adopt one of the schemes recommended at Paris, the pope fell into a kind of melancholy. Sometimes he spoke of resigning and then, as news reached him of the breach between the court and the university, he talked of a new expedition into Italy. The last weeks of his life were given up to this idea. But, on September 16, 1394, a fit of apoplexy carried him off. iii. Benedict XIII's Quarrels with the French, 1394-1403

The interregnum at Avignon was extremely short. Ten days only after the death of Clement VII his twenty-one cardinals unanimously elected Peter de Luna to succeed him; he chose to be called Benedict XIII. With the election of this Spaniard the conduct of the Schism rises at once from the misery of petty expedencies in which it had for so long been caught. Peter de Luna had been a cardinal since 1375, and he was now an old man of sixty-six. He was universally esteemed as a scholarly and experienced jurist, and a practised diplomatist; he was learned, eloquent, pious; a man of principle, indeed, and soon to show himself the most obstinate of mankind -- and the most unscrupulously ingenious -- in defence of the principle which he considered to matter most of all, namely that the pope has no master in this world and is answerable to God alone for his rule of the Church. The election of Benedict XIII was a most definite turning point in the long involved story of the Schism; from now on there is added to the conflict between the rivals who claim to be pope, a second conflict between Benedict and the crown of France in which the principles at stake, the rights and the claims, are manifestly fundamental.

The action of the popes of the Avignon line, in the history of the Schism, as this is usually told, quite eclipses that of the Roman

popes. It is no doubt inevitable that the towering ability of Benedict XIII plays all his rivals off the stage for years. It is also the fact that the records of the Avignon line are far more complete than those of the Roman popes. [] But, quite apart from these two very real considerations, the dramatic struggle between Benedict XIII and the French is of the very highest importance because it is now that the theories, the methods, and the spirit are developed which will one day produce the Councils of Pisa and of Constance, the "conciliar" theory and the baleful myth of the "liberties" of the Gallican Church.

It is in Peter de Luna's relations with France -- with the court, the hierarchy and the university world -- that the chief interest lies of his long thirty years' career as Benedict XIII. For, very soon after his election a conflict began of practical policy, about the best way to end the Schism. It ended -- after nearly four years -- by the French "withdrawing" their "obedience" (July 5, 1398). This schism within a schism lasted for five years and two months -- until May 30, 1403; the French then "restored" their "obedience" to Benedict and they continued in it for another five years nearly -- until May 21, 1408; when they again withdrew it, absolutely this time, and for ever.

The occasion of the breach between this second pope of the Avignon line and its royal French protector, was the oath by which each cardinal, in the short conclave of 1394, had bound himself, should he be elected, to resign if the Roman pope agreed to resign simultaneously, and also to be guided in this by the advice of the majority of his cardinals. All Benedict XIII's troubles arose from this oath. He had been extremely unwilling to take it, as he had been unwilling to accept elections as pope -- and as he had been extremely unwilling, sixteen years earlier, to take part in the conclave of Fondi. Once elected he declined to be bound by the oath, while the cardinals, and the French generally, endeavoured to hold him to it. Peter de Luna, however, did not begin by any explicit renunciation of his promise, by any declaration that promises of this kind were unlawful in themselves, and therefore could not bind, such as Innocent VI had published after his election in 1352. But with a patient, persistent wiliness unmatched in history, he raised objection after objection; he contrived endless delays, and he devised all manner of distinctions; ever careful on occasion to make private protest, in legal form, that he would not necessarily

consider himself bound by the public engagement he was now about to contract, he so extended, for the peace of his own conscience, the principle that promises made through fear are not binding, that in the end he wore out the patience of all concerned and all men's belief in his own truthfulness. [] Benedict XIII has gone down to history as a prodigy of conscientious double-dealing and elaborate self-deception -- the inevitable penalty of such genius.

The contest began when the King of France, in May 1395, begged the Avignon pope to communicate the actual text of the oath he had sworn in the conclave. Benedict kept the royal ambassadors dancing attendance on him for 120 days, and even then, though he did not hand over the text, he contrived not to express any disagreement with the scheme for a double resignation which Charles VI was urging on him. The king next turned to look for allies among the princes of Christendom in his effort to heal the division. His diplomacy produced, in June 1397, a joint Anglo-French mission which visited both Benedict and Boniface IX. But it won no concessions from either.

Twelve months later Charles had induced the emperor, Wenzel, to plead with Benedict; and now, in May 1398, to the emperor's ambassadors, the Avignon pope spoke out his mind, denouncing the resignation scheme as sinful and utterly repudiating it. Whereupon the French court resolved to force the old man to consent to it.

This new determination to try what force could do against Aragonese obstinacy was not due merely to zeal for religion. For a whole generation now -- since 1368 -- the kings of France had enjoyed, from the different popes, a permission to levy taxes on Church property for the nation's ordinary needs. This permission Benedict XIII had renewed, at first for two years only, and then for one. Latterly he had refused any further renewal. The crown urgently needed the money; the pope would not grant it; and if the clergy still acknowledged him as pope they could not be persuaded to defy him and vote the money without his leave. And so the crown came round to a plan which certain pillars of the University of Paris had devised, that the nation should withdraw its obedience from Benedict, as a kind of threat that he had better look to his election promises and begin to fulfil them. The withdrawal was to be done with the semblance of

legal form -- through a council of the clergy, a full debate and a general vote. This council met at Paris, May 22, 1398, and it remained in session until the beginning of August. In some ways it is the most pregnant event in all the religious history of the two hundred years that separate Philip the Fair from Henry VIII -- both for what was done, and the way it was done.

Forty-four archbishops and bishops took part in the council, with two delegates from the various cathedral chapters, two doctors from each university, and a great number of abbots -- some 300 voters in all. The first session was thrown open to the public, and the opening speeches were made before a huge audience of thousands. The presidency of the council was singular: [] five royal princes, the brother, [] uncles, [] and first cousin of the king, [] Charles VI, who was now once again out of his mind. The real guiding spirit in the affair was the royal chancellor, Arnould de Corbie. []

It was explained to the council -- by the king's party -- that Benedict was a perjurer, for he had broken the oath sworn in the conclave; no one, therefore, need henceforth obey him. The Holy See was, in a kind of way, vacant and it was now the duty of the King of France, acting as its protector, to bring about Benedict's formal resignation. While the king could choose for himself how best to do this, he had nevertheless thought well to ask advice. Hence this council. The real source of Benedict's strength was financial. Let him once be deprived of taxes, and of the right to appoint to benefices, and he would presently be starved into surrender.

The policy suggested was subtle. There was no open denial that Benedict was pope; and there was, of course, an abundance of reverential language about his office and the rights of the Holy See. But the pope's acts were for the future to be silently ignored. More than one speaker of the king's party pointed enviously to England where, with such statutes as Provisors and Praemunire, things of this kind at any rate were now so much better ordered than in France. It was also urged upon the prelates and clergy that this was the golden moment to recover the ancient liberties of the Gallican Church, and to force through the much-needed reforms so long held up, it was suggested, by papal indifference.

Against the court prelates it was bluntly pointed out that what they proposed was in reality nothing less than an attack on the bases of the pope's position as pope. The corruption complained of in the papal administration would not come to an end through any mere change in the personnel who ran the machine. And moreover, it was asked, what authority had a merely local council, of one particular country, to sit in judgment on the head of the universal church, and declare him not to be the pope?

The debate went on for days, and then, on June 11, the voting began. The system adopted was highly ingenious. Each member of the council gave his opinion in writing, and he handed it privately to the little group of the royal princes and the chancellor, who thereupon proceeded to argue the opinion if it did not favour their design of immediate total withdrawal of obedience from Benedict. The device avoided all chance of the council as a whole knowing how the voting was going; it also revealed to the government -- and to the government alone -- the exact views of all these leading ecclesiastics; and it gave to the government the best opportunity conceivable of influencing the vote, and of changing it, in the very moment it was to be cast.

About the views of the University of Paris there was no secret whatever. On the day the voting in the council began it publicly declared for the policy that Benedict should be coerced by an immediate, total suspension of obedience.

Then for four weeks there was a curious silence; and when, gradually, the council began to show its anxiety, the government explained that the classification of all these votes was naturally a slow business. However, on July 28, with a public of something like 10,000 looking on, the chancellor announced the result. For the government's plan there were no fewer than 247 votes, for all other schemes 53; a royal decree would "implement" the council's advice. That decree was, of course, already prepared; it was, in fact, dated for the previous day, July 27, 1398. Its effect -- along with a complementary declaration from the prelates [] -- was to organise the Church in France after a fashion hitherto unknown among Catholics, as an autonomous body independent of all papal control.

The king, advised by the council, orders by this decree that from

now on none of his subjects are to render any obedience to Benedict XIII. Penalties are provided for any breach of the law. The pope's partisans are to be deprived of their benefices by the bishops, and the administration of such benefices is to pass to the king who will, of course, enjoy the profits while they remain vacant. Papal judges and commissaries engaged within the realm on suits against the king's subjects are immediately to terminate such proceedings under penalty of loss of goods and imprisonment. All bulls and letters of any kind from Benedict are to be surrendered to the king, and if they are bulls against this decree, those who have brought them into the kingdom will be imprisoned.

The prelates in the council decreed that, until the end of the schism, [] elections of abbots in monasteries exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishops should henceforth be confirmed by the bishop of the diocese -- where, until now, it had been the pope who confirmed them. All promises of appointments made by Benedict were to be ignored. Marriage dispensations were to be granted by the bishops or the cardinals. Appeals that had once gone to the papal curia were now to be decided by the bishop of the diocese, the metropolitan of the province and, finally, by the annual provincial council. As for cases (whether of ecclesiastical penalties or of sins) where absolution was reserved to the pope, they were for the future to be sent to the penitentiaries of Avignon, if these had abandoned the pope; if they remained loyal to him the bishops were to absolve, under the condition that the penitent sought absolution later from the universally recognised pope, once such a pope was elected. First fruits, procurations, and all the taxes payable to the pope were abolished -- a reform intended by the council to be final and definitive. Any sentences Benedict might pass in reprisal were declared in advance null and void. Notaries were forbidden to style Benedict "pope" in the acts they drew up and finally, to quiet the anxieties of the scrupulous, the government declared that Catholics were bound in conscience to conform in these matters to what the king had decided.

Here, on the face of it, was a great victory for the government of France; and it was the activity of Catholics that was thus victorious over the papacy, the activity of Catholic bishops and clergy -- no less than of Catholic laymen -- against the man whom all of them believed to be the lawful pope. The events of

1398 are important, ultimately, not because they compromised the fortunes of Benedict XIII, but because they laid the axe to the root of the tree and compromised the traditional Catholic teaching about the nature of the pope's authority in the Church of Christ. The material object of all this hostility may indeed be no more than an anti-pope, but formaliter, so to speak, this hostility is Catholic action -- action of the Catholic state, of the hierarchy, of the studium -- upon the papacy, as will be the action of the Council of Pisa, and of the still greater Council of Constance. The schism is now, in 1398, twenty years old. Twenty years of disunion, of discontent and unrest, have produced this collaboration of university and clergy with the crown, and its dire fruit. For yet another twenty years Christendom will more and more feed upon that fruit, and strange maladies thence develop, in more than one of its organs, to trouble the general body for centuries.

Already the spirit is active in the University of Paris which, at Pisa, ten years from now, will sweep away the claims of Roman and Avignon pope alike, and elect a third claimant in their stead; already, in this very council of 1398, this very suggestion has been made. [] We can note other things too; how few open defenders there are of the rights of the Holy See among the bishops; how eager the bishops are to strip the Holy See of its power to appoint to ecclesiastical offices, and to tax appointments and the property of the Church; how easily in fact, the government finds, within the hierarchy, quisling prelates ready to betray the Holy See. After a demonstration of this kind, and experience of a regime where such anarchical doctrines are, for years, given every freedom, and even built into a system, how long will it be before France is again normally Catholic in its relations with the papacy? We are assisting, in 1398, at the birth of the notion that there exists a Gallican church with privileges in its own right, sometime ago " usurped " by the papacy, and to recover which rights or liberties all good French clerics will -- in the best interests of religion -- always unite with the crown against the papacy. The proceedings of this council of Paris in 1398 are surely momentous in the general history of the Church.

There was to be, of course, a reaction in favour of Benedict, but before describing this it is important to notice how the French government in 1398 achieved its disconcerting success. For the decision was a carefully manipulated swindle, "a lie that has

triumphed even down to our own times." [] The slips on which these 300 or more members of the council recorded their votes or views were not destroyed at the end of the month of arrangement and classification. Still in the canvas bags where the chancellor had then stored them after the event, they remained forgotten and unexamined down to recent years. M. Noel Valois set himself to study them and his conclusions are startling. The government did indeed win a majority of the council to its plan, but a majority of about 180 to 120 rather than 247 to 53; and of the episcopate and the greater prelates a half, at least, voted against the government. "So slender was the majority of those in favour of the suspension of entire obedience that we may ask whether the result of the council would not have been entirely different, had it not been for the pressure that the government brought to bear from the very first day." []

With parties so nicely balanced, reaction was bound to develop soon.

On September 1, 1398, the French ambassadors arrived at Avignon with the official news of the royal decree. The immediate effect was a general flight to the king's side of all the Frenchmen in Benedict's service, led by eighteen of his cardinals. The townspeople, too, deserted the pope. Nothing was left him but five cardinals, a few personal friends and his troops, in the great fortress palace that Benedict XII had built sixty years before. To capture this, the eighteen cardinals now called in one of the local lords and his band of mercenaries, and a seven months' siege began. After four weeks of fruitless assaults, in which, more than once, storming parties were led by the military-minded cardinal, Jean de Neufchatel, the besiegers turned to the less costly tactic of starving out the garrison.

While the siege continued, French diplomacy was busy in the courts of Benedict's supporters. The French claimant to Naples -- Louis II -- was won over to desert him, and the kings of Navarre and Castile also. But Martin I of Aragon, Benedict's own sovereign, remained his friend; [] and it was through Martin's good offices that, in the spring of 1399, the King of France came to the pope's aid. In return for a declaration by Benedict that he accepted the resignation scheme, and that he would discharge the troops of his garrison, the king undertook to protect the pope, and to compel the cardinals to raise the siege. It will be

noted that no "restitution of obedience" was promised. The French merely pledged themselves that no harm should come to the pope or to his property (10 April, 1399); and the better to survey the activities of the pope (whom they did not trust in the least degree), as well as to ensure his protection, a commission of prelates and royal officials was now sent to Avignon. For the next four years Benedict was, to all intents and purposes, the French king's prisoner, and during all this time the Church in France was governed according to the decrees of 1398.

It was not, of course, a happy time, either for the churchmen or for the cause of religion. The new freedom of chapters to elect the various bishops and abbots was never a reality. The king, the great nobles, the womenfolk of the king and great nobles, all had their candidates, and ample means to influence the electors. The university world complained bitterly that far less attention was paid to clerical learning and talent than under the oppressive papal regime, and in 1400, as a protest against the systematic appointment of ignorant and illiterate clerics to high places, the University of Paris suspended all lectures and examinations. It was a more general cause of complaint among the clergy that the burthensome papal taxes abolished by the council of 1398, continued to be levied -- but now by the king, in order (so it was explained), to pay the immense expenses of the royal action in liberating the Church; also, these taxes were now collected by the royal officials, and much more efficiently than of old. "The old truth was being proved yet once again that no church frees itself from the pope without falling under the heavier yoke of lay control." []

But the harsh treatment of the man whom all France believed to be the pope, was alienating the common people; the exploitation of church property and patronage was alienating the clergy and the universities; in the king's council there was a serious personal conflict about the treatment of Benedict between the king's brother, Louis of Orleans and his uncle the Duke of Burgundy; Benedict himself remained resolute on the vital point, he would not consent that any other mind than the pope's should decide for the pope how he ought to act in the matter of ending the Schism. Discontent in France, then, was steadily growing, and the government already greatly embarrassed, when, on March 12, 1403, the old pope [] broke the tension by escaping from his captivity. With seven attendants he got

through a hole in the wall of his palace, and, in the night, made his way past sentinels and guards. By morning he was in safety, in the territory of the Count of Provence. []

And now the reaction in Benedict's favour was immediate. The leading personages of the tiny papal state came in to make their submission, and the eighteen cardinals sent a delegation begging to be received into the pope's favour. They came back on the pope's terms -- unconditional surrender indeed -- Benedict refusing to the last to pledge himself by oath even to show them ordinary good will, the cardinals kneeling before him and tearfully promising all manner of devotion for the rest of their lives (April 29). And just one month later, the negotiations for the restitution of obedience ended with Benedict's triumph over France too. An assembly of bishops at Paris (May 28), declared for the restitution, the king -- now for the moment lucid -- was eagerly of the same opinion. Benedict, without any new commitment -- except what might be inferred from promises made to the Duke of Orleans -- was, for the moment, victorious over all his foes. There was a great ceremony of thanksgiving at Notre Dame (May 30, 1403), at which Peter d'Ailly, now Bishop of Cambrai, preached and at the end of his sermon he read out the pledges Benedict had given to the trusting duke. iv. The Roman Popes, 1389-1406

These first nine years of the reign of the second pope of the Avignon obedience (1394-1403) were taken up almost entirely with the fight to maintain his independence against the French crown and the University of Paris. Benedict XIII had been left little leisure so far in which to plan any attack on the position of his Roman adversary, Boniface IX. But the Roman, too, had had his difficulties during these years, difficulties often of a like nature. There was not, indeed, among the princes loyal to Rome any one power so strong and so well placed, should it turn to oppress Boniface, as the French monarchy and its great academic ally. But all the princes of Christendom realised the weakness of the papal position, and there was scarcely one that did not, in his turn, make use of it to wring concessions from the Roman pope too. Boniface IX was never really free to profit from the embarrassments of Benedict XIII. And within less than eighteen months of Benedict's temporary victory over the French in 1403, Boniface had died; and with the election of Innocent VII in his place, the whole relation of the rival popes

takes on a new colour.

Throughout his reign of fifteen years (1389-1404), the double anxiety had never ceased to worry Boniface IX, where to find money and how to keep the different princes faithful to him. He had to suffer serious losses of territory in Italy, when Genoa went over to his adversary, and Sicily too. Then, in 1398, the emperor Wenzel -- whose support had brought to the Roman line a prestige that neutralised the French support of the Avignon obedience -- was won over by the French to declare himself neutral; and England, also influenced by France, began to show herself less partisan than before. From the danger of the empire's adherence to Benedict XIII the Roman pope was delivered by the revolutionary act of four of the prince electors who, in 1399, declared Wenzel deposed and elected in his place Rupert of Bavaria. But although Rupert declared for the Roman line, Boniface was for the moment too wary to recognise him as emperor-elect. It was doubtful whether the deposition of Wenzel was good in law, and Rupert was only acknowledged in the west of Germany. Moreover, warned by the fate of Benedict XIII, and by the beginnings of the like trouble among his own supporters, Boniface would not recognise Rupert unless he swore to leave entirely to the pope the business of bringing the schism to an end; and this pledge Rupert refused to give.

Meanwhile, there were the beginnings of civil war in Germany between the partisans of Wenzel and Rupert. In 1401 Florence called Rupert into Italy to help in the war against pro-French Milan. But the emperor-elect was badly defeated (October 21, 1401), and in April 1402, he returned to Germany with barely enough troops for an escort. He still, however, steadfastly refused the pope's terms, and when, after his defeat, Boniface had made them stiffer still, Rupert's refusal had stiffened too. The princes of Germany supported his refusal, and in the autumn of 1402 Rupert began to negotiate with France and with England for united action to force both Boniface and Benedict to resign. Boniface IX was finding that the new emperor was no more his subject than the old. Then, in August 1403, the pope recognised the king who was his one real supporter, Ladislas of Naples, as King of Hungary also, to the great offence of a rival claimant -- Sigismund -- who was the emperor Wenzel's brother. Whereupon Sigismund openly deserted the Roman cause, and Boniface, pushed by necessity, was driven to recognise Rupert

as emperor elect without any of the special conditions upon which he had been insisting for the previous two years.

This was in October 1403. Boniface's reign had, to the very day, just a year to run. His hold on the states that acknowledged him as pope could hardly have been feebler, and had Benedict XIII now been free to intervene in Italy the political fortunes of the Roman pope might have been brought crashing to the ground. But Benedict was once more involved in the old conflict with the French crown and with the University of Paris. Mission after mission was arriving at Avignon to remind him of his promises; but all in vain. The wily old man eluded the most practised of the diplomatists, and showed himself in his speeches more pious than the most pious of the bishops who bade him think only of the cause of religion. He steadily refused to recognise any of the ecclesiastical appointments made during the five years of the withdrawal of obedience; and he sent out collectors to demand the arrears of moneys due to him for that period. As the clergy had already paid their dues, but to the crown, they now turned to the king for protection against the pope, and this was solemnly guaranteed to them by a royal edict of January 10, 1404. []

Six months after this, Benedict re-opened negotiations with Boniface, interrupted now for nearly seven years. His ambassadors arrived at Rome in late September 1404, and Boniface IX granted them audience. But there were stormy scenes, the pope calling Peter de Luna a liar and a dissembler, and the ambassadors retorting that Boniface was a simonist. The pope was already failing in health, and this interchange ended fatally. On October 1, 1404, two days after the interview, the pope collapsed and died.

Was Boniface IX indeed a simonist? For his latest biographer [] the charge is proved beyond all doubt, and the blistering phrase " the crooked days of Boniface IX " [] seems only too true a description. Like Urban VI -- the pope who made him a cardinal when scarcely out of his teens -- Boniface was a Neapolitan. He was a practical man, ignorant indeed in matters of professional clerical learning, but a realist, able to manage men, and to get things done, "the man the crisis called for," and he was young, little more than thirty when elected pope. Throughout the reign which followed -- fifteen years -- the pope was far too busy with the urgent political problem before him to have any leisure for

religious affairs properly so called. His own life was, seemingly, correct; the immense sums he raised were not spent on pleasures, nor on his own personal artistic fancies. But the young pope's superficial mind misread the nature of the evil he confronted. That his view of the division of Christendom ruled out all possibility of seriously negotiating with Avignon, cannot indeed be held against him. But the pope stands charged with the dreadful error of treating this religious tragedy as a matter of politics, and in his anxiety to raise the money he needed, Boniface sank to the lowest levels. [] The papal collation of benefices now became a matter of simple marketing. Provisions and expectatives were given for cash down, and for prices which only the rich could afford, and without any guarantee that they would not be sold a second time to anyone who offered a higher price. Then, in 1402, Boniface annulled all grants made hitherto, unless the holders had them renewed within twelve months. Also the tax of annates was extended to all benefices worth more than twenty-four gold florins annual revenue. But the most mischievous wickedness of all was in the matter of indulgences. The pope multiplied, beyond all wisdom, the grants of indulgences ad instar -- indulgences, that is to say, whereby, in general terms, there was granted such a remission as might have been gained by doing other (and immensely more laborious) penances and good works, pilgrimage to the Holy Land for example or enlisting as a soldier in the crusades. For the jubilee of 1390, Boniface called in the bankers to organise the collection and despatch of the moneys to Rome. This jubilee was liberally extended to other cities outside Rome, but to gain it an offering of money was one condition needed, and the amount was fixed at the cost of a journey to Rome from the place where the indulgence was gained, plus the amount that would have been offered by the pilgrim at the different Roman shrines. Of the total taken, a half was to go to the banker as commission. "It seemed as though one could get the indulgence for cash down. It even happened that confessors gave absolution in exchange for money, without exacting any true repentance or reparation of the injustices done to others. Boniface, more concerned to demand that the preachers of the indulgence should send in accounts that were in good order than that they should explain the doctrine of indulgences correctly, assuredly bears the responsibility of the deformation of religious sense among the masses which was to result from such imprudences and from abuses on such a scale." [] In

Germany especially there was great indignation, strong, violent and organised opposition indeed; and the German clergy made the reformation of this system a main point in the programme which they presented to the Council of Constance and Martin V a few years later. []

Sixteen days after the death of Boniface IX, the cardinals elected in his place the Bishop of Bologna, Cosmo Megliorati; he took the name of Innocent VII. As in 1389, all the electors had sworn that, if elected, they would do their utmost to bring the division to an end, even resigning the Holy See if necessary, and that immediately after the election they would call a General Council. This last pledge Innocent was prompt to fulfil and the council was summoned for 1 November, 1405. []

The envoys Benedict XIII had sent to Boniface returned to their master -- now at Genoa -- with a very strange tale (April 11, 1405). The Romans, they said, had looked on them as the murderers of Boniface IX; they had been imprisoned in Sant' Angelo, and had only been freed on payment of an enormous bribe. They had besought the Roman cardinals not to elect any new pope in a hurry, but to take this opportunity to consult Benedict XIII and so end the schism by an agreed election. The Romans had, however, rejected this offer.

But about the same time that this account of the conclave reached the French court from Benedict, there came in another, very different, version sent by Innocent VII. According to this, the Roman cardinals, before the conclave opened, had offered to delay it until Benedict XIII had been told of their offer not to proceed to an election by themselves if the Avignon pope would now abdicate. To this the Avignon envoys had replied that Benedict would certainly never resign, and also that the resignation scheme was contrary to all law and right.

This revelation, that only Benedict's now notorious determination to cling to his position had prevented the best chance of a settlement that had appeared in nearly thirty years, infuriated the influential parties in France with whom, for so long, he had been at war. A letter to Innocent from one of the royal princes brought a reply that strengthened belief in the Roman pope's first letter, and then, in September 1405, the University of Paris opened direct negotiations with the Roman

pope.

The result was to confirm the French suspicion of Benedict's good faith, and also to instil in the Roman pope unshakable mistrust of his rival. Benedict had, for some time now, really been planning a new assault on Italy. Barely six weeks after the election of Innocent VII, he had left France, and before Easter 1405, he was established at Genoa. His diplomacy was busy in Florence too, and at Lucca, and it seemed for the moment as though his loss of position in France would be balanced by gains in Italy. Pisa promised him recognition and Florence agreed to remain neutral. And all this time Benedict never ceased his demands for money, especially from the clergy of France and Spain. Even religious orders always exempted hitherto from such taxation were now subjected to it. Finally, from Castile, there came in the spring of 1406 a new plan to end the schism; but a plan which must entail the disappearance of Benedict. To work against the Castilian ambassadors he sent a special legate to the French court. All unknowingly he thereby set in motion a new anti-de-Luna movement that produced a new council of Paris, and a new withdrawal from his obedience -- a withdrawal that was, this time, to be permanent, and to meet which there would be a corresponding withdrawal of the cardinals of the Roman pope.

When Benedict's legate, the Cardinal de Challant, appeared in Paris at Easter 1406, he was rudely told, "All that interests your master is money"; and when the university was admitted to state its case its orator, Jean Petit, immediately struck a note that was to be heard in all the debates of the next ten years. Pope Benedict, he said, has broken his sworn promises, and thereby he has lost all claim on men's obedience. In the great debate before the court called the Parlement de Paris (June 7 and 8, 1406), this was urged more passionately still, and the plight of the French church, bled white by Benedict, was set forth in detail; prelates pawning church property to pay the fees due to the curia on their nomination, the pope keeping benefices vacant in order to make their revenues his own, the high cost of absolution from censures to the unfortunate clerics too poor to pay the papal taxes. In the three years since France came back to Benedict's obedience he had gathered, it was said, no less than 1,200,000 francs from her clergy. The crown decided that a new council should meet at Paris to decide whether to continue

in obedience to Benedict.

This council met in November 1406, and its debates went on until the first weeks of the new year. It was not so much the creature of the crown as the council of 1398 had been; the dominating influence now was the University of Paris, to whose initiative the whole of this new movement against Benedict XIII was due. Each side selected a panel of speakers to thrash out the different points in dispute, and the anti-de-Luna party made no endeavour to hide their feelings. " For the sake of the ship," said Jean Petit, [] "let us throw both these quarrelsome, incompetent captains into the sea." Another doctor, Pierre Plaoul, set out the theory of the pope as the servant of the Church and as enjoying, thereby, an inferior kind of power to that possessed by kings. [] Benedict's supporters asked how, since not even Christendom itself had any authority to judge the pope, this council could so presume? No action on its part could possibly deprive him of "la puissance dez cles". And, in lighter vein, the Archbishop of Tours, arguing that to attack Benedict was not a practical policy, reminded the council that he came from a country world-famous for its mules.

The long debates ended in a compromise. Benedict XIII was to be obeyed as the chief in spiritual matters, but his appointments to benefices were to be ignored and also his taxation of church property. It was these last two points, indeed, which now, as through all the next forty years, chiefly occupied the speakers of the anti-papal party; and when the question was raised how the pope could be brought to accept these restrictions, nine-tenths of the council voted that the king ought to compel his acceptance. Whereupon (January 3, 1407), the clergy petitioned Charles VI to make perpetual the edict of September 11, 1406, that had abolished first fruits, servitia, and procurations, and also to abolish the papal tithes and papal collations to benefices in France; and this the king consented to do, in a new decree of February 18, 1407. But this new decree was, almost immediately, suspended. Since the council of Paris began a new pope had been elected at Rome, and there seemed every hope that the schism was now really to be brought to an end.

The very short, and very stormy, reign of Innocent VII had, in fact, ended just ten days before the council opened in Paris. The fourteen Roman cardinals had, thereupon, bound themselves by

a pact more stringent than any yet devised; and after a seven-days' conclave they had chosen, unanimously, the Venetian cardinal, Angelo Corrario. [] This new pope Gregory XII -- was an old man of seventy, known for his austere life, and chosen for one reason only, that he seemed to live for nothing else but to work to heal the division. All the circumstances of his election seemed, indeed, to make him "less a pope than a proctor charged to abdicate the papacy in the interests of unity". Gregory XII was, before he finished, to prove the greatest disappointment of all, but the first seven months of his reign seemed the beginning of a new age, and it was in the first flood of these hopes that the King of France held up the decrees that would otherwise have engaged all the ecclesiastical energies of his people in a new war with Benedict XIII. They would now be better employed in negotiations with this unexpectedly helpful pope newly elected at Rome.

The cause of all these hopes was the pact sworn to by Gregory XII before his election, and sworn to again immediately afterwards, and the care which the pope took to give the pact all possible publicity. The pope, in fact, had bound himself to abdicate if Benedict XIII should do the same or should chance to die -- provided that the cardinals of both obediences would agree to join for the election of the new pope; also he had promised that within a month of his election he would notify Benedict and his cardinals, the various Christian princes, and the bishops everywhere of this undertaking; also that he would send ambassadors, within three months, to arrange with Benedict a suitable meeting place for a personal interview; finally, Gregory XII promised not to create any new cardinals while these negotiations were in progress, unless to equalise his college with that of Benedict. [] From this pact the new pope swore, moreover, that he would not dispense or absolve himself.
v. Benedict XIII and Gregory XII, 1406-1409

Gregory XII carried out to the letter all that he had promised. His envoys reached Paris in the last days of the council, and on January 21, 1407, a solemn service of thanksgiving took place at Notre Dame for the appearance in the church of such an apostolic spirit. Throughout France and Italy the rejoicing was universal.

Benedict's answer was in much the same tone as the Roman

letter, but those experienced in his ways -- the French bishops, for example -- did not fail to detect that his ingenuity had once more devised avenues of escape. And the King of France, on the very day that he suspended the decrees against Benedict, decided to send an embassy both to the Avignon and the Roman courts. About the same time that this embassy was commissioned, Gregory XII also despatched an embassy to his rival, and it was this embassy that reached Benedict first, who was now in residence at Marseilles. The chief business of the mission from Gregory XII was to arrange where the contending principals should meet, and the audience was as stormy as most audiences were in which any of these popes met the envoys of their rivals. But after nearly three weeks an accord was reached, the so-called Treaty of Marseilles (April 20, 1407), and it was agreed that Gregory and Benedict should meet at Savona by the feast of All Saints next following at the latest (November 1).

The embassy from the King of France, a much more elaborate affair, took weeks to gather and to make its way to Marseilles. Long before it could arrive, the Italian embassy had finished its business, and meeting the Frenchmen was able to report what it had achieved. It is of interest that the Italians strongly advised the Frenchmen to handle Benedict gently if they wished for concessions. Finally, on May 10, Benedict received the French king's envoys, and in a most eloquent speech he accepted their point of view wholeheartedly. But when, the next day, the ambassadors begged him to publish his concessions in a bull, all the old trouble began anew. For a week the two parties wrestled, but without any result. Benedict refused absolutely to declare publicly that he, too, was willing to resign if Gregory would resign. We know, now, that he was moreover, at this very time, preparing an elaborate sentence of excommunication for all who had urged this resignation scheme; and the ambassadors knew, then, that, in order to resist any repetition of the siege of 1398, he was gathering men and arms.

So the French embassy, leaving two of its members at Marseilles to keep watch on Benedict, now made its way to Rome. But by the time Rome was reached, July 18, 1407, a great change had come over Gregory XII. His family had worked him round to cling to the papacy -- as the family of Gregory XI had once worked round that pope to cling to Avignon; they had also infected the old man with the idea that Benedict planned to

kidnap him when the two met; and, moreover, the Roman pope's chief political supporter, Ladislas, King of Naples, was strongly opposed to the plan of any meeting between the popes. From now on Gregory's court is the scene of intrigues as complicated and as obscure as any of Peter de Luna's feats; one series of these, it seems, was a hidden understanding with Ladislas, in virtue of which the king attacked Rome, and so provided Gregory with the best of reasons for not leaving the Papal State.

Against this new mentality in the old pope, not all the efforts of the French could prevail. When they offered oaths as security, and armies, and hostages, he only reminded them how they had treated Benedict whom they believed to be the lawful pope. Could he, Gregory, really expect to be treated better?

After nearly three weeks of sterile argument the French at last left Rome (August 4, 1407), certain that Gregory would now prove a second Peter de Luna, but certain of this also, that he had lost the confidence of his own cardinals. For the Roman cardinals had privately assured the ambassadors that whatever Gregory did, they at least would go to Savona, and also that should Gregory die they would not give him a successor.

The news of the change in Gregory was, of course, highly welcome to Benedict. Assured in his mind that the Italian would never come to a meeting, Benedict now spoke about the plan with enthusiasm, and setting out with a great escort he was at Savona long before the appointed day. For the next seven months these two ancient men worked to outwit each other with the infinite pertinacity of the senile; with embassies passing constantly between the two; arrangements half-made, suggestions and new suggestions, discussed, accepted, and then questioned; with suggestions first to change the place of the meeting, and next about the conditions; until finally they wore out the patience of all but their own personal attendants. How could they meet, said the wits: the one was a land animal that dared not trust the water, and the other a sea monster that could not live on land. At one moment less than a day's journey separated the two, Gregory at Lucca and Benedict at Porto Venere.

Then, on April 25, 1408, the King of Naples took Rome, without a blow struck in its defence. Gregory's joy -- and the joy of his

family -- was undisguised. Ladislas demanded that whenever Gregory and Benedict met, he must be present. All hope of free action by the two was now at an end. The plan to end the schism by a double resignation died a natural death, and at the Roman court it was forbidden henceforth to preach sermons reminding Gregory of his famous oath. The pope also considered himself freed from his pledge not to create new cardinals, and his unusual preparations for the consistory fired the long smouldering discontent of the Sacred College. On May 4, in a palace packed with soldiery, [] Gregory -- first forbidding any comment or discussion -- told the cardinals that he proposed to add four to their number. They protested energetically, but the pope silenced them, and sternly forbade them to leave the city, or to meet, together without the pope, or to negotiate with either Benedict's ambassadors or those of the King of France. The mild old man had suddenly shown himself terrible. Was he to be another Urban VI? Gregory XII already knew enough about the cardinals' opinion of his change of policy to fear that a repetition of the acts of 1378 was, indeed, in preparation. One week later the consistory was held and the names of the four new cardinals were announced; two of them were nephews of Gregory, Gabriele Condulmaro (the future pope Eugene IV), and Angelo Corrario, Gregory's chief adviser since his election and commonly held to be the chief cause of his apostasy from his election promises.

That same night one of the cardinals fled to Pisa in disguise, and the next day six of the rest followed him [] (May 12, 1408). From Pisa the seven cardinals issued manifestos protesting against Gregory's restriction of their liberty, and appealing from the vicar of Christ to Christ Himself. They spoke of the dungeons Gregory had made ready for them, and declared that their conclave oath bound them to seek out the cardinals of Benedict XIII and to make common cause with these to bring the schism to an end. Finally, they appealed to all the Christian princes to support their efforts. They also sent an urgent invitation to Benedict to fulfil his promise and come as near to them as Leghorn.

The Florentines, however, refused Benedict a safe conduct, and he sent to Leghorn four cardinals in his place. The Roman cardinals at Pisa delegated as many again, and the eight soon reached agreement on the principle that a joint council of both

"obediences" should be summoned, at which both popes should simultaneously abdicate and a new pope be elected, whom the whole Church would then know to be the true successor of St. Peter. But Benedict's cardinals first explained the pact to their pope as a plan for a joint council where he would preside; and it was in this way that they won from him a kind of general approval of all they were doing to promote the union. He was eventually to be undeceived; but his treacherous legates were, by that time, free from any anxiety which the thought of his anger might bring. For, on June 5, they learned that a great ecclesiastical revolution had, a fortnight earlier, wrested France once more from its obedience to Benedict. The long malaise in the Aragonese pope's relations with Charles VI had ended in a most violent rupture, and in the same weeks when Gregory XII's feeble mismanagement was renewing the disaster of 1378, Benedict XIII was losing for ever the sole source of what real importance he had ever possessed. The French cardinals, now that their king was no longer behind Benedict, could desert him without fear of the future.

Benedict's new misfortune had begun when, in the previous November (1407), the Duke of Orleans, his one really loyal supporter among the French princes, was murdered. [] On the 12 January following, Charles VI came to a decision -- unless by the feast of the Ascension next (May 24, 1408) unity of government in the Church had been restored, France would finally withdraw its obedience from the Avignon pope. Benedict was not, of course, to be moved by such threats. He received this declaration on April 18, and immediately sent a warning to the king that, unless he revoked the ultimatum, the bull which he now sent under cover would be published. This bull was a sentence, drawn up in May 1407, excommunicating all who suspended their obedience to the pope, or who appealed from him to a future council. The reaction of the French to this was violent in the extreme. [] The decrees of February 1407, abolishing all payments to the pope of first fruits and other taxes -- the decrees hitherto suspended -- were now published; Benedict's leading supporters were arrested, and an order was sent to seize the pope himself. At Paris, all the scenes that had marked the struggle between Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII were renewed. There was a great public demonstration, [] where the king and the royal princes were present, with many bishops, the chief figures of the university, the lawyers of the parlement,

and the chancellor of the kingdom. Speeches explained once more the king's duty as champion of religion against the schismatical and heretical pope, a perjurer and a persecutor of the Church; and then the bulls were brought out to be ceremonially ripped in pieces by all the notables, king, bishops, state officers and the dignitaries of the university, all lending a hand. On May 25 appeared the royal decree declaring that France, henceforward, was neutral as between Benedict XIII and Gregory XII, and imposing obedience to this policy on all the king's subjects.

It was on June 5 that news of this change in their pope's fortunes reached Benedict's cardinals at Leghorn. He had taken the precaution of sending with them some of his personal friends [] to keep watch on their activities, and it was from these -- who remained faithful to him -- that on June 11, at Genoa, he learnt of his own danger. Very speedily he decided to leave for Perpignan, a town then within the frontiers of his native land. But on June 15, immediately before he sailed, Benedict issued a summons calling a General Council to meet at Perpignan on November 1, 1408.

Both popes had now suffered the fate of Urban VI in 1378 -- each was deserted by almost all his cardinals. But the deserters had combined and on June 29, 1408, the feast of SS. Peter and Paul, the fourteen united [] cardinals published the agreement to which they had sworn, and appealed to the whole body of the faithful to support them. Each college -- it had been agreed -- would invite the prelates of its own pope's obedience to a council and the two councils would open simultaneously, if possible in the same city. Each college would do all in its power to induce the pope it acknowledged to be present in person at the council and to induce him to offer it his resignation. If the pope refused to abdicate, the council would depose him. Once Benedict and Gregory were out of the way -- whether by abdication or by such deposition -- the two colleges would unite and elect a pope and the councils would become one.

The pact was announced to each of the popes by the cardinals of his own group, to the King of France also and to the University of Paris; and Gregory XII's cardinals now instructed all those who had so far acknowledged him to withdraw their obedience.

The history of the next nine months (June 29, 1408-March 25, 1409) is unusually complicated, for there are now three centres from which instructions and commands go out to the Church. Thus, three days after this declaration by the independent cardinals, Gregory XII convoked a General Council, to meet at Pentecost 1409, in some city of north-eastern Italy, to be named later. Then, leaving Lucca, he made his way by Siena to Rimini, where Carlo Malatesta, one of the best captains of the day, and an admirable Christian, offered him protection. And the cardinals on July 14, twelve days after Gregory's summons, announced that the joint council they had in mind would meet at Pisa, on March 25, 1409.

For the next three months it is in France that the most important events are happening, at the national council summoned by the king to meet in Paris in August. This council was called to organise support for the king's policy of neutrality, to punish those who supported Benedict XIII, to provide for the religious government of France until the schism was ended, and to arrange for the representation of France at the coming Council of Pisa. The council was not very well attended: there were, for example, never more than thirty-five bishops present out of the total of eighty-five. But there was, this time, no opposition to what the crown and the university proposed. The messengers who had brought in Benedict's letters, and the threat of excommunication, were pilloried with the maximum of Gallic contempt; [] and in official sermons or harangues, made to the populace in front of Notre Dame, the pope himself was most grossly reviled. [] He was declared to be a heretic, and so also were his leading French supporters. As in 1398 the supreme religious authority in France was to be, in each province, the annual provincial council. It is noteworthy that, for all the bitterness against this particular pope, and the drastic act of rebellion against his rule, there is nowhere any movement to destroy the papacy, neither to abolish the office, nor to organise religious life as though it would never reappear. The whole system now set up does indeed "smack of the provisional"; [] and there is no attempt to set up for religious affairs any single authority for the whole nation. The several ecclesiastical provinces retain their equal status, and their independence of one another; they are not formed into a new body under some single authority (ecclesiastical or lay), some new "Church of

France as by law established." It was also by provinces that this Council of Paris voted; and the council decided that by provinces the Church in France should be represented at Pisa, twelve delegates to be sent from each province in addition to the bishops and other prelates who would, of right, be convoked individually. Also the council, before it separated, on November 6, chose these 130 delegates; and the king issued a decree commanding all those summoned to Pisa not to fail to attend

Meanwhile, Benedict XIII had reached Perpignan in safety, with the three cardinals who remained true to him. On September 22, 1408, he created five new cardinals, and on October 22 he at last received the letters from his cardinals at Leghorn explaining what they had done, and inviting him to ratify it by coming to the Council of Pisa or by sending representatives. He sent, on November 7, the reply which they doubtless expected, denying them any power to call a General Council -- that is the prerogative of the pope alone -- and commanding them to appear at the council which he had summoned and which was now about to begin. Benedict opened his council in person just a fortnight later. [] He sang the inaugural high mass, presided at all the sessions -- stormy sessions many of them -- and with wonderful vigour, now an old man turned eighty, he argued and fenced, publicly and privately, with men as stubbornly skilful as himself -- for the vast majority of the fathers were of his own race. There was a small handful of prelates from Lorraine, Provence, and Savoy, but scarcely anyone from France, where Charles VI had closed the frontier. The mass of the council were Spaniards, in all something like 300 clerics of various ranks, [] to be argued with or persuaded.

The pope found them unexpectedly independent. They acknowledged him, fully, to be the lawful pope; but they were most critical of his policy and, anxious above all else that the schism should be ended, they urged Benedict not to ignore the council that was to meet at Pisa; he should send a delegation at any rate, and give it the widest powers, powers even to offer the council his abdication; at least -- so the Spanish council thought -- Benedict might pledge himself to abdicate if at Pisa they deposed his rival. On every side Peter de Luna was receiving this same advice, even here "at the uttermost bounds of the earth." But he was still Peter de Luna, and he held stubbornly to his plan never to surrender his right to make decisions, never to

commit himself, and never to give any answer that he could not later distinguish and sub-distinguish and thereby most veraciously evade. As the sterile weeks went by, the council grew weary, bishops, abbots, and delegates began to steal away to their homes, and by the end of February (1409) there was not a handful in attendance. It was this remnant who tendered to Benedict the council's official advice: to be represented at Pisa, to make a definite pledge that he would abdicate, and to forbid his cardinals to elect a successor to himself should he chance to die. Benedict, of course, accepted in principle; and then adjourned the council for seven weeks, until March 26

Long before that day came -- it was the day following the triumphant, splendid opening of the council at Pisa -- the cause of Gregory XII had shrunk to far less even than that of Benedict.

From Rimini, Malatesta had worked earnestly for an understanding with the cardinals at Pisa, but Gregory was now as stubborn as Benedict -- he, too, was a very old man, now seventy-three. Henry IV of England added his plea, but without any effect. Then, on December 24, 1408, England, too, deserted the Roman pope. Two days later Wenzel -- who had already gone over to the cardinals as King of Bohemia -- now gave them his support as emperor, while his rival Rupert put his miserable remnant of prestige at the service of Gregory. In the first days of the new year, 1409, Gregory excommunicated his rebellious cardinals, depriving them of all their dignities, their cardinalial rank and rights. Then, January 26, Florence deserted him. The Roman pope had now none to acknowledge him but Malatesta, Venice and Ladislas of Naples. The vast bulk of the princes and bishops were wholeheartedly neutral, pinning all their hopes on the united cardinals and the council which they had summoned.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



5. THE CHURCH UNDER THE COUNCILS, 1409-1418 i. Pisa, 1409

The Council of Pisa opened on the day appointed, March 25, 1409. If judged by the number who came to it, and by the variety of countries from which they came, the council was a huge success, the most splendid gathering certainly that Europe had seen for two hundred years. All its twenty-three sessions were held in the nave of the cathedral, the last of them on August 7 of this same year. It seems not to have been easy for contemporaries to say exactly how many ecclesiastics took part in it. The numbers varied, of course, from one session to another, and seemingly they were at the maximum in the important sessions in which Gregory XII and Benedict XIII were judged and deposed -- when something more than 500 fathers attended. These would include the twenty-two cardinals and eighty-four bishops who came (102 other bishops were present by proxies), the eightyseven abbots (200 more were represented by proxies), the forty-one priors, the four generals of the Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites and Augustinians, the three representatives of the military orders (the Hospitallers, the Holy Sepulchre and the Teutonic Knights), the hundred deputies from cathedral chapters, the deputies from thirteen universities, and the 300 or so doctors of theology and law -- these last a new and significant element in a General Council's composition, for they were given a voice in its judgments. Moreover, seventeen foreign princes also sent ambassadors -- the kings of France, England, Bohemia, Poland, Portugal, Sicily and Cyprus; the dukes of Burgundy, Brabant, Holland, Lorraine and Austria; the prince-bishops of Liege, Cologne and Mainz; the rulers of Savoy, Thuringia and Brandenburg: the whole body of Christian princes in fact, save those of Scandinavia and Scotland, of Spain and of Naples.

The council was a marvellously unanimous body. There was little or no discussion in its main sessions. All were agreed on the business that had brought them together, and the council had little to do beyond giving a solemn assent to the decisions as the cardinals and its own officials had shaped them. If any nation was predominant it was the Italian; fifteen of the twenty-two cardinals present were Italian, and so were ten of the

fourteen chief officials, though the presidency was given to the French, and first of all to the sole survivor among the cardinals of the college of Gregory XI, the last pope before the schism, sole surviving cardinal, too, of those who had elected Urban VI in April 1378 and then, five months later, elected Clement VII. This was Guy de Malesset.

The key-note speech of the council was made by the Archbishop of Milan -- Peter Philarghi, an ex-cardinal of Gregory XII's obedience -- who on March 26 excoriated Gregory and Benedict alike, for their crimes and their treason to the cause of religion. Meanwhile, before proceeding to any juridical consideration of the position of these rivals, the council solemnly summoned both to appear before it -- a ceremony five times repeated in the first month of its sittings.

While the fathers were awaiting the expiration of the time allowed for the popes' appearance, they had to meet the practical problems set by two embassies that now arrived, the one from the Emperor Rupert [] (denying them any right to be considered a General Council) and the other from Gregory XII, inviting them to abandon Pisa and join him at Rimini in a council where he would preside.

It was on April 15 that the imperial ambassadors were received in audience. They presented a lengthy memorandum in which Gregory XII's case against the cardinals who had left him was well set out, and the traditional doctrine that the General Council is subject to the pope in its convocation, its proceedings, and the ratification of its acts, was well argued against the new theories by which the united cardinals had publicly justified their action. Much of this criticism was unanswerable. Gregory had, at one time, undoubtedly been acknowledged as pope by these cardinals who had elected him. When, asked Rupert's envoys, had he ceased to be pope? The universal Church had not condemned him; he had not been convicted of heresy. To convoke a General Council is a prerogative that belongs to popes alone, and, in point of fact, Gregory XII -- they said -- had long ago actually convoked one, that would meet within a few weeks. Moreover, if the popes of the Roman line were really popes, the popes of the Avignon line were not -- if the cardinals of the Roman line were really cardinals, the Avignon cardinals with whom they were now joined were not cardinals at all. What

then was their value as a basic element of this new union? The ambassadors therefore proposed a meeting between the council and Gregory XII. That pope would then carry out his election promises; and if he refused, Rupert would support the cardinals in their move to elect a new single pope -- a curiously illogical conclusion, surely, to the arguments made in his name !

The council heard the lengthy argument, and appointed a day for the answer. But the argument, and the way it was presented, seem thoroughly to have annoyed the council. The ambassadors realised how hopeless were their chances of persuading the fathers, and on April 21, without awaiting the formality of any official refutation, they left Pisa, secretly, leaving behind a public appeal [] from this assembly to a true General Council when this should meet.

Gregory XII's own champion -- Carlo Malatesta -- had no better fortune with the council, although he managed to carry on the discussion in a friendly spirit. The cardinals appointed to meet him gave forty reasons why they could not abandon the work begun at Pisa; Gregory XII ought to abdicate and the best service that Malatesta could do the Church was to persuade - - or coerce -- him to come to Pisa and there lay down his authority. There was much discussion about the compensation to be given Gregory (and his relatives) if he consented; Malatesta seems to have raised a general laugh when he twitted the ambitious Philarghi with his known willingness to bear the terrible burden of the papacy; and the cardinals agreed to meet Gregory at Pistoia or at San Miniato for a conference. On April 26 Malatesta went back to Rimini and reported to Gregory that this was all he had been able to achieve. The old man wept, explained again his dilemma -- that if he went back to his first policy he would be deserting his present supporters, Rupert, for example, and Ladislas -- and finally he refused to meet the cardinals elsewhere than at Rimini.

These embassies had distracted the council for weeks from completing even the preliminaries of organising itself. But now, on May 4, the fathers declared the union of the cardinals lawful, and that this was a lawfully convoked council, a true General Council with sovereign rights to judge Gregory XII and Benedict XIII; and by appointing a commission of nineteen cardinals and prelates to examine witnesses, the council began what, in effect,

was a trial of the popes. That Ladislas of Naples was now besieging Siena -- only sixty miles away -- evidently making for Pisa, and that Gregory was subsidising him, no doubt stiffened the council's resolution.

The lengthy enquiry about the rival popes at last came to an end; a sentence was prepared, and the council made it its own. On June 5, 1409, the council solemnly declared that both Angelo Corrarion and Peter de Luna, once called Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, were notorious heretics, and perjurers, ipso facto excommunicated and incapable in law of ruling as popes; and as such it deposed and excommunicated them. [] All nominations they might make were declared null; all Catholics were forbidden, under pain of excommunication, to obey them or give them any support; if necessary the secular authority would be used against them and their adherents; their censures against members of the council were declared null and void; and the cardinals they had created since the cardinals now legislating deserted them were no cardinals at all.

How contradictory this was of all tradition -- and of tradition explicitly set forth at the very threshold of that Canon Law which so many of the council professed (to say nothing of theology) -- let two texts from Gratian witness: (I) *Cunctos iudicaturus, ipse a nemine est iudicandus, nisi deprehenditur a fide devius*; [] (2) *Aliorum hominum causas Deus voluit per homines terminari, sedis autem Romanae praesulem, suo, sine quaestione, reservavit arbitrio*. [] By what steps had so many, and so famously learned, ecclesiastics come to such a revolutionary position as to vote the mischiefs of the Schism, the opportunity which it provided for strange novelties to develop in the doctrine *de Romano pontifice*, and indeed to be developed as part of any zealous Christian's duty to restore peace and harmony to the Church.

Since the time of John of Paris, whose *De Potestate Regia* has been described as part of the contest between Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair, [] there had been in circulation two new ideas which appear in that work. First of all, there should function under the pope, an advisory council for the whole Church, of delegates elected by each ecclesiastical province; thus the faithful might have a share in the administration of the Church. Next there is a theory that justifies the deposition of a pope for

heresy, on the ground that, besides the supreme papal power there is in the universal Church a latent supremacy exceeding the pope's power, which comes into play in just such an emergency. In that case *orbis est maior urbe*, says the Dominican. That a pope is answerable to the Church for the orthodoxy of his own belief was no new invention of John of Paris. The quotation from Gratian just given is one earlier evidence of the idea; and John the Teutonic adds two other causes for which popes may be judged, notorious sin and public scandal. This author says explicitly that in matters of faith the Council is superior to the Pope, and that it is for the Council to judge a disputed papal election. A third writer previous to the Schism, the Cardinal Bertrand, also considers that a bad pope -- although not a heretic -- is answerable to the General Council, and that should he refuse to summon it and take his trial, the right to convoke it passes to the cardinals.

These three writers are, all of them, eminently respectable Catholics -- which is more than can be said of the three most revolutionary theorists on the matter which the century produced, Marsiglio of Padua, Michael of Cesena and Ockham. Marsiglio's theory of the General Council has no roots at all in canonist tradition. His idea of the pope as the Church's delegate and servant (to which Pierre de Plaoul was to give dramatic utterance in a famous council at Paris []) is of Marsiglio's own devising. Ockham is less simple -- more aware of the depths of the problem he is trying to solve. But for him the source of all authority is representation. Sovereignty lies in the Church as a whole, and the council's power comes from this alone that it is the Church's agent. Since the man in whom the divine authority to rule the Church as pope is invested, receives it through an agency that is human -- since only the authority is divine, and not either the mode of its devolution or the detail, why not then, if it should prove convenient, two popes at once, or three, or indeed one for each country?

It was not, however, to the theories of any of these ingenious revolutionaries that the canonists turned, once the election of Robert of Geneva had brought about the state of schism. They went where men *ex professo* so conservatively minded must go, to the canonists. Prior to the question whether Urban VI's election was valid was that other, who had the power to determine this question juridically? Was it within the

competence of a General Council? This was the main pre-occupation of the earliest writers who studied the matter once the Schism was a fact, Conrad of Gelnhausen, for example and Henry of Langenstein. The conclusion to which they came was that it was for the General Council to decide, and this, not because the Council is the pope's superior, but because this is the exceptional case that falls within the Council's special competence.

It is only later on, with the second generation of the Schism, when the feeling grows that the case is desperate, that the desperate remedies appear in the shape of the new conciliar theories. It is now that we have Francis Zabarella, the leading canonist of his generation, declaring plainly that the pope is but the first servant of the Church, that his power derives from the Church and that the Church cannot so delegate its power to him that it retains none itself. Peter d'Ailly is no less extreme, and if Zabarella has read Ockham so too, it would seem, has the Bishop of Cambrai. The Church alone, he says, is infallible. That the General Council is infallible is no more than a pious belief, and that the pope is infallible is wholly erroneous. The papal authority is only a matter of expediency, a practical device to ensure good government. General Councils may judge the pope not only for heresy, and for obstinacy in sin, but also for opposition to the Council. Gerson's famous sermon at Constance [] does not say more. The Pope, for Gerson, is merely the executive organ within the Church, the legislative power remains with the General Council.

Such is the intellectual and academic hinterland that has bred the men now to function, not only as reformers of Catholic life, but as the architects of reunion, the saviours of the papacy from schism. []

Nine days after this "crowning mercy" of the council, an embassy arrived from the King of Aragon, escorting the envoys whom Benedict XIII had sent, in fulfilment of his pledge to his own council at Perpignan three months earlier.

Out of respect for the king the council appointed a commission to meet Benedict's legates. The news of their arrival in Pisa had been the signal for a great riot, and noisy crowds, bent on mischief, surrounded the church where they were received by

the commissioners. The negotiations never went beyond this first meeting. It was explained to Benedict's party that their safety could not be guaranteed, so violent was the anger of the people against Peter de Luna at this moment when the cardinals were about to enter the conclave and, by electing a pope, bring the schism to an end; and that night the ambassadors left by stealth, happy to escape with their lives. They had previously approached the cardinal legate of Bologna -- Baldassare Cossa -- for a safe conduct which would take them to Rimini and Gregory XII; but he only swore that he would burn alive any of them who came into his hands.

The embassy had indeed arrived at the least lucky moment of all, when the council's creative act was, men believed, about to give the Church the pope of unity. On June 13 a conciliar decree had ordered the cardinals to proceed to the election of a pope, authorising them to unite for this purpose, although they had been created cardinals by rival popes who mutually denied each other to be pope; for this once they would elect the man they chose by an authority deriving from the council. And the cardinals swore only to elect the candidate who gained two-thirds of the vote of each of the two groups. The conclave lasted eleven days, and on June 26 it was announced that Peter Philarghi, Archbishop of Milan, had been chosen unanimously -- Alexander V.

Alexander V -- pope by the authority of the Council of Pisa, was, like Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, a veteran of these ecclesiastical wars, and now seventy years of age at least. He was Greek by birth, a foundling whom the charity of an Italian Franciscan had rescued from the streets of Candia. He had later become a Franciscan, and a theologian of sufficient merit to fill chairs at Paris and at Oxford. One of the Dukes of Milan had found him a valuable counsellor; he had been given -- the see of Piacenza, thence promoted to Novara and, in 1402, to Milan. Innocent VII had created him cardinal and he had taken part in the conclave that elected Gregory XII. When Gregory's first fervour declined, Philarghi had been one of the most active, and effective, of his opponents. His nationality -- not Italian, nor French, nor Spanish -- made him a most "available" candidate in this first conclave for generations in which Italians and French men divided the votes. Guy de Malesset is credited with the proposal to elect him, and Baldassare Cossa -- late the strong

man of the Roman obedience -- with the negotiations that won over to Philarghi the partisans of other candidates. It was Cossa who was to be all powerful in the short ten months' pontificate which is all that fate allowed Alexander V.

The first thought of the electors and supporters of Peter Philarghi was the personal profit they could draw from his elevation. Even before his coronation the hunt after spoils was in full cry; and sees, abbeys and benefices were showered on all lucky enough to be near the new pope. [] And from Alexander V's willingness to make men happy the whole of his obedience gained. In the twenty-second session of the council -- July 27, 1409 -- a great comprehensive decree validated all manner of appointments and dispensations lately made without due reference to the papal authority, and the pope generously forgave all arrears due, on various accounts, to the papal treasury and lifted all sentences of excommunication and the like that lay upon defaulters. He also surrendered his claim to revenues that had accrued, from the estates of dead bishops and prelates, during the vacancy of the Holy See, and he asked the cardinals to follow his example and give up the half of what payments were due to them. Also, it was decreed that a new General Council should meet in April 1412, at a place to be determined later. Finally, in the closing session, August 7, 1409, the first preparations for this next council -- whose work was to be the reform of Christian life -- were outlined; local councils were to be summoned -- provincial and diocesan synods, chapters of the various monastic orders -- where matters calling for reform were to be discussed and schemes prepared. Then, with Alexander's blessing, and a last sermon, the fathers dispersed.

At Cividale, meanwhile, seventy miles to the north-east of Venice, the council summoned by Gregory XII was all this time still struggling to be born. It had been convoked months before, and the place announced on December 19, 1408. But when it opened, on the Feast of Corpus Christi, 1409 -- the day after Gregory had been sentenced at Pisa -- almost no one had arrived. On June 20 the letters of convocation were renewed, and a second session took place on July 22, Gregory XII presiding. A declaration was then made that this was a true General Council, and also that the popes Urban VI, Boniface IX, Innocent VII and Gregory XII were true popes: Clement VII,

Benedict XIII and Alexander V being sacrilegious usurpers. The Emperor Rupert continued to support Gregory, who rewarded him by lavish powers to take over the revenues of all bishops and clerics in the empire who supported the anti-popes. Ladislas of Naples, too, remained faithful to Gregory XII: by now he was master of almost the whole of the Papal States. But Venice -- Gregory XII's own. native state -- upon whose territory the Council of Cividale was held, was wavering. The deed accomplished at Pisa, and the immense support given to it by all the princes, were not without effect upon this most politically-minded of all states. The Pisan council soon opened negotiations with the most serene republic, and on August 22, by sixty-nine votes to forty-eight, Venice went over to Alexander V. Gregory realised his danger, and announced his departure for Rome. But before he left he held a third session of his council (September 5). In this he announced that, as always, he was most anxious to bring the long division to an end. But now that Alexander V had appeared, what would his resignation and that of Benedict avail? However, if both Benedict and Alexander would resign, and their cardinals would promise to join with his to elect a single pope, Gregory XII would resign too. Also he would submit to the wishes of a new council if Benedict and Alexander would do likewise. Next day he left for Latigiana, and dropped down the Tagliamento to the coast where the galleys sent by Ladislas were waiting to take him to Pescara. Thence, with an escort provided by the king, the pope crossed the Abruzzi, and in November 1409 he took up his residence at Gaeta.

There could hardly have been a greater contrast between the splendid position of Alexander V, the elect of this great parliament of the Christian nations, with seventeen princes, bishops innumerable, and thirteen universities supporting him, and the miserable condition of Gregory XII, now reduced to a single faithful supporter, Carlo Malatesta, for Venice had now deserted Gregory for Alexander, and Ladislas of Naples was serving his cause only so long as this served himself. There could hardly have been any greater contrast, except perhaps between the Pisan papacy's prestige now and what it would be in a short two years. All this grandeur was, indeed, of its nature, transient. For it rested on nothing more enduring than the opinions of scholars and the good will of princes, the novel opinions of scholars about the right of the Church to control the

papacy, to set up popes and to pluck them down in appropriate season. Here was the source of all its power, and no papacy thus conceived could long continue to hold men's allegiance.

Alexander V reigned for less than a year. [] The reign began with a military expedition against Ladislas of Naples -- excommunicated and deposed by Alexander on November 1, 1409 -- in which the French claimant to Naples, Louis of Anjou, and the warlike cardinal-legate of Bologna, Baldassare Cossa, joined forces. On the first day of the new year they recovered Rome. But the pope to whom they restored the shrine of St. Peter did not live to take possession. Before his death he had, once more, solemnly excommunicated Gregory XII and Benedict XIII and by a bull in favour of the mendicant orders [] -- Alexander was himself a Friar Minor -- he had managed to rouse the hostility of the University of Paris. This squabble came to nothing, for Alexander's successor rescinded the bull, but it is a squabble of more than passing interest, for the university, as by a habit now become second nature, while speaking of Alexander with the utmost respect, and in no way denying his authority, declared that the bull had been obtained from him by misrepresentations; it could therefore be disregarded, and from the pope misinformed the university would appeal to the pope truly informed; also the king's aid was sought, and Charles VI forbade the parochial clergy to allow any Franciscan or Augustinian to preach or administer the sacraments in the parish churches of France.

The successor of Alexander V was Baldassare Cossa, elected on May 17, 1410, after a short three days' conclave held in the castle of Bologna. He took the name of John XXIII. About the events of that conclave we have no certain knowledge. It is known that Malatesta moved to delay the election, in the hope of reconciling the cardinals with Gregory XII. Cossa replied that this would be tantamount to a surrender of the Pisan position; moreover, were there any delay in providing a successor to Alexander his curia would disperse.

Was the election of John XXIII vitiated by simony? The charge has been made, and very generally believed. Those who hold Gregory XII to have been the true pope in all these years can afford to be impartial about Cossa's character. He has indeed come down in the history books as a finished blackguard. But

most of the atrocious stories are from the memories of men who had good cause to hate him, and when John XXIII came to take his trial at the next great council only a very small fraction of the charges made against him figured in the sentence of deposition. The first great patron of his ecclesiastical career had been Boniface IX -- a fellow Neapolitan -- who made him a cardinal in 1402 in reward for his practical service of finding badly-needed sums of money, and appointed him as legate to rule Bologna. For the next six years Cardinal Baldassare Cossa was the strong man on the Roman side, and after the surrender of Gregory XII to his relatives he was that pope's chief opponent, and luridly characterised as such in Gregory's later bulls.

Historians have noted how, as his reign went on, all John XXIII's wonted political sagacity seemed to desert him. The truth is that his position was, from the beginning, simply impossible; and, after a time, every month that went by showed this more clearly. At first, indeed, his cause seemed to prosper. Malatesta and Ladislas of Naples continued the war on behalf of Gregory XII, but John retained Rome and occupied the city in April 1411. Ladislas was next beaten in the field, re-excommunicated by John, and a crusade preached against him; and in June 1412, brought for the moment to his knees, he opened negotiations with John and on October 16 acknowledged him as pope. Whereupon Gregory XII -- who was still at Gaeta -- fled, lest Ladislas should arrest him and hand him over to John. So far all had gone well; and the election as King of the Romans on July 21, 1411, of the ex-emperor Wenzel's brother, Sigismund, had also been a gain to John, for Sigismund had been Gregory XII's enemy ever since that pope had supported Ladislas against him in Hungary. But this was the last of John's good fortune, and Sigismund -- for the moment his greatest support -- was soon to become the chief instrument in the pope's ruin.

This Pisan line of popes was bound, by its pledges to the council of 1409, to summon a new council which would promote reforms, not later than 1412. The place where it should meet had not been determined, and when John XXIII convoked it to come together in Rome there was great dissatisfaction in France and Germany. John however, more confident perhaps since the submission of Ladislas, held firm and in the last days of 1412 the council opened. It was poorly attended; indeed, the delegates from France and Germany did not arrive until all was

over, for on March 11, 1413, John prorogued the council until the following December. The solitary permanent achievement of the council was its condemnation of John Wyclif, [] but in John XXIII's personal history it figures as the beginning of the movement among his own supporters to make an end of him. .

To some of his own newly -- created cardinals [] -- Peter d'Ailly notably -- the council was an opportunity to rebuke John to his face for his evil life, and the chief effect of the meetings between the pope and the various delegations was to spread far and wide the belief that John XXIII was indifferent to the cause of reform, and only interested in the papacy as a means of personal power.

The reformers were, of course, far from being a united party. As always, side by side with the idealists, there were others chiefly interested in changes for the personal profit they might be made to produce. From France and from Germany there came, very generally, loud demands yet once again for the abolition of papal taxes on Church property and revenues. But the University of Paris, fresh from its recent experience of how little bishops were disposed to encourage ecclesiastical learning by promoting learned men to benefices, was now strongly opposed to any movement that would limit the pope's power to collate universally to benefices. The Roman Curia had been much more friendly to learning than the local episcopate; and so now the university expressed itself as shocked and horrified at the anti-papal tendencies [] -- although, in its turn, it was bitter with John XXIII when he chose Rome as the meeting place for the council.

Here, then, was a first serious division among the reformers. The action of the King of France produced a second. The only reform in which he was interested was that the pope should give him vast new rights of nomination to benefices of all kinds; and his ambassadors warned the pope that were this refused him the king might make common cause with the university, and champion its theory of the liberties of the Gallican Church -- or perhaps follow the example of the Kings of England and enact, for France also, an anti-papal statute of Provisors. []

These disturbing embassies from France and Germany had scarcely left Rome when Ladislas suddenly broke his treaty with the pope. In May 1413 his armies invaded the Marches, and on

June 8 he took Rome -- which made no resistance whatever. John XXIII fled to Florence, and appealed urgently for aid to Sigismund, and the emperor in reply demanded that a new General Council be summoned. John sent two cardinals to him at Como -- the Savoyard diplomatist de Challant and the great canonist Francesco Zabarella. With the emperor they decided on the place and the time for the council, the German city of Constance for November 1, 1414. John XXIII was now at Bologna (November 8, 1413). The prospect of a General Council in a territory where he was not the civil ruler dismayed him. He had no choice, however, but to accept; the initiative had, by his own act, passed to Sigismund. Pope and emperor now came together (November 1413 to January 1414), and on December 9 John published a bull convoking the council for the time and at the place the emperor had chosen.

Ladislas, meanwhile, carried all before him in the Papal State, sacking Rome a second time in March 1414. Then he made for Bologna, and John; but the Florentines turned him back, and on August 6 death brought to an end this last meteoric fifteen months of his career. Their one lasting achievement had been to put John entirely into Sigismund's power. On October 1, 1414, the pope, reluctant to the end, and his plan to return to Rome thwarted by the cardinals, left Bologna for the council and on October 28 he made his solemn entry into Constance, very apprehensive about his own fate, and about that only. ii. Constance, 1414-1418

The great Council of Constance is the closing, transformation scene of the medieval drama, if the Middle Ages be considered as a time when the mainspring of all public action was western Europe's acceptance of the spiritual supremacy of the pope. Not, indeed, that the moment has arrived when that supremacy is rejected by large parts of Christendom; nor that there are, as yet, signs not to be mistaken of that coming revolution. But after Constance things are never again the same; the ecclesiastical system -- the Catholic Church built on the divine right of the popes to rule it -- has suffered a shock, and there has been a settlement. The intangible has been struck and to the ordinary man it has seemed to stagger if not to crack up. The great scandal of the attack at Anagni has now, a hundred years later, been evidently renewed. Rough hands have again been laid on the ark; and again the assailants have survived their sacrilege --

the harm done is none the smaller for the fact that the assailants are in good faith, invincibly ignorant and unaware of the sacrilege.

The hundred years that lie between Constance and the first movements of the coming revolution, these last hundred years of a united Catholic Christendom, are a transitional period, in which a new order of things is struggling to be born, socially, politically, culturally, philosophically; they are a period in which it is not only the way in which popes exercise their power that is more and more generally questioned, but their very right to exercise it; the very existence, as well as the nature, of their spiritual authority over the Church of Christ. Ideas which are of their nature noxious, and even fatal, to the traditional theories and beliefs about the papacy, had already been given a kind of public recognition at Pisa. Now they were to be recognised again, by a much more imposing kind of council, a council itself recognised -- at one time or another -- by two of the three claimants to the papacy, and a council through whose activity came the pope whose legitimacy the whole Church was to acknowledge. No council ever sat so continuously for so long a time as did this Council of Constance; and no council ever changed so often its character -- if by character we mean its authority as canon law and theology define a council's authority.

In certain of its widely different phases this council enacted decrees that were as contradictory of fundamental Catholic practice as anything any heretic who appeared before it for judgment had ever held. The theologian who to-day studies the acts of the council has no difficulty in distinguishing between the value of the decisions to which it came in one or another of these phases. Nor had the popes of the united Christendom any difficulty at the time. But the new harmony of Christendom achieved in the council -- its great achievement indeed, because of which historians have been loth to speak harshly even of its really serious shortcomings -- was too frail a thing, on the morrow of the council, for all ambiguity to be stripped away from the council's proceedings, the ambiguity which made it possible for the untrained mind of the ordinary observer to see Constance as an authoritative consecration of the revolutionary doctrine of Pisa that the General Council is the supreme authority in the Church of Christ; the ambiguity which, from now on, could be exploited by chauvinistic theologians, everywhere,

in the interests of their princes whenever popes were enmeshed in any crisis of political or religious revolt.

The history of the Council of Constance cannot ever be too closely studied. [] If it was the occasion of the disappearance of all controversy which of the men who then claimed to be pope was really the pope, controversy that had troubled the Church for forty years, its proceedings were also the cause of a survival of ideas -- materially heretical -- that harassed religion and sorely debilitated it for another four centuries and more. For example, the grave anxiety -- henceforth chronic -- arising from the fact that influential Catholics clung to theories that would make the pope the Church's servant and not its ruler, and that such Catholics only awaited a new chance to put them again into action, was to be not only a good excuse for lazy popes and weak popes and bad popes to ignore the clamant need for a spiritual restoration -- only to be brought about with the aid of a General Council -- but, much more tragically, it became a valid reason whereby good popes too hesitated, really fearing lest with the abundance of tares they would root up the little wheat that remained. These theories did much to bring it about that the popes of the next four hundred years were no longer so much the master in their own household as their medieval predecessors had been -- unless a pope knew that his primatial authority over the whole Church was unquestioned, in practice and in theory, he could hardly proceed to the drastic house-cleaning that was called for. Saints perhaps would have gone ahead, and in the name of God dared all; but the average pope was no more than an average in his own kind, and spiritual mediocrity was unable to surmount the general habitual feebleness which consciousness of divided opinion on this vital matter did so much to produce.

The Council of Constance was in continuous session for three years and five months, [] and perhaps the most convenient way to study briefly what it accomplished is to disregard the timetable of events, and to set out the problems which it faced and the solutions it found for them. These problems were, in the main, the three matters of the Schism, the new heresies in England and Bohemia, and the reform of Christian life; the second of these will be more conveniently dealt with in the next chapter, where Wyclif's heresy, the work of Wyclif's disciple, John Hus, and the significance of the Hussite wars will be

treated together.

But before problems could even be stated, the council must organise its own procedure, and in these preliminary discussions, which went on all through December 1414 and the first weeks of the new year, traditional serious divisions showed immediately. The first to offer an agenda (December 7) were the Italians. To them this new council was but a continuation of the Council of Pisa. It should decree stricter censures than ever on Gregory XII and Benedict XIII and their supporters, and call on the Christian princes to put an end to the dissensions by force of arms; John XXIII's position being thus strengthened, the council could then be dissolved, to be followed by another General Council in ten, or perhaps twenty-five, years. The impudent naivety of this programme provoked a tough reply from the leader of the French delegation, Peter d'Ailly. His main thought, as always, was to heal the divisions of Christendom, and he now proposed that every effort should be made to conciliate the popes deposed at Pisa and to win them over to take part in the new council; and, thanks in great part to his effort, it was agreed that if Gregory and Benedict sent cardinals as envoys these should be received as such, and allowed the insignia of their rank. This was a first defeat for the friends of John XXIII, a clear indication that he was not to be any more the master of the council than was Gregory or Benedict.

The English arrived on January 21, 1415, and some days later the Germans. Both joined the anti-Italian forces; and the Germans, in their plan for the council, made the revolutionary demand that not bishops and mitred abbots alone should have a defining vote, but also the proxies of absent bishops and abbots, the delegates of cathedral chapters also, and of universities; and that masters of theology and doctors, and the envoys of princes should also be allowed a vote. If all this were allowed, the band of supporters which John XXIII had brought from Italy -- in numbers almost half of the bishops so far present -- would be swamped at every vote.

By what succession of controversy and compromise, of offers and of threats, John XXIII and his supporters were brought to surrender does not appear. It was, however, agreed that all these various classes of clerics and laymen should share in the council's work, but not by voting as individuals in the General

Sessions where the decrees were solemnly enacted. They should have their vote in the preliminary discussions on the decrees, and for these discussions the council was divided into "nations," after the fashion of the University of Paris. There were four of these nations, the Italian, German, French and English. When, by separate discussions, a solution had been agreed upon in each nation, it was to be adopted in a General Congregation of deputies from all four, and then reported to the General Session of the Council and officially voted. Each nation, whether represented at the council by hundreds or by single units, would thus have equal power whenever there was a conciliar vote.

The political genius behind the scheme is evident; it was an innovation, and it succeeded. But such a system destroyed all possibility of the council's being reckoned one of the General Councils in the traditional sense of the word, for in these the function of the bishops is to speak and vote, not as contributing to the general fund the quota of their own personal learning and wisdom, but as witnesses testifying to the belief of the churches they rule. Peter d'Ailly's argument that learned doctors of theology were of greater importance in a General Council than ignorant bishops, was beside the point altogether. The assembly he had in mind was no more than a congress of Christian learning; it was not a gathering of the teaching Church witnessing to the faith held everywhere by the faithful.

The Council of Constance was well attended, if not by bishops, by doctors of theology and law, by the clergy generally, by princes, by statesmen, by nobles and laity of all ranks and of all degrees of virtue. The numbers varied largely during the three and a half years it was in session. At its maximum attendance there were 29 cardinals, 186 bishops, [] more than 100 abbots, 300 and more doctors either of theology or of law, 11 ruling princes -- the Emperor Sigismund at their head, and ambassadors from twelve other Christian princes. With their suites -- the elaborate suites of the princes and the great prelates -- and the huge spontaneous inflow attracted by the chances of profit which such a gathering must offer, the little city of Constance saw its normal population of 6,000 many times multiplied, over the long period of nearly four years.

John XXIII had journeyed to Constance as to a doom that was

certain; and, indeed, the immediate question in the minds of most of the prelates making the same journey was how to disembarass Christendom of its latest scandal, a pope who was notoriously an evil liver. In the ten weeks between the first and second general sessions of the council, the opinion gained ground that John must go. A well-written pamphlet, of anonymous authorship, that set out his misdeeds and called for an enquiry by the council, was brought to John's notice sometime in February 1415. Whatever plans he had made to brazen out his position crumbled; he asked advice of cardinals he could trust, and they all urged him to abdicate, to spare the Church the scandal of a trial where the pope must be proved guilty of crime. John yielded, and at the mass with which the second general session opened (March 2, 1415), his solemn pledge to abdicate was publicly read. The pope was himself the celebrant of the mass, and at the words "I swear and vow" he left his throne to kneel before the altar in sign of submission. But he speedily changed his mind, and while the details of the resignation were being worked out, in the night of March 20, he fled from Constance in disguise, hoping to bring about the dispersal of the council.

For a moment the pope's flight produced its intended effect, and the council seemed about to break up in a general confusion. But the vigorous action of the emperor saved the day, and he won from the cardinals a pledge that they would carry on. There was, naturally, a most violent outbreak of anti-papal feeling and the nations, trusting neither the pope nor the cardinals, forced on the third session, March 26, at which only two cardinals -- d'Ailly and Zabarella -- attended. This session is the turning point of the council's history, the moment when it awakens to the opportunity before it and boldly takes the revolutionary step of decreeing that whether the pope returned or not the council's authority remained sovereign and intact; that it would not dissolve until the Church had been fully reformed, the papacy and the Roman Curia no less than the general body; and that the council could not be transferred elsewhere without its own consent.

To the envoys whom the council sent to him in his refuge at Schaffhausen, John gave a shifty answer, that only provoked at Constance a demand for strong action and for a new general session. In preparation for this, the English, French and

Germans combined (March 29) to secure the enactment of four decrees that would officially establish the doctrine that in the Catholic Church the General Council is the pope's superior. But, only a few hours before the council met, the cardinals won over the emperor to support an alternative scheme, and he persuaded the nations to accept it; at the general session (March 30) it was this that was passed. The excitement in the city was, by this time, at its height; the divisions within the council were known, the Italians it seemed were still loyal to John, and also a party among the cardinals, several of whom had gone to join him; the emperor was gathering troops for an attack on the pope's protector, Frederick of Hapsburg, Count of Tyrol. At this moment came the news that the pope had moved still further into Germany, after revoking and annulling all he had conceded. Opinion now hardened rapidly against him, and at the next [] general session -- April 6 -- as a legal basis for operations against the pope, the council voted the original four articles of March 29.

These most famous articles [] declared that this council, lawfully assembled, was an oecumenical council representing the whole Church Militant and that it derived its authority directly from God; that the whole of the world, therefore, the pope included, owed it obedience in all that concerned the faith, the extinction of the schism, and reform; whoever, then, obstinately refused to obey its decrees, or the decrees of any other General Council lawfully assembled, made with reference to the matters mentioned, was liable to the council's correction and to the punishment it ordered, even were that person the pope himself; the flight of John XXIII was an act of scandal, entailing the suspicion that he was fostering the schism and had fallen into heresy; within the council, it was stated, the pope -- and indeed, all the fathers -- had enjoyed full freedom of action.

As the emperor's troops moved out from Constance, the cardinals who had joined the pope returned to the council and John sent in an offer to abdicate -- at a price. He was to remain a cardinal, to be named legate for life for Italy, to be given the Avignon territories of the Holy See and the sum of 30,000 ducats in cash. All this the council ignored; it was now busy constructing a formula of abdication in which there would be no loopholes. Then, on April 30, John's protector surrendered to the emperor. The crisis was over. The pope could now be

rounded up whenever the council needed him.

On May 2 John's trial was officially demanded in the council on six general charges, namely notorious heresy, complacency in schism, simony, dilapidation of Church properties, misconduct and incorrigibility. While he continued, for the next four weeks, to fence with the successive citations to appear and take his trial, a special commission heard the witnesses and sorted out their charges as a preliminary to drawing up a formal indictment. Officials of the curia, bishops, and cardinals too, appeared to tell the story of John's misdeeds, ever since he was a disobedient and incorrigible boy in his own home. On May 17 the pope was arrested at Freiburg-in-Breisgau and brought to the castle of Radolfzell, near Constance. All the fight had now gone out of him; he wept and asked only for mercy, surrendered his seal to the council and wrote that he would, if they chose, abdicate, or accept and ratify any sentence of deposition they chose to pass. When the fifty-four charges, proved to the council's satisfaction in the session of May 25, were read over to him, he had no reply to make save that he put himself in the council's hands; it was holy and could not err, he said. He did not accept the offer to defend himself, but again begged only for mercy. Two days after this, on May 29, in the twelfth general session, sentence of deposition was passed on him and on May 31 John formally accepted it and ratified it and with an oath swore never to call it in question. And then he was taken off to the prison where, under the guard of Lewis of Bavaria, he was to spend the next three years. []

Just five weeks after Baldassare Cossa so meekly accepted the council's sentence, the fathers met to receive the solemn abdication of Gregory XII. He was in fact, and to the end he claimed to be in law, the canonically elected representative of the line that went back to Urban VI, the last pope to be acknowledged as pope by Catholics everywhere. [] The abdication was arranged and executed with a care to safeguard all that Gregory claimed to be; and this merits -- and indeed, requires -- much more detailed consideration than it usually receives. []

Gregory XII sent to Constance as his representatives his protector Carlo Malatesta, the Lord of Rimini, and the Dominican cardinal, John Domenici -- to Constance indeed, but not to the

General Council assembled there by the authority, and in the name, of John XXIII. The envoys' commission was to the emperor Sigismund, presiding over the various bishops and prelates whom his zeal to restore peace to the Church had brought together. To these envoys -- and to Malatesta in the first place -- Gregory gave authority to convoke as a General Council -- to convoke and not to recognise -- these assembled bishops and prelates; [] and by a second bull [] he empowered Malatesta to resign to this General Council in his name.

The emperor, the bishops and prelates consented and accepted the role Gregory assigned. And so, on July 4, 1415. Sigismund, clad in the royal robes, left the throne he had occupied in the previous sessions for a throne placed before the altar, as for the president of the assembly. Gregory's two legates sat by his side facing the bishops. The bull was read commissioning Malatesta and Domenici to convoke the council and to authorise whatever it should do for the restoration of unity and the extirpation of the schism -- with Gregory's explicit condition that there should be no mention of Baldassare Cossa, [] with his reminder that from his very election he had pledged himself to resign if by so doing he could truly advance the good work of unity, and his assertion that the papal dignity is truly his as the canonically elected successor of Urban VI.

Malatesta then delegated his fellow envoy, the cardinal John Domenici, to pronounce the formal operative words of convocation; [] and the assembly -- but in its own way -- accepted to be thus convoked, authorised and confirmed in the name "of that lord who in his own obedience is called Gregory XII". [] The council next declared that all canonical censures imposed by reason of the schism were lifted, and the bull was read by which Gregory authorised Malatesta to make the act of abdication [] and promised to consider as *ratum gratum et firmum*, and forever irrevocable, whatever Malatesta, as his proxy, should perform. The envoy asked the council whether they would prefer the resignation immediately, or that it should be delayed until Peter de Luna's decision was known. The council preferred the present moment. It ratified all Gregory XII's acts, received his cardinals as cardinals, promised that his officers should keep their posts and declared that if Gregory was barred from re-election as pope, this was only for the peace of the Church, and not from any personal unworthiness. Then

the great renunciation was made, [] ". . . renuncio et cedo. . . et resigno. . . in hac sacrosancta synodo et universali concilio, sanctam Romanam et universalem ecclesiam repraesentante"; and the council accepted it, [] but again as made "on the part of that lord who in his own obedience was called Gregory XII". The Te Deum was sung and a new summons drawn up calling upon Peter de Luna to yield to the council's authority.

The work of Pisa was now almost undone, and by this council which, in origin, was a continuation of Pisa. It had suppressed the Pisan pope -- John XXIII. It had recognised as pope the Roman pope whom Pisa, with biting words, had rejected as a schismatic and no pope. One obstacle alone -- the claims of Peter de Luna -- now stood between the council and its aim of giving to the Church a pope who would be, universally accepted. To some of the nations who made up the Council of Constance Benedict XIII had been, for six years now, no more at best than an ex-pope, deposed by a General Council for perjury, schism and heresy; for others he had never been pope at all. Yet the promoters of the council, in their desire to remove all possible causes of future discord, had in 1414, by an agreement that was unanimous, disregarded consistency and invited him to take part in the discussions. Benedict had consented at any rate to send an embassy, and his envoys were received in audience on January 12 and 13, 1415. But the business of the embassy was really with the emperor, whom they were commissioned to invite to a meeting with their master and the King of Aragon in the coming summer, when means to re-establish unity would be discussed. It was nearly two months before they were answered, and then, at the urgent request of all parties, envoys, cardinals and the nations, Sigismund agreed (March 4). By the time he was free to leave Constance, however, the situation had been immeasurably simplified (for the council) by the disappearance of both Benedict's rivals. Benedict alone now stood before Christendom claiming its spiritual allegiance, and if behind him he had only Scotland and the Spaniards, he had also the prestige of twenty-one years' exercise of the papal authority and a long life unstained by any of the vices that stained most of the personages of the high ecclesiastical world, nepotism, simony, and undue regard for the favour of princes.

Emperor and council took leave of each other in the general session of July 14; by the Feast of the Assumption, a month

later, Sigismund had reached Narbonne, and on September 18 he entered Perpignan, where the King of Aragon awaited him and Benedict. The negotiations that now began, dragged on until the last day of October. Benedict -- now eighty-nine years of age -- was as ready to resign as ever he had been, but, as always, on carefully thought-out conditions which, somehow, could not but leave him victorious. The latest safeguard he had devised was a proviso that the pope to be elected after his resignation must be canonically elected -- an innocent phrase indeed, but whose inner meaning was that it must be left to Benedict to choose him, for, Benedict explained, he alone was certainly a cardinal, the single surviving cardinal created by a pope whom the whole Church had acknowledged, Gregory XI.

Sigismund wasted no time in rebuttal of such subtleties as this, but simply repeated his demand that Benedict should abdicate; whereupon the conference broke up. But while the emperor was at Narbonne, on his return from Perpignan, the King of Aragon with envoys of the other princes of Benedict's obedience begged him to make yet another attempt on the old man's obstinacy, pledging themselves that if this failed they would renounce him and go over to the council; Benedict was to be asked to abdicate in the same forms that had been used by Gregory XII. The emperor's envoys found the old man in the impregnable rock fortress of his family at Peniscola. Again he refused; he announced the convocation of a new council, and he sent word to the princes at Narbonne that he would deprive them of their kingdoms if they dared to withdraw their obedience. This message put an end to their last doubts, and after a fortnight's discussion the details were settled [] of an accord with the council. Benedict's cardinals were to go over to the council, and to be received as colleagues by the other cardinals; the council thus fully representative was next to come to a decision about Benedict (i.e. to depose him) before electing the desired new pope, the sentence of Pisa being tacitly ignored, and the business done over again. All sentences against those obedient until now to Benedict, by whomsoever decreed, were to be declared null by the council, and also all Benedict's sentences against the council and its supporters. Also, the council would confirm all grants and favours and dispensations made by Benedict up to the day of his last refusal to the princes. Should Benedict die, his cardinals would not elect a successor, and if they did so the Spanish kings would give such successor

no recognition.

The council ratified this treaty two months after it was signed (February 4, 1416), but it was many more months before it began to go into effect, before the Spaniards arrived at Constance -- where they formed a new, fifth, nation -- and the new trial of Benedict XIII could begin. The first to arrive were the Aragonese, in October 1416, and the preliminaries to the trial began in the twenty-third general session, November 5, when a commission was named to enquire into Benedict's responsibility for prolonging the schism. He was cited on November 28 to appear before the council, and its envoys then had to make the long journey to Spain to deliver the summons. It was March 1417 before they had returned. Then came the consideration of his refusal to appear, a decree that he was contumacious, a new commission to examine the evidence against him, its report May 12, 1417), and finally, on July 26, [] sentence of deposition was given. No one had ever sinned more -- the sentence declared -- against the Church of God and the whole Christian people, by fostering and encouraging disunion and schism. Peter de Luna is declared a perjurer, a scandal to the whole Church, schismatical, and a heretic notoriously and manifestly; and thence it is that the council declares him deprived of all right to the papacy and excommunicates him; and Sigismund sent trumpeters through the streets of the little city to proclaim the great news that this ancient nuisance was no more.

The Christian world was now once more united in its acceptance of a single spiritual authority, the council at Constance. It only remained to elect a pope. But the question now became urgent, who should vote in the election? As the law had stood for three hundred and fifty years [] none could be pope whom the cardinals did not elect. On the other hand the council did not trust the cardinals. Feeling ran high on both sides, and to serious men it must have seemed that there was again every chance of an election whose legality must be questionable. The problem had been for a long time in the minds of all when it was publicly raised by the Castilian ambassadors to the council in the April of this year 1417. They had then been told that the council would decide the procedure once all the signatories to the Treaty of Narbonne had joined it, and from this moment the election problem became the chief subject of debate among the nations. It was complicated by a second division of opinion as to

whether the council should elect a pope now or, first of all, enact a scheme of general reforms. The emperor was anxious that reforms should first be dealt with; the cardinals [] and the Latin nations gave priority to the election; the English and German nations supported the emperor.

Various schemes were drafted, and the discussions grew so violent that, in June 1417, it seemed as though the council was about to break up. The deadlock between the cardinals and their party on the one side, and the party in the council whom the emperor supported on the other, lasted until July 13, when it was agreed to allow the council to discuss the reformation of the papacy and curia before proceeding to elect a new pope; and a fortnight later the council, free at last from the incubus of the trial of Benedict XIII, turned to the question of reform.

It was soon evident that there were as many plans for reform as there were sections in the council, and that, without such leadership as a pope alone could provide, the stress of the reform discussions must dissolve the council into a mass of petty factions. The cardinals again raised the question whether it would not be wiser to elect the pope immediately. They had the French on their side, and now only the German nation gave wholehearted support to the emperor's determination that the new pope should inherit an authority reformed and trimmed by the council, that the papacy should be reformed, without consultation or consent, while the Holy See lay vacant. Presently the two parties were in open public conflict and accusations of heresy flew from each side to the other. New quarrels -- equally bitter -- about precedence also developed between Castilians and Aragonese. The cardinals asked for their passports. The emperor spoke of putting their leaders under arrest. They swore an oath to stand firm until death itself.

It was an Englishman who, in the end, brought all parties together, Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester, uncle of the English king, Henry V. He had arrived at Constance less than a month after the death of his fellow countryman the Bishop of Salisbury, Cardinal Hallum, [] who had been the emperor's chief supporter in the council, and while the English there were still suffering from this sudden loss of their leader. Beaufort proposed a compromise -- and both sides accepted it; the council would first decree that after the election of a pope the

question of reforms was to be seriously undertaken, and then immediately publish decrees for reform in all matters where agreement had already been reached, while, thirdly, a commission would at the same time be set up to decide how the pope was to be elected. This was at the beginning of October 1417, and by the end of the month an agreed procedure for the election had been worked out, which the council adopted in the general session of October 30. [] To the twenty-three cardinals there were to be added, for the purpose of this election only, six delegates from each of the five nations; the pope to be elected must secure, not only two-thirds of the cardinals' votes (as the law had required since 1179), but also two-thirds of the votes of each of the five nations; all these electors were to be bound by the conclave laws already in force, and the conclave was to begin within ten days of this decree.

The carpenters and masons of Constance rose to the occasion nobly. By November 2 they had prepared fifty-three cells and accommodation for the electors' attendants in the great merchants' hall of the city. The emperor isolated the building with a cordon of troops -- there was to be no chance of any repetition of the events of 1378 -- and after a solemn session of the council on November 8, at which the names of the chosen electors were published, the conclave began. It was surprisingly short, and on St. Martin's Day, November 11, at 10. 30 in the morning, the announcement was made that the Cardinal Odo Colonna had been chosen by a unanimous vote, and had taken the appropriate name of Martin V. []

The election of Martin V -- the first pope for forty years whom all Catholics acknowledged as pope -- is, no doubt, the high-water mark of the work of the Council of Constance. It was not only an end accomplished but the means to further accomplishment, a means to ensure that reformation of Christian life throughout the Church, which, for many of the fathers, was the most important question of all. A very strong party had, indeed, only consented to give priority to the settlement of the papal question when experience brought it home to them that, without the leadership of a pope, the council would never agree on reforms.

Of many practical matters that called for attention, the first and most important, so it seemed to all, was to bring about a better understanding between the papacy and the local ordinaries

everywhere. Until a pope universally recognised had been elected, the council could not seriously hope to reach any agreement on reform that would be effective, and until, under the pope's leadership, the grievances of the episcopate against the Roman Curia had been frankly discussed, it was just as hopeless to expect that immense united action of pope and bishops through which alone could come the wholesale reformation which all openly acknowledged to be everywhere urgently needed. When, during the opening weeks of the council, the different delegates came in to Constance, each had brought its own plan of reforms -- even those Italians who had come in order to support John XXIII through thick and thin, had their proposals for a restoration of virtuous living among clergy and laity.

The council was, from the first, in its own mind and intention, a body assembled largely for the purpose of reform, and its desire for reform is the expressed motive for the revolutionary theory of a General Council's powers set forth in the decrees of its third and fifth sessions. The council here proposes, in fact, to reform the Roman Curia and the papacy, and no papal obstruction, it is stated, can lawfully withstand the council so acting. Until its task is finished it retains its sovereign authority despite all papal declarations to the contrary. Again, its power being from God directly, the pope is bound to obey the council's decrees just as other Catholics are; and if he is disobedient the council can correct and punish him.

Once the council had thus corrected, and punished, the pope who had called it into being (John XXIII), it set up a special commission of thirty-five members to prepare the needed reformation decrees. This commission immediately turned its attention to the highly centralised control of the universal Church which the popes of the last hundred and fifty years especially had so largely developed -- that control, through taxation of church property and through appointments, which has already been described in its main lines. [] The question was now raised whether the practice of papal provisions should not be entirely abolished. The bishops favoured the proposal but -- a first serious division in the ranks of the reform party -- the universities preferred the new system; the popes, said the delegates from the university of Vienna, repeating what the university of Paris had said already, had more thought for

learning than the bishops, in those to whom they gave appointments. About the next great source of general complaint, the taxes payable on appointments of bishops and abbots, there was also a marked division of opinion. To zealots who sought the total abolition of these fees it was objected that the pope and his curia must have some fixed source of revenue in the universal Church in order to pay the expenses of a universal administration.

These discussions occupied the commission for the next seven or eight months, and meanwhile Sunday by Sunday, the best preachers in Europe (many of them bishops) never ceased to tell the assembled council the tale of the sins -- the clerical sins especially -- which afflicted the Church, to point out that episcopal simony and the simony of the Roman Curia were the chief cause of the decay of Christian life, and to exhort the fathers to pass from talking to action. []

But between the appointment of this special commission and the appearance of reform decrees in a session of the council, two years and more were to elapse. There were many reasons for this delay; it was not by any means mere clerical supineness. For one thing, since there was now no pope (for all but the Spaniards and Scotsmen, still faithful to Benedict XIII), there had devolved upon this heterogeneous assembly the all but impossible task of the day-to-day administration of the universal Church. This parliament now had to function as a cabinet, and a general department of state, and this at a time of long drawnout crisis. It had to consider and provide for affairs like the trials of John Hus and of Jerome of Prague for heresy, for the civil war in Bohemia that began after their execution, for nominations to vacant sees, for the arrest of the wicked Bishop of Strasburg, for the trial of the crimes of Frederick of Tyrol against Church jurisdiction; there was the great case of John Petit's defence of tyrannicide and Gerson's great attack on this theory, a case beneath which burned the great question of Burgundy against Armagnac that had set all France ablaze with civil war. Later the collapse of Benedict XIII's hold on Spain slowed down the whole activity of the council, for the Spaniards had been invited to the council in such a way that only after they had come to take part in it could it continue as a General Council; and it was more than a year after the Treaty of Narbonne before the last of the Spaniards had come in. Then, too, in June 1416, the emperor

(now in England negotiating an alliance with Henry V, lately victorious at Agincourt) sent an urgent petition that the council would halt its plans for reform until his return; and he did not return to Constance for another seven months. And before he had returned, in November 1416, the trial of Benedict XIII had opened that was to take up the most of the council's time for the next nine months nearly. Nor did this last great event proceed against any background of monastic calm. The English invasion of France, their alliance with the anti-royalist faction in the French civil war, and their victories, were an inevitable cause of the most bitter strife within the council. There were ever-recurring disputes about right and precedence between other nations too; and presently, as has been told, in the summer of 1417, the old question of the relation between the papacy and the council came to life again in the violent discussions about the way the new pope should be elected.

Such were the causes and occasions of the delay in producing and enacting schemes of reform. When the council was at last free to attend to the problem of reform, it set up a new commission to draft decrees, and now the old controversies broke out afresh, and during August, September and October of 1417 they raged most violently. What the fathers were now actually debating was whether the Roman See should continue sovereign in the Church, or whether the Church should for the future be ruled by an aristocracy of its bishops, and university dignitaries. Were the cardinals, it was asked, of any real value to religion, or would it not be best to abolish the Sacred College as a permanent hindrance? The cardinals, offering to reform what was amiss in their organisation, stood firm for the traditional rights of the Roman See, and the Italians and Spaniards supported them. It was from France and Germany and England that the proposals came for radical changes; but even here opinion was not unanimous in each nation.

It has been told how the Bishop of Winchester reconciled these warring factions, and there was now sufficient agreement among them for the council to enact five decrees of reform in its public session of October 5, 1417. [] The first of these -- the famous decree *Frequens* -- opens with the statement that General Councils are the chief instrument for the tillage of God's field and that neglect of them is the chief reason for the decay of religion. Therefore, within five years at most of the conclusion of

this present council, another General Council shall be summoned, and a third council within seven years from the end of the second, and after that there shall be a General Council every ten years for all time. The pope shall consult each council about the place where its successor is to meet and this shall be announced before the council disperses; if the Holy See happens to fall vacant the council shall choose the place. The Church will, for the future, live from one General Council to the next.

Then there comes a decree which provides a remedy against future schisms, and this decree, apart from the ingeniously minute procedure it enacts, [] a is interesting evidence that it was the mind of the council that not only this particular Council of Constance but the General Council as such is the pope's superior. The third decree provides a new profession of faith to be made by future popes the day they are elected. The fourth states that religion has suffered greatly from the practice of translating bishops from see to see, and that the fear of being translated has been used to coerce the freedom of bishops; to protect future popes, ignorant perhaps of the facts, from assenting to translations promoted by crafty and importunate self seekers, and also from any careless use of the papal power, the council decrees that bishops shall not be translated against their will, unless after the case has been heard by the cardinals and their consent obtained. Finally, there is a decree about the burning question of the pope's rights to spolia and procurations. [] Papal reservations of these are no longer to hold good, but such procurations and spolia are to belong to those to whom they would have gone had this papal custom never been introduced.

There was, it may be remembered, a second clause about reforms in the Bishop of Winchester's settlement or pact, by which both the cardinals and the nations agreed to vote, in a general session of the council, a pledge that, after the new pope's election, the work of reform would be seriously undertaken. This pledge was given in the first decree of the fortieth general session held on October 30, 1417, three weeks after the voting of the five reform decrees just described. In this decree the council ordains that the pope to be elected must, in union with the council or with deputies chosen by each nation, reform the Church in its head and in its members and the Roman

Curia also, before the council is dissolved; and the matters to be reformed are then set out in the decree under eighteen heads. But the commissioners of the five nations still failed to come to any practical measure of agreement about the detail of the reforms, and the Germans then suggested that two schemes should be prepared, the one of general reform, for the whole Church, and the other of reforms to meet the particular needs of the several nations; and that these last should be set out, not in decrees of the council, but in specially drawn agreements between the various nations and the pope -- the so-called first concordats.

The Germans presented to the new pope, in the first days of January 1418, a list of eighteen suggested reforms; the French and Spaniards did likewise; and on January 20, Martin V sent to the nations for their study a draft of eighteen decrees based on the eighteen points of the council's decree of October 30. It is worthy of note that the pope takes up all the topics which the council recommended, save one only: he makes no mention at all of the council's thirteenth point namely, How popes shall be corrected and deposed for crimes other than heresy. It was from the discussions of this draft within the various nations, that there finally emerged the seven decrees of universal reform published in the forty-third session (March 20, 1418), and also the text of the several concordats.

These seven decrees deal almost entirely with the long-standing conflict between Rome and the bishops about papal taxation of benefices. By the first decree Martin V, with the approval of the council, revokes all privileges of exemption from the jurisdiction of the local ordinaries [] granted since the death of Gregory XI (1378), by whatever personages -- says the decree -- who acted as though they were popes; [] and he promises that, for the future, no such exemption shall be granted without the bishops' opinions being heard. All unions of benefices and incorporations made since Gregory XI's death are to be revoked if the parties concerned desire this, provided there has not been true and reasonable cause for the amalgamation. The pope surrenders all rights to the revenues of vacant sees, monasteries and benefices. As to simony, no law, says the pope, has yet succeeded in really extirpating this vice, so he now proposes one "with teeth in it". Those ordained simoniacally are ipso facto suspended from the exercise of the order thus

received. Elections where simony has intervened are null and void, and they confer no right of any kind. Those who, so elected, make their own any revenues or profits attaching to the office to which they have been elected are bound to restitution. [] Both those who give, and those who receive, in simoniacal transactions are by the fact excommunicated, and this even though they be cardinals or the pope himself. The fifth decree abolishes a kind of papal dispensation whose very existence is surely evidence of immense decay in the religious spirit of the high ecclesiastical world, dispensations that is to say, which allow men to hold sees without ever being consecrated, to hold abbeys without receiving the abbatial blessing, to hold parishes without being ordained priest. All such dispensations are now revoked, and those who hold them are, under pain of losing the benefice to which their dispensations refer, to receive the appropriate order or blessing within the time the existing law appoints. The burning grievance of the papal tithe is next reformed, and the sixth decree gave some hope of relief to the sees of Christendom which had for so long been tithed by the popes, systematically, at every crisis of the fortunes of their own state and of the states of their allies among the Christian princes. For Martin V now revived the old law that only the pope could tithe and tax sees and ecclesiastical revenues, and he pledged the Holy See never to tax the whole body of the clergy except for some extraordinary cause that affected the whole Church, and even then only with the written consent of the cardinals and of what bishops could be consulted; nor would special tithes or taxes be levied on any particular country or province without the consent of the majority of its bishops; and such tithes, if levied, would not be collected except by ecclesiastics using only the authority of the Holy See. The last -- seventh -- decree deals with the needed reform of clerical life. It has nothing to complain of but that priests and bishops tend to dress like nobles, and that they even dare to appear thus clad, with only a surplice thrown over the " deformity ", to celebrate the divine office in their churches. The new law provides the new penalty of loss of a month's income for such unseemliness.

These seven decrees, it may be thought, are slender fruit indeed after four years of conference between priests and prelates from every part of Christendom, reputedly zealous for the reform of Christian life. They are not, of course, the whole programme, but even the several concordats [] do not contain much more than

prohibitions in restraint of the more glaring financial abuses. Nowhere is there any sign of constructive thinking, and it is surely a notable failure that nowhere is there any care to provide for the formation and the better education of the parochial clergy. The chief subjects, yet once again, are the claims of the bishops against the new papal control of the benefice system, and their complaints about the Roman Curia.

The pope promises -- in all the concordats -- that there will not for the future be so many cardinals that these will be a burden to the Church, or that the dignity will be held cheaply. The maximum number is fixed at twenty-four, and it is promised that the cardinals shall be chosen proportionately from all parts of Christendom. They will be men distinguished for their learning, their way of life and experience, and will be doctors of theology or law -- unless they are of the kin of reigning princes for whom *competens litteratura* will suffice. None shall be created cardinal who is brother or nephew to a cardinal already created, nor shall more than one cardinal at a time be chosen from any one of the mendicant orders. The cardinals, moreover, are to be consulted as a body about new creations.

Two nations speak for their own special interests in the curia; the German concordat recognises that in the present condition of the affairs of the Roman Church there is no other way to provide subsistence for the pope and cardinals but by the old method of granting them benefices and through the payment of the *servitia communia*. [] But no cardinal, the principle is laid down, is to enjoy a revenue of more than 6,000 florins from church revenues. Rules are made that the cardinals shall provide suitable priests to act for them in benefices which they hold, and that they shall not let out such monasteries or benefices to laymen, and that they shall not cut down the number of monks, and so increase their own profits. If, through the negligence of the cardinal's deputies, the monastery falls into decay, and if the cardinal ignores the injunctions of the monastery's religious superiors, the Holy See is to be approached; and if the pope does not remedy the evil, the superiors are to bring action against the cardinal's deputies as though they were the abbot and monks in whose hands the property once lay. The special concession to the English was simpler -- that Englishmen too, should be employed in the different posts of the Roman Curia.

In all the concordats, except that with the English, there was also a clause restricting the number of suits to be heard in the Roman Curia. It would no longer, for example, be possible in Germany for suits that in no way touched on Church business to be taken to the pope for judgment simply because the suitor was a crusader; or (in Italy, France and Spain) to take to Rome matrimonial suits for a hearing in first instance. Penalties were also provided for litigants who interjected appeals to Rome that were judged to be frivolous. There are five clauses which reform the law and practice of clerical appointments, three of them applying everywhere but to the English, one applying to the English alone, and one universally. First, by whom are appointments to be made -- the question of Provisions? The pope, henceforth, will not reserve to himself the appointment to any benefices except those vacated *apud sedem apostolicam*; [] or by the deposition, deprivation, papal translation, or defective election of the late holder; or where the late holder was an officer of the Roman Curia. The other benefices to which the popes had been used to appoint would, for the future, be filled alternately by the pope and the proper collator. Secondly, to whom might benefices be given? The concordats restrict the papal practice of giving them in *commendam*. To no one -- not even to a cardinal -- is any abbey to be given in *commendam* which has a community of more than ten monks, [] nor any major dignity in a cathedral chapter, nor any parish, nor any hospital or hospice, nor any benefice worth less than fifty florins annual net revenue. These last two clauses do not appear in the English concordat, but this contains, like all the others, a clause by which the pope promises certain restrictions in the use of his dispensing power. For the future, no one will be dispensed from the need to be of the canonical age in order to receive the episcopate, [] or an abbey or a parish, 9 by more than three years: except in especially rare cases, and here the cardinals will be previously consulted. To the English the pope promises still more. The law already provides that more than one benefice shall never be granted to the same person (unless he is of noble birth or of outstanding learning), and the present custom by which lords (both temporal and spiritual) obtain dispensations from this law is to cease, and the rule be observed. Again, in England, the Holy See has of late years granted an unusual number of dispensations to allow beneficed clerics not to proceed to the needed holy orders and still keep their benefices,

to the great scandal of the Church. All these dispensations are now revoked, and those who hold them must obey the common law in this matter and seek ordination, if they are otherwise suitable for ordination. Also, in England, it has been a serious obstacle to the cure of souls, and a cause of contempt for the bishops' administration, that papal dispensations have allowed beneficed clerics to live away from their posts and archdeacons to make their visitations by proxy. For the future such dispensations are not to be granted without reasonable cause which must be expressed in the dispensations; all dispensations granted so far without such cause are revoked, and it is left to the bishop to determine which these are. Likewise the pope revokes all faculties by virtue of which religious in England have obtained benefices, except in cases where the religious has actually been put in possession. For the future no such faculties will be conceded.

The beneficiary, once appointed and installed, pays to the Roman Curia, as a tax, one year's revenue -- annates. This was now fixed as the amount for which the benefice was inscribed in the papal tax books under the heading *servitia communia*. [] If this is not a just amount the beneficiary's case will be heard, and a new assessment made, due account being taken of such special circumstances as a country's poverty at a particular time. Annates, also, will only be asked once in any one year, even though there is more than one change in the incumbency during that time; and an incumbent is no longer to be liable for his predecessor's arrears of annates. To France, then ravaged by the invasion of Henry V and the civil war, Martin V made the special concession that only half the annates would be asked for the next five years. To England the pope made the concession that there should, for the future, be no appropriations of parish churches [] unless the bishop of the diocese has satisfied himself that religion will really benefit from them. All appropriations made during the schism are annulled.

The sole remaining changes of general importance are the regulations about indulgences. While in France, Spain and Italy the pope decided to make no changes, to the bishops of Germany he promised to be more careful for the future in granting indulgences, "lest they became cheapened, " and he revoked all those granted since 1378 in imitation of previous indulgences. [] To England also he gave a special pledge. Here

the numerous indulgences granted by the Holy See to those who visited certain shrines or made offerings to them, and the special faculties enjoyed by those administering to such pilgrims the sacrament of penance -- together with the collectors [of alms for pious objects], of whom, it is stated, there are far too many in England -- are for many people, the concordat states, an occasion of sin. These people scorn their own parish clergy, and desert their parish churches for the shrines where these indulgences and absolutions can be had, and they take thither the tithes and offerings due to their parish churches. The bishops are given power to enquire into these scandals and to suspend the indulgences and the special faculties of confessors, and they are to report the matter to the pope that he may revoke these privileges.

The concordats were only to run for five years -- perhaps because, in accordance with the decree Frequens, the General Council would then reassemble? -- but the English concordat is noted as binding for all time. []

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



CHAPTER 4: FIFTY CRITICAL YEARS, 1420-1471

1. *THE MENACE OF HERESY AND SCHISM, 1420-1449*

THE task before Martin V was immense; [] his resources were scanty; the greatest of his difficulties were perhaps, as yet, scarcely known. Never was it to be more forcibly brought home to any pope that the pope's real power is a moral power. It was true that the Church was once more united in its acknowledgment of a single head. But bound up with this fact that Martin V was the universally acknowledged single head of the Church, were such other facts as those revolutionary proceedings at the late council in which, as Cardinal Odo Colonna, Martin V too had played his part; and from which council he had emerged as pope. The new pope's prestige was inevitably bound up with the proceedings at Constance. Some of the acts of that council no pope could accept and remain pope; and yet, any immediate blunt repudiation of them would probably have thrown Christendom back into all the chaos of the schism. Here was a first weakness bound to hamper the pope once he faced the task of rebuilding Sion.

A second weakness derived from the inability of the recent reforming councils even to diagnose, much less prescribe for, the main evils that were eating away the vitality of religion. What was to be devised at Trent, a hundred and fifty years later—whether through drastic reorganisation such as to make the worst abuses simply impossible, or whether, through the invention of such new methods and institutions as the diocesan seminary, to do vital work which in all these centuries had never yet been done -- all this needed to have been done, given the times and the nature of the crisis, at Constance.

But it was with the old machinery, the very machinery to whose defects the disaster of the schism had been largely due, that the popes after Constance had to do their work. Whatever their good intentions, their zeal, and their realisation that a reformation of Christian life was imperative, they were bound, under such conditions, in great part to fail. Things were to be very much worse, before they were ever given a real chance of becoming

permanently very much better.

Martin V knew that he must return to Rome and, somehow, bring it about that the Papal State was a stronghold for the security of the freedom of the popes in their government of the Church. He knew too that he must exercise the new, radically anti-Catholic theory that popes are subordinate to General Councils; and yet he must contrive not to alienate the influential churchmen who had either invented this view, or adopted it as a way out of the long deadlock of the schism. He knew he must reform the general life of all Christians, clerical and lay. He probably did not realise, as yet, that the Turkish conquest of south-eastern Europe was imminent; nor of what immense consequence to Christendom that revival of letters was so soon to prove, the first beginnings of which he was now unconsciously patronising. Problem, then, of the new theories about General Councils; problem of the independence of the Papal States; problem of the reform of Christian life; problem of the Turks; problem of the Renaissance -- here, in rough summary, is the task before the popes in all the hundred years between Constance and Luther.

The Council of Constance assembled for the last time on April 22, 1418, and Martin V, refusing the French suggestion that he should re-establish the papacy at Avignon, and Sigismund's offer of a Germany city, made his way towards Italy. He moved slowly and with the greatest caution, by way of Berne and Geneva and Milan. In five months he had got no further than Mantua, where he wintered, and in February 1419 he moved to Florence. The condition of the pope's own territory offered him little prospect, either of security or real freedom of action; Bologna was an independent republic; various other new "states" had been carved out by the successful condottieri; Benevento, and Rome itself, were held by the Neapolitans. Gradually the pope's diplomacy brought about the restoration of Rome, and also won over the actual ruler of central Italy, Braccio di Montone. Bologna was subdued by July 1420, and on the last day of September Martin V made his solemn entry into Rome a city of ruins, and deserted, grass-grown streets, into which the wolves came, unhindered, by night to ravish from the cemeteries the corpses of the newly-buried dead.

But the recovery of his states was not the only critically urgent

problem to harass the pope on the morrow of the great council; Catholicism was now fighting for its life in Bohemia, and the crusade against the new heretics was beginning to be a catastrophic failure. Bohemia, after Constance, was like Egypt after Chalcedon; a heretic had been condemned at the General Council and punished who was, at the same time, a national leader; and the reaction against the council, involving the cause of Czech culture against German imperialism, so shook the hold of the papacy on these lands that never again could the popes take their spiritual allegiance for granted. The event was a first demonstration -- had some gift of prophecy been granted the pope whereby to read the fullness of the sign -- of what could happen, and would henceforth happen repeatedly, when propagation of anti-Catholic doctrine was bound up with a people's ambition to assert itself as a nation or as possessed of a specifically national culture. This first Bohemian war of religion lasted for seventeen years (1419-1436). It ended in a compromise which, nominally, was to the advantage of the Catholics. But the memory of the long succession of national victories over the Catholic crusaders -- brought in from every part of Europe -- never died out; more than once, in the years between the settlement of 1436 and Luther, the war flared up again. Bohemia, for the generation to which Luther spoke, was a watchword, whether of warning or of promise, and down to our own day the memory of the heretic burnt at Constance, John Hus, [] has been the constant rallying point of all that is militant and revolutionary in the patriotism of the Czechs.

What made the fortunes of the religious theories which Hus preached was the circumstance that his appearance as a religious leader coincided with the critical hour of a great national renaissance, fruit of the wise and capable rule of Charles IV (1347-1378). In the later fourteenth century, as to-day, the land of the Czechs, the kingdom of Bohemia and the margravate of Moravia, was a country where very varied influences -- national, social, cultural -- fought for mastery. Both the kingdom and the margravate, which were now united under the one ruler, were vassal states to the German king, and part of the Holy Roman Empire. Everywhere there were pockets of German settlers. Many of the native nobility had gladly surrendered to the influence of German culture; many of the traders were German too; and for centuries the sees of the kingdom had been subject to metropolitan sees in Germany. The

Czech Catholics had, however, a strong anti-German tradition that went back for hundreds of years. Catholicism had originally come to them through missionaries of the Greek rite, the famous ninth-century saints, Cyril and Methodius. Later they had been "Latinised, " and from resentment of this -- it is said -- there was among them a certain anti-papal tradition, and an especial resentment of two reforms for which the medieval popes were responsible, their revival of the ancient discipline of clerical celibacy and the practice of administering the Holy Eucharist under the form of bread alone.

Fourteenth-century Bohemia had all its share of the chronic ills of late medieval Catholicism, worldliness, simony and evil living among the higher clergy, and general slackness among the parochial clergy and in the monasteries; and the Waldensian heretics were more numerous here than in any other part of Europe outside their native mountain fastnesses. But from the time when the Emperor Charles IV -- Luxemburger by birth, French by upbringing -- made the development of his hereditary kingdom of Bohemia the central purpose of his life -- and so determined the Czech renaissance -- the country had seen a succession of vigorous and plain-spoken reformers of ecclesiastical life, most of them orthodox Catholics. As a reformer John Hus was, then, only in the tradition of his age. But where others had but talent he had genius, and in addition to all his religious and ascetic qualities he was a great Czech. He was also to prove himself a great heretic, and in the main his heresies were importations from the England of Richard II. The first begetter, indeed, of all these ideas which served to promote the long Bohemian wars was an Oxford theologian, a one-time scholar and Master of Balliol, John Wyclif.

Wyclif belonged to the generation intermediary between Marsiglio and Hus, and his career as a reformer of Christian life and as a heretic was, like that of Marsiglio, bound up with a quarrel between his sovereign and the Holy See. When this dispute -- which involved no point of traditional Christian doctrine -- brought the English theologian for the first time into public life, he was a man just past his fortieth year. Parliament, in 1365, had passed a law protecting, against the pope's jurisdiction, suits about benefices, a matter in which the royal courts had always claimed jurisdiction. The pope, Urban V, retaliated by asking for the payment of the tribute due from

England as a vassal kingdom of the Holy See -- but now thirty-three years in arrears -- and threatening, should this not be paid, to sue for the penalties provided in King John's surrender of his kingdom one hundred and fifty years before. The storm which this reply raised may be imagined. The whole country -- king, lords, commons, prelates and barons for once united -- joined to repudiate, and for ever, not only the arrears but the papal suzerainty itself. King John, they said, had acted without the consent of, the nation; his surrender therefore was void in law and fact. It was as a champion of the nation against the pope that Wyclif, on this occasion, entered literature and public life. Five years later, when a "cabinet" made up of ecclesiastics was displaced by a lay ministry, Wyclif was again to the fore, inspiring one of the earliest proposals to disendow the Church for the profit of the State; and when, in 1374, the long dispute with the papacy which had dragged on since the crisis of 1366 was settled by the Concordat of Bruges, Wyclif was one of the royal commissioners appointed to negotiate the treaty.

These were the years when the long reign of Edward III was coming to its end in a misery of incompetence and scandal. The sins of churchmen did not escape the censure of this disillusioned and discontented time, as the bitter language of a petition of the House of Commons "against the pope and the cardinals" remains to show. In language which, to the very words, re-echoes what St. Catherine of Siena was saying at that very moment, it is there said, "The court of Rome should be a source of sanctity to all the nations, but the traffickers in holy things ply their evil trade in the sinful city of Avignon, and the pope shears his flock but does not feed it. " [] When the Prince of Wales -- the Black Prince -- died, June 8, 1376, the prospect of better days was indefinitely lessened, for now the chief person in the realm was his younger brother, the weak, blustering intriguer John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster. The duke was also the anti-clerical leader, and Wyclif now seemed likely to become a force in the national life. But he overplayed his hand, and his anti-clerical harangues in the London churches gave the Bishop of London an opportunity to cite him for trial (19 February, 1377). Wyclif appeared, with Lancaster to escort him. There was a bitter quarrel between the duke and the bishop and then the mob, friendly to Wyclif but hostile to the duke, broke up the assembly before the trial began. There, for the time, the matter ended.

But in May, that same year, Gregory XI, to whom nineteen propositions taken from Wyclif's works had been delated -- by whom we do not know -- wrote a stern reproof to the Archbishop of Canterbury for his sloth and indifference in this vital matter. The pope condemned the propositions, and the primate was ordered to arrest Wyclif, to interrogate him about them, and to hold him prisoner until the pope's judgment on his answers was made known. However, by the time these instructions reached the primate, a great change had come over English life. In June 1377 Edward III had died; the new king was a boy of ten, and the new parliament decidedly anti-papal. Lancaster was, for the moment, all-powerful, and Wyclif safe. Then in the following March the pope died, and within a few months his successor, Urban VI, had the problem of the election of Clement VII to distract him from the question of Wyclif's heresies. But the English bishops, once William Courtney had been translated from London to succeed as primate the feeble Simon of Sudbury, [] pursued the heresiarch relentlessly. At a great council in May 1382 twenty-four of Wyclif's doctrines were condemned as opposed to Catholic teaching, [] he was expelled from the university and forbidden to teach. Whereupon he retired to his rectory of Lutterworth and gave himself to writing what was to be the most popularly effective of all his works, the Trialogus, and at Lutterworth he died of paralysis on the last day of 1384.

It was Wyclif's thought which formed the mind of John Hus, and of a whole generation of Czech theological rebels. That thought had developed in the way the thought of most heretics develops who would, at the same time, be practical reformers of institutions. The new ideas are, in very great part, the product of exasperation at authority's indifference to serious abuses, and there is only a difference of detail between Gregory XI's condemnation of the nascent heresy in 1377 and Martin V's, of the finished heresiarch, forty years later. Gregory XI, in a letter to Edward III, drew special attention to the social mischievousness of the heresy, and to the bishops he noted how Wyclif repeated Marsiglio and John of Jandun. []

In the nineteen propositions condemned by Gregory XI in 1377, Wyclif, like Marsiglio, proposes as the ideal a Church which is no Church at all. Its sacramental jurisdiction is declared to be superfluous, its external jurisdiction is so hedged about that it

ceases to be a reality, while all clerics are to be answerable to the lay power for the whole of their conduct; the clergy are to be incapable of ownership and the Church's ownership is to be at the discretion of the prince. Five years later Wyclif is explicitly stating that all sacerdotal sacramental powers disappear once a priest or bishop falls into mortal sin, and that the pope in such circumstances ceases to be pope; the Schism is now four years old and for Wyclif this is, he says so explicitly, the opportunity to abolish the papal office for ever. He has already emancipated the prince from the Church's jurisdiction, and now he does as much for the preachers. Also he declares that the religious orders are manifest and inevitable hindrances to salvation, and that the great saints who founded them are in hell, unless they died repentant of their life's work; for a friar to ask alms, for a layman to give to him, is damnation for both. But what struck Wyclif's contemporaries as the crowning wickedness was his revival of the old heresy of Berengarius, namely that in the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist Jesus Christ is not really and corporally present. The Mass, he said, had no warrant in Holy Scripture, and Scripture -- this is a doctrine of his last years -- is the sole source and test of religious truth. All men can understand Scripture, for as they read it the Holy Spirit will make its meaning clear to them; and Wyclif's efforts to bring the Bible to the ordinary man have given him a well-known place in the history of Bible translators. Another doctrine of Wyclif's later years was fatalism -- all things happen as they do because they must so happen; yet another was a revival of the old heresy that oaths are always unlawful. Learning, he said, universities and university degrees were the invention of the devil; and again, that to the devil God must be obedient, for it is God who is the real author of our sins. []

In this year, 1382, which saw the great condemnation of the English heretic, the English king, Richard II, married the sister of the King of Bohemia -- the Emperor Wenzel -- the daughter of the late king and emperor Charles IV. One effect of the marriage was to bring into close contact the universities of Oxford and Prague, and thereby to introduce Wyclif's theories to Bohemia. It was not, however, until the first years of the new century that his main theological work, the *Triologus*, reached Prague, [] and the man who, already familiar with Wyclif's philosophical writings and won over by his violent condemnation of clerical sins, was from this time on to prove himself Wyclif's second self. John

Hus was now thirty-three years of age, rector of the university, and incumbent of the Bethlehem Church lately founded for the preaching of sermons in Czech, and already, through the sermons and lectures of Hus, "a university for the people." Hus was not a particularly good theologian, but he was a great orator and preacher, a severe critic of the ways of his clerical brethren and a man of extremely austere life. Once he was won over to the English theories all Prague would soon be taking sides for or against them.

The fight opened when, in the next year (1403), the ecclesiastical authority in the Czech capital condemned the twenty-four Wyclifite theses condemned at Oxford in 1382 and another twenty-one also extracted from his works. There was a second condemnation in 1405, at the demand of Innocent VII, and a third in 1408. Hus had accepted the condemnation of 1403, but five years of effort as a reformer had turned him into an extremist. The clergy's attachment to goods, he was now saying, was a heresy, and as for Wyclif -- who had thundered against it in much the same terms -- Hus prayed to be next to him in heaven. Hus was now suspended from preaching, but as the king continued to favour him he disregarded the prohibition. There was a schism in the university -- where the German, anti-Czech element was strongly anti-Wyclif -- and presently a solemn burning of Wyclifite literature. Hus was now excommunicated, first by the Archbishop of Prague and then by Cardinal Colonna [] acting for John XXIII, and Prague was laid under an interdict, so long as he remained there. In 1411 he appealed from the pope to a General Council; in 1412 a still heavier excommunication was pronounced against him; he began to organise his following among the Czech nobles, and when, at the king's request, he left Prague, it was to spread his teaching by sermons in the country villages and the fields. Prague, and indeed all Bohemia, were now in great confusion. The king still supported Hus and exiled his Catholic opponents, even putting two of them to death, and the crisis was the first topic to occupy the General Council summoned at Rome by John XXIII in 1413, from which came a fresh condemnation of Wyclifite doctrine. When it was announced by the emperor that a new council was to meet at Constance, Hus declared that he would appear before it, to defend the truth of his teaching, and on October 11, 1414, with a body of associates and an escort of Czech nobles, he set out from Prague. He reached Constance on November 3, two days

after the solemn entry of John XXIII. For both of them the city was to prove a prison, but for Hus a prison whence he was to go forth only to his execution.

The story of the trial of John Hus at the Council of Constance is too important in its detail to risk a summary history's distortion of it. His heresy was manifest and the longer the discussions continued the more clearly was it proved. He refused to abandon his beliefs, and, declared a heretic, on July 6, 1415, he was handed over for execution to the town authorities, and burnt at the stake that same day. One year later his associate, Jerome of Prague, a layman, after trial before the council, suffered the like fate.

Death by execution of the capital sentence was, before the Victorian Age, the common lot of the malefactor everywhere. Thieves, forgers, coiners ended at the gallows then, as surely and as inevitably as do murderers with us. Nor was there much ado about the gravity of their fate. And heresy was, by universal consent, a crime of the worst kind. These were by no means the first executions which the fifteenth century saw for this particular offence, nor the last. But they were the first that ever caused, in any community, a general reprobation of the authority by which they were brought about. Their effect in Bohemia was amazing. Four hundred and fifty Czech nobles signed a protestation to the king, and a solemn league and covenant was sworn, by which it was agreed to defy the condemnation of the doctrines Hus had preached, to ignore the proscription of Hussite literature, and to defend against ecclesiastical authority the priests who were of the new way. To one point of ritual -- which, indeed, had never been a great consideration with Hus -- the party gave much importance, namely that Holy Communion should be administered under both forms, and this became with them the badge and the criterion and the shibboleth of Hussite orthodoxy; whence the general names of Calixtines and Utraquists. []

King Wenzel was personally hostile to all this movement, but, as ever, weak and incapable of action; his consort was strongly in its favour. The king had no children. His heir was his brother, the Emperor Sigismund, than whom none was more orthodox, and who would hardly bear it indifferently that his brother's impotence should now lose him a kingdom. But on August 16,

1419, Wenzel died, and in anticipation of Sigismund's repression the Hussites prepared for war. Unfortunately for the new king and for the cause of the Catholics, the Hussites had a general of genius, John Zizka, and Zizka did not wait to be attacked. Presently he was master of the capital. After centuries of foreign rulers the Czech race was master in its own land (1420).

The epic of the Hussite wars must be read elsewhere; the story of how, first under Zizka and after his death under Procop, the Czechs successfully defied the Catholic-Imperialist coalition and brought to nothing the successive crusades organised under the authority of Martin V. After Zizka, in 1420, had compelled Sigismund to raise the siege of Prague (July to November) there was, indeed, an effort to reach agreement, to unite Hussites and Catholics and also to reconcile the factions into which, already, the Hussites were themselves dividing. The Four Articles of Prague -- proposed by the Hussites as a basis of agreement -- provided that in the Czech lands there should be full liberty of preaching, that all those guilty of mortal sin should receive due punishment, that the clergy should lose all rights of ownership, and that Holy Communion should be administered under both species. But though the papal legates were not to be inveigled into the labyrinth which these vague and ambiguous propositions concealed, the Archbishop of Prague accepted the articles, and a kind of national church was set up. Then a political revolution set a Lithuanian prince on the throne of Bohemia and soon the war was on once more. Within three months (October 1421-January 1422) Zizka had destroyed Sigismund's armies, [] and crippled the Catholic effort for the next few years.

It was only the divisions among the Hussites that now kept the party from a permanent mastery of Bohemia. The quarrels between the moderates -- Catholic in all but their attachment [] to the use of the chalice in Holy Communion -- and the extremists, the Taborites, [] who had adopted the full Wyclifite creed and now showed themselves a species of pre- Calvinian Calvinists, developed into a bloody civil war. In this war the Taborites lost their great commander Zizka, but they found a second, of hardly less genius, the priest known as Procop the Great. In the hope of ending the dissensions, and in order to compel the Catholics to acquiesce in a settlement, Procop in 1426 took the offensive. Once more there were bloody defeats

for the crusaders, and the Czechs invaded Hungary and Silesia, wasting and destroying countrysides and towns. Sigismund, to halt the advance, now offered to negotiate, but the Czechs would have none of it, and in December 1429 they invaded Germany itself. The main army ravaged Saxony, while flying columns carried the work of destruction and terror into the north. The imperial commander now accepted their terms, and in return for an indemnity, and the pledge of a settlement based on the Four Articles of 1420, Procop fell back on Bohemia (February 1430). But Martin V, far from accepting such terms, prepared a new crusade, and to organise it he sent to Germany the most capable man in his service, Giuliano Cesarini. [] The question now, it seemed, was not so much when the Czechs would be crushed, but rather whether all Germany would not soon be Hussite. Not since the days when Innocent III made a stand against the Albigenses had Catholicism faced such a possibility of catastrophe.

Cesarini did his work well and presently a new army of crusaders was in the field. It invaded Bohemia in August 1431 and, almost immediately, it suffered one of the bloodiest routs of all, at Taussig, on August 14, when the Czechs again slew the fleeing Germans by the thousand. This was the end of the papal attempt to crush the heretics by force of arms. Orthodoxy, lacking commanders of military genius, will never -- except by a miracle -- triumph over heretics possessed of such commanders and leading troops passionately interested in victory. Cesarini, who had greatly distinguished himself on the battlefield by his brave endeavour to rally the panic-stricken host, seems to have realised to the full how strong the Hussites were, and why. From this time on he turned all his ingenuity to discover a means of arresting and containing their hostility by some scheme of concessions. The instrument he proposed to use was the General Council summoned by Martin V to meet at Basel in the very summer of the great defeat, and to preside over which Cesarini had been appointed at the same time that he was commissioned for the affairs of Bohemia. But Cesarini's plan was immediately complicated by a desperate crisis within this council itself.

The anti-papal spirit that had so largely inspired the debates in the Councils of Pisa and Constance was once again in action at Basel. If Constance had been orthodox enough to burn John

Hus, it had been as anti-papal as Hus himself when it decreed that the General Council is the pope's superior, with a right to punish his disobedience to its decrees; and at Basel the pattern and precedent of Constance would now be followed in every jot and tittle. From the beginning the council would show itself, if zealous against the heretics, determined to control the negotiations with them, and at the same time to control the papacy too. The crisis opened by the Hussites was to be turned, now, to something still more threatening, and the popes to be caught between the Wyclifite heresy, militant and successful, without, and the rebels within, sapping and mining the very basis of papal authority and of the unity which is the Church's life. The history of the Council of Basel, which tormented the popes for a good eighteen years (1431-1449), made clear beyond doubt the existence of the most subtle danger of all, namely the persistence of a mentality among theologians and canonists and bishops -- a mentality very welcome to princes -- which would transform the reality of the divinely organised primacy, while it left unchanged and unchallenged the outward appearance and reverence, and the mass of the traditional Catholic beliefs.

The popes of the time -- Martin V and Eugene IV -- were well aware of the danger, and of the weaknesses in their position. To control and arrest the new development, on which the great assembly at Constance had conferred such prestige, was indeed the main anxiety of their reigns, the need urgent beyond all else, and because of which, in a structure that seemed to shake and totter uneasily with every speech, anything so challenging as the needed ruthless destruction of abuses must be indefinitely postponed. Neither of these popes was -- it is true -- a great man in any sense. Neither will, for example, stand comparison not only with such contemporary bishops as St. Antoninus [] or St. Laurence Giustiniani, [] but even with such contemporaries as the cardinals they created, with Cesarini, let us say, or Capranica or Albergati, the great Carthusian bishop of Bologna. Martin V and Eugene IV were, indeed, mediocre popes, but the ultimate reason for the apparent sterility of the thirty years after Constance, and for the apparent incompetence with which these two popes met the successive councils, was something far deeper than their own personal incapacity.

At Constance, acceptance of the old Catholic idea that the pope was answerable to God alone for his rule of the Church had

suffered badly. The relation of Pope and Church, as this gathering had set it out, no pope could accept. [] And in less than a month after the dissolution of the council the very pope it had elected made this clear. Martin V had not, while the council was still assembled, confirmed any of its acts except its condemnations of the Wyclifite heresies. This [] was his sole reference to the critical activities that had filled the last four years. But, on May 10, 1418, in public consistory, dismissing an appeal from the Polish ambassadors (against the decision that John of Falkenburg had not been condemned by the council), the pope declared, "It is not lawful for anyone to appeal against the judge who is supreme, that is to say, against the judgment of the Holy See, of the Roman Pontiff, the vicar of Jesus Christ, nor to evade his judgments in matters of faith; these last, in fact, because of their superior importance, must be brought for judgment to the pope's tribunal. " []

Yet once again the phenomenon was seen how the most unlikely man, once elected pope, became a man of principle in matters of faith. Odo Colonna, created cardinal by a pope of the Roman line (Innocent VII), had in 1408 deserted the Roman pope Gregory XII and joined with the rebels from the Avignon camp to set up the Council of Pisa. There he had played his part in the " deposition " of Gregory XII, and in the " election " of Alexander V. He had also his share of responsibility for the "election" of John XXIII, and when Constance, five years later, put this pope in the dock, he had been a principal witness for the prosecution. What were the personal opinions of the cardinal Odo Colonna about the powers of General Councils over popes, and about the validity of these successive depositions in which he had played his part? Contemporaries describe him as a simple, amiable man, free from any spirit of intrigue, not at all self-opinionated or obstinate; the last man in the world, one would have said, to hinder the further evolution of the work in which he had played his own important part.

Martin V did not, however, publish to the Church this manifestation of his mind made, publicly enough, in the consistory, at the very outset of his reign. [] He would not, he could not, accept the principle on which Constance had founded so much of its action. But, on the other hand, he did not refuse to be bound by its prescription that a new council should meet in 1423 and yet another in 1430. It was his policy to lie as low as

he was let, and to say as near to nothing as was possible. And so the twelve years of his reign were no more than an uneasy truce.

Martin V duly opened the General Council of Pavia (April 23, 1423), arranged and announced at Constance five years earlier (April 19, 1418). The legates appointed to preside (February 22, 1423) found awaiting them in the city of the council two abbots, from Burgundy. During the next two months four bishops arrived, two of them from England. Then in June the legates transferred the council to Siena -- the plague had broken out in Pavia, and the pope could come to Siena, whereas Pavia was a city in the territory of his enemy, the Duke of Milan. It was November before the first general session was held -- and even then no more than twenty-five bishops had appeared. But decrees were passed against the Hussites, and reprobating slackness in the pursuit and punishment of heretics. Then the handful of bishops came to the practical business of reform, and the storm began in earnest. The pope had given the legates the power to transfer the council from the city where it was convoked, and one party in the council now declared that such a grant was a violation of the law [] made at Constance. The French were demanding that the nations should have their say in the nomination of cardinals. The ghost of Benedict XIII (dead at last [] in the opening months of the council), appeared when the King of Aragon recognised his successor "Clement VIII" and intrigued with the Republic of Siena to secure recognition for him in the very city of Pope Martin's council. Then a friar preached before the council a strange sermon in which he explained that, like Our Lady, the Church had two spouses. There had been St. Joseph (who obeyed her) and the Holy Ghost whom Our Lady herself obeyed: so the Church, too, must obey the Holy Ghost but could command her other spouse, the pope. The months were going by without the Church in general showing any interest in the council, and the council was proving itself no more than a debating society on the solitary, but inexhaustible, topic of conciliar supremacy. There were, of course, those whom these debates bored, and presently they began to make their way home. The legates made their plans accordingly and announcing that the next council would meet at Basel in 1431, they dissolved the Council of Siena (March 7, 1424).

The pope promised that he would himself reform the curia, and the decrees he published [] have been taken, not unnaturally, as the measure either of his inability to recognise wrongdoing when he saw it, or else of his indifference. For they are little more than pious generalities about the need for cardinals and their suites to set a good example to the rest of mankind, and a repetition, for the hundredth time, of ancient laws about their dress and ornaments. []

"The very word 'council' filled Martin V with horror, " said a contemporary. There was every reason why it should; [] and as the time drew near for the council at Basel, to which he was pledged, placards appeared on doors of St. Peter's to remind him of his duty and threaten revolt if he failed in it. On February 1, 1431, he appointed the legate who was to preside, Giuliano Cesarini, and three weeks later Martin V was dead, carried off by apoplexy.

The conclave was short, and its choice (March 3) was unanimous, the Venetian cardinal, Gabriele Condulmaro; he took the name Eugene IV. The new pope was forty-seven years of age, a Canon Regular, and greatly reputed for his austere life. He was a nephew of Gregory XII, and one of those four cardinals whose creation, in 1408, had been the occasion of Gregory's cardinals deserting him and of the subsequent Pisan extension of the schism. As a cardinal Eugene IV had stood loyally by Gregory XII until his abdication. Only then had he taken any part in the council at Constance. The Church had in him a pope whose action would not be hampered by any memories of a past in which he had patronised the new conciliar doctrines and used them as a whip to chastise unworthy popes. But while Eugene IV faced the approaching crisis with this undoubted advantage, he had unhappily inherited something of the vacillation which had ruined the career of his uncle, Gregory XII. And not only had he, like the rest of the cardinals, signed and sworn the pact drawn up in the conclave, [] but as pope he publicly renewed his promises, pledging himself thereby to increase the importance of the cardinals, and to give the Sacred College, as such, a real share in the direction of the Church, making it almost an organ of government. [] The curia was to be reformed in head and members; cardinals would only be chosen according to the decrees of Constance; the pope would ask their advice about the new General Council and would be guided by it; and, as well

as guaranteeing them a half of the main papal revenues, he would not, without their consent, make treaties and alliances nor any declaration of war; finally, all vassals of the Holy See would henceforth, swear allegiance not only to the pope, but to the Sacred College too.

Cesarini, it has been said, [] had been given a two-fold commission by Martin V. He was to preside at the council and also to organise, in Germany, the new crusade against the Hussites. The new pope confirmed both the commissions. Actually, the more urgent matter now was the Hussite invasion of Germany, and so while the fathers of the council made their slow way to Basel, and while the pope was beginning to turn his own thoughts to the new offers of reunion from the emperor at Constantinople, the legate to the council was busy preaching the Holy War in Germany and organising supplies for the army. On June 27 Eugene had sent word to him that the opening of the council might wait until the Hussites had been settled, but that settlement proved to be the disastrous defeat of Tauszig. [] It was with this dreadful catastrophe still very fresh in his mind, and with a certitude about the fact and the nature of the crisis before the Church, that Cesarini, only three weeks after the battle, came to the council (September 9).

The legate's first act was to begin a vigorous campaign to secure a better attendance. So far, in fact, it was the experience of Pavia and Siena all over again, a mere handful of prelates who could not conceivably be taken to represent anything but themselves. However, on December 14, after three months more of publicity, the legate held the first solemn general session.

And now began the long story of misunderstanding and cross purposes, not only between the anti-papal majority at the council and the Holy See, but between the pope and his legate. For, nearly five weeks before this solemn opening, Eugene had despatched to Cesarini a new commission which, reciting with great detail all the hindrances that were making, and must make, this council such another miserable fiasco as Siena had been, gave the legate power to dissolve it, and to announce a new council to be held at Bologna in the summer of 1433, without prejudice to the council which Constance had decreed must meet round about 1440. This new commission did not, however, reach the legate until nine days after the opening session, at

which the one piece of business accomplished had been to re-affirm the fundamental decree *Frequens* of Constance. Had the legate known it, a second, still more drastic, commission was already on its way to him. Even before Cesarini had received the first, Eugene IV, on December 18, had signed a bull dissolving the council, and giving as the determining reason the invitation which it had sent to the Hussites (on October 30), to attend and state their case. The second bull came to Cesarini's knowledge on January 10, 1432, and although he did not leave Basel he ceased from that date, to preside over the council.

From the moment when Eugene IV, in 1431, decided to bring the council at Basel to an end, and thereby provided the advocates of the new conciliar theory with their opportunity to renew the attack on the traditional practice of the papal supremacy, all other questions sank into comparative insignificance -- even the question of a peace with the victorious, militant Hussites of Bohemia. The story of the council's handling of the Bohemian crisis is, however, closely bound up with the still more involved story of its long duel with the pope; but the history may be more intelligible if the stories are told separately.

The Council of Basel -- as will be told -- decided that it was its duty to ignore the pope's will and to continue in session; and when (February 10, 1432) the Hussites decided to accept its invitation, they were told that, despite the pope's instructions, the council would go on with its work. The next seven months were taken up with diplomatic preliminaries, and especially with the arranging for safe conducts for the Hussites, in which no loophole was left that would allow for their execution as heretics should they fail to convert the council to their way of thinking. In October deputies from Bohemia came to Basel to make the last arrangements, and in January 1433, three hundred Hussites arrived and the discussions began. They continued for more than three months (January 7-April 14), and they settled nothing at all, except the real meaning of the Four Articles of 1420 and the impossibility that any Catholic could accept them. The council proposed amendments that would make the articles acceptable, and when the Hussites returned to Bohemia a deputation from the council went with them, to urge the council's views at Prague.

This mission -- it was the first of five -- remained in Bohemia for

six months (June 1433-January 1434). Its great achievement was the Hussites' acceptance of the articles as the council had amended them -- the so-called Compactata of Prague (November 30, 1433). The Hussites had been divided now for years into mutually hostile sections; and this helped the council's envoys. A further cause for their success -- wholly unconnected with the intrinsic reasonableness of their demands -- was the victory of the Bavarians over the Hussites on September 21, 1433, the first real military disaster which the party had suffered. The Compactata amounted, in the first place, to a treaty of peace. The war was to cease and all ecclesiastical censures on the Hussites to be lifted; they were to have full liberty to administer Holy Communion under both kinds if, in all other respects, they accepted the faith and discipline of the Church and returned to union with it, and it was agreed that priests so administering the Sacrament were to explain to the people that it was equally truly and as well received under the one kind as under both; the demand that those guilty of mortal sin should be punished was allowed, but it was stated explicitly that the power of inflicting punishment on the guilty belonged only to those who possessed jurisdiction over the guilty, and not to private individuals; as for liberty to preach, here again there was a restriction, preachers must first be approved by the appropriate authority; the fourth article, against the cleric's right to own, was also made more precise so that it was now admitted that the clergy could own what came to them by inheritance, or gift, that the Church could own also, and, finally, that while clerics were bound to administer ecclesiastical property like faithful stewards, the property itself could not be taken over by others without the sin of sacrilege.

Obviously the articles so qualified were not the articles for which the enthusiasts had fought in Zizka's armies. They were no sooner signed than a party among the Hussites proposed to re-open the discussion. The envoys went back to Basel to report, and the rival factions among the Hussites began a civil war. On May 30, 1434, the more extreme party were badly defeated, at Lipau, and their great leader Procop was among the slain.

The victors now approached Sigismund with offers of peace and recognition of him as King of Bohemia. The basis of the negotiations was the agreement made at Prague in the previous

November, but when the Hussites met the emperor (Diet of Ratisbon, August 22-September 2, 1434), they demanded that the use of the chalice in the administration of Holy Communion should be compulsory. The council's envoys, however, stood firm for liberty, and the Hussites had to yield. When these, however, came to make their report to the Bohemian Diet at Prague (October 23), the Diet put out for Sigismund's acceptance thirteen points, many of them altogether new; such for example, as that bishops in Bohemia should henceforth be elected by their clergy and people, and that the pope should exercise no jurisdiction over criminous Czech clerics.

The council's envoys refused to accept the novelties; war broke out once more between the Hussite factions; and then, when the moderates were again victorious, the council at Sigismund's request, sent yet another commission -- the fourth -- to try and negotiate a peace. The scene of the negotiations this time (July-August 1435) was Brno in Moravia. Here the Hussites stood stubbornly by their demand for the thirteen points, while the Basel legates asked how a party could expect further concessions which had not yet honoured the pledges solemnly given in the Compactata of 1433? The single result of the conference was that Sigismund -- weary after sixteen years' exclusion from his kingdom -- began to lean towards the Hussites, to whom he made, in great secrecy, the promise that he would somehow secure for them recognition of their thirteen points (July 6, 1435). [] The final breakdown came when the Hussites asked for a change in the wording of the article about Church property, and on September 16, after eight months' absence, the envoys returned to Basel.

Seven weeks later they were taking the road once more. The peace party -- so Sigismund reported to the council -- had now triumphed at Prague. He was recognised as king, the council was to be accepted, but, the right of the Czechs to elect their bishops must be conceded. The envoys were, then, commissioned to attend the diet about to meet at Stuhlweissenburg, and to obtain first of all a guarantee that the obligations sworn to in the Compactata would be honoured, and also that there would be liberty for all to communicate as they chose; if driven to it the legates could accept the Hussite modification of the articles about Church property. The diet opened on December 20, 1435, and on December 28 the envoys

bluntly put it to the emperor that he was playing a double game. The storm that followed raged for days and on January 1, 1436, the envoys demanded a written promise from the emperor that he would not interfere in matters of Church discipline. The Hussites strongly opposed them. A compromise was arranged -- Sigismund was to make the promise to the legates verbally, but there was to be no mention of it in the treaties. All was now ready for the solemn promulgation of the Compactata, but the act was deferred until a new diet should meet at Iglau. Here, in June 1436, the old controversy began all over again, but at long last, on July 5, the Compactata were published, and on August 14 Sigismund was recognised as King of Bohemia.

The war was over at last, and a peace patched up by which the Hussites were recognised -- by the Council of Basel -- as Catholics. But the peace rested on pledges which no real Hussite ever, for a moment, intended to honour. On the very morrow of the great ceremony of reconciliation, the Archbishop of Prague publicly broke the agreement about the manner of administering Holy Communion, in the very city where the ceremony had taken place.

A few weeks later there was another shift in the balance of the Hussite factions, and he fell from power. Once again a delegation left Prague to report the change to the council, but it arrived to find the fathers of Basel facing the most anxious hour of their history. The enforced long-suffering of the pope had at last reached its end. The council was under orders to transfer itself to Ferrara. None of its negotiations with the Hussites had as yet been submitted to the pope for his judgment, nor would they now ever be submitted to him. For the council was about to disobey the bull translating it, and so itself to incur an excommunication as real as any that had ever lain upon the Hussites.

While the last scenes of the tragic farce were being acted at Basel, Sigismund died (December 9, 1437), and the lately pacified kingdom of Bohemia split yet once again into civil war, the prelude to years of anarchy. The danger to Christendom from militant Wyclifism was indeed over; but the Hussites remained, very much alive in Bohemia; and Bohemia was now a frontier province of Christendom, for the Turkish conquest of south-eastern Europe had begun, and the long Turkish

occupation of the lands between the Adriatic and the Carpathians.

When, in January 1432, it had come to the knowledge of the council at Basel that Eugene IV had issued a bull dissolving it, the council did not refuse to obey him, nor simply ignore his act, but in a solemn general session (February 15) it re-enacted the decree of Constance which laid it down that it is the pope's duty to obey a General Council, and the council's duty to punish his disobedience, and that without its own consent a General Council cannot be dissolved nor transferred to another place. Eleven days later, the bishops of France came together (under the king's patronage) at Bourges; their meetings continued for six weeks, and they begged and exhorted the pope to continue the good work being done at Basel. The emperor, Sigismund, also intervened strongly on the council's behalf, only to draw from the pope a curt reminder that this was an ecclesiastical affair. And the council pressed on to beg the pope to withdraw his decree of dissolution, and also to cite him to take his place at Basel. The cardinals too, were "invited" and given three months in which to appear. [] These citations were nailed to the doors of St. Peter's on June 6, and on June 20 the council made special regulations to provide for an election should the pope chance to die, and it also forbade the pope to create any new cardinals while the present misunderstanding continued.

On August 20, 1432, the council was given the pope's reply. Eugene granted practically everything the council had demanded, but he did not grant it in the way they demanded. The council was allowed to continue its negotiations with the Hussites, and to plan the reformation of clerical life in Germany, and it could choose another city for the coming council instead of Bologna. But the council wanted an explicit withdrawal of the decree dissolving it, and an acknowledgment that without its own consent it could not be dissolved (September 3). General Councils alone, the pope was told, were infallible. At this moment the council consisted of three cardinals and some thirty-two other prelates, though the lower clergy (and especially the doctors) were there in great numbers. England too, however, had joined with France and the emperor to support the council, and -- what must have weighed very heavily indeed with a pope who recalled the crisis of 1408 -- out of the twenty-one cardinals only six were securely on his side. Then, in the last week of

1432, the council gave Eugene sixty days to withdraw his decree, and to approve, without any reservation, all it had enacted; and the council declared null all nominations made by him until he obeyed it.

The sixty days went by, and Eugene did not surrender; but in a bull of December 14, 1432, he explained that the coming council at Bologna would really be a continuation of that at Basel, and that only in this sense did he intend to dissolve the Council of Basel. But this did not relieve the situation at all, and the council grimly persisted that the pope must acknowledge that what had been going on at Basel continuously since the beginning was a General Council, guided by the Holy Spirit. There were, again, long and impassioned discussions between the pope's envoys and the council (March 7-10, 1433), and then, on April 27, the eleventh general session published eight new decrees which completed the fettering of the papacy that Constance had begun.

The pope next appointed new presidents for the council -- a tacit recognition that it still existed -- but the council would not recognise them: the pope must be explicit in his withdrawal of the decree of dissolution. The powers he gave the new legates were too wide for the council's liking; and his act was, in fact, a reassembling of the Council. On July 13 the council took away from the Holy See for ever all right to appoint bishops and abbots, [] and decreed that all future popes must swear to obey this law before being installed. Eugene was threatened with punishment, and reminded how patient the council had been so far and he was now ordered to withdraw the decree and to announce solemnly his acceptance of all that the council had done. []

Eugene meanwhile prepared two bulls, the first of which annulled whatever had been done against the rights of his see (July 29), while the second (August 1) accepted the council as a lawful General Council and formally withdrew the decree of December 18, 1431, that had dissolved it. This still did not satisfy the council. It was not enough that the pope recognised it now, and as from now; he must say that his own decree had never any force, could never have had any force. On the very day that the council made this retort, [] Eugene, at Rome, was making his formal reply to the acts of July 13, quashing and

reprobating this mass of anti-papal legislation.

And now, political necessity cast its shadow over the isolated pope's defiance. The Milanese -- at war with Venice, the pope's homeland, and, because of that, the pope's ally -- invaded the Papal State in force. They won over the pope's own vassals and commanders and he was soon forced out of Rome, a fugitive. What relation there really was between the invaders and the council we do not know -- but they gave out that they came in its name to chastise the pope. Eugene now made a further concession to the council (December 15, 1433). He re-issued the bull of surrender of August 1, 1433, but with the changes which the council had demanded; he admitted now that he had decreed a dissolution in 1431, and that his act had been the cause of grave dissensions; he decreed that the council had been conducted in a canonical way ever since it opened and, as it were, now ordered it to continue its good work, and amongst other things, to reform the papacy. The dissolution then was null, and all sentences against the council are annulled; and the pope no longer demands that the council shall retract its anti-papal decrees. This bull was read in the council on February 5, 1434, and the council declared itself satisfied.

The council now had the ball at its feet. Eugene was presently an exile, [] in Florence, and on June 26, 1434, at the eighteenth general session, the declaration of Constance was published once again, that a General Council derives its power immediately from God and that the pope is bound to obey it in all matters of faith and of the general reform of the Church, and that he is subject to its correction should he disobey. From the unhappy pope there came not a sign that he was aware of this dangerous impertinence. []

In silence, and with a newly acquired patience, Eugene IV waited until he could intervene without more loss to his cause than profit. Given a little more rope the council would in the end destroy itself. Month by month, through 1434 and 1435, it assumed to itself one after another of the administrative and executive and juridical functions of the papacy, repeating here the great mistakes made at Constance. Soon there was time for little else. The council occupied itself with the Jewish problem and closed the profession of medicine against the feared and hated race; it decreed a distinctive dress for them; and, with

their conversion in view, it ordered that chairs of Hebrew should be founded in all the universities. [] Then, in January 1435, it turned to the problem how to reform the lives of Christians. It made a stringent decree against clerical concubinage from the terms of which it would not be unfair to deduce that this was common enough, [] and even a notorious feature of ordinary life; there are countries, says the new law, where bishops take bribes from the clergy to connive at misconduct of this kind. Such bishops must make over to charities the double of what they have so received. Bishops must also be less lavish in their sentences of interdict; these have indeed become so frequent as to be a real scandal. There is also a notable mitigation of the law that made excommunication infectious as it were, through communication with the excommunicated; and a fourth law to restrict vexatious appeals from the bishops' tribunals. []

Then, in the summer of that same year, [] the council made a clean sweep of all the papal taxes due on appointments to benefices, annates included, and enacted that any further attempt to levy them was simony. Should any pope disobey this canon, he is to be denounced to the next General Council and this will deal with him. All the papal collectors were bidden to send in their accounts to the council for examination, and to pay into the council the moneys they had received. []

It is important here to note to what extent the universal Church was in fact represented at Basel in this, the high noon of the council's power. The legate Ambrogio Traversari, writing about this time, [] says that although there are between five and six hundred who take part in the proceedings, there are barely twenty bishops among them, and many of the great mass are not clerics at all. The truth of this is borne out by the recorded attendance at the general session of April 14, 1436 when there were present twenty bishops and thirteen abbots. []

When the council's envoys brought to the pope the decree of June 9 that abolished all his main sources of revenue, they lectured him for his failure to give a good example by obeying the council, and they stiffened their lecture with threats. But Eugene merely acknowledged that he had heard them, and to the council he sent a reply that the pope is its superior, and that the Holy See cannot function without a revenue.

The deadlock -- for such the situation had become -- was destined to be solved by the success of the pope in winning over the Greeks to discuss the proposed reunion with himself rather than with the council. For there had actually been rival embassies negotiating at Constantinople, from the pope and from Basel. As it became evident -- to both parties -- that the Greeks would disregard the council, the pope's defiance of its threats increased. The greater part of 1436 (April to December) went by in mere repetition of these threats, and it was not difficult for the pope to charge the council, before the princes of Christendom, with utter sterility save for its proposal to enlarge the authority of the bishops at the expense of that of the Roman See.

With the new year, 1437, active preparations began for the reception of a host of Greek delegates and their suites. It was necessary to decide, once and for all, where the meeting of pope and emperor should take place. The pope, explaining that the Greeks preferred the convenience of a city in Italy, invited the council's vote. But the council treated the Greeks with as little ceremony as it treated the pope. The Greeks had objected that Basel was too far away, and the council then proposed Avignon. These debates were the most heated of all. Venerable prelates had to be forcibly held back as their brethren replied to their speeches. Roysterers in a tavern, said a cynically-amused spectator, [] would have behaved more peaceably. Troops were brought into the cathedral [] to prevent bloodshed, where the Cardinal-Archbishop of Arles, the leader of the anti-papal majority, had been sitting on the throne, fully vested and mitred, since cockcrow, lest another should capture this point of vantage. Each side had its own decree ready, and once the cardinal began the mass they were read out, simultaneously, the rival bishops racing anxiously, each eager that his own side should first begin the Te Deum. The scene is indeed worthy of what the council had been for far too long, and not unrepresentative of all that the so-called "conciliar movement" ever really was. []

But the pope now felt himself master at last, and to yet another summons to appear before the council and answer for his disobedience, he replied by the bull *Doctoris Gentium*, September 18, 1437, which transferred the council to Ferrara and gave the assembly at Basel thirty days more to wind up its

negotiations with the Czechs. When the legates left Basel, in December 1437, many of the bishops went with them. And while the little rump which remained now began the first formalities of the trial of Eugenius, the Greeks arrived at Ferrara, and there, on January 8, 1438, the first general session of the council took place.

There seemed now no longer any real danger to Catholic unity in the West, whatever the lengths to which the handful of clerics at Basel might go; but in truth the crisis was by no means at an end. The Christian princes, even though they did not break with the pope, and probably, never intended to break with him, found the little council too useful an arm against the papacy for them to be willing to see the pope destroy it. For France, and for Germany, this was an opportunity to lay the beginnings of that blackmailing tutelage of the papacy which was not wholly to disappear until our own times.

It is this last important aspect of the Basel activities that alone justifies the seemingly inordinate length at which the story has been told of an assembly so insignificant in numbers; and it is this which makes it necessary to tell the weary tale to the very end with the same detail. Here, in fact, we can observe, for the first time, not so much the new ideas about the royal control of Catholicism, but those ideas given political form, and that form blessed by the approbation of theologians, of canonists and of Catholic bishops, the local episcopate now showing itself quivering to the Holy See, despite the long tradition and despite the consecration oaths of personal fidelity to the pope.

Much has been written about the "conciliar movement," but does not the phrase itself do the thing too much honour? A general movement there was indeed, for a whole generation, to bring about the restoration of unity by means of a General Council. But when was there any general enthusiasm for the government of the Church through councils? Not even the tiny active minority of bishops, so ready to use the machinery of a council to control the Holy See, proposed to obey the existing laws which subjected them to meet in provincial councils for mutual correction and the good of religion. As for the "democratic" idealists among the lower clergy, who made up the mass of the demonstrators, what more did any of them want but a career?

Again, what did those reforms amount to, of which it has been said so often that had not the papacy blocked them, they would have purified, and given new life to, the Church? What is there new in them beyond the liberation of episcopal incomes from the papal taxation? Nowhere do they provide remedies for the real troubles that were rotting away the bases of men's allegiance to the faith; the lack of any system to form and train a good parochial clergy; the need to reorganise of all the major monastic orders; the reorganisation of sees to make the needed contact of bishops and clergy possible; the de-secularisation of the episcopate -- which would make the bishops really shepherds of men's souls; the correction of what was wrong in the philosophical and theological schools; the relating of the religious life of the common man to the fundamental doctrines of the faith; the needed restoration of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist (that is, as Holy Communion) [] to its proper place in Christian life. Of all these needs our reformers of Basel and Constance seem wholly unaware. Independence of the higher authority of Rome in the administration of their sees, and above all a tighter grasp on their revenues, such were the main considerations that moved the fathers of these assemblies when they turned from their novel speculations about the papal office to the practical work of reform. " It is the spirit which giveth life, " to the clerical reformer as to all other things Christian. The great historian of these times [] has, it would seem, said the last word about these men and their constructive work, and he does but re-echo the biting language already quoted from their contemporary Aeneas Sylvius. []

" [These zealous Gallicans] might have been still more persuasive, and more interesting, had they been as keen to promote those useful reforms which would not have put money into their pockets; if they had acknowledged the need for themselves to meet occasionally in provincial councils and synods; [] if they had adopted the praiseworthy custom of living in their sees. . . if, in a word, after having (according to the day's current phrase) reformed 'the Church in its Head, ' they had set themselves seriously to reform it 'in its members' -- in other words to reform themselves. "

The miserable history shows, too, in what an anaemic condition the papacy came forth from the long ordeal of the Schism; and

of how little support in Christendom it could be certain, when it had to take such notice, and for so long, of the crude impertinencies of such insignificance. Surely none but minds already formed in a tradition of opposition to the very idea of the papal supremacy could, with the facts before them, ever have exalted and glorified the proceedings of this wretched assembly, and seen in them the promise -- blighted, alas ! almost ere it was born -- of a new age when religion would be purified from tyranny and from the abuses which tyranny must breed. The story of the Council of Basel in the last eleven years of its existence (1438-1449), and of the opportunity it proved to the Christian princes, needs to be known well in all its concrete detail (and it is rarely told in more than vague generality) [] if the suspicion is to be understood which henceforward attached in the eyes of the Roman Curia to all who, wishing to reform the Church, spoke of a council as the obvious tool for the job. There is need, at any rate, to know exactly what the Council of Basel did, and exactly what it was that the popes reprobated in it, and exactly what those reforms were which the council proposed and whose development the popes arrested. The opportunity now (1438) offered to the Catholic princes -- and the history of the next eleven years is the story of their eager use of it -- lay in this that the Council of Basel reopened the Schism. The consequent crisis between the Roman Curia and these princes was over, in France, in less than two years; in Germany it dragged on for another seven. In both countries the crisis was ended by a compromise that left the princes stronger than before in their control of the Church.

About a fortnight or so after the opening of the council at Ferrara, the assembly at Basel declared Eugene IV suspended from his functions as pope (January 15, 1438). Just a month later, to the day, Eugene replied by excommunicating his judges (February 15); and just a month later again the principle on which Basel had been acting for the last seven years, that no pope could transfer a council against its will, was declared by the little assembly to be an article of the Christian faith (March 15). At Frankfort, in these same weeks, the diet of the empire was assembled for the last formalities of the election of an emperor, and it declared -- what the new emperor, Albert II, [] confirmed -- that, as between Eugene and the council at Basel, Germany would be neutral, that a new (third) General Council ought to be called to reconcile the pope and the fathers of Basel,

which council should meet in an imperial city, Strasburg, or Constance, or Mainz. The crisis, then, was to be prolonged and the settlement would be a German-influenced settlement.

In France, on May 1, 1438, the king -- Charles VII -- called together a great assembly of prelates and notables at Bourges. Two questions were proposed for their opinion; what ought the king to do in this new conflict between the pope and Basel? what action should be taken about the Basel decrees for a reformation of Christian life? After six weeks of discussion, in which envoys from the pope were heard and envoys from Basel also, the first demanding that Charles withdraw all support from Basel and the second that he should support its condemnation of the pope, the assembly answered that the king ought to work for the reconciliation of Basel with the pope, and that he ought to accept the reform decrees, with some changes of detail. The second opinion was embodied in a royal edict that gave the reform decrees force of law in France -- the so-called Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, June 7, 1438. [] Without any reference to the pope, in defiance indeed of his known will, the Church in France was henceforth to be governed by the decrees of a "council" which the pope had just excommunicated.

The new emperor, Albert II, reigned for only a short eighteen months, but long enough for the Diet of Mainz (March 26, 1439) to adopt the Instrumentum Acceptationis which was substantially the German equivalent of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. [] And now the various reforming princes and prelates set themselves, individually, to gather what privileges and favours they could, both from the council at Basel and from the pope; and German Catholicism began to split up; the same city, chapter and see being at times divided for and against the pope, and rival bishops appearing, here and there, to claim the same see. In support of the plan for a new council, an informal league of princes began to form, France, Castile, Portugal, Navarre, Aragon and Milan, in addition to the German princes bound by the decision of Mainz.

Seven weeks after that decision the Basel prelates promulgated a "definition of faith. " It was declared to be a doctrine that all must believe, under pain of heresy, that General Councils are superior to the pope, also that the pope has no power to transfer a General Council against its will (May 16); and a month later the

council deposed Eugene IV (June 25, 1439). On this momentous occasion there were present no more than twenty prelates and only seven of these were bishops; and the president had relics brought in from the churches and placed on the waste of vacant seats -- the pope, it should appear, was condemned by the saints as well. The Holy See -- in the eyes of these twenty prelates and their somewhat more numerous following of doctors -- was now vacant, and it remained vacant for another seven months, while the rest of Christendom, with Eugene IV, gave itself, at Ferrara and Florence, to the business of reuniting the Eastern Churches with Rome. But at Basel, throughout the summer, the plague was raging, sweeping away the inhabitants of the little town by the thousand. On September 17, however, the " fathers " defined the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, [] and on October 24 they approached the problem how to form a conclave for the election of the new pope.

They had but one cardinal to support them, [] and they decided to add to him thirty-two electors chosen from the council, who must, all of them, at least be deacons ! Of the thirty-two, eleven were bishops, seven abbots, five doctors of theology, and nine doctors of law (canon or civil). Next there was a violent dispute, about who should have the best accommodation in the conclave, that nearly wrecked the whole affair. The bishops demanded first pick of the rooms, but they were persuaded to allow the more usual practice of drawing for them by lots. Then, on October 30, this miserable parody of Constance proceeded to its consummation and the conclave opened. From the beginning the favourite candidate (16 votes out of 33 in the first ballot) was the Duke of Savoy, Amadeus VIII. [] As he rose in successive ballots to within one vote of the required two-thirds, the opposition grew violent. He was a layman, it was argued, and a temporal prince; he had been married and four of his children were still alive. Sed contra, this was a time when the Church needed a pope who was rich, [] and well-connected. At last, on the fifth ballot (November 5), Amadeus was elected, with 26 votes out of 33. The council (on November 19) confirmed the election and on January 8, 1440, the duke accepted. He proposed to call himself Felix V.

Never surely has there been so odd a choice. Cesarini reassured the council at Florence. Amadeus was so avaricious, he said, that he grudged to pay for food enough to keep himself alive;

there would soon be open war between the anti-pope and his council. [] Truly enough, his first reply to the council's offer was to ask how was he to live now that the council had abolished the annates? He had to support him his own state and Switzerland generally, Scotland too, and Aragon, with its dependencies Sardinia and Sicily. Eugene IV excommunicated Felix on March 23, 1440; Felix, however, went through with the sacrilegious farce, was ordained, consecrated and crowned on July 24. But the King of France, though not repudiating the act of 1438, protested against the election, and obliged his subjects to continue faithful to Eugene. Brittany followed suit, so did Castile.

The only real additional anxiety which the election brought to Eugene was in Germany, where the Emperor Frederick III, [] although he did not acknowledge Felix, maintained the policy of neutrality, and continued to call for a new council in Germany. This was in the spring of 1441, by which time the first disputes between Felix and his council were well under way. They had refused, on principle, to accept the president he gave them; and their scheme for nuncios and legates to enlist the support of the princes had broken down when Felix refused to contribute to the expense. It was yet another grievance that he refused his newly-created Sacred College [] the half of the revenues to which they were entitled. In November 1442, and soon after his meeting with Frederick III -- who carefully avoided all dangerous occasions of implicit acknowledgement, and whose main concern was to marry off his widowed daughter to one of the pope's sons -- Felix left Basel, for ever. He had spent as much on the adventure as he proposed to spend, and he settled now at Lausanne. In that year, 1442, the council had held no public session and on May 16, 1443, it held its forty-fifth, and last. In June Alfonso of Aragon had returned to his allegiance, a most important gain to Eugene, for he was king now of Naples too, with a frontier coterminous with the Papal State on its southern and eastern sides; and with Alfonso there also returned his ally, the Duke of Milan.

The whole interest henceforth lay in the fate of the Roman hold on Catholic Germany. Hussite zeal was still hot in the south below the deceptive agreement of 1436. How much of the country would the pope be able to hold to union with his see? In Germany little could be done during the next two years, for war

broke out between the Swiss and Austria. The war left the princes of Germany still more divided, and it aggravated the differences between the partisans of the council and those who, with Frederick III, leaned towards Eugene. In January 1445 Eugene began to move against two of these pro-council princes, the Archbishop of Cologne and the Bishop of Munster, who were anti-imperialist also. There was a diplomatic exchange between pope and emperor -- Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini representing Frederick, and the Spanish canonist Juan Carvajal the pope; and out of this there emerged the foundations of a lasting settlement. But now the pope's habitual impetuosity nearly wrecked all.

Feeling himself secure, Eugene deposed the archbishop-electors of Cologne and Treves (January 24, 1446) [] and caused thereby such a storm in Germany that barely a month after his legate had signed with the emperor the accord of Vienna (February 1446), the whole body of the prince-electors had formed a league to resist the pope and to compel the emperor to the same policy (March 21). The electors demanded, in fact, not only that the depositions should be revoked, but that the pope should accept the principles of Constance and Basel about his subordination to General Councils, should accept also the reforms decreed by these councils, as Germany had accepted them at Mainz in 1439, and should convoke a new council to meet in Germany. If Eugene accepted their terms the electors would recognise him provisionally as pope, that is until the council met: if he refused they would -- so they secretly decided -- go over to the Council of Basel.

It was in July 1446 that the envoys of the princes delivered this ultimatum to the pope. Aeneas Sylvius accompanied them, sent by Frederick to warn Eugene of what awaited should he refuse. But the pope, for once, forbore to be rash and merely pledged himself to send a reply to the diet that was to meet at Frankfort on September 1.

At Frankfort the critical discussions went on for three weeks (September 16 to October 5, 1446). The pope sent a strong team of diplomatists and canonists, Parentucelli (the future Nicholas V), Carvajal, Nicholas of Cusa (already the greatest German churchman of the time), and Aeneas Sylvius. Very skilfully they brought it about that what the diet discussed was not any reply

of Eugene to their ultimatum, but the pope's acceptance of their terms as the pope had modified them. To the legates Eugene had indeed made very clear the limits beyond which he could not go. [] The diet, however, was far from satisfied, and it broke up without reaching any decision. The legates, in fact, had managed to divide the princes, and to form, secretly, and at the slight cost of some 2,000 florins, a bloc favourable to the pope. All parties now made for Rome and in the first days of the new year, 1447, Eugene received the envoys of the princes in public audience (January 12, 1447). Their demands -- the demands of 1446, but now more politely stated -- he referred to a commission of cardinals specially appointed, and a month later, in four documents, he gave his decision. The princes -- the majority of them -- accepted it. The pope was already seriously ill when the envoys arrived. During the next four weeks he rapidly grew worse, and it was actually kneeling round his deathbed that the princes swore their fidelity. Sixteen days later Eugene IV died (23 February, 1447).

What, in the end, had he managed to save of the authority of his see? Against all likelihood he had preserved it intact, and had seen it acknowledged in all its integrity; but he had had to make large concessions. He had had to accept the princes' scheme for a new council to meet in Germany in two years' time; and he had had to make a show of accepting the new, unacceptable theories about the superiority of General Councils. It was, however, no more than a show, for the pope's acceptance did not admit any obligation to call such a council, nor that it was necessary to call councils, nor that it was useful to do so -- he even went out of his way to say that he did not believe it to be useful. Nor did he declare -- as the princes desired -- that it would be for the council to decide the disputed question whether he was really pope. As for recognition of anything done at the Council of Basel, the pope, now, never even referred to it. Moreover, a limiting clause, "in the way our predecessors have done, " destroyed any reality of submission which the clause might at first sight present, and where the princes demanded recognition of the "pre-eminence" of General Councils, the pope only acknowledged their "eminence. " And while the other matters in dispute were settled with the solemn finality of a bull, this, the most important of all, was set down in the comparative informality of a brief. As to the deposed elector-prelates, Eugene indeed promised to reinstate them, but only when they had

sworn obedience to him as "true vicar of Christ. "

Here was the main point at issue -- the pope's primatial authority over the whole Church, laity, clergy, episcopate, and over all these, it might be, united. And what the pope conceded here was something substantially different from what had been demanded with such noise and threatening. That the princes accepted without demur this singular and scarcely concealed transformation was due, of course, to the simple fact that they were really interested in something else, and in that alone -- in drawing to themselves as much as they could of the control of Church properties, and of the scores of ecclesiastical principalities that lay within the empire. And in this matter the pope's surrender was very great. He accepted the Basel statement of the German grievances, and the decrees by which that council had hoped to remedy them -- the statement, in fact, adopted by emperor and princes at Mainz in 1439. He ratified and validated all appointments to benefices, all sentences and dispensations granted during the ten years of the "neutrality, " even those made by prelates who had stayed on at Basel after he had transferred the council to Ferrara. There was, in fact, a general and unconditional lifting of all the sentences laid upon the members of the council and their adherents. After ten years the princes -- and especially the ecclesiastical rebels -- had won, in this more material field, all they had fought for; but they had only won it as a grant from the very authority which they had, for all that time and longer, professed to call in doubt, and which they had desired to cut down until it could scarcely exist at all.

Ten days after the death of Eugene IV, Tommaso Parentucelli, the late legate to Frankfort, was elected in his place -- Nicholas V. He, of course, confirmed all that Eugene had sanctioned, and in July 1447 he sent the promised legate to discuss with the princes the indemnity which they had agreed should be paid the Holy See now that annates were abolished. The fruit of these discussions was the concordat of 1448. [] This agreement, repeating the concordat of 1418, set permanent limits to the pope's collation to benefices within the empire. Except in the special circumstances which the concordat carefully enumerates, appointments to vacant sees and abbeys are henceforth to be by election, the elect needing from the pope confirmation only. The pact also greatly restricted the pope's power to reserve to himself appointments to benefices in the

future; and finally -- the principal object of the concordat -- in place of the tax called first-fruits which the pope has surrendered, it is agreed that the newly appointed bishop or abbot will pay a sum determined separately in each case. [] No see will be so taxed more than once in any one year, even though there be several successive bishops in that year; and arrears due on this account to the pope's treasury will, for the future, die with the debtor.

Now that the pope and the princes of Germany were at one, the very days of the council at Basel were surely numbered. The emperor was at last able to bring pressure to bear on the city authorities, and in June 1448 they asked the council to find another meeting-place. On July 24 its members trekked as far as Lausanne, where their pope still abode. Switzerland and Savoy were, in fact, still loyal to him and to them. But the new pope, Nicholas V, had been secretly negotiating a surrender, and Felix now announced, with the consent of the council, that he was ready to resign. On January 18, 1449, Nicholas V lifted all the sentences and censures with which the anti-pope was loaded, and freed the council too, and all its supporters. On April 4 Felix was allowed to do the same for Nicholas V and for the dead Eugene, and to confirm all grants he had made and to announce his coming abdication. The great event took place three days later -- not a penitential submission in forma as "Clement VIII" had made to Martin V in 1429, and as the Franciscan "Nicholas V" had made to John XXII a hundred years earlier, but a formal abdication made to the council for the good of the Church, and ending with a prayer to the princes to take the act in a friendly spirit and to uphold the authority of General Councils. On April 16 the council met once more, to withdraw all the excommunications and deprivations it had decreed and then, on April 19, it solemnly elected as pope "Thomas of Sarzana, known in his obedience as Nicholas V"; the pattern of Constance was faithfully followed to the end. An end only reached five days later when the council, conferring on Felix, as legate and perpetual vicar, ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all the lands that had continued faithful to him to the last, granting him the first place in the Church after the pope, and the privilege of wearing the papal dress, decreed at last its own dissolution.

Nicholas V, a humanist of cultivated wit as well as an admirable Christian, patiently tolerated these last ritualistic antics and then

in June, the council now out of the way for ever, he created Felix a cardinal and gave him, for life, authority as legate over his old domain; and, what the ex-pope no doubt appreciated just as much, a handsome pension. [] Nicholas was generous also to the cardinal who for all these years had directed the anti-Roman activities at Basel, Louis Aleman. He re-accepted him as a cardinal and as Archbishop of Arles; [] and he also gave the red hat to three of the cardinals Felix had created.

The indulgence shown by Nicholas V to the susceptibilities of these trans-alpine rebels, once they gave signs of submission, had gone very far -- farther than, from precedent, might have been expected. But here was a pope with the very unusual experience that he knew Germany personally. He also had at his side a great German ecclesiastic who was a scholar and a theologian and possessed by a truly apostolic zeal -- Nicholas of Cusa. The pope now determined to advance a step further the new reconciliation with Germany, in this hour when all was, presumably, love and joy, by sending Nicholas of Cusa [] as legate with full papal powers [] to put right all that he found wrong in the ecclesiastical life of the country.

The legate's tour of Germany and the Low Countries lasted a whole twelve months (February 1451 to March 1452). In that time he visited all the chief cities from Brussels to Magdeburg and Vienna, and from the Tyrol to the Zuyder Zee. His own mode of life continued to be that of the scholarly ascetic. Everywhere he went he preached, and nowhere would he accept the magnificent presents offered him. For the ills which troubled religion he had two main cures to propose -- closer relations with the Holy See and a thorough reform of the greatly relaxed religious orders. At Salzburg, Magdeburg, Mainz and Cologne he held provincial councils; at Bamberg a diocesan synod. The commission he appointed at Vienna visited and reformed some fifty Benedictine houses of men and of women, and also the houses of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine. At Wurzburg the legate himself presided over a provincial chapter of seventy Benedictine abbeys, and here each abbot came to the high altar in turn, to bind himself by vow that he would introduce the reforms into his monastery. There was already at work in Germany the great reform associated with the abbey of Bursfeld; the pioneer of this movement was in the closest touch with the legate, and Nicholas of Cusa, at Wurzburg, urged the Bursfeld

reform on the assembled abbots.

The legate made a lengthy stay at the university town of Erfurt, and the commissioners he left behind spent seven weeks investigating, and amending, the lives of the monks and friars and nuns of the town. At Magdeburg, where there was a good archbishop, things were in better order, but the provincial synod enacted very rigorous legislation to correct the unreformed religious houses. At Hildesheim the legate deposed the abbot for simony, and at Minden -- where he found the diocese in a deplorable state -- another problem exercised him, the growing tendency for the pious laity to trust in the mere externals of religion for their salvation. The latest source of this danger was the confraternity spirit, and the legate forbade the founding of any more confraternities.

Undoubtedly this missionary year, where the missionary was a cardinal and legate of the pope, brought about many changes for the better. But if the changes were to be permanent, return visits, and by legates of the same character as Nicholas, were called for; by legates, also, who were themselves natives of these countries. This great expedition stands out however, as a thing unique in the history of these last two hundred years before the Reformation -- as Nicholas himself is almost the unique German of these centuries to be given the prestige and the power for good that goes with the coveted honour of the cardinal's hat. []

Another cardinal, Giulio Cesarini, legate in Germany twenty years before this, had written to Eugene IV that unless the German clergy amended the* ways of life their people would massacre them, as the Hussites were massacring the clergy in Bohemia. a The laity were, however, not so interested in the matter as the Italian cardinal seemed to think. Except for sporadic raids -- of which Nicholas of Cusa's expedition is the best example -- the clergy and churches of Germany remained untroubled in their chronic state of disorder, under their impregnable prince prelates, awaiting the ultimate inevitable day of doom, and the saving grace of the Jesuits and St. Peter Canisius.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. THE RETURN OF ISLAM, 1291-1481

The submission of the Council of Basel to Nicholas V in 1449 brings to fulfilment, after nearly ninety years of effort and strife, the determination of the popes to re-establish themselves at Rome. Never again, until the French Revolution, will the pope be forced out of Rome, and never again will there be an anti-pope. In the face of the many evident defeats which the popes sustained during their ninety years of effort, it is well to establish these two facts firmly and in all their high significance. But from that precariously won victory Nicholas V turned to find, confronting the Christian hope, the menace of an imminent Mohammedan conquest of all that remained of the Christian East. The ninety years which had seen the papacy's recovery had also seen the rise of a new power in the world of Islam, the Ottoman Turks.

At the time when the loss of St. Jean d'Acre, the last Latin stronghold on the mainland of Syria, had plunged the West into a stupor of despair (1291), the Ottomans were no more than a petty tribe in the service of the Sultan of Iconium, a Moslem state in central Asia Minor. By the time Clement V had suppressed the Templars (1312), they had acquired a small, strategically placed, territory of their own, that ran from the Sea of Marmora to the Black Sea, behind the strip of Asiatic shore where the Byzantine Empire still held the ancient cities of Nicea and Nicomedia. Then, in the next generation, under their sultan Ourkhan (1326-1359), the organisation began that was to make the Ottomans, for the next two hundred years, an all but unconquerable scourge: the nation turned itself into a drilled and disciplined professional army, the cream of which was the corps of Janissaries recruited from Christian European children, sometimes given as hostages, sometimes kidnapped. From the middle of the fourteenth century everything fell before this new, most formidable engine of conquest. The Ottomans made themselves the first power in the Mohammedan world and they also conquered, without any great difficulty, all that remained to the emperor of his territories in Asia Minor.

In 1356 the rivalry of a Byzantine prince, John Cantacuzene, with the emperor, gave the Turks their first footing in Europe; they

became masters of Gallipoli. Nine years later they took Adrianople. And, at last, the Christian princes were roused to action. Peter I of Cyprus, with the active support of Pope Urban V, gathered a fleet which, in 1367, raided several of the Syrian ports, destroying arsenals and stocks of munitions and supplies, and thereby halting the Turks for some years. But the great princes of western Europe held aloof. From Edward III of England and Charles V of France, exhausted both of them by the first long bout of the Hundred Years' War, the pope had a flat refusal; to the maritime states of Italy, Genoa and Venice, their own commercial interests in the East were of greatest importance, and, if these called for it, Genoa and Venice would even side with the Ottomans against the crusaders.

Yet upon these states -- and upon Venice especially -- there already lay a great deal of the responsibility for the weakness of the Christian position in the East, and for the policy of appeasement which was the only defence that the Byzantines could now contrive whenever the Ottomans increased the pressure. Venice had been the inspiration, and the chief director, of the great act of piracy which, in 1204, had virtually destroyed the Eastern empire; and, with Genoa, it had, ever since, clung desperately to the valuable territories which it had then been able to wrest from the empire. Never again, after that fatal date, was there any power in the East capable of holding off a new Mohammedan offensive should such occur. The modern country of Greece was henceforward in the hands of a medley of Latin princes, Dukes of Athens, Princes of Achaia, Counts of Cephalonia and the like; the Serbs rose to found an empire of their own on the ruins of the power of the hated Greeks; the Bulgarians, too, established themselves as independent. The territory of the empire at the time when Michael VIII negotiated with Gregory X the reunion of 1274 was, then, only a tiny fraction of that which the Latins had conquered seventy years earlier. By the time that Michael's successors, in the fifteenth century, were once more planning a union with the West, their power had shrunk to little more than the capital and its immediate hinterland (1423). The Serbs had gone down at the bloody defeat of Kossovo (1389), and the Turks were masters of Greece and Bulgaria too. Constantinople, thirty years before its fall, was already isolated from the West. The last joint crusade to relieve it -- a great host of French, Germans and Hungarians led by Sigismund, King of Hungary [] -- had ended in yet another

catastrophe at Nicopolis (1396), and it was only the appearance of a rival Mohammedan power, taking away the Ottomans to defend their own capital, which now saved the empire from the coup de grace.

It is very easy to list the causes of the chronic Christian disasters; [] they were as evident to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as they are to us, and they were as much discussed. An abundance of writers agreed that there was no hope until the Christian princes put aside their own jealousies and vanities; until the crusading armies consented to accept some form of discipline; until there re-appeared, what had been lost for a century and more, the old religious fervour; and until the Italians could be persuaded to forgo their lucrative trade with Islam. The missionaries -- the most practical men of all -- had no hope whatever that the way of war would succeed. The sole solution for the problem of the Turks was, they held, to convert them to Christianity.

As to practical measures, here again there was general agreement about what ought to be done, and almost never was any of it done. Egypt was the vital centre of the Mohammedan world. Egypt lived by its commerce. So let a blockade of Egypt be proclaimed, and an international fleet be formed to enforce it; especially let Venice and Genoa be forbidden the* traitorous trade. Thus it was that, so early as 1291, Nicholas IV put a ban on the trade and raised a small fleet of twenty galleys to enforce it; and Clement V made this blockade the special business of the Knights-Hospitallers.

But these were gestures far too slight to have any permanent effect. The popes were, already, almost alone in their understanding how truly Christendom was a unity, that no one part of it could look on indifferently while an alien civilisation and cult made itself master of another part. They were alone in their anxiety, and the Turks established themselves in Europe, to be for four hundred years and more an unmitigated curse to the millions whom they misgoverned, and, when finally expelled, to leave behind them within the very heart of those peoples, a degrading, if inevitable, legacy of feuds and pride and hate, of cruelty and treachery, the legacy which still threatens to plunge the East back into anarchy and barbarism. From the moment when the Ottomans first established themselves on European

soil the popes, unhesitatingly and instinctively, in what was perhaps the most critical hour their own rule had known for a thousand years, set themselves to organise the defence of Europe against Islam. A writer of the time, one day to be pope himself, and to die at Ancona after years of exertion in this business, as the fleet he had painfully assembled sailed into the harbour of that ancient city, has vividly described their impossible and thankless task. "The titles of pope and emperor," he says, "are now no more than empty words, brilliant images. Each state has its own prince, and each prince his own special interests. Who can speak so eloquently as to persuade to unity under a single flag so many powers, discordant and even hostile? And even should they unite their forces who will be so bold as to undertake to command them? What rules of discipline will he lay down? How will he ensure obedience? Where is the man who can understand so many languages that differ so widely, or who can reconcile characters and customs that so conflict? What mortal power could bring into harmony English and French, Genoese and Aragonese, Germans, Hungarians and Bohemians? If the holy war is undertaken with an army that is small, it will be wiped out by the unbelievers; if the army is of any great size, it will court disaster just as infallibly through the insoluble problems of manoeuvre and the confusion that must follow. To whatever side one turns, one sees the same chaos. Consider only, for example, the present state of Christendom."

[]

One effect of the Ottoman conquests after their victory of Nicopolis (1396) was to convince Venice, at last, that her only chance of survival lay in making herself feared. From the beginning of the fifteenth century Venice shows a new spirit of independence in its dealings with the Ottomans; the republic was now all for a crusade, and all for a reunion of the churches which would bring to an end the most bitter of all the differences that hindered joint Christian action against the common foe. It was then by no means coincidence, or accident, that the election of a Venetian as pope -- Eugene IV -- in 1431, brought the possibility of reunion into the sphere of urgent practical affairs, nor that to this pope, from the first weeks of his reign, the Eastern question was the principal question. His plans were simple and grandiose: to reunite Constantinople and Rome and to preach a general crusade that would sweep out the Turks for ever. Here, if anywhere, is the positive intent of the pope who

fought the long duel with the assembly at Basel, here is the real Eugene IV. That council was, from the beginning, wholly taken up with its scheme to make the papacy, for the future, the servant of the clerical element in the Church; and that the pope had to spend years fending off this peril was an immense distraction from the no less urgent business of the menace to the Christian East. It was not the only way in which the council hampered his action, for independently of the pope, and in a kind of competition with him, the prelates at Basel also began to negotiate a reunion scheme with the Eastern emperor and his bishops.

These negotiations began with the council's invitation to the Greeks to take part in its proceedings (January 26, 1433). In the end, after nearly four years, they broke down completely, partly because the council was unable to find the money to pay the expenses of the Greek delegation, and unwilling to remove to some Italian city more convenient to the Greeks. But the principal cause of the breakdown was the Greek determination not to recognise any synod as oecumenical unless the pope (as well as the other patriarchs) took part in it. It might be hazardous to negotiate a reunion with the West at all, but to discuss reunion with a council that was permanently at loggerheads with its own patriarch -- and him the pope -- would be an obvious waste of time.

Meanwhile the pope had been extremely active. He had not only begun discussions with the emperor, but with the Christian rulers of Trebizond and Armenia too. His nuncios had penetrated to Jerusalem, and they were, ultimately, to negotiate not only with the Orthodox Churches but with the Monophysites of Syria and Ethiopia, and with the Nestorians also. By the year 1437 Eugene felt himself strong enough to risk all that the enmity of Basel could effect, and, as we have seen, on September 18 of that year he transferred the council -- reunion now its main business -- to Ferrara.

It is interesting to note how completely the precedents of the reunion council of 1274 were now disregarded. This time the theological questions at issue were to be discussed in the council itself, and the reunion was to be the act of a council in which Greeks and Latins sat together, under the presidency of the pope. And the General Council was preceded by a synod at

Constantinople in which the Greeks chose the delegates who were to represent them at Ferrara, bishops and other leading ecclesiastics. It was a small army of some seven hundred which in the end set out, and at its head was the emperor himself, John VIII. The Patriarch of Constantinople -- who, if the reunion were accomplished, would be, by virtue of Innocent III's decree, the first personage in the Church after the pope -- was the only one of the four Eastern patriarchs to attend in person; but the other three -- Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem -- were represented by proxies to whom they had given unlimited powers.

The Greeks sailed from Constantinople in November 1437, and after a ten weeks' voyage, on February 8, 1438, they reached Venice. There the Doge and the papal legate received them in a scene of dazzling splendour. On March 4 the emperor entered Ferrara and on April 9 Greeks and Latins assembled in the cathedral for the first joint session, and agreed on a first decree recognising the council as truly oecumenical.

Then the difficulties began to appear. The emperor's one anxiety was that nothing should now mar the prospect of a firm military alliance to drive out the Turks, and since the discussion of theological differences (all alleged by many of his bishops to be differences about the Faith) would be the speediest way to disturb the momentary harmony, he made every possible effort to put off the discussions. Apparently he would have preferred some act of accord in as general terms as could have been devised, to be ratified and consecrated by whatever gestures of reverence the pope cared to ask for; and the Greek bishops showed themselves, in this, the emperor's faithful and obedient subjects. It took all the tact of the Latin diplomatists -- and here, as at Basel, the principal role fell to Cesarini -- and all the good will of the pope, to keep the peace while the Greeks were slowly compelled to come to the point, to say, that is, why they thought the Latins heretics, and to listen to the Latin explanations of the Latin formularies that must -- if understood -- convince them of Latin orthodoxy.

The four main differences were the Latin teaching about the relation of the Holy Ghost to the other two Persons of the Blessed Trinity, the Latin use of unleavened bread in the Mass (the Greeks using ordinary bread), the Latin teaching about Purgatory, and the primacy of the Roman See over the whole

Church of Christ. The pope proposed that a preliminary commission -- ten Greeks and ten Latins -- should be set up to discuss these four questions. The emperor, however, would not hear of any discussion except upon the third topic; and it was only after some time that he would agree even to this. But at last the discussions on Purgatory began, and they went on steadily for two months (June-July 1438). On July 17 the Greeks agreed that what the Latins believed was not different from what they, too, believed. And then nothing more was accomplished for another three months.

However, by October, the emperor was brought to allow that the alleged diversities in the doctrine about the Blessed Trinity might be considered, and so there began a long nine months' theological discussion. [] It ended, on June 8, 1439, [] by the Greeks accepting that the Latin doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son is not heresy, and that the Latins did not sin in adding to the creed the word Filioque to express this doctrine. Then, after another week of hesitation, the emperor once more showing great reluctance to renew the debates, the most delicate question of all was attacked -- the claim of the pope to a universal primacy in the Church. But the debates, this time, were surprisingly soon over. By June 27 agreement had been reached, and after another week's work the text of the reunion decree had been drafted. It was signed on July 5 by 133 Latins and 33 Greeks and solemnly published in a general session of the council, July 6, 1439. []

The decree is in the form of a bull, *Laetentur Coeli*, and published both in Latin and in Greek. While, at the earlier reunion council of Lyons in 1274, the only theological difference determined by the council was the controversy about the orthodoxy of the Filioque, now, at Florence, the council reviewed the whole position. The bull is, in form, a definition of faith made by the pope with the approval of the council (*hoc sacro universali approbante Florentino concilio diffinimus*) The pope, then, explicitly defines, as a truth to be held by all Christians, that the Holy (Ghost proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, and that the addition of the word Filioque to the creed, made for the sake of greater clearness in expressing this truth, was lawful and reasonable. He defines, also, that it is indifferent to the validity of the consecration in the mass whether the bread used be leavened or unleavened; and that it is Catholic doctrine

that all the souls of those who die in charity with God but before they have made satisfaction for their sins by worthy penances, are purged after death by purgatorial pains, from which pains they can be relieved by the pious acts of the faithful still alive, by prayer for example, by almsdeeds and by the offering of masses. Finally there is a detailed definition about the fact and the nature of the Roman primacy. This part of the decree calls for the council's own words, or a translation of them. "We define, in like manner, that the holy Apostolic See and the Bishop of Rome, have a primacy (*tenere primatum*) throughout the whole world, and that the Bishop of Rome himself is the successor of St. Peter the prince of the Apostles, and that he is the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him in St. Peter there was committed by Our Lord Jesus Christ full power to pasture, to rule and to guide the whole Church; as is also contained in the acts of the General Councils and in the sacred canons. " Here, without any reference to the new theories of the last sixty years, without any reference to those decrees of the assemblies at Pisa, at Constance and at Basel, which attempted to give the new theories a place in Catholic belief, the tradition is simply and clearly stated anew. And it is also worthy of notice that, although various Greek bishops opposed the definition of Florence in its preliminary stages, for various reasons, no one of them ever urged against the papal claim the theories set forth so explicitly at Constance and at Basel. []

The union of East and West once more established, the Greeks left Florence with their emperor (August 26, 1439). To John VIII it had been a disappointment, which he did nothing to disguise, that the council had been so purely a theological conference, that none of the great princes of the West had appeared, and that it had not, in the manner of the famous council of 1095, been the starting point of a great military effort.

But the Council of Florence did not break up when the Greeks departed. Its later history is indeed not very well known to us; all the acts of the council, the official record of its proceedings, have disappeared, and when the most interesting events were over the contemporary historians lost interest in the council. It continued, in fact, for another six years or so, at Florence until 1442 and in its final stages at Rome. It is not known how or when it actually ended; [] But in the years while it was still at Florence

the council was the means for other dissident churches of the East -- some of them heretical bodies -- to renew their contact with the Roman See, to renounce their heresy and to accept again its primatial authority. Thus in 1439 the Monophysite churches of Armenia, led by the Patriarch Constantine, made their submission; [] in 1441 the Monophysites of Ethiopia (Jacobites) did the same [] and the Monophysites of Syria too; in 1445 the Nestorians (Chaldeans) of Cyprus came in, and also the Maronites.

The Council of Florence is perhaps chiefly important to us as the General Council which, of all the long series, was most visibly representative of Greeks and Latins, where the differences which for so many centuries had sundered them were discussed in all possible detail, and at great length, through eighteen successive and eventful months; a council whence there emerged a detailed agreed statement about the supreme earthly authority in the Church, so explicit and so all-embracing that, after five hundred years, it still retains all its practical usefulness. [] But to the pope, as well as to the Greeks, the council was an assembly of Christians met to cement a new unity under the menace of imminent catastrophe. The Greeks had come from a city that seemed doomed; it was to a land fighting its last battles against an invader that they went back. The year in which the Greeks appeared at Ferrara, Transylvania was invaded and Belgrade attacked. In 1442 there was a second invasion of Transylvania, and from its bloody scenes there at last appeared a great military commander on the Christian side, the Hungarian nobleman John Hunyadi. For a time the Turkish advance was halted, and their armies defeated. The pope again deputed Cesarini to organise a crusade, and in 1443 the combination of the great cardinal, John Hunyadi and Ladislas of Poland drove the Turks out of Servia and Bulgaria, and forced a ten years' truce on them. The sultan -- Murad II - - was so discouraged that he went into retirement. But when reinforcements came in to the Christian armies, in 1444, Cesarini persuaded Hunyadi -- against his better judgment -- to break the truce and to invade Bulgaria. This brought Murad into the field once more. There was a bloody battle outside Varna (November 10, 1444) and the Christian army was destroyed. Ladislas and Cesarini were among the slain.

The sultan now turned south and made himself master of the

Morea (1446) and two years later, on the already fatal field of Kossovo, he destroyed yet another Hungarian army which Hunyadi had managed to raise. In 1451 Murad II died. His successor was the still greater Mohammed II, who almost immediately began the long-distance preparations for the capture of Constantinople. Against him there was nothing but the personal valour of the emperor -- Constantine XII -- and his handful of an army. The emperor, like his brother and predecessor, John VIII, stood by the union with the pope, and his fidelity cost him the support of the mass of his people. So bitter, indeed, was the anti-Latin spirit in the capital that even after thirteen years the emperors had not dared to publish officially the reunion decrees of the council. In all that time, the prelates who had accepted the papal authority for political reasons, and against their own real convictions, and the very much smaller band who had never, even at Florence, accepted it at all, had made good use of their unhindered freedom to campaign against the Latins. Never did the mass of the Greeks hold the Latins in greater detestation than in these last years and months before the Turk administered the final blow. It was, indeed, in these very months that the famous saying (or its equivalent) was first uttered, " Better the turban of the Prophet than the Pope's tiara. "

By this time the pope of the reunion council was dead, and in his place there reigned the great humanist and patron of Greek letters Thomas of Sarzana, Nicholas V. Like his predecessor he did the little that was possible to help the city, endlessly pleading with the princes of the West, and gathering what money and ships and men he could. It was a great misfortune that this pope was by nature what we have lately come to call an " appeaser. " The Christian cause had suffered so badly that Nicholas V had almost come to dread the thought of an offensive. Especially did the disaster of Kossovo in 1448 fill him with dismay, and he strongly urged the Hungarians to keep to a war of defence. But to the emperor at Constantinople, who was again appealing piteously in 1451, the pope sent a strong warning that so long as the Greeks trifled with their pledged word and refused in their pride to submit to the divinely founded authority of the pope, they could hardly expect anything but chastisement from the justice of God; [] the emperor must make a beginning and, without further delay, proclaim the divine faith to which he has pledged himself. But the pope did not merely

lecture the emperor. He sent all the aid he could, money to repair the fortifications, a little fleet, and, as his legate, one of the Greek bishops who had been resolute for reunion at Florence and consistently loyal to it since, Isidore, once the Metropolitan of Kiev, and now a cardinal.

On December 12, 1452, the union of the churches was at last proclaimed, in a great ceremony at Santa Sophia [] -- and from that day until the very evening before the city fell, the mass of the people avoided the church as though it were plague stricken.

It was nearly five months later than this that the pope's ships arrived, after fighting their way through the blockading fleet (April 20, 1453). Outside the city, and all around it, was the vast Mohammedan host, 160,000 regular troops. Within the walls perhaps 7,000 men stood by the emperor, nearly two-thirds of them Westerners, Italians chiefly. The population, cursing their emperor and dreading Mohammed, awaited in passive superstition the arrival of a miracle. But after two months of siege the city fell (May 29, 1453). Its capture was the crown of a hundred years of Moslem victories, and immediately it gave to the Ottoman achievement a solidarity, a consistency and an air of permanence it had never hitherto possessed. Their hold on this city which for one thousand five hundred years had been a key point of world strategy, gave to the Turks a kind of prestige as invincible which the race never lost.

Its more immediate effect was to make it certain that the yoke laid upon the Christians of south-east Europe would not be lifted for centuries, and that the tyranny would, in the near future, extend to yet further provinces of what had once been Christendom. The West, Christian Europe, has now before it -- and will continue to have before it down to our own time -- the permanent anxiety of the "Eastern Question"; and the popes, since they at least realise the menace and resist it, are henceforward burdened with a second, [] and permanent, major distraction from their duty to attend to the badly-needed reform of Christian life and thought. It is perhaps this last effect of the Turkish conquests which was the most disastrous of all, from the point of view of religion. Even had the popes been able to bring about the impossible, to put new life into the France of Charles VII, to unite in immediate harmony the England of the Wars of the Roses, to banish the Hussite feuds still eating away

the vitality of Germany, and then, uniting these mutually antagonistic national interests and combining these princes with those maritime states of Italy whose policy was in its inspiration the least Christian of all, to launch a well-planned, well-organised joint attack at a distance of months of marching from its bases and even had the attack been successful and the Turks, five hundred years ago, been crippled for ever, what could the papacy thereby have gained for religion? Territories where the victorious Latin princes would assuredly have been the rulers, and where populations violently attached to their anti-Latin prejudices would continue to prefer the temporal rule of Islam to the spiritual rule of the pope. Nothing but a succession of miracles -- suspensions of the laws of the nature of things -- in the fields of diplomacy and war could have now brought the Christian cause to triumph over the Turks, and nothing but a new series of miracles could have saved the lands so liberated from the bloody anarchy which had been their fate already for generations wherever Latins ruled Greeks and hellenized Slavs. [] It is, however, rarely given to any man to see the problem of his own hour in all its dimensions. What is demanded of him, by posterity, is that he shall have faced the crisis generously, with a total abandonment of self-interest. By this test the popes of this generation must be judged to have succeeded, and in the continuous nine years' effort of the two popes Calixtus III and Pius II, the papacy now reaches to heights unscaled since Gregory X.

When Nicholas V died (March 24-25, 1455), fifteen cardinals met to elect his successor. [] Seven were Italians, there were two Frenchmen, two Greeks, and four Spaniards. An Orsini party in the Sacred College favoured a French pope, while a Colonna party aimed at another Italian. The only way out of the deadlock was to elect a cardinal who was neither, and for a brief moment it seemed that the new pope would be the Greek Bessarion, the hero of the reunion party at Florence, a fine scholar, a theologian, and a good administrator; in many ways the most noteworthy churchman of his age. But prejudice was too strong, and jealousy of the neophyte. There was next a movement to elect, from outside the cardinals, the Friar Minor Antonio of Montefalcone; and then, "as it were to postpone the contest, " [] on April 8 the cardinals elected an aged Spaniard, Alonso de Borja. []

Calixtus III -- this was the new pope's title -- came of a race for which militant opposition to Islam, still, after seven centuries, in occupation of the south of Spain, was of the essence of Catholicism. He was, moreover, a Catalan, and the kingdom of Aragon, in whose service he had spent the greater part of his life, was the greatest of the Christian maritime powers. The pope began his reign by a solemn public vow to work for one thing only, the expulsion of the Turks from Europe and the liberation of their Christian victims. Then he set himself, with wonderful energy and skill, to reorganise the crusade. Indulgences were announced, tithes decreed, the date of departure fixed and legates sent to all the Christian princes, cardinals to the chief of them, bishops and the new Franciscan Observants [] to the smaller states. Calixtus made his own generous personal contribution, sending jewels to the saleroom and his plate to the mint, and even selling off castles. The restoration plans of Nicholas V were abruptly halted. Sculptors were set to cut stone cannon balls, and architects bidden design ships and engines of war. There was to be an expedition by land under the command of the Duke of Burgundy, [] while the sea warfare would be the task of the pope's old master the King of Aragon and Naples. [] There was already a small papal fleet in existence, and it was now ordered into the Aegean to succour the population of the islands still in Christian hands. During the winter of 1455-1456 the pope set up shipyards along the Tiber, and at an immense cost built a second fleet of twenty-seven ships.

The difficulties which had hampered earlier popes did not disappear. From no one of the Western princes was there any real response to the pope's enthusiasm. Hardly any of the money laboriously collected from the clergy and people ever reached the pope. The Kings of France and Denmark and Aragon, and the Duke of Burgundy himself, simply transferred it to their own use. In France it was even denied that the pope had any right to levy taxes on French Church property, and Calixtus was threatened with a General Council should he not withdraw the tax -- a threat which this tough old man met by excommunicating those who had signed this protest. In the first summer of the reign war broke out in central Italy -- a war in which the King of Naples secretly helped the freebooter Picinnino against the pope, while the papal fleet (commanded by an Aragonese archbishop), instead of sailing to the Aegean, joined itself to the Aragonese fleet in an attack on Genoa. Nor

was the new fleet, at first, a more useful instrument. It was not until August 6, 1456, that the cardinal who commanded it -- Scarampo -- could be persuaded to leave the security of Naples. And by that date the one great event of the war was over, the relief of the besieged city of Belgrade.

The conqueror of Constantinople, Mohammed II, who had in 1455 made himself master of Serbia, next planned the conquest of Hungary, the last power between himself and the West. Throughout the winter and spring (1455-1456) he made his careful preparations, and in June 1456 he moved, with a well-equipped force of 150,000 men. In July he laid siege to Belgrade. Against all likelihood the siege was raised, and Mohammed was forced to retire, with heavy losses in men and in material. The heroes of this amazing feat were the nameless thousands whom the sanctity and burning eloquence of the General of the Observant Franciscans, St. John Capistran, had recruited for the new crusade, whom the genius of the Spanish cardinal legate, Juan Carvajal, had organised, and whom John Hunyadi led. [] The first stage of the victory was the five-hour fight on the Danube (July 14) when the crusaders forced their way through the Turks into the city and the citadel. Just a week later the sultan ordered a general assault. The Turks persisted for two days, and then they retired, in great confusion. Mohammed brought off his army indeed, but his losses were extremely heavy.

Hopes ran high at Rome, when the splendid news came in, and the pope, to commemorate for ever a victory which he regarded as a patent answer to his crusade of prayer, founded the new feast of the Transfiguration of Our Lord (August 6). Elsewhere the great victory was readily interpreted as a proof that no further effort was needed. In Servia itself the very worst happened. Hunyadi died -- of the plague -- only three weeks after the rout, and St. John also died, a few weeks later (October 23). And next, when the weakling Habsburg King of Hungary -- who had fled to Vienna as Mohammed's armies neared Belgrade -- arrived with reinforcements (November), there was so violent a quarrel between Germans and Hungarians that the crusade broke up.

So much had the energy and faith of Calixtus III accomplished in one short year, and to so little had it all been brought. But the

failure did not break the pope's spirit, nor halt his effort. A new Christian champion -- Skanderbeg -- now appeared in Albania, [] and in August 1457 the little papal fleet won a battle off Mitylene, when twenty-five enemy ships were captured.

But the catastrophe which followed the relief of Belgrade was really the end of anything that Calixtus, at his great age, could expect to accomplish. Two years later he died, on the very feast he had founded, August 6, 1458.

As in 1455, and 1447, the vacant see was soon filled. On August 19 the Cardinal of Siena was elected, Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini. He chose to be called Pius II, from devotion it may be thought to Virgil, rather than to the distant memory of that Pius I who was almost Virgil's contemporary. For Aeneas Sylvius, fifty-three years of age at his election, had been for a good thirty years and more one of the brightest figures in the revival of classical letters. He was not so learned as Nicholas V, nor had he that pope's natural affection for the sacred sciences. But much more than that enthusiastic collector of manuscripts, he had been throughout his life a most distinguished practitioner of the new literary arts. He had written poems in the classical metres, histories, romances even, and as a practical professional diplomatist he had shown himself a finished master of the new, highly-stylised oratory. His whole career had been rather that of a cultivated man of the world than of a priest, and in fact it was not until he was past forty that Aeneas Sylvius took the great step of receiving Holy Orders. What had delayed him for years he himself set down, with stark directness, in a letter to a friend: "Timeo continentiam." His life as a layman had, indeed, been habitually marked by the gravest moral irregularities, and it was partly due to his way of life that at fifty-three he was prematurely old and broken, white-haired and crippled with gout. But the mind was as keen as ever, the enthusiasm for letters burned no less brightly, and the whole man, like another St. Augustine, was now devoted to the interests of religion.

The contrast between Pius II and his predecessor could not have been greater, save for one thing, his resolute will to free Christendom from the menace of Islam. With Pius II, too, this was the primary task before the Holy See. In a speech made on the very day of his election, the pope had made this clear. Given the many successes of his long diplomatic career, it was not

strange that the pope should begin his reign by yet another effort to achieve the needed European unity, nor that the means he proposed was a congress of the sovereign princes. On October 12, 1458, he announced to the cardinals that he proposed to call this congress to meet at Mantua in the June of 1459, and that he would himself preside at it. On January 22 -- in the face of much criticism -- he set out from Rome. Travelling by slow stages, halting at Perugia, Siena, Florence, Bologna and Ferrara, he at length came to Mantua, on May 27.

The seven months of the pope's stay at Mantua [] were an all but unrelieved disappointment. Of all the princes invited not one had even troubled to send an envoy. The very cardinals had secretly worked to dissuade the princes, and now they did their best to persuade the pope to abandon the scheme. Scarampo especially, the late admiral of the papal fleet, showed himself hostile and contemptuous, and presently returned to Rome. The emperor, whose interests Pius II had served magnificently when he was his secretary, chose this moment to proclaim himself King of Hungary, and thereby to begin a civil war in "this kingdom which is the shield of all Christendom, under cover of which we have hitherto been safe. " [] The King of France, with whom the emperor was plotting to force a transfer of the congress to some imperial city, made it clear that he would not co-operate in the war unless the pope acknowledged the claims of the House of Anjou to the kingdom of Naples, and he underlined his hostility by scarcely veiled threats to renew the anti-papal agitation and feuds of Basel and Constance. The Venetians were so indifferent that the pope told them plainly they were thought to hold more with the Turks than with the Christians, and to be more interested in their trade than in their religion. []

It was not until September 26, four months after the pope's arrival at Mantua, that enough envoys had appeared for the congress to hold a meeting. And though the pope, and various envoys, remained on for another four months it never met again. The pope thought it more practical to deal with the various ambassadors individually.

The delegates from France did at last arrive, in November 1459, but their real business was to bully the pope and to coerce him into a change of policy in Naples. [] But Pius II was resolute,

and so far from cowed by the king's hostility that he took the offensive, and demanded a revocation of the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438. The Bishop of Rome, he said, was only allowed in France such jurisdiction as it pleased the Parlement to grant him. Were this to continue, the Church would become a monster, a creature with many heads. And to clinch the matter he published, from Mantua, the famous bull *Exsecrabilis*, [] condemning as a novel and hitherto unheard-of abuse, the practice of appealing from the pope to some future General Council.

The congress formally ended with a bull proclaiming a three-years' crusade and announcing new grants of Church revenues for its support. On January 19, 1460, the pope left Mantua. It was not until October 6 that he was back in Rome, after an absence of nearly two years.

The response of Europe to the new appeal was as poor as ever. Eleven months after the return of the pope to Rome the news came, in September 1461, that Mohammed had overrun the last Christian state in Asia Minor, the empire of Trebizond, and that he was master of the Black Sea port of Sinope. Then it was once more the turn of the Balkan states and Greece. Lesbos was captured in 1462, and Bosnia was conquered in 1463. The Venetian admiral had looked on unmoved while the Turks took Lesbos, but their attack, later that same year, on the republic's colonies at Lepanto and in Argolis brought the war party in Venice into power. Pius II, though under no illusions about the nature of the new Venetian zeal for a crusade, [] thought the moment had arrived to publish the resolution to which he had come in March 1462 -- the resolution of a brave man indeed, but of one who has all but despaired of his generation, and who will all but demand that Providence shall save it by a miracle. Venice, at last, had been persuaded by events that the only way of salvation for a Christian state was to defeat and destroy for ever the Turkish forces. Hungary, whence alone could come the military complement to the maritime power of Venice, was at last delivered from the war with Frederick III. [] The French still resolutely held themselves aloof; Florence thought that Venice and the Turks should be left to fight each other until neither was strong enough to be dangerous to anyone else. But on September 12, 1463, the Venetians signed an offensive alliance with Hungary, and on September 23 the pope announced his

resolve. To kill for ever the often-heard gibe that pope and cardinals would do anything except expose themselves to suffer in the Holy War, Pius II would personally lead the crusade, and all the cardinals would go with him, save only the sick and those needed for the vital administration of the Church.

"Whatever we do, " said the pope, "people take it ill. They say we live for pleasure only, pile up riches, bear ourselves arrogantly, ride on fat mules and handsome palfreys, trail the fringes of our cloaks and show plump faces from beneath the red hat and the white hood, keep hounds for the chase, spend much on actors and parasites, and nothing in defence of the Faith. And there is some truth in their words: many among the cardinals and other officials of our court do lead this kind of life. If the truth be told, the luxury and pomp of our court is too great. And this is why we are so detested by the people that they will not listen to us, even when what we say is just and reasonable. . . . Our cry [] 'Go forth' has resounded in vain. If instead, the word is ' Come, with me, ' there will be some response. . . . Should this effort also fail, we know of no other means. . . . We are too weak to fight sword in hand; and this is not indeed the priest's duty. But we shall imitate Moses, and pray upon the height while the people of Israel do battle below. "

So did the pope speak to his cardinals, and although there were political realists among them who only sneered, the majority caught something of his devoted spirit. To the princes who looked on unmoved at the last preparations, at the strenuous efforts to raise funds, the sale of vestments, chalices, and other plate, the renewed appeals to Florence, to Milan, and to Siena, and to the rest, at the slow labour of turning into an ordered force the thousands of poor men who came in from France, Germany, the Low Countries, from Spain and Scotland too, to seek victory and salvation with the pope, Pius II spoke his last word on October 22, 1463. "Think of your hopeless brethren groaning in captivity amongst the Turks or living in daily dread of it. As you are men, let humanity prompt you. . . . As you are Christians, obey the Gospel and love your neighbour as yourself. . . . The like fate is hanging over yourselves; if you will not help those who live between you and the enemy, those still further away will forsake you when your own hour arrives. . . . The ruin of the emperors of Constantinople and Trebizond, of the Kings of Bosnia and Rascia and the others, all overpowered

the one after the other, prove how disastrous it is to stand still and do nothing. " The time was indeed to come when some of those who heard this would see the Turks masters of Hungary as far as Buda, masters, too, of the whole Mediterranean marine.

All through that winter, 1463-1464, the work of preparation continued, and the pope remained fixed in his resolve, though even his own subjects had to be constrained to subscribe to the war fund, though there were cardinals who used every chance to hinder and to destroy the great work, and though the French king, Louis XI, threatened an alliance with the Hussites and a new council once the pope was out of Rome.

On the day fixed, June 18, 1464, after a great ceremony in St. Peter's, Pius II left the city for Ancona, the port of assembly. He was already an old man, broken with years of gout and stone. The intense heat tried him further. It took him a month to reach Ancona, and by this time he was seriously ill. In the port all was confusion, crowded with Spanish and French crusaders -- all of the poorest class -- unorganised, leaderless and at daggers drawn. As August came in, and the temperature mounted, the plague broke out. The papal fleet had been delayed in its voyage from Pisa, and of course there was not a sign of any vessel from Venice. A new siege of the pope now began, to persuade him to abandon the expedition and to return to Rome. But the onetime elegant aesthete was long beyond the power of arguments addressed to his material happiness. He held firm to his resolve to sacrifice himself utterly, and tortured now by new anxieties as to the loyalty of Venice as well as by his fiendish bodily pain, Pius II slowly came to his end, with the disgusted among his cardinals occupied only with chances and prospects in the conclave that could not now be far off. At Ancona, in the night before the feast of Our Lady's Assumption, the pope died. He had had his last view of the world he had so loved, the antique world and the new, two days earlier, when carried to the window of his sickroom he saw the first of the Venetian galleys round the mole that runs out beyond the triumphal arch of Trajan.

The body of the dead pope was taken back to Rome, and the cardinals hastened to follow it, for the funeral service and the conclave. The crusade had died with the pope. The doge used the opportunity of his presence at Ancona to make clear to the cardinals how ill-advised he thought the whole affair; and the

cardinals, anxious above all else to get the expedition off their hands, made over the crusade fleet to him -- to be restored should the pope whom they were about to elect require it for a crusade. They also paid to the doge -- for transmission to the King of Hungary -- what remained of the treasure collected, 40,000 ducats. The doge returned to Venice on August 18, and gave orders immediately that the great fleet should be dismantled.

The cardinals were all back in Rome by August 25, and on the 28th they went into conclave. [] The election was soon over, for on the very first ballot they chose as pope a rich Venetian noble, forty-eight years of age, Cardinal Pietro Barbo, a nephew of Eugene IV. He took the name of Paul II. Personal leadership of the crusade was never any part of his policy. But Paul II was far from sympathising with the selfish policy of the great

. city whence he came. He gave what aid he could to Hungary in the crisis of 1465, and to Skanderbeg when hard pressed at Croja two years later. But Albania fell to the Turks in 1468, and the important Venetian possession, Negrepont, in 1470. Here, for the moment, the tale of Moslem success ended. After twenty years of conquest the effort of Mohammed II was coming to a halt, and his death in 1481 gave relief to the West for a generation.

The last events in the drama of Mohammed's reign were first the naval expedition, organised by Sixtus IV in 1473, which took and sacked the Turkish ports of Attalia (whereupon dissensions, and the return home of the Neapolitan contingent) and of Smyrna (after which the Venetians deserted); and finally, in 1480, a Turkish invasion of Italy and the temporary occupation of Otranto (August 11). [] Had Mohammed's successor been such another as himself, nothing could now have saved Rome and Italy. The pope prepared to flee; Avignon was got ready for his court; [] a an immense effort was made to raise an army and equip a fleet, and then, on June 2, 1481, the welcome news came that Mohammed II was dead. Special services of thanksgiving were held, and it was in a wholly new spirit of confidence that the fleet sailed to besiege Otranto. After ten weeks of vigorous resistance the Turks surrendered. And then, as always, the coalition broke up. The pope's scheme of an attack on Valona, in preparation for an attempt to free Albania, came to nought.

Plague broke out in the papal ships, the men refused to serve any longer, winter was at hand, and so, despite the pope's energy, all the advantage was lost. The Turks were no longer attacking -- when next a soldier of genius appeared among them it was Syria and Egypt that would attract him -- and the Christian states were only too willing to leave them undisturbed in their new empire.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



3. THE RETURN OF THE ANCIENT WORLD

The fifty years that followed the Council of Constance saw a remarkable revival in the fortunes of the papacy; in that time the popes managed to reassert everywhere the idea and the practice of their traditional primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church. In that same half century, despite the continuous endeavours of the same popes, Christendom, as a political association, refused to league itself against the new militant Mohammedanism of the Ottomans; and at the very moment when Islam was about to be expelled from the last remnant of its ancient hold on Spain, it was yet able to gain in the south-east a greater hold on Christian Europeans than had ever been its fortune in the whole eight hundred years of its existence. But what is more generally associated with the history of these first two generations of the fifteenth century is that first rapid new flowering in Italy of literature and the arts, which, universally, is called the Renaissance. The effect of this on the fortunes of Catholicism was speedy, it was profound, and it has lasted.

There is scarcely any need nowadays to labour the point that there were painters and sculptors of lasting significance before, let us say, Botticelli and Donatello, or that the Gothic is not sterile and barbarous; nor, on the other hand, is it necessary to insist how barren in creative literature was this new revival in its most enthusiastically classical stage. Nor, again, will it be any longer contended that the most splendid achievement of the thought of Greece was a closed book for the West until, in the fifteenth century, Chrysoloras and Gemistes Plethon began to teach the Greek grammar to the enthusiastic patricians of Florence. But although the nature of the change which then began was for long misunderstood, the scale of its effect has never been exaggerated. It brought about, ultimately, a change in the educated man's whole outlook upon life, a revolutionary change, which disturbed all his standards of judgment -- a change after which the Christian world was never to be, anywhere, quite the same kind of thing as before.

It all began with a new interest in the Latin literature of the golden age, in Cicero above all and in Virgil; and this interest became a permanent enthusiasm, and indeed a main purpose of

life, in the world of the cultured as, during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, long forgotten works of these Latin poets, rhetoricians, philosophers and historians began to be "discovered" in the various monastic libraries of Italy, France and southern Germany. The second stage was the introduction to the West, now all aglow with the novelty of an artistic appreciation of literary form, of the still finer literature of the Greeks. It was in translations, first of all, that these masterpieces were read, translations made by the occasional Latin humanist of the new type who knew Greek. But presently the desire to read the actual texts bred a very passion to learn the language; and ability to read the Greeks themselves, once this became at all general, wrought such a revolution in the mind of the West that, for the next five hundred years, Greek studies would be everywhere considered not only the first foundation of all scholarship, but a vital necessity in the intellectual formation of the generally educated European.

It has been urged that the Renaissance had no importance, in the fifteenth century, for the ordinary man, that it passed by the people of its own time. This is no doubt true; but it by no means passed by the ruling classes of the time, whether rulers in the Church or in the State, and it actually created a new class, destined to be as powerful as either of these, the independent thinkers, with no official attachments, who wrote for the general public of men who could read. Also, this new ruling class came into existence almost simultaneously with that new art of printing, one of whose main results was precisely this, that now, for the first time, the ordinary man could really make a contact with all the great literature of the world. And the invention permanently established the public influence of this new ruling class, making it forever impossible to set barriers to the spread and development of new ideas, whether these were good or bad, whether to popes and kings they were found convenient or inconvenient.

Is it too much to say that the discovery of printing was the most important event of this century? Books had already been made, at the end of the fourteenth century, where each page was printed from a single block -- an adaptation of a Chinese invention already some hundreds of years old. But the all important idea was that of making separate types for each letter and to print by combining them in a frame. To whom was this

due? The question is still much controverted. But, at a time when the idea was "in the air", it was the German, John Gutenberg (1398-1468) who first, successfully, began to print, at Mainz. The first piece we possess of his craftsmanship is an indulgence, dated 1454, and among his books are two magnificent bibles. Two of Gutenberg's associates, Fust and Schoeffer developed the new art. Bamberg, Strasburg, Augsburg and Nuremberg all had presses by 1470, and it was a printer at Cologne who taught the craft to the Englishman William Caxton, who set up his press at Westminster in 1476. The first Italian press was set up in 1464, very appropriately in the Benedictine abbey of Subiaco. Soon there was an abundance of printers in Italy, thirty-eight in Rome alone by the end of the century, and as many as a hundred in Venice. Printing came to France in 1470, where its first patrons were the king, Louis XI, and the theologians of the Sorbonne.

Everywhere, indeed, the ecclesiastics welcomed the new invention, patronised the craftsmen and protected them against the strong opposition of the calligraphers, and of the booksellers too. The bishops in Germany, for example, considering the craft as a work of piety, granted indulgences to the printers and to those who sold the new books. Naturally enough, among the first to set up presses were the Brothers of the Common Life. Canons Regular, Benedictines, Premonstratensians, did the same. The first printer at Leipzig was a professor of theology in the university, and it was a Franciscan lector in theology who set up the first press in the university town of Tubingen.

Such is the tale everywhere, cardinals, bishops, religious and clergy united in an immense practical enthusiasm to employ and develop the art. At Rome the pope who saw its beginnings -- Paul II (1464-1471) -- put at the disposal of the first printers the manuscripts collected by his predecessors. The generous zeal of Nicholas V now began to reap a harvest far beyond anything he could have hoped. Bessarion did as much for the presses of Venice, lending the printers his Greek manuscripts. The printers were held in high honour. Popes employed them as ambassadors, ennobled them. It was an art that the clergy were proud to exercise, and among these earliest printers there were, at Venice, even nuns. And when the navigators revealed to Europe the existence of the new lands beyond the Atlantic, it

was the missionaries who took the printing press across the seas.

The question must indeed rise immediately to the mind, how such a humanist movement as this -- the humanist movement par excellence, in popular impression -- affected the religion to which, for many centuries now, Western humanity had brought its mind in captivity; how did it affect, that is to say, not so much Catholicism as a body of truths, but as an association of human beings who accepted those truths? The Renaissance came upon this Catholic world at a moment when the Church was labouring under serious disintegrating strains, effects of the schism, of the long disputes about the papal primacy, and of the long decay of thought; in an age characterised by a general scepticism about the usefulness, or the possibility, of philosophy, an age when prelates who were the leaders of Catholic thought managed, in simple unawareness, to hold simultaneously the Catholic faith and philosophical positions incompatible with it, and this without interference, amid the time's general unawareness; and while, since Ockham, this practical scepticism had been slowly rotting the Christian mind, considerations of quite another order had been shaping the religious outlook of the new capitalist bourgeoisie, chafing at a morality which would limit its opportunities of profit. It was upon a Christendom "ready for anything" that there now came this movement which, inevitably, would not stop at any mere artistic appreciation of literary form. Almost from the beginning the movement effected important -- if as yet concealed -- apostasies from the Christian standard of morals.

It was the greatest movement of the century, the greatest movement of the human spirit indeed, since that which began in the days of Abelard and John of Salisbury, and -- one of its most singular features -- among the chief patrons of the movement, and even among its leaders, were the popes. Not all of them, indeed, were enthusiasts, but hardly one was indifferent to it, and none of them set himself in direct opposition to it.

What, it may be asked, had the popes to do with a movement that was not religious in its nature, nor yet in its immediate objective? where was their place in this new world of poets and painters and sculptors, of men of letters and artists generally? Here, surely, is the very antithesis to that conception of

Christian perfection which inspired the contemporary Devotio Moderna? Rarely, indeed, in history has the papacy placed itself at the head of any contemporary new development, whether in thought or life; rarely has its role been that of the pioneer. In the earlier, medieval, renaissance -- a renaissance not of a particular way of writing, of thinking, or of life, but a rebirth of life itself, of the activity of the human mind after the quasi-death of the terrible Dark Ages -- the popes had scarcely initiated at all. They had been sometimes helpful, always watchful, and more often than not extremely suspicious. There are no philosopher popes in the formative stage of the century of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure and Siger. But now, in the fifteenth century, popes are themselves among the most famous exponents of the new culture. The contrast could not be greater than between the attitude of Gregory IX to the Aristotelian revival in the first half of the century of St. Thomas, and that of Nicholas V in the morning of the Renaissance. The earlier pope, theologian and canonist, saw only the dangers -- really latent -- in the new rising cult of the Greek, but not the immense value of what was true in his thought, nor how the dangers it presented could be met. His successor, two hundred years later, saw only the glorious promise of a new age of Christian culture and wisdom; in an age already more superficial than any for five hundred years, it is not surprising that he mistook the signs, already evident, of an essential antagonism of ideals for the personal indecencies of a handful of looseliving men of letters.

The earliest of the medieval popes whom we know as an interested and discerning patron of the fine arts on the grand scale, was Boniface VIII, and this was made a count against him in Philip the Fair's endeavour to bring about his posthumous condemnation as a heretic and a false pope. Boniface had, indeed, done much to assist the Roman art of his time, employing such masters as Pietro Cavallini and the Cosimati; and he had also brought to Rome, from Florence, Arnolfo di Cambio and Giotto. The record survives of the mass of precious church and altar furnishings, of vestments, episcopal jewellery, reliquaries, statues, work in metal and in ivory, tapestries and embroideries, made to the order of this pope by artists and craftsmen from every country in Europe. Boniface, in the last months before the fatal crisis of Anagni, also completed the organisation of the Roman university, by adding a faculty of arts to the existing faculties of the sacred sciences and law. He

founded a second university at Fermo; he founded anew the archives of the Apostolic See, which had disappeared during the troubled years of the wars between his predecessors and Frederick II. Finally Boniface VIII collected what remained of the ancient library of the popes, works for the most part of theology, liturgy and canon law; and by his care to extend this collection he has a real claim to be a principal founder of the Vatican Library. Boniface VIII could find but a handful of manuscripts that had survived the storms and the years of chaos. He left behind no fewer than 1,300. Most of these were religious works, many of them newly transcribed for the pope, and illuminated by the staff of copyists he had formed. There were bibles and theology and philosophy, liturgy and law and church history; there were the Latin fathers and some of the Greeks too -- Origen at any rate, St. Athanasius and St. John Chrysostom. But there were also -- and it is this which interests this chapter -- manuscripts of Cicero and Seneca, Virgil and Ovid, Lucan, Suetonius and Pliny, the grammatical treatises of Donatus and thirty-three works in Greek, the earliest collection of Greek texts we know of in any medieval library, and works, all of them, of a scientific kind, Euclid, Ptolemy, Archimedes.

Boniface VIII died in 1303, his immediate successor reigned only a short nine months, and Clement V who next succeeded, the first of the Avignon popes, had not ever, until the close of his reign, any settled place of residence. Not until the coming of John XXII (1316-1334) were the popes again in a position to interest themselves in literature and the arts. It was this pope, and his successor, Benedict XII (1334-1342), the main organisers of the Avignon papacy as a system of government, who provided so magnificently for its housing in the great Palais des Papes that still dominates the ancient city by the Rhone. From this time Avignon became a centre to which architects, painters and sculptors and the whole world of craftsmen and artificers, flowed steadily in search of patronage; and with them came the men of letters, the most notable of all being Francesco Petrarch. While Rome, intellectually and materially, fell back into a very barbarism, Avignon, in these central years, of the fourteenth century, bade fair to become what Florence was a hundred years later.

The papal library was developed anew, and yet again there figured among its treasures what Latin classics the medieval

world possessed -- no Horace as yet, nor anything of Tacitus -- and new translations from the Greek, of Aristotle, for example, and Aesop and Porphyry. But there is no Homer, no Demosthenes, no Thucydides, and no Greek tragedy. Yet although the Greek influence is still exercised in so limited a way, and through translations only, the fourteenth century is a time when contact with the Greek-speaking world is being steadily extended. The rapidly developing crisis of the Christian East, as the Ottomans advance, brings more and more Greeks to the West, in search of assistance or simply as refugees, and with both kinds of necessitous Greeks the papal court, in all these years, is very familiar. Gradually a practical knowledge of fourteenth-century Greek becomes more common at the curia and, through the curia, elsewhere too. The new religious discussions between Latins and Greeks also, inevitably, turn the mind of the West not only to the less familiar of the Greek fathers but to the original texts of all of them. In this new interest the pioneers are the Dominicans and the Franciscans -- the Franciscans especially -- whom, for more than a hundred years now, the popes have been employing as missionaries and agents in the islands of the Greek sea, in Asia Minor, in the very lands of central Asia as far as China itself. [] As the diplomacy rises and falls between the popes and these Eastern princes, presents are exchanged, and among the presents from the East there are manuscripts of the Greek classics.

It is this world into which Petrarch was introduced, a young man in his twenties, about the year 1330. Here, at the papal court, he found patrons, protection, books, and the stimulus of new opportunities, rewards, a career, the means to form his own famous library, and his first Greek. And after this, a first practical fruit of the ancient literature's hold on him, came his interest in the other remains of the ancient culture, the beginnings of all that practical historical and artistic interest in the sculpture and architecture of Greece and Rome. Petrarch, it was said long ago, is "the first modern man." Others have also been put forward for the distinction, but there is much in Petrarch which is new, and which since Petrarch has become characteristic and typical. We can see in him all the main elements of the promise which the Renaissance seemed to offer to the Christian future, and something also of what it was that blighted that promise. Recalling his career, and the development of his spirit, we can better understand the unmisgiving way in

which such an admirable Christian as Nicholas V welcomed the movement with open arms and without any reservations. Petrarch is the "modern man" in his violent reaction against the cultural achievement of the medieval world. Here he is a pioneer and, given his genius, his effect is weighty indeed. He has, for example, nothing but scorn for the unclassical latinity of the Middle Ages. He mocks the time for its dependence on translations; Aristotle would not recognise himself in his thirteenth-century Latin disguise. And he mocks at the cult of Aristotle himself. He is impatient with the superstition that entangles the learning of the Middle Ages, the bogus sciences of astrology and alchemy, the charlatanry that often passes for medicine; and he is impatient with the new lawyers' religion of the civil law, which they so eagerly develop, with a jargon of its own and distinctions for the sake of distinguishing, into a new and profitable pedantic superstition.

In Petrarch we also note, for the first time in a personage of international importance, the study of ancient history passing into such a love of the ancient world therein portrayed that the restoration of that world is urged as a practical solution for present discontents. Here is a first crusader driven by that *nostalgie du passe* which has afflicted so many others ever since. Rome, the Rome of Cicero, is the golden age; all since is usurpation and decay. So fourteen hundred years of history must, somehow, be undone. Whence the crazy-seeming alliance of Petrarch with Rienzi; whence the new Ghibellinism in which Petrarch tries, with all the power of flattery at his command, to enlist the realist princes to restore the Roman State; whence also the new anti-papal spirit, for the fact and presence of the papacy in Rome is the great obstacle to any real restoration of the republic. Here are ideas and ideals which, once given to the world, will not die. They inspire very many of the humanists -- and conspirators -- of the next generation, and Machiavelli will give them a still greater vitality, and thence they come down to our own age. Who will be so bold as to say we have yet heard the last of them?

Petrarch was a poet and a man of letters, and only incidentally was he a thinker or politician -- these activities were but the overbrimming of his literary contemplation. But in one respect he makes an interesting contact of accord with the world of some contemporaries whom he never met, and with whom

doubtless he would not have recognised that he had anything in common. For Petrarch was not anti-Aristotelian simply because, on crucial questions, he preferred the teaching of other philosophers, but because, fundamentally, he thought all such speculative philosophy a vain waste of time. Happiness is the object of life, thought cannot guide man to it, for in thought there is no certainty, and if a man wants to know how to be happy, let him read the Gospels -- or Cicero. Not, indeed, because Cicero is a thinker-another Aristotle -- but because Cicero is himself an apostle. Aristotle is cold, but Cicero is on fire with love of virtue and will enflame all those who read him. Not thought then but eloquence, not the philosopher but the artist, is the safe guide. Petrarch is yet another man who, sceptical about the power of reason, seeks elsewhere than in his reason the assurance he needs. And, as often happens when good men shrink from the labour of thought about their religious life, he assembles a strangely assorted company to aid him, and finds a curiously unchristian ratio for their union, and offers us Cicero and the divine Gospel as joint warranty for a Christian life, twin guardian angels for man cast into a world of temptation.

Petrarch, of course, knew that world as well as any other man. His sensitive spirit had been tried there as only such can be tried, and he had suffered defeats and perhaps routs. But the religious foundation remained secure. One day Petrarch was converted, and thenceforward he did battle manfully and continuously and, one may say, systematically with the tempter. Two traits, however, very notably, survived that conversion, to be a main source of anxiety with him to the end. They need to be mentioned explicitly, for they are to be the outstanding characteristics of almost all the great men of the Renaissance, though with these they are not defects, but rather the main end of life and the natural, hardly to be regarded, effect of their pursuit of it. Those traits are the desire for fame, and vanity. In Petrarch we find the earliest signs of that mania to be famous which is the leading note in the life of public men of all sorts during the last fifty years of which this book treats. No cult could be less compatible with the Christian ideal.

Petrarch, although he is hardly more than a precursor of the Renaissance as the term is generally used, is yet, as poet and man of letters, and as a man, a far greater personage than any of

those who follow him in the more brilliant Italy of the next []. century. Before we speak of these lesser men -- who by the accident of their special scholarship were necessarily the artificers of the greatest change of all -- and as a kind of preface to the statement of the effect of their lives on the last generations of medieval Catholicism, we need to note that Petrarch was not by any means the only Italian whose genius these French popes fostered at their court of Avignon. It is at Avignon that the popes first begin to employ the new humanists as their secretaries. The new age is not yet arrived when to write Ciceronian prose is the best of titles to a prince's favour, and a rapid highroad to wealth; but it is fast approaching. The last three of the Avignon popes -- Innocent VI, B. Urban V, Gregory XI -- were all men of culture, all university types, the first two indeed one-time professors. Innocent VI and Urban V brought to the service of the chancery the famous Coluccio Salutati, who later was to pass into the service of Florence as its chancellor and there to sponsor the entry into life and letters of "the heavenly twins" of the new age, Leonardo Bruni (called Aretino) and Poggio Bracciolini, and to bring to Florence the most active cultural force of all this time, the Byzantine Manuel Chrysolorus from whom Poggio, and Cenci, Filelfo himself, Ambrogio Traversari, and Thomas of Sarzana who was to become Pope Nicholas V, all learned their Greek. And it was Gregory XI's employment of Francesco Bruni that led to the appearance of his nephew Aretino in the papal chancery, and so to the beginning of all that development which made the corps of papal secretaries one of the first and most important centres of the classical revival in fifteenth- century Italy, a centre from which almost everything else was to come.

This is not a history of that revival, but the story cannot be told of the effect of the revival upon the papacy, and upon the papacy's government of the universal Church, without some mention of the famous humanists whom, from about this time, the popes began to call into their service, nor without some reminder of what that scholarship was which made these "civil servants" so famous. The chief of them, Poggio Bracciolini, entered the service of the popes, as a young man in his early twenties, about 1403. He served them for fifty years, rising to be the chief official of the chancery and amassing a huge fortune. In 1414 Poggio made one of the suite of John XXIII at the Council of Constance. For the debates there was presently great want of

theological and patristic texts, and it was Poggio's task to organise the collection of needed manuscripts from the libraries of the monasteries of Switzerland and southern Germany. Along with the fathers he found in these libraries much else; a host of minor writers of the silver age of Latin letters, the histories of Ammianus Marcellinus, for example, Quintilian's Institutes and several long-forgotten speeches of Cicero. From this moment Poggio was a celebrity. Martin V was glad to retain him in the chancery as he reorganised it in 1418. Some few years later it was Poggio's good fortune to discover Petronius and Pliny and Tacitus. This man of letters was no less interested in what we have come to call antiques, and he was one of the first collectors of medals, coins, marbles, statues and other relics of the art of the ancient world. His museum was indeed celebrated, and the missionaries in the East were encouraged to contribute to it, for presents of this kind were the surest passport to Poggio's influence in the curia.

Among Poggio's colleagues in the offices of the chancery there were three other scholars of note, who shared in the hunt after the lost classics and who were also poets, Bartholomew Aragazzi, Agapito Cenci and Antonio Loschi. All three were already in the service of the curia by the time of Martin V's election (1417), and they remained in it for the rest of their lives. They are the first editors and commentators of the Latin classics, practitioners of the new art of writing Ciceronian prose, and they were brought into the papal service so that the state-papers -- bulls and the like -- might be drafted in a style worthy of the Roman See. Never did this somewhat pedantic occupation seem so marvellous an accomplishment; and never, before or since, was it so munificently rewarded. []

The leading cardinals of the time followed the example set by the popes. It was Louis Aleman -- whom we have seen in set opposition to the papacy at Basel -- who was even able, when legate at Bologna, to win to the papal service, for a few brief months, the most famous of all Italian teachers of Greek, Filelfo. The Bishop of Bologna at that same time, the Carthusian cardinal Nicholas Albergati, was also a generous and interested patron of the new fashions. In his palace Filelfo was welcomed and he found there, among those eager to learn from him, the two future popes, Thomas of Sarzana, now beginning as the master of the cardinal's household a twenty years'

apprenticeship to the business of effectively patronising art and letters, and Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini. A third patron in the Sacred College who, like Albergati, was known universally for the piety and austerity of his life, was the youthful Domenico Capranica. A fourth, very notable, figure was the wealthy Girolamo Orsini, who gave all his energies and his money to gather a great library which, like the papal collection, should be at the disposal of all who loved studies. It was due to the combination of Poggio and Girolamo Orsini that the long-lost comedies of Plautus were given back to the world, and another effect of the revival is to be seen in the cardinal's no less momentous recovery of the works of St. Cyprian.

What first brought the popes of the fifteenth century into contact with the Renaissance was the most practical reason of all. The immediate task before these popes was to reorganise the machinery of government, and to rebuild the ruined churches and palaces and offices of their capital. They needed Latinists, and they needed architects, and painters and sculptors; and in each department they strove to gain the services of the best. With Martin V bringing to Rome Gentili and Masaccio and Ghiberti, that historic association of popes and artists begins that is, in the minds of all, one of the most permanent memories of the next hundred and fifty years; the association that reaches its peak in the collaboration of the two gigantic figures of Julius II and Michelangelo. Eugene IV's long reign was too broken for him to bring to a finish Martin V's great work of restoration. Of the work done by Eugene's orders in St. Peter's, only Filarete's great doors remain. The chapel in the Vatican, to decorate which this pope brought Fra Angelico from Florence, has disappeared, and there disappeared too, in the time of Paul III, (1534-1549), the frescoes painted for Eugene IV by Benozzo Gozzoli.

Eugene IV was, to the end of his days, a most observant religious, [] but neither by temperament nor training was he a man of letters or an artist. Nevertheless he too had learned Greek, and he was a great reader and student, especially of histories. His real interest in the new scholarship is shown unmistakably in his active patronage of one of the most winning figures of the time, the Camaldolese monk Ambrogio Traversari. This truly saintly man had learnt his Greek, when prior of his monastery in Florence, from Filelfo; and from his cell in that austere cloister, through conversations, and through a most

extensive correspondence, he exercised a very real influence on the movement, proposing and executing translations from the Greek and joining in the quest for still more manuscripts. Eugene IV made Traversari, in 1431, General of his order. In 1435 he sent him to Basel as legate, in a critical moment of the council's proceedings, and the combination of learning, letters and perfect charity that was Ambrogio Traversari worked wonders with the touchy assembly. It was Traversari, again, whom the same pope sent as his legate to Venice in 1438 to receive the Greek emperor and the delegation that had come for the reunion council. In the council he played the chief part on the Latin side, and living long enough to see the reunion a fact, he died just a few weeks later *felix opportunitate mortis* (October 20, 1439). But none of these public employments really interrupted the main interest of Traversari's life. He translated, at Eugene's request, the lives of the Greek Fathers, the Greek acts of the Council of Chalcedon, and he undertook also a new translation of the Bible.

Another evidence of this same pope's interest in the new scholarship, for the services this might be expected to render to the study of Sacred Scripture, is Eugene IV's lifelong patronage of Cyriac of Ancona, [] a great traveller in the Greek East, a scholar and a practical archaeologist also. Eugene had first met Cyriac when, Cardinal Legate of the Marches, he had employed him to remodel the harbour of Ancona. From the East Cyriac brought back to the pope new manuscripts of the Greek Testament, and he was commissioned to compare these texts with the Vulgate translation; one of the first instances of the application of the new methods to scriptural studies. Cyriac was also a pioneer when he compiled the first collection of classical inscriptions.

Cyriac of Ancona is thus one of the earliest of archaeological writers. But still more celebrated, the very "Father of Archaeology," was Flavio Biondo of Forli (1388-1463), yet another of the college of papal secretaries, recruited for the service of the Holy See by Eugene himself in 1434. For the remaining twenty-nine years of his life Biondo remained in that service, studying actualities and composing the works which, after five hundred years, have by no means lost their value, and continue in daily use; namely the history of his own time, and the two great works *Roma Instaurata* and *Italia Illustrata* which

are a skilled and detailed inventory of what still remained of the architecture and sculpture of the ancient world. No writings had a more speedy, or more lasting, effect in extending the general interest of that century in all the aims of the Renaissance.

The name of Tommaso Parentucelli -- more generally styled Thomas of Sarzana -- has already come into this story as a papal diplomatist and as one of the innermost circle of the leaders of the new movement. So late as 1444 he was still no more than the majordomo of the Cardinal Albergati. But when that saintly Carthusian -- for such he assuredly was -- died in that year, Eugene IV named Parentucelli to succeed him as Bishop of Bologna. In December 1446 the same pope gave him the red hat, and then, only ten weeks later, Tommaso was elected pope. There seemed something all but miraculous about such a speedy exaltation of a man, still on the young side of fifty, from the utmost obscurity in the ecclesiastical world to the very summit. In memory of his old master, the new pope took the name Nicholas, and in Nicholas V, so all historians have agreed to say, the Renaissance in all its unspoiled freshness was truly enthroned as pope. Here were combined, in fact, high technical competence, impeccable taste, limitless enthusiasm, magnanimity and magnificence in their only true sense, religious scholarship, deep sincere piety and humility of soul, and a disinterestedness from all thought of self not to be seen again in that chair for seventy years, [] and never again to be seen there allied with such a splendour of natural gifts.

But how far did Nicholas V, as pope, understand the realities of his time? the real condition of religion, the real nature of its weaknesses where it was weak, the causes of the weaknesses, and which weaknesses were heaviest with menace and even with mortality? To his immediate successor, the Aragonese crusader-pope Calixtus III, much of Nicholas V's programme was, apparently, little better than aesthetic trifling; and the next humanist pope, Aeneas Sylvius himself, made little secret of his belief, barely three years after Nicholas' death, that there were more urgent tasks before the papacy than the advancement of scholarship and belles lettres and the arts, even for what service these might bring to religion. We can, of course, hardly dismiss from our minds, as we regard the splendid schemes of Nicholas V, our knowledge of what the years that followed his reign were to bring, but if it is with a kind of reservation that we con the tale

of his magnificent ideals, and of those vast achievements of his all too short and prematurely ended reign, we must remember also that to nothing were the later disasters due more, than to papal and episcopal neglect to foster ecclesiastical learning, and to make this truly effective by marrying it to all that was best in the intellectual life of the time. What the next fifty years needed was a succession of popes in whom the spirit of Nicholas V was active.

It has been a commonplace with the historians since the very reign of Nicholas V that, in him, the Renaissance itself was enthroned as pope. But true though this is, in one respect he was not a Renaissance type at all, as the term has come to be understood. For to Tommaso Parentucelli the central ultimate purpose of the passionately desired perfection in letters and the arts had never been the perfection of man, but the clearer manifestation of the glory of man's Creator. And this continued to be, no less certainly, the guiding principle of his immense humanistic activities as Pope Nicholas V.

To his brilliant constructive genius the chronic civil disorder of the Papal State was a challenge not to be ignored. A whole scheme, or rather series of schemes, sprang from his mind for the restoration of decayed towns, of bridges, of roads, of schools and universities, and for the establishment of permanent harmony between the fierce local patriotisms and the central Roman authority, between the patricians and the bourgeoisie, between the nobles and their papal ruler. And a most unlikely number of the schemes were carried through. No pope had ever built so much before. Nicholas did not indeed live to realise his dream of making the capital of the Christian religion the active chief centre and source of culture, too, for the whole Christian world; but it was he who finally swept away all the accumulated debris and patchwork restoration that remained from the disastrous Avignon century, and who crowned the tentative endeavours of the previous twenty-five years with an effective restoration on the grand scale. The walls of Rome in their whole circuit were rebuilt and strengthened, the great aqueduct of the Acqua Vergine was repaired and a beginning made thereby of a new era in the health of the city. Four of the bridges on the main roads out of Rome -- the Ponte Milvio, Ponte Nomentano, Ponte Salario, and Ponte Lucano -- were restored and fortified. The Capitol, too, rose up again from its ruins, and a

good dozen of the ruined churches were rebuilt, while great works of restoration were carried through at the basilicas of St. Mary Major, St. Paul-without-the-walls, the Twelve Apostles and St. Lorenzo. It is again to Nicholas V that the oldest part of the Vatican as modern times know it goes back; it is, indeed, from this pope's time that the palace begins to have that importance in the story of the popes which has ended in its name being almost synonymous with the papacy itself. In the plans of Nicholas V for the rebuilding of the Leonine city we see his creative genius at its greatest. [] These plans involved the most sacred shrine in Rome, the great basilica built by Constantine over the tomb of St. Peter. After a thousand years of wear and tear the fabric was, indeed, in a parlous state, the main south wall leaning outwards from the perpendicular as much as five feet, and the north wall pulled inward to the same degree. At first the pope thought only of rebuilding the choir, and the walls of the new choir had gone up as high as fifty feet when the views of the Leonardo of the day, Leon Battista Alberti, [] induced Nicholas to consent to the extremely drastic remedy of pulling the great church down and building something entirely new in its place. But the pope died before anything more had been achieved than a little preliminary destruction, and it was not until the time of Julius II, fifty years later, that the transformation was really put in hand.

Rome was, indeed, during the eight years reign of Nicholas V, one huge building yard, a workshop, a studio. But outside the capital city the pope was no less active. At Orvieto, Spoleto, Viterbo, Fabriano, Assisi, Civita Castellana, Civita Vecchia, Narni, Gualdo and Castelnuovo, public buildings of all kinds, and public works, were planned on a generous scale and undertaken and carried through. The pope's great aim was to end the misery of the long baronial wars which made central Italy one of the least safe places in Christendom. His diplomacy, and his frequent visits to the provincial cities, did much to end these feuds, and his "Bloodless restoration of peace and order to the State of the Church", is indeed one of his chief glories. Particularly important was his reduction of the chronic insubordination of Bologna, in many ways the most important city in the pope's domains. Nicholas V is perhaps the most celebrated of the many great men who have passed from the spiritual rule of Bologna to the Roman See. [] He had spent twenty-five years of his life there as priest and bishop, and he

now won the city over by a kindness, and a willingness to concede, that were new in the history of Bologna's papal rulers.

The details of the history of the popes as rulers of their Italian principality are perhaps no great concern of the history of the Church, except in so far as their political activity and its attendant cares influenced the general fortunes of religion. But Nicholas V's policies were of such rare generosity, his achievements were on such a scale and so characteristic, both of his own constructive genius and of the new vitality of the great movement with which he is associated, that they could not go unmentioned. Nevertheless, all this activity of what we would call town-planning, of restoration and new building, this extensive employment of architects and builders, of sculptors and painters, of goldsmiths and jewellers and weavers of precious stuffs, was the less important part of the pope's great and lasting influence on the development of the European mind.

Nicholas was primarily a scholar -- an erudit, to be still more precise; the great passion of his life was books and the multiplication of other book lovers. The essential verse in the epitaph which Aeneas Sylvius wrote for him [] is surely *Excoluit doctos doctior ipse viros*. His mission was that of Albert the Great two hundred years earlier: "To make all these things understandable to the Latins"; "these things" being, now, not the ideas of Aristotle but the beauty and strength of Greek literature. "The Renaissance until now had been Latin, henceforward it was Greek," a modern scholar has said, with pardonably warm exaggeration. But to no scholars, indeed, was Nicholas V so liberal -- and his liberality to all of them knew scarcely any bounds -- as to those who knew Greek. As he planned a new cite vaticane where popes and cardinals and ambassadors and scholars and monks should live, and the central activity of the Church turn for ever in a setting worthy of its sublime ends, so the pope also planned a new Latin literature, the translation of the literature of Greece wrought by the masters of the new Latin prose and verse.

For Nicholas V, then, Valla translated Thucydides and Herodotus; Poggio and Lapo di Castiglione undertook Xenophon; the corpus of Aristotle was divided among a half-dozen "best wits", Bessarion doing the *Metaphysics*, and George of Trebizond (alas ! for he was more interested in pay

than in accuracy, or indeed in good work at all), the Rhetoric and the Ethics; Plato's Republic too, was in the list and the Laws, and Philo Judaeus also. Polybius, one of the pope's favourite authors, went to Perotti, who also produced a wonderful version of Strabo that for a hundred years or more obscured the original. But the greatest desire of Nicholas was never to be realised, the translation of Homer into Latin hexameters. For this he was prepared to pay no less than 10,000 gold pieces. First of all he prevailed on Carlo Marsuppini -- then acting as secretary to the Florentine Republic -- to undertake it; and when he died, in 1453, Filelfo took up the task. But Nicholas was dead before Filelfo had really begun his work. These were but literature and philosophy. Nicholas also arranged for translations of the Greek Fathers, of St. Basil, of the two Gregories, of Nazianzen and Nyssa, of St. Cyril and St. John Chrysostom and also of Eusebius of Cesarea. Finally, he commissioned Gianozzo Manetti, the pupil of Ambrogio Traversari, and a leading personage in the great world of Florence for years until he fell foul of the rising Medici, to re-translate the Bible. Manetti [] knew Hebrew as well as Greek, and his Old Testament was to appear in three parallel columns, his own translation, the Septuagint and the Latin of St. Jerome's Vulgate.

But Nicholas V's time was short -- far shorter than the rejoicing humanists could have guessed when their fellow, at forty- nine years of age, was elected pope in 1447. In 1450 he was already so ill that his life was despaired of; in the first months of 1451 he was ill again, and from this time indeed, never really well, and alas, utterly changed in disposition, nervous and apprehensive and reserved, where he had been all his life the friend of all the world. He was ill again in 1453, and for the last eighteen months of his life (he died on March 25, 1455), he scarcely ever left his bed. "Thomas of Sarzana saw more friends in a day," he said to his Carthusian friends who were preparing him for death, "than Nicholas V sees in a year." It was a sad ending to such bright promise, and yet it was said of his saintly passing, "No pope in the memory of man has died like this." Not all the detail was realised of what the great pope had planned, but the fundamental things remained, and above all the great fact that the papacy -- an infinitely greater force than all the cultural courts and coteries of the day -- had taken up and blessed the new movement and, as it were, made it for a moment its own work. This certainly lasted, and it was the personal work of

Nicholas V.

With the passing of this pope there comes a time of flatness in the Renaissance story. Not even Aeneas Sylvius -- Pope Pius II -- is his heir, nor the cultured Venetian, Paul II, who next succeeds, but, of all men the least likely, the Franciscan theologian Sixtus IV, elected pope in 1471. And by that date -- sixteen years after the death of Nicholas -- many tendencies had developed which in his time were but in germ. For there is another side to the story of all this splendour of scholarship and poetry and art. It is time to consider how the return of the ancient world affected other things in the artist besides his mastery of technique, to say something of those Renaissance ideas, which, from now on, acted most powerfully against what still remained of the medieval synthesis of natural and revealed knowledge, against what remained of medieval theology's prestige, against the educated man's appreciation of the prestige of Christianity itself, and against the traditional Christian scheme of virtuous living.

We should perhaps not be far wrong if, attempting the impossibility of summary description, we said that the Renaissance was the effect upon the men of the fifteenth century of their rediscovery of classical culture in all its fullness; and that what men found most novel and most characteristic in that culture, and most congenial, was its perfection of form. New respect and enthusiasm for the newly discovered perfection of form, and a new ambition to realise the like perfection, are perhaps what chiefly differentiates the men of the Renaissance from their medieval forerunners. Classical antiquity is, for them, the age of perfection; the golden age, of life no less than of art. Life, as that perfect thing the literature of the Greeks has revealed it, is for them the proper study of mankind; and it is now that there is born that prejudice of the superiority of the classical culture over the Christian which even yet, amongst educated men, is far from extinct. This new cult was all the more easily triumphant because it came upon the educated world in a moment when this lacked an object adequate to its needs. Not only, at the opening of the fifteenth century, was there no such figure as Dante, a spirit nourished by the philosophy and theology of the schools, but the philosophy of the schools had by now all but vanished from the ken of the liberally educated; it was now scarcely more than a preoccupation of the new scientists in their disputes with the professionals of the old

university world. The influence of the characteristically medieval thought upon its own world had been steadily declining for years; the reappearance of Greece had, for the liberally educated world, the effect upon that thought of a coup de grace. All who know no Greek are now as nothing, and by Greek is meant the literature of the Greeks as literature and, above all, Plato.

Here again, in recent years, the specialists in the matter warn us that we must be ready to revise old judgments, as we endeavour to understand what kind of thing that re-appearance of the Greek texts of Plato is, in western Europe of the fifteenth century. Not only, they tell us, was Plato not unknown in the Middle Ages, but medieval Platonism was not mere neo-Platonism. There did exist in the Middle Ages an active direct tradition of Platonic doctrine. But what a wealth of difference there lies between devotion to such a tradition, and devotion fed with the newly-revealed texts of the master himself ! Once these were available the cultured world "went Platonic" in a generation or so -- and very consciously it went anti-Aristotelian -- and Platonic it has remained, consciously and unconsciously, almost ever since. How should this be important to Catholicism? Very evidently, in this way at least, that the official theology of the Church, for now nearly two centuries, had been bound up with many of Aristotle's logical and philosophical doctrines and with his methods. And now, for Aristotle, already defeated in the field of physics, and his supremacy threatened by the Nominalist denial of the possibility of metaphysics, there was to be substituted, as the ideal, his own vastly more attractive master. If Plato reigned instead of Aristotle, what would become of the old theology's hold -- none too secure already -- upon the mind of the educated? True enough, St. Thomas Aquinas, who had somewhat tamed Aristotle to the Christian yoke, was not the first in time of Catholic theologians. Stretching back for a thousand years before St. Thomas there was the long line of the Fathers, and these were Platonists all. And the greatest of the Latin Fathers, St. Augustine, was not only Platonist, but was indeed the main channel through which -- down to the discoveries of the fifteenth century -- knowledge of Plato had come to western Europe. Whence the natural result of a reaction towards the Fathers, producing theologians who would like to ignore the Scholastic Theology, about which, also, (to the new sensitiveness of this literary generation) there clung something of Aristotle's own grimness of speech.

But damaging as this new indifference, and even hostility, of the new theologian was to the hold of Scholastic Theology, the new cult of Plato wrought also a harm that was positive. For thinkers who were Christians, Plato had always had this first attractiveness that here was philosophic recognition of the existence of a nonmaterial order of reality, and of its superiority to the material order; there was recognition that there existed an order of reality accessible only to the intelligence, and superior to that other order of reality with which the senses are occupied, the model indeed and the archetype of this lower order. In practice, here was a philosophy teaching that the things of earth are inferior, and that man's only happiness lies elsewhere, in his contact with that superior world and with the divine; here were theories to explain the divine nature, the kind of thing man's soul is and his mind, the way man's mind works, and the way man can attain to wisdom which is the condition sine qua non of his true happiness. Plato's temperament, it has been said, is essentially religious and ethical, and the religious (and specifically the theistic) interpretation of the universe is the chief historical legacy of his philosophy to subsequent ages. And it was as "a fusion of the rational-mathematical, the aesthetic and the religious elements in the contemplation of the universe. . . [a] glorification of the cosmos" that Plato appeared to the men who so eagerly gave themselves to him in the fifteenth century. []

How would these new disciples of the philosopher whom all styled " the divine ", accommodate their discovery with the Catholic faith in which they had been bred? Would that faith remain as the guide of life, or could not a man find all that he needed in Plato? It was, all over again, the trouble that had tormented the Christian mind when, two hundred years before, the corpus of Aristotle's thought had first been laid before it. In Plato, so Marsiglio Ficino, one of the finest flowers of the new age, was to say "there are set forth all the directives for life, all the principles of nature, all the holy mysteries of things divine." [] And again, "Plato. . . shows himself everywhere as much a religious man as a philosopher, a subtle disputant, and a holy priest, a fecund orator. For which reasons, if you will continue as you have begun, to follow further in the footsteps of the divine Plato, you will -- God guiding you -- find happiness, and this especially because Plato, along with the philosophy of

the Pythagoreans and Socrates, follows the law of Moses and is a precursor of the law of Christ." []

Marsiglio Ficino was the protege of Cosimo de' Medici, and the very foundation of that Academy of Florence which was the chief shrine of the new Platonic studies. When his old patron lay dying, in 1464, Marsiglio (not yet a priest) came to his assistance. Cosimo had earlier written bidding him bring his promised translation of Plato, " For I desire nothing more ardently than to learn that way which most easily leads man to happiness." As Cosimo lay in his last illness he made his confession and received the last sacraments. With Marsiglio he spoke much of Plato, and Plato was read to the dying man. He spoke too of the miseries of earthly life and of the contempt for it which a man should have who aspired to higher happiness, and Marsiglio reminded him how "Xenocrates that holy man, the beloved disciple of Plato," had set forth these things in his treatise on death. The story is a curious melange of Catholicism and Platonism, with Catholicism, surely, already suffering from the alliance. []

Nor did Plato come to the age unaccompanied. Only a pace behind, in his very shadow, and not always distinguished from him, came Plotinus and the religious cult of Neo-Platonism which had developed through Plotinus. [] Here was Platonism presented as a religion, where communion with the divine through ecstasy, for which lifelong asceticism prepared the soul, was presented as the supreme achievement of life. It was a "religion" where there was no place for real freedom, nor for personal responsibility, nor prayer, and where sin had no meaning. The world, for the Neo-Platonist was not created by the free act of a loving creator, but was the necessary expression of the nature of the first principle of all. Providence was but the kind of universal sympathy that links all things together in a fixed necessitated movement, all being moved by the single soul of the world. Here, in ultimate logic, is Pantheism and all its horrors; religion without a personal God, without any possibility of the Incarnation, mystical life without any need of grace and -- since there is no such distinction as between creator and created -- communion without subordination, and the idea that mystical experience is the basis and the test of truth.

Many things in Platonism and in Neo-Platonism can no doubt be

given a Christian interpretation, but of themselves they are not Christian; for Christians with intelligences less than very well trained in Christian teaching, they are obviously dangerous.

But it was not only Platonism -- in its purer and in its baser forms -- that came to life again in the West as a force in men's lives. Stoicism also revived; and Epicureanism. Once more man is invited to the belief in the perfectibility of his nature, and to accept the doctrine of his own goodness. To the Christian doctrine of the fall and its effects on human nature, of all men's need of healing grace, there is opposed the new, more elegantly stated, cult of man as he is, meditations on a way of life unfettered by sobering thoughts of man as he ought to be. The new man is to be made perfect by the full freedom to indulge his every impulse, to satisfy his every desire; for this alone is life. Man is simply an animal endowed with the power to think, master of his fate indeed, sole captain of his soul, to whom all that is possible is lawful. Never before was the " natural " so attractively portrayed to the Christian world as good and perfectible. []

And the artists re-echoed the philosophic teaching. "Such a feeling for nature in spring time," says a French critic of Lippo Lippi's "Adoration of the Shepherds," (painted about 1430) "as veracious in representation as it is intense in perception, had never before charmed the eye." Here, too, the primacy of nature begins to triumph, as the mysteries of the beauty of the human form are more and more lovingly explored. "Men had discovered that, outside Christianity altogether, there existed a culture, an art that was not only infinite in its riches, but which was also essentially natural, the spontaneous fruit of man's own faculties wherein was no element of dogma or revelation. And it SO happened that these products had, as things of beauty, an overwhelming superiority over all others. . . . The Christian centuries, from this point of view, seemed, -- indeed, a time of repression and of barbarism." [] Beauty -- it had, indeed, never been lacking to medieval man; but for the first time there was now revealed to his meditative gaze, and in what formidable competition with Christianity, the long lost beauty of that pagan world over which Christianity had once -- and it seemed finally -- been triumphant. Here, again, there was a system and a formula that were complete, a whole philosophy of nature and of life: here was most potent matter for the revolt of revolts against the

authority of Christianity, and that in an age already in revolt against the personnel of the Christian Church. The revival of interest in classical letters was showing itself, by the middle of the fifteenth century, as but a step in the quest for other ideals of thought and life.

And with the new cult of the natural, following upon the new proclamation of the primacy of Nature, there began the new attack on what chiefly stood between it and success, the spiritual and moral teaching of the Church. It was now that there began, not attacks upon the clergy for their vices, but attacks upon the monks for the "folly" of their ascetic ideals, and -- another new feature -- the literary glorification of vice. Morals begin, in every city and court of Italy, their gadarene descent, and among the most notorious of these ill-living antagonists of Christian ideals are the humanists of the Curia Romana. Nowhere did the new worship of antiquity produce greater contempt and hatred for the culture and the religion inspired by other sources, than in this circle. Poggio made the sins of priests and religious the butt of his filthy *Facetiae* and in his work on *Avarice* he mocked the very spiritual ideals that should have prevented sin. Valla, author of the *De Voluptate*, made an open attack on the ideal of chastity declaring that prostitutes were more useful to mankind than nuns. Aretino wrote the *Oratio Heliogaboli ad meretrices*. Alberti, correct it would seem in his personal conduct, did not scruple to accept the dedication of Beccadelli's infamous *Hermaphrodite* [] There is scarcely one of the band whose work is free from sexual dirt, and their lives were as their writings. It has been said -- no doubt truly -- that public opinion by this time, looked upon the artist and the man of letters as a special kind of creatures, [] in whom laxity of life was no longer shocking. Familiarity with the spectacle of such wickedness, and a general toleration of whatever was well expressed, slowly corrupted the judgment of those ill authority also, and after the spectacle of popes who were good men giving employment to such active agents of moral dissolution we come, in the next generation, to popes who, themselves good-living men, begin to promote badliving men even into the Sacred College. Finally, there come popes whose own lives are an open scandal.

It is a curious thing that the two popes who, above all others, were by temperament in sympathy with the Renaissance, and

who lavished honours and wealth upon the new humanist scholars -- Nicholas V and Paul II -- were taught by practical experience how real was the determination of some of these to restore the Rome of antiquity, even at the expense of the papacy. In the time of Nicholas V Stefano Porcaro and his associates had planned to capture the pope and his cardinals, if necessary to kill them, and to set up the republic. This was in January 1453. The plot was, however, discovered on the eve of the day appointed and the conspirators taken and executed.

Ten years went by -- the years when Calixtus III and Pius II were too engrossed with the urgencies of the crusade to be able to spare time or money for the patronage of poets and the arts. Then, in 1464, the newly-elected Paul II, re-arranging the curia, dismissed a number of the humanists appointed by Pius II. First they petitioned and then they threatened, prepared, they told the pope, to bring about a General Council before which he would have to justify his action. Their leader, Bartholomew Sacchi, called Platina, was arrested, put to the torture, and imprisoned in Sant' Angelo. After a time he was released, and presently, in revenge, he organised a new conspiracy.

The centre of this was Julius Pomponius Laetus, the most extreme -- not to say eccentric -- of all the humanists of Rome, a scholar who to the best of his ability and knowledge lived the life of Latin antiquity, refusing to learn Greek lest it injure the perfection of his Latin pronunciation, worshipping the Spirit of Rome, the leader of a band of like-minded semi-heathen freethinkers. Their aim was to re-establish the Republic of classical time and to drive out the pope and the whole body of clergy. In February 1468 the papal police suddenly rounded up the chiefs of the party. Again Platina was taken, again he was arrested and tortured. The plot, so the pope declared, [] was twofold -- to set up paganism once again in Rome and to murder himself. Presently Pomponius Laetus was arrested in Venice, and handed over to the pope. He too, like Platina, now confessed himself a most repentant Christian and, terror-stricken, begged for mercy. Their lives were spared, and presently they were released. Pomponius lived to become the principal tutor of three future popes, Leo X, Clement VII and Paul III; Platina to rise to great favour in the reign of Sixtus IV, the successor of the pope against whom he had plotted. He now became Vatican librarian, and was able to revenge himself on

Paul II for all time by writing his life.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



CHAPTER 5: 'FACILIS DESCENSUS. . .' 1471-1517

1. A PAPACY OF PRINCES

THE title of this chapter is melodramatic; it is exaggerated; and, as a summary description of the life of the Church during the next forty years, too inexact, of course, to be true. But the Virgilian line summarises fairly correctly the impression which the reader usually retains from his study of the period; from one, quite understandable, point of view, it may even be said to describe the period very well.

The history of the Church, if history indeed describes the flowing stream of time, bears no relation to that tapestry of the 'full fed river winding slow mid herds upon an endless plain"; it is rather, and it must ever be, a stream in flood, driving over a hard bed and through a resisting channel, where the rapids are frequent, and where, once in a while, there comes a sudden gigantic alteration of the level over which the waters pour in a very Niagara. It is so, and it must be so, because the Church is not just humanity socially ordered for ends that are natural, and to be attained very largely by a harmony of action that need be no more than external. The Church is a divine creation, imposing an order whose ends are supernatural, where the needed harmony is utterly unattainable except by action that is rooted in personal conviction, and based on assents that are, of their nature, internal. Herein lies all the promise of the Church to labouring and expectant humanity; and herein lies the whole tragedy of its long history. For assents such as these lie wholly within the uncontrollable power of the individual; the Church, whose good fortune largely depends on these internal assents, cannot compel them. The Church continues through time, and must face its task, whatever the generosity, or the rarity, at any given period of these needed internal assents to its teaching and direction; and in all ages it never ceases, and can never cease, to demand such assents, and to demand that all else be subordinated to them. Temporal rulers, kings and princes -- the State -- are no doubt bound, in their function, by the same moral law that binds the spiritual ruler; but the spiritual ruler does not only need to keep the moral law, it is the primary function of his

office continually to profess and to proclaim it. Kingdoms do not suffer, except accidentally, from the scandal of the ruler's bad life, but when the spiritual ruler falls it is, necessarily, the very institution and notion of the spiritual that the scandal harms. His wrong doing compromises immediately the very raison d'être of the institution. It is, in a way, contrary to the very nature of his office and of the institution. It is disintegration in what only exists in order to promote integrity; in order to preach that integrity as the inescapable condition of human happiness, and to minister the divinely devised means of achieving integrity. Disintegration here must, always, have about it the air of catastrophe -- no matter how slight the degree in which it is allowed. And in this sense it is true to say that, over the history of the fortunes of the supernatural moving visibly among mankind, there ever hangs something of this dark possibility. "The gates of hell" shall never, indeed, prevail -- but where was it ever promised that they should cease to trouble? and was it not also mysteriously said " When the Son of Man cometh think you shall He find faith on earth?" The temporal kingdom can not only survive the sins of its rulers, it can even, for a time, profit from them; the wicked, here too, flourishing like a green bay tree. But in the spiritual kingdom sin tolerated, fostered, made an instrument of power, is fatal, instantaneously, to all that it touches. Sin in the actual ruling of that kingdom is necessarily not only blacker to the sight but more mischievous in fact; and so too, are all the personal sins of the rulers, whether these be such surrenders to the material as sexual licence, worldliness and avarice, or the still more grievous " spiritual" sins of ambition, libido dominandi, [] mental sloth, indifference to the development and spread of truth.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



SIXTUS IV

With the advent of Sixtus IV, in 1471, the flood does, indeed, seem to pour over the edge of the abyss; the failures and the surrenders are suddenly more grossly material -- and, being this, they are more evidently shocking, shocking now to the least reflective, and perhaps, to these, the most shocking of all. The age of the della Rovere, Borgia, and Medici popes has become, in popular repute, the most scandalous age of all. But sinfulness of this kind -- whether, in the manner of old-fashioned Protestant controversy, we gloat over it as a final proof that the papacy is the Scarlet Woman of the Apocalypse, or whether, horror stricken, we strive to minimise it in a new apologetic -- was chiefly important in its distraction of the ruler from activities that would have made Protestantism impossible, from the devising of ways, for example, through which good bishops would have filled the sees of Christendom, a true philosophy and a live theology informed its universities, and a clergy, spiritually trained and equipped with professional knowledge been provided for all its parishes. It is a very easy mistake, and a fairly fatal mistake, to concentrate on the dramatic details of these personal sins of la papaute princiere [] while their graver, if more humdrum, faults of omission go by unconsidered. Such concentration -- as common as it is natural -- wrecks the real proportions of the event.

When Paul II died, so suddenly, July 26, 1471, there was not any obvious successor to him among the cardinals. They were fairly evenly divided into two rival parties and it was only after a certain amount of manoeuvring that, on August 10, they managed to agree on Cardinal Francesco della Rovere. The conclave had begun on the feast of St. Sixtus II, the pope who was the patron of the great Roman martyr St. Lawrence, and the new pope, appropriately, called himself Sixtus IV. He was now fifty-seven years of age, a Friar Minor (but not one of the new Observants) from the Genoese town of Savona, and sprung from so poor a family that it had not even a surname. In his order the friar had had a great career, as lecturer in theology in various Italian universities, as a preacher and administrator. Bessarion had followed the lectures he gave at the university of Pavia and had brought him to the notice of Paul II. In 1464 the Franciscans

had chosen him for their minister-general, and in 1467 he had been created cardinal. As minister-general of the Friars Minor, Francesco della Rovere had shown himself a reformer, and in the great theological dispute of the day -- the question of the Immaculate Conception -- he had risen high above the ordinary level of the controversy with his thesis that the views of Duns Scotus and St. Thomas were complementary rather than antagonistic.

It was a curious combination of forces that had secured his election as pope. Bessarion's high opinion of him as a scholar and a religious had done much. The wishes of the Duke of Milan -- Galeazzo Maria Sforza -- had been no less effective. And of a like nature with this political influence was the support of the cardinal vice-chancellor, Rodrigo Borgia, who now, forty-one years of age, after fifteen years of comparative seclusion in the routine of his office, makes his first steps in the public policies of the Holy See. A further element was the skill as negotiator of Francesco's young Franciscan nephew, Piero Riario, whom he had taken into the conclave as a kind of secretary-attendant. It was this young friar who, at the critical moments, did the actual work of binding together and keeping together the heterogeneous majority that made his uncle pope.

Francesco della Rovere, whose strong, intelligent face the genius of Melozzo and Pollaiuolo have made familiar to us, had immense energy; as pope he was to show himself strongwilled, and even imperious, but to be betrayed, time and again, by his lack of knowledge about the political world in which, almost exclusively, he now chose to be active. The one-time reformer of the Friars Minor was determined to make the Papal State secure, once and for all, against the princes who threatened its life, by developing its political resources to the full, and by making the papal sovereignty a reality everywhere within it. But over and over again he blundered, and after thirteen years of rule he left the papacy hated as a power, where before it had merely been mistrusted, and saddled with a new and most disastrous precedent of nepotism, aggressive war and even crime, to say nothing of unconcealed luxurious living and moral laxity. No charge against the pope's own morals -- in the narrow sense of that word -- has ever been seriously sustained. He was regular and attentive to his priestly duties, and noted indeed for his deep devotion to all that affected the cult of the Mother of God.

But banquets of a crazy extravagance, hunting parties, gambling bouts, nightly revels began, in his time, and without any interference from him, to be part of the common order of high ecclesiastical life in Rome; and in all this departure of new unseemliness and wickedness the pioneers were the pope's own near relatives, young friars for the chief part, upon whom throughout his pontificate, he heaped one undeserved promotion after another. Never had pope such a horde of needy, insignificant, and incompetent kinsfolk for whom to provide; and never was any pope so lavish in the provision.

Sixtus IV was one of five children, and it was his eleven nephews and two nieces who were the main instruments through which whatever ideals he began with were brought to nought, and through whom a new poison was injected into the none too healthy system of the Renaissance papacy. Of the eleven nephews six were clerics -- it was a simple matter to make five of them cardinals, while the sixth became Bishop of Ferrara and Patriarch of Antioch. Two of his lay nephews the pope married to daughters of the King of Naples, a third to the heiress of the reigning Duke of Urbino, and a fourth to a daughter of the Duke of Milan. A sixth red hat went to one of his niece's sons.

The ablest of this small army -- the only one in fact who proved ultimately to have any real ability at all -- was Giuliano della Rovere, but far more influential in the policies of the reign were the two brothers, Girolamo and Piero Riario. To Piero, the manager of the conclave, a young friar of twenty-five, the pope gave the see of Treviso within a month of his election (September 4, 1471); on December 15 he made him a cardinal; in September 1472 next he gave him the see of Valence, and in 1473 the archbishoprics of Spoleto (April 28), Seville (June 25), and Florence (July 20), with the wealthy French see of Mende (November 3) -- all of which sees the young cardinal was allowed to hold simultaneously. [] He was, by now, as nearly the equivalent of a millionaire in the life of the time as it is possible to conceive. The story of his extravagances, and his profligacy, is writ large in all the diaries and diplomatic correspondence of the time, a subject of cynical mirth, where it does not provoke disgust. But Cardinal Piero did not last long. The pace soon killed him, and he died, "while he gave promise of still better things," said his uncle, in the first days of 1474. But in the two

short years or so of his course he had been the pope's most confidential adviser and agent. This place was now taken by his brother Girolamo, one of the worst men of all this bad time, a typical Renaissance bravo and bully, for whom the moral law can scarcely be said to have held any meaning at all. For Girolamo, his uncle, when he married him to Caterina Sforza, had established a little principality in the north of the Papal State, centring round the episcopal city of Imola. The territory was small, but it was meant to extend, and its strategic importance was already considerable.

The Papal State [] could hardly have been less conveniently designed for popes who meant to be effective rulers. It may be described as made up of two roughly rectangular territories, one to the south based on the Mediterranean coast of Italy, and the other to the north based on the Adriatic. From the southern tip of the southern rectangle where it touched the kingdom of Naples, to the northernmost point of the state is, in a direct line, 260 miles. The Apennines, in their steepest and least easily traversable masses, are a prohibitive natural barrier between the rectangles in the central part of the state where, for seventy miles, these overlap. During the whole of the Middle Ages, down to the time when the Avignon residence began, the popes were never really masters of much beyond the southern rectangle, the district whose natural centre is Rome and that runs from, say Orvieto to the neighbourhood of Gaeta. By the time of Sixtus IV they were also, fairly securely, masters of the district beyond the Apennines called the Marches, the southern half of the northern rectangle, a region whose chief cities were Fermo Camerino and the port of Ancona. But the richest part of the State, and the wealthiest cities, were in the district to the north of the Marches, the territory called Romagna, the lands to the south of the Po, the ancient Roman Aemilia. Here was Bologna, the most important city of the whole State after Rome -- always violently anti-papal -- and Ferrara, and Ravenna. All this valuable territory was parcelled out into half a score of city states, some republican in their form of government, others ruled by families descended from the successful condottieri. The most important of these states was the Duchy of Ferrara, held by the d'Este family, who were also lords of Modena and Reggio, territories that formed a buffer state between the pope's territory and the Duchy of Milan. Imola lay twenty-five miles to the south-east of Bologna, and almost midway in the narrow part [] of the long

neck that joined the Romagna to the half of the Papal State where the popes were really masters. Imola in strong, trustworthy hands would be a check to Ferrara, a good starting point if ever the pope planned to reduce Bologna, and an excellent centre from which to conduct the lengthy business of destroying the petty tyrants of the Romagna, at Faenza for instance, or Forli, Cesena, and Rimini. [] Hence the determination of Sixtus to plant his nephew at Imola as its lord, his insistence that Milan (in whose power it then lay) should restore it, and his willingness to pay the Milanese the heavy price asked, 100,000 ducats. And as the pope thus secured -- or hoped to secure -- this key city at the northern end of the " neck," so, by marrying another nephew, Giovanni della Rovere, brother of Cardinal Giuliano, to the heiress of the Montefeltre, he meant to make sure of the entrance to the " neck " from the south, their ducal city of Urbino. Giovanni's son did, in fact, live to inherit Urbino; he is the duke, Francesco Maria, who plays a part in the history of the second della Rovere pope, his uncle, Julius II. And Girolamo, the Count of Imola, lived to make himself master of Forli, and Cesena, and Rimini, and even of Sinigaglia, before, in 1488, some of his subjects found the courage to avenge a hundred crimes by assassinating him.

The other princes of Italy were not slow to realise that a new spirit was influencing the policy of the ruler of the Papal State. At the death of Paul II, Naples, Florence and Milan had stood leagued together against Rome. Now, by his marriage alliances, the pope had detached Naples and was, seemingly, about to make himself master of the all-important lands in the north. It was Florence -- the Florence of Lorenzo de' Medici -- that first grew definitely uneasy about this unmistakable threat on her north-eastern border; there was a succession of " incidents " between Lorenzo and the pope and then a great crime, a terrible repression, and war (1478). Florence was still, in name, a republic where the Medici family were no more than private citizens, but in fact they had now, for half a century, been its all-powerful rulers, through their immense wealth and their skilfully exercised technique for the secret management of public affairs. Lorenzo was much more truly the ruler of Florence, than the pope was ruler of Rome. When the reign of Sixtus IV opened, relations had been friendly, and presently the pope made the Medici the Holy See's banking agents. But he would not consent to make Lorenzo's younger brother Giuliano a cardinal, and then

Lorenzo made difficulties about advancing the money that Sixtus needed to buy Imola from Milan for Count Girolamo; he even did his best to prevent the sale, not at all wanting to see the pope's nephew strategically installed on his flank. Then Sixtus changed his financial policy. The Medici were dismissed, and the papal business was given to their rivals, the Pazzi. Next, in 1474, there came a vacancy in the see of Florence. The pope named one of his own kinsmen, Francesco Salviati, but the Medici protested so strongly that he had to give way. When, some months later, he named the disappointed candidate to the vacant see of Pisa, the Medici again protested. This time, however, the pope held firm; but the Medici kept the new bishop out. Now came the conspiracy, a plot to overthrow the Medici regime in Florence in which Count Girolamo, the Pazzi, and the Archbishop of Pisa were the ringleaders. They also proposed to murder Lorenzo and his brother Giuliano. And, such was the pitch to which six years of the political game had brought the Roman mind, the conspirators, as a matter of course, laid the whole matter before the pope for his approval.

Sixtus was not at war with Florence, but he had only one objection to make to the plot -- there must be no murder of the two Medici. The count, the banker, the archbishop, and the assassin whom they had hired, laboured long to convince the pope that their death was unavoidable in the kind of thing that a revolution is, and argued that, since the Medici were bound to die, it could not much matter how exactly this happened. But Sixtus would have none of it. He did not indeed countermand the plot, but he explicitly commanded that the princes should not be murdered; it is, nevertheless, hard to believe that, after the interview as we have it recorded, he can have been under any illusion about what the conspirators were determined to do.

The visit to Florence of Count Girolamo's nephew, the newly-created Cardinal Raffaele Sansoni (a lad of seventeen) provided the opportunity. The cardinal, brought to Florence by his desire to see the wonders of the Medici palaces, was to preside at a High Mass in the cathedral on Sunday, April 26, 1478, and afterwards be entertained by the Medici. The mass seemed to offer a most suitable moment for the murder; the two victims and all the notables of the city would be safely contained and held by the confusion in the great church while, outside, the main body of the conspirators would seize the seat of

government and all the controls. At the last moment the bravo hired to do some of the killing -- Montesecco -- did indeed object, some scruple about the place and time of the deed was, it seems, troubling him. But a couple of priests, "patriotic" enemies of the Medici tyrants, were found to take his place. The cardinal entered and the mass began. Then -- at the elevation, or the priest's communion -- the signal was given and the murderers made for their victims. Giuliano de Medici, was killed with a dozen wounds or so in his body, but Lorenzo, only slightly wounded by the clerical enthusiasts who had undertaken to despatch him, managed to gain the sacristy and to barricade himself. Meanwhile in the church there was the expected pandemonium, but the fury was all against the assassins, and the young cardinal -- thought to be in the plot -- came so near to death that, in all the forty years of life that remained to him his face never lost the pallor which came into it that day. While, in the cathedral, the murderers were taken, the chiefs of the conspiracy outside had also failed. Something in the manner of the archbishop as he essayed to bluff the Gonfaloniere into surrender put that officer on his guard. He arrested the archbishop and those with him, and when, presently, the mob came streaming by, mad with the news, he acted very promptly, putting ropes round the necks of the prisoners and thrusting them out from the windows of the palace. When the ropes were cut the mob amused itself with the corpses, [] as we have seen happen again in that same land within these last few years. All that day, and the next, the vengeance continued. Whoever was thought a supporter of the Pazzi was mercilessly slain. Scores were thus hanged out of hand and thrown to the mob. The cardinal, meanwhile, was kept under close arrest.

The conspiracy then had failed, and except Count Girolamo, who all this time had not stirred from Rome, the conspirators had all of them been taken and executed. When the news reached him the count was beside himself, and the Florentines in Rome were for a time in great danger. The pope took no immediate public action. He regretted the crime of Giuliano's murder and wrote to Florence a letter, which has disappeared, to say so. He also demanded the release of the unoffending cardinal. The Florentine envoy in Rome wrote to support the pope's demand, and Naples and Venice gave their advice that Florence should not add fuel to the fire by keeping the prelate in prison. On May

24 an envoy from Sixtus appeared in Florence with a formal written demand and the threat that, unless the cardinal were released, the pope would punish the republic. The Florentines were, however, not to be moved, and eight days later the bull appeared excommunicating Lorenzo and all who adhered to him, and threatening the republic with an interdict if, within three weeks, it had not obeyed the pope's commands. The pope's case is set out fully: all the political grievances of the years before the conspiracy, the excessive vengeance for the conspiracy itself, the hanging of an archbishop and other ecclesiastics, the imprisonment of the cardinal; the republic must accept the pope's sentence that neither Lorenzo nor anyone who supported him should be capable of ever holding any office in Church or State, or of performing any legal acts; their property must be confiscated, their houses torn down, and Lorenzo handed over to the pope; all this within a month. Again the Florentines refused to be moved, and on June 24 the interdict was declared.

The Pazzi Conspiracy, scandalous as is its history, is of course no more than one of a score of similar events in the complicated story of fifteenth-century Italian politics. It needs, however, to be told in some detail not only because, in this particular feud, the pope was one of the protagonists, but also because of the contrast between the high tone of the pope's demands before he knew he was going to be beaten, and his subsequent tacit surrender of all but the appearances of submission. Here is something which is, for a time, going to pass into the political habits of the papacy, and to be yet another potent cause of that alienation from the popes of their greatest natural resource, the sympathy of instructed Catholic opinion. No power has so rightly been expected to make war on the haughty and successful, to yield to none but the needy. With these political popes the Roman maxim began to be reversed, to the great hurt of their spiritual hold on their children everywhere.

Florence replied to these anathemas by skilfully-written manifestos which all Italy read. The clergy acknowledged that Sixtus was indeed helmsman of the barque of Peter, but complained that it was to Circe's island that he was steering it; while the republic broadcast the confession of Montesecco, in which that scrupulous assassin told the story of the ambiguous interview with the pope. The finished irony of the humanist is

now, for the first time, set to mock the solemnities of the papal remonstrance and its awful sentence, and to call in question, by its reasoned moderation, the assumption that the pope is telling the truth. "Collect yourself, we pray you, Holy Father," say the Florentines, " and return to those sentiments which become the gravity of the Holy See."

In August the war began, Florence isolated and the pope leagued with Naples and Florence's eternal foe Siena. The Florentines turned for help to Louis XI of France, and not in vain. The king, already bitter because Sixtus had refused the red hat to the prelates he had nominated, was only too happy at the chance of harassing the pope into new concessions of jurisdiction in ecclesiastical affairs. He had already, in 1475, begun to proclaim himself the champion of the "liberties of the Gallican Church" and begun to speak of the need of a General Council to reform the Church and to elect a lawful pope in the place of the simonist Sixtus IV. [] Then, in March 1476, he had ordered all the French cardinals and prelates in Rome to return home for a great national council that would discuss the best way of bringing about the needed General Council. Now, upon the Florentine appeal, the French envoys to the Holy See were instructed to join with those of Florence, Milan, Venice, and Ferrara in a protest that the pope's conduct towards Florence and Lorenzo was a scandalous hindrance to the unity of Christendom. Since the pope would not listen to the ambassadors' petition for a removal of the interdict from Florence, a General Council must be summoned (July 11, 1478). []

The pope did not find it hard to answer Louis XI, but the emperor -- Frederick III -- was no less pressing that Florence should be treated more mercifully, and most of the cardinals were anxious for peace. But Florence would not accept the only terms the pope offered and presently, her allies not venturing more against Sixtus than threats of a General Council, and her territories ravaged by the papal and Neapolitan armies, the situation of the republic grew desperate indeed. It was saved by the boldness and diplomatic skill of Lorenzo. In December 1479 he made his way uninvited, unannounced, to Naples and won over the king. The terms were hard, but Florence was delivered from the dilemma it faced of destruction or a humiliating submission to the pope. Some submission indeed there was to

be, but it came now from the initiative of the republic, and at a time when all other questions were stilled by the recent descent of the Turks on the Italian mainland and their capture of Otranto. [] On Advent Sunday, 1480, [] twelve leading citizens of Florence knelt before the pope in the portico of St. Peter's, acknowledged the city's guilt, and humbly besought forgiveness. The pope lectured them, mildly enough, and absolved the city from all the spiritual censures laid upon it. As a penance Florence was to provide fifteen galleys for the war against the Turks. But not a word was said about the position of Lorenzo de' Medici, who, and not Florence, so Sixtus had repeatedly declared, was the real enemy and the reason for the war. Nor, of course, was Lorenzo among the twelve who knelt before the pope.

For a short eighteen months there was peace, but Count Girolamo, who had opposed the peace party in Rome in 1479, now made himself master of Forli on the death of the last of the Ordolaffi who had ruled it for a century or so (1481). And he planned to take Faenza also. In this he had the support of Venice; and the great republic was willing to encourage also a much bolder design, nothing less in fact than that Girolamo should make himself King of Naples. Venice, as payment for its aid, was to be allowed to take Ferrara.

The King of Naples [] began the war, invading the Papal State (April 1482) when the pope's preparations had scarcely begun, and at a moment when a miniature civil war -- Orsini against Colonna -- was raging. Soon Rome itself was threatened with siege, and though the arrival of a Venetian general, Roberto Malatesta, to command the pope's troops, and his victory over the Neapolitans at Campo Morto (August 21, 1482), delivered the city, the general's death three weeks later, and the departure of the Venetian contingents, soon renewed the danger. For the next few months the Neapolitans ravaged the pope's lands with little hindrance, while in the north the pope's allies conquered Ferrara almost at their ease. To add to the papal misfortune a half-mad Dominican archbishop had re-inaugurated (if that be the word) the Council of Basel, and though, as yet, he was the only bishop present, Florence and Milan were beginning to wonder whether they had not here a useful weapon with which once more to beat the pope. It was Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, seemingly, who finally decided the pope to break with Venice and make peace.

On December 12, 1482, the treaty was signed between Sixtus and the King of Naples. All conquests were to be restored and the Duke of Ferrara was to be reinstated; also a pension was guaranteed to Count Girolamo. The Venetians -- with whom the war was going well -- had not been consulted about all this, but the pope now informed them of what had been done, and ordered them to ratify the treaty. Not very surprisingly they utterly refused, and warned the pope not to use spiritual weapons to coerce them, threatening, if he did so, to call in the Turks and plunge all Italy into war.

The pope's diplomacy had not brought him peace. Instead of fighting Naples as the ally of Venice, he was now to fight Venice as the ally of Naples. Immense sums had to be raised and a fleet equipped -- an essential condition for success against the great naval power, the pope declared. [] The 50,000 ducats needed were got by the creation of new posts, and the sale of the appointments. The immediate problem was to relieve Ferrara, and meanwhile (May 25, 1483) the Venetians were excommunicated, and their state placed under an interdict.

The war went very slowly. The Venetians used their sea power to capture towns on the Apulian coast of Naples, but they failed to take Ferrara. Soon, feeling the strain of their isolation, for the pope's diplomacy had momentarily leagued all Italy against them, they sued for peace (March 1484); but Count Girolamo succeeded in hardening the pope against them. Then the Colonna troubles burst out afresh in Rome, with greater violence than ever (April-June). The pope was successful against the great clan in Rome itself, but the incompetent Girolamo was baffled time and again in the fights for their various strongholds in the surrounding country. Sixtus IV was beginning to feel his age, the unlookedfor strength of the rebels depressed him, and then the great league began to break up -- after all, it had held together for nearly eighteen months. At what seemed the last hour for Venice, the Duke of Milan withdrew, and secretly came to the aid of the republic, and presently the Peace of Bagnuolo was arranged (August 7, 1484). Once again all conquests were mutually restored; and this time without any gain at all to Count Girolamo. The news was brought to the pope as he lay dying, and the disappointment of such a peace finished him. On August 12, the feast of St. Clare, one of the two greatest saints of the order he had once governed, he passed away.

So died this first of the popes who showed what a difference the pope could make as a prince in this delicately balanced world of petty Italian states. Sixtus IV had indeed established his family among the reigning houses of Italy, but with all these years of war and of realist diplomatic practice he had not really developed the pope's hold on his own state, nor given that state any new security against the greedy and treacherous princes who surrounded it; while, in Rome itself, the habit of war and the sudden new insistence on the material aspects of the papal office, had given new life to the old habits of riot and feud and had indeed "revived a barbarous past." The cardinals' palaces were now strongholds where each lived surrounded by his own guards, centres of bloody tumult only too often, sanctuaries for bravoes and assassins. The degree of this sharp return to the ages of violence was shown very markedly during the interregnum that now followed the death of Sixtus IV, and the proceedings in the conclave are evidence how greatly he had secularised the college of cardinals.

No sooner was it known that the pope had died, than the mob rose, and with shouts of "Colonna for ever," stormed and sacked the palace of Count Girolamo, and the houses of all his hated Genoese compatriots. The count hastened back to Rome from his operations against the Colonna fortresses, and while he lay encamped outside the city, his wife, Caterina Sforza, the classic type Or the Renaissance virago, boldly installed herself as commandant of the all-important stronghold of Castel St. Angelo. Then, for a fortnight nearly, the rival bands of soldiery fought and plundered in the streets of the city. The Colonna had returned in force, and the different cardinals sent out in haste for reinforcements for their private armies. The funeral services of the dead pope began with hardly a cardinal present; few could have made their way to St. Peter's without fighting their way through the armed forces of their colleagues. Finally the strong statesmanship of one of the few cardinals whom all respected, the Venetian Marco Barbo, a nephew of Paul II, brought peace. He prevailed on the count to surrender St. Angelo, and to leave Rome; and he prevailed on his ally Virginio Orsini, the count being magnificently compensated in money and promises. The Colonna, the Savelli, and the Conti also agreed to march out from Rome. There was to be a truce, not to expire before two months from the day of the new pope's coronation. This was on

August 22, and four days later the conclave began.

Sixtus IV had created cardinals lavishly, thirty-four in all, [] and in the conclave of 1484 no fewer than nineteen of the twenty-five present were of his naming. All but four of the twenty-five were Italians. [] The short-lived period of a more or less international college was over: [] even had the other seven cardinals then living [] been present, the Italians would have been twenty-two to ten. On the other hand, there was not between these Italians, subjects of half a dozen distinct and independent sovereign states, the modern bond of a common national feeling. The twenty-one were fairly evenly divided between the states only lately at war, and always mutually hostile. Venice had five cardinals, Milan four, Naples two; there were four Romans (Colonna, Orsini and Savelli), one from Siena, a Genoese and -- a new element -- four nephews of the late pope who formed a faction apart.

This is the first conclave of the type to be classic henceforward for a good three hundred years and more, where political considerations played a leading part, the first to which different princes sent instructions through their agents and at which, through cardinals who were their subjects, they even felt strong enough to declare to the Sacred College that there were certain cardinals who must not be elected. It was also a conclave in which bribery played a great part. The cardinals began by making a pact that whichever of them was elected would give the poorer cardinals -- those whose income from benefices was below 4,000 ducats -- an allowance of 100 ducats a month, and that he would compensate them for any benefice they lost through failing in their votes to oblige the various princes. The two leading figures in the conclave were Giuliano della Rovere and Rodrigo Borgia. The first wanted a pope he could control, and so maintain the influence on affairs he had begun to possess during his uncle's last years. The other wanted to be pope himself. All were agreed that the new pope must be acceptable to the league whose action had recently imposed the Peace of Bagnuolo, and so a friend to Venice. Borgia was the leader of the cardinals who stood actively by the league, a small group that included such powerful personages as Ascanio Sforza, brother of the Duke of Milan, and Giovanni of Aragon, a son of the King of Naples. Borgia made certain he would be elected. But his actual following was small, and he was not

trusted. The other leader was hardly more fortunate. In the first scrutiny a Venetian, Marco Barbo, came within five votes of election. Whereupon the skill of Giuliano della Rovere prevailed upon Borgia, and his associates, to abandon his candidature. The election of Barbo would mean an era of reform, and a restoration of ecclesiastical discipline. So Borgia and della Rovere combined forces, and through the night of August 27-28 they worked hard upon their colleagues, directing their minds towards the most complete nullity of them all, Giovanni Battista Cybo. They managed to secure for him eighteen votes in all, and on August 28, at nine in the morning, he was proclaimed as Innocent VIII. []

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



INNOCENT VIII

The new pope was a Genoese, fifty-two years of age, a bishop since 1467, created cardinal by Sixtus IV in 1473. All contemporaries agreed to praise his kindly nature, his inability to refuse requests, but the different ambassadors noted also -- what events soon showed to be equally true of him -- that he had no judgment of his own, and little understanding of the problems that faced him. It was Giuliano della Rovere who would really reign, "the cardinal of St. Peter. . . pope and more than pope." Innocent VIII, it has also to be recorded, has the unfortunate distinction in the history of this time that he made no secret of the fact that he was the father of a family. [] "He was the first of the popes," says the grave Augustinian, Giles of Viterbo, [] " openly to make a show of sons and daughters, the first who openly arranged marriages for them, the first to keep up the weddings in his own palace. His predecessors had left him no such example. Would that he had not found successors to imitate him." As Sixtus IV had used the marriages of various nephews to assist his diplomacy, so Innocent VIII now made play with the marriage of his son and his granddaughters.

The pope was all but bankrupt as a result of the wars of his predecessor, the bitter Colonna-Orsini feud was still seething and yet, in the first twelve months of his reign, he, or his adviser-in-chief, drifted into yet another war. The enemy this time was Naples, and once again the papacy was almost without allies, while the rest of Italy stood by, neutral towards the pope and sympathetic to his foes. The cause of the war was the refusal of Naples to pay the annual tribute due to the pope as suzerain of the kingdom. It was another grievance that the king -- Ferrante -- was filling vacant sees without any reference to Rome. The war dragged on for nine months or so (October 1485-August 1486), each side helping the rebels in the territory of the other. Innocent appealed to one after another of the Catholic sovereigns for help, but all were deaf to him. Then Giuliano della Rovere revived the ancient remedy of calling in the French claimant to the Neapolitan kingdom. He went to Genoa to negotiate with the claimant -- Rene II of Anjou -- and to arrange a naval alliance with the republic. But by the time he returned Innocent, terrified by the disorders in Rome, and the damage

done his territory by the marauding Neapolitans, scenting disapproval and treachery everywhere among his own commanders, had made peace. Ferrante too was alarmed, at the prospect of a Franco-Genoese invasion. He gladly made terms, giving way on all points to the pope -- it was merely a matter of making promises -- and then going home to glut his vengeance on the Neapolitan barons who had been the pope's allies.

For the next twelve months -- while Cardinal Giuliano sulked in his fortress at Ostia -- the papal diplomacy feebly plunged hither and thither, seeking allies, until it fell under the strong influence of Lorenzo de' Medici. The new alliance was sealed by the marriage of the pope's son Franceschetto to Lorenzo's daughter Maddalena -- a marriage where there was twenty years' difference between the age of bride and groom; and Innocent consented to give the red hat to Lorenzo's second son, Giovanni, a boy of thirteen. It was, however, provided that the young cardinal should not wear the insignia of his rank for another four years, nor be admitted to consistories. Meanwhile the disorders in the Papal State mounted higher and higher. In April 1488 at Forli, Count Girolamo, the once all-powerful bravo, was murdered, and a few weeks later the lord of Faenza met the same fate. At Perugia and Foligno, Ancona and Ascoli there were like troubles, and everywhere the King of Naples was busy aiding the rebels.

The one gleam of success that relieved the tale of ignoble drifting and its sorry fruit was the pope's securing, in the face of great competition, the person of the brother of the Sultan, Prince Djem. Here, it was felt, was a hostage possession of whom could be used to keep the Turks quiescent. The Turks, for their part, were willing to pay the pope handsomely [] to keep Djem under lock and key. He cost the pope a cardinal's hat to the grand-master of the Knights of St. John, and another to the French king's counsellor, the Archbishop of Bordeaux, and also a promise not to grant without delay the dispensation that would enable Alain d'Albret to marry the heiress of Brittany -- a bride desired for the boy king of France. The story of Djem's adventures, of his reception by the pope, his haughty, undisguised contempt for the whole paraphernalia of the Vatican etiquette, and the spectacle it all was for years to come, to Rome and all its visitors, makes pleasant reading after the petty, sordid chicanery to which the public activities of the papacy had now

shrunk.

Towards 1488 a new kind of scandal was discovered, when high officials of the Chancery were arrested on a charge of forging papal bulls. The whole administration of justice had fallen into a bad way. It was a rare crime indeed that could not be atoned for by a money payment. The semi-bankruptcy in which Innocent had found the administration never really improved. Continually the pope created new posts to sell to the highest bidder, twenty-six new secretaryships in 1486, and fifty-two plumbatores whose duty was to affix the leaden seals to the bulls. These last paid, each, [], 500 ducats on appointment: an immense sum which they would recoup from the fees paid by those for whose affairs the bulls were issued. There were obviously better ways still of compensating oneself, and in September 1489 two secretaries and four minor officials were arrested. In two years, they confessed, they had put out fifty bogus bulls, liberal grants and dispensations. For which the pope had them burned alive.

To the very end of the reign, the King of Naples continued to sap and mine the weak pope's authority. Innocent even spoke of leaving Rome, and taking refuge at Avignon. Then suddenly, in the last weeks of 1491, Ferrante veered round completely. Once more he made a treaty in which he accepted the pope's terms, and sealed it with an offer to marry his grandson Luigi of Aragon to the pope's granddaughter, Battistina.

The new year 1492 thus opened well, but in March, Innocent -- rarely free from illness -- began to fail. On April 18 Lorenzo de' Medici died, and all Italy waited in apprehension, for the son who succeeded him had none of his father's political genius. By the end of June it was known that Innocent was slowly dying, and the end came on July 25. [] Just nine days later one of his fellow countrymen set sail from Pelos on that voyage which was to discover the New World.

Innocent's reign left the papacy in worse case even than he had found it. He had been cautious in one respect, the creation of new cardinals, though in this he was yet again his own yielding, compliant self. For the existing cardinals had strongly objected to any substantial increase in their numbers. Innocent VIII had had but one creation, March 9, 1489, and added only eight cardinals to the college. Thirteen cardinals had died during his

reign, and at his death the total number was twenty- seven. Of these, twenty-three made up the conclave that was to elect his successor, all but two of them Italians; and of the total there were still twelve of the creation of Sixtus IV.

In this conclave of 1492 there was hardly any unity of national groups. There was no Cybo faction, and the four della Rovere cardinals were almost the only party when the election began (August 6, 1492). But there was a strong reaction against Giuliano della Rovere, held responsible for the disasters of the late reign. His rival of 1484, Rodrigo Borgia, so an ambassador hinted to his sovereign, might now achieve much, through the great array of wealthy benefices which his election would cause to be vacant. The spoil, to a share in which his electors might look, would be tremendous. For four days the election hung fire, three scrutinies taking place without any sign which way the election would go. Then Ascanio Sforza, one of the undoubtedly bad men among the cardinals, doubting his own chances of election, went over to Borgia. Bargains were struck, the spoil apportioned out, and gradually -- counting Borgia's own vote -- he was only short of one vote to make the needed sixteen. Finally the confederates gained the promise of the ninety-six years old Patriarch of Venice, "hardly in possession of his faculties". [] Rodrigo Borgia was pope, at sixty years of age, Alexander VI. Such is the story as Pastor tells it, [] and it seems to be the true story.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



ALEXANDER VI

Alexander VI reigned for eleven years. He had won the name of a good administrator during the thirty-five years he had served the various popes, as cardinal and vice-chancellor. But no more than the weak Innocent VIII, or the technically inexperienced Sixtus IV, did this bureaucrat show himself a statesman in his handling of the grave political problems of the time. His solution, the same miserable superficial business of installing his own family and personal dependants in the chief posts, could, if it succeeded, only add to his successor's difficulties the presence within the curia and the state of yet another powerful faction of well-placed and experienced kinsmen of the last pope, determined to surrender as little as possible of the influence they had wielded. Alexander had to fight, as it were for his life, with the della Rovere. Was the next pope to have against him the Borgia as well? It was a policy that could only have succeeded had the papacy been hereditary, and even then it would have called for a higher degree of statesmanship than any of these papal families were ever able to boast.

The pope's own kin was numerous. In addition to various nephews, he had at least four children of his own who now came into prominence. The eldest son, Juan, betrothed to a cousin of the King of Spain, left Rome for his marriage and his Spanish duchy of Gandia in the first year of the reign. The second, Cesare, a lad of seventeen, was already, thanks to his father's influence, Bishop of Pampeluna. This see he now gave up, and was instead made Archbishop of Valencia, the see his father had held for thirty-six years, ever since the election to the papacy of Cesare's great-uncle, as Calixtus III, had vacated it. [] For the youngest son, Jofre, [] Alexander secured as a wife Sancia, a granddaughter of the King of Naples. The third of these children was a girl, that Lucrezia Borgia all too famous in the Borgia legend that was later developed by the innumerable enemies that the success of the family produced. Lucrezia, perhaps fourteen years old at the date of Alexander's election, was already engaged, but the marriage was immediately broken off, and a much more distinguished match arranged with a kinsman of the Duke of Milan, namely Giovanni Sforza, [] the Count of Cotignola and Lord of Pesaro.

The alliance of Alexander with Milan was far from welcome to Ferrante of Naples. Hostile to Alexander's candidature in the late conclave, and suspicious from the moment of his election, he now strove to avert the marriage. Once the contract was signed he began to work upon the hostility to Alexander of the disappointed Giuliano della Rovere. But the pope's diplomacy produced an anti-Naples combination, and yet another war seemed about to begin when Ferrante made the offer of a royal marriage for the boy Jofre. Upon which a general reconciliation took place, even between the pope and Cardinal Giuliano. Only a few weeks later the brittle peace was again all but broken when, in the first great creation of cardinals, Alexander gave hats to the nominees of almost all the princes of Europe except the King of Naples (September 20, 1493).

Ferrante did not live long enough again to trouble Alexander's peace. He died in the first weeks of 1494. [] The King of France, Charles VIII (1483-1498), immediately laid claim to the kingdom, and thereby not only brought to an end the first, easy part of Alexander's reign, but began the first chapter of the history of modern Europe, the long rivalry of France and Spain for the control of European affairs, that was to fill the next hundred and fifty years. The eleven years of Alexander's reign are thus a link between the older world when all the rivalries and wars of Europe are civil wars between small states which are, consciously, parts of a single Christian whole, and the modern age when princes and states strive for a position whence they may dominate the life of the whole world. The accident that Italy was the battle-ground of the first of these great national duels, and that it continued to be so for the next seventy years nearly, gave the popes of the new age a new kind of importance in international politics; they were, in all this game, extremely important figures, but they were not now important as the recognised spiritual chiefs of a christendom where a common religious faith produced a common public estimate of international right and wrong, but important principally as the rulers of a state centrally situated in the territories contended for, a state whose independence was one of the few indubitably fixed and stable elements of European life, and yet a state that might change sides at any moment, since its rulers were elected -- a state that might change sides often, since its rulers were rarely so young when elected as to be likely to reign for long. a

The French invasion of Italy in 1494 was a wholly new kind of thing, and this is the crucial year of Alexander's reign. He was now to meet the supreme test of the administrator promoted to rulership. Meanwhile, his first creation of cardinals was an indication that in his use of high ecclesiastical patronage he would follow faithfully the tradition of his last two predecessors. Unlike Innocent VIII, he was to be lavish in his creations, adding forty-seven in all to the Sacred College in the nine years of his reign, where Innocent had but added eight in almost the same length of time. Alexander's first cardinal, created five days after his coronation, [] was his nephew, Juan Borgia, who since 1483 had been Archbishop of Monreale. [] Now, in September 1493, the pope created another twelve, six of them from outside Italy. Seven were by favour to the different princes, namely the Roman ambassadors of the Kings of France and Spain, a confidential agent of the emperor, the Archbishop of Canterbury, [] the sons of the King of Poland, of the Doge of Venice and of the Duke of Ferrara. There was also a small family group, Cesare Borgia, Giuliano Cesarini (brother to a son-in-law of Alexander) and Alessandro Farnese, whose sister stood to Alexander in a relation that may most politely be described as equivocal. Cesarini and Farnese were both very young, Cesare Borgia was still in his teens and so too was the Ferrarese Ippolito d'Este. []

The French king's claim to succeed Ferrante in Naples met with no support from the papal suzerain. Alexander recognised Ferrante's son Alfonso as king, and sent a papal legate to crown him. But the young Charles VIII was utterly carried away by the desire of military glory, and the opposition to him was welcome. He began to prepare the mightiest army Italy had seen for hundreds of years, and meanwhile his diplomacy was busy "softening" the papal resistance. The threats now usual on the lips of princes determined to wring concessions from the pope were made, namely to withdraw the nation's obedience from him, and to confiscate all benefices held by his appointment. And, on the suggestion possibly of the Duke of Milan -- Charles's Italian partner in the coming expedition -- the services were enlisted of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere. On April 24, 1494, Giuliano fled from Rome, first to his bishopric of Avignon, and then to the French camp. Soon Charles was proclaiming the need to call a General Council which should judge the pope, the Colonna -- worked upon by France -- began to move, and by the middle of June Alexander had passed from alarm almost to

despair. He even turned to beg aid from the Turks. The pope's sole ally was his cruel, cowardly and treacherous vassal of Naples, Alfonso II.

In September Charles VIII crossed the French frontier. The Dukes of Milan and Ferrara joined him and so, publicly, did Cardinal Giuliano. By October 14 he had reached Pavia, whither Piero de' Medici journeyed from Florence, and surrendered to him -- whereupon the Florentines drove out the Medici and restored the old government of the republic. On November 17 Charles was at Florence, and presently moving against Rome. The French -- thanks to the Colonna -- were already in Ostia and their galleys menaced the mouth of the Tiber. Alexander began to send legates to the king. But Charles refused to treat with anyone but the pope. He had a vow to visit the Holy Places, he said, and must spend his Christmas at Rome. But the legates also reported to Alexander that, everywhere, the French were announcing their mission to reform the Church. And the advance continued, relentlessly. For a brief moment Alexander's hopes rose, for on December 10 the army of the King of Naples marched into Rome. But a closer view of all that his ally could do depressed him to the extreme of preparing for flight. By December 18 " everything in the Vatican down to the bedding and table service " had been packed. It was, however, too late. The very next day the French pickets made their appearance, and from the windows of his palace the pope could see them exercising their horses in the Prati. The Neapolitans retired, glad to be away before the army itself arrived. That same night -- December 25 -- Alexander made terms with the French king's commissioners, and on New Year's Eve his armies marched in.

Charles VIII remained in Rome almost for a month. He was fascinated by the wealth and the beauty and the luxury of the city -- as, indeed, he had been fascinated by all he had seen of Italy since the invasion began. He was also fascinated, and overcome, by the pleasant-mannered pope. No one has ever accused Alexander of haughtiness or awkwardness. His was, it would seem, a gay and gentlemanly spirit, good-humoured, witty, a kindly, talkative man of the world, and his charm worked wonders with the raw, awkward, misshapen little man who was the offspring of that oddest of kings, Louis XI.

Once king and pope had met informally, and Alexander, with no

more than a graceful gesture of assent, had admitted two of his friends to the college of cardinals, the murders and rapes and plunderings of the troops in Rome ceased to matter. The army would soon be out of the city and on its way to Naples.

The pope managed to keep possession of St. Angelo, and he was not to be forced into any recognition of Charles as King of Naples. But he had to grant free passage to the French armies through his state, and to surrender his main port, Civita Vecchia; also he must appoint as legates and governors in all the chief cities prelates approved by Charles. He had, next, to surrender to Charles the invaluable brother of the Sultan, and also (as a hostage, though this was not expressly stated) his son Cesare. All the cardinals and barons who had supported Charles were to be forgiven, and especially Giuliano della Rovere. There was no more talk of reforming the Church. The eight cardinals who had gone over to Charles saw their leader become as papal as the pope himself. At the crucial moment of the audience, with Alexander in their toils, Charles had ruined it all by a sudden unconditional profession of obedience and homage, of recognition that Alexander was the true Vicar of Christ and successor of St. Peter. On January 28, 1495, the French marched out from Rome.

Charles had got no further than Marino, ten miles to the south, when the news came that Alfonso of Naples, terrified, had abdicated, leaving the chaos to the management of his young son Ferrantino. At the same time the French king received his first hint that even the cynical Europe of the Renaissance would not allow the papacy to become any one prince's tool, when the Spanish ambassadors brought him the strong protest of Ferdinand and Isabella against the invasion of the papal state and the occupation of Rome. And now Cardinal Cesare neatly gave him the slip. But, on February 22, Charles entered Naples, without opposition, the populace frantically enthusiastic for the novelty, more suo.

While the French gave themselves to the manifold pleasures of their new southern possession, the Italian diplomacy knit together a new league that would bar the king's return to France, the pope, Milan, and Venice joining with Spain and the emperor, the pope being pledged to use his spiritual powers for the objects of the alliance (March 31, 1495). Charles was mad with

anger and alarm. He might make a parade of himself, crowned as King of Naples, in the cathedral of his new capital, but prudence bade him look to his communications, and only a week later (May 20), with half of his army, he began the return towards France. Alexander, this time, evaded, by a timely flight to Orvieto, the meeting Charles desired. Rome was stripped of its valuables in anticipation of a sack. But the French passed through without any delay. They got over the Apennines safely, and at Fornovo, on July 6, beat off the attack of the allied army without great difficulty. By October Charles VIII was back in France, and the great expedition was over, although it still remained for the allies to clear out the garrisons the king had left behind in the south, ten thousand men in all. It was not until July 1496 that the last of these surrendered, to the Spanish commander Gonsalvo of Cordova.

While the Spaniards were thus engaged, Alexander turned to punish the barons who had sided with the French. The chief of these were the Orsini. They were now excommunicated, and all their possessions declared confiscated. But the execution of the sentence was put into the hands of the pope's eldest son, the Duke of Gandia, and it proved a task beyond his powers. The main fortress, Bracciano, defied all his efforts, and sorties of the Orsini even descended as far as Rome, where the rebels joined forces with their supporters in the city. The fortress was still untaken when, on January 25, 1497, the Orsini completely routed the pope's army at Soriano. Alexander now had to make peace on their terms, and restore their castles. Then, for a moment, fortune smiled on the papal cause, and on March 9 the Spaniards drove the French from Ostia.

And now began a series of extraordinary events in the family life of the pope that kept Rome interested and alert for a year and a half. In Holy Week (March) 1497, Lucrezia's husband, Giovanni Sforza, suddenly disappeared from Rome. The question had been raised of declaring his marriage null, on the ground that he was impotent. Sforza had refused to let the case go against him undefended, and he now fled to his city of Pesaro to escape the anger of the pope. Lucrezia, it seems, stood by her husband. In May the pope created a third Borgia cardinal, another Juan Borgia, [] the son of one of his sisters and on June 7 he granted to the Duke of Gandia and his descendants for ever the Duchy of Benevento with Terracina and Pontecorvo; the next day Cesare

was named legate for the coronation of the new King of Naples, Federigo. [] Then, on June 14, the Duke of Gandia mysteriously disappeared. For two days he was missing, and then his body, slashed with a score of wounds, the throat cut, was fished out of the Tiber. Was it the Orsini or some jealous lover or husband? The mystery has never been resolved, but the murder roused even the Rome of 1497, and it shook Alexander to the point that he solemnly promised to amend his life, and even named a commission to plan a complete reform of the curia and the Church.

It is after the murder of his elder brother that Cesare Borgia first comes into the public life of the reign. He returned from crowning the King of Naples meditating a dramatic change in his status. He now wished to break off his ecclesiastical career, and he thought an exchange might be arranged between himself and Jofre, his youngest brother. Cesare would be freed from all his obligations, and resign his archiepiscopal see of Valencia and his cardinal's hat; the marriage between Jofre and Sancia would be dissolved, on the ground that it had not been consummated; Cesare would marry Sancia and become a prince, while Jofre would succeed to his cardinalate and all his other benefices. Alexander was slow to agree, but by December he had got so far as to say that the change of status must be so arranged as not to give scandal. While the best way to do this was carefully considered, the other domestic problem, Lucrezia's marriage, was successfully solved. Her husband's long resistance ceased, and under pressure from his two kinsmen, the Duke of Milan and Cardinal Ascanio Sforza, Giovanni Sforza now swore that he had never consummated the marriage and that he was unable to do so, and on December 20, 1497, a decree of nullity was published. Lucrezia had broken with him in June, and in August negotiations were begun for her second marriage to a son of the Prince of Salerno. []

Cesare's scheme still moved slowly, the first fantastic plan was abandoned, but a few months after the disgraceful tinkering with matrimonial justice on behalf of his sister, on April 7, 1498, the King of France, Charles VIII, died. He left no son to succeed him, and the crown passed to his cousin the Duke of Orleans, Louis XII. This change in the succession was, in time, to make all the difference to Cesare's future. The new king had a claim on Milan, as a descendant of the ancient Visconti dukes; he was as eager

to distinguish himself in the field as his predecessor had been; a second invasion of Italy was, then, to be looked for soon. Meanwhile, Louis sought the annulment of his own marriage with Jeanne de Valois, sister of Charles VIII, a poor invalid and a cripple, his wife for many years but who had not borne him any family; and he also sought a dispensation to marry Anne, the widow of his predecessor, and Duchess of Brittany in her own right (June 1498). The grounds on which the annulment of the marriage was sought were that Louis had married her through fear of his terrible father-in-law, Louis XI, and that the marriage could not be consummated. While a new chapter in French -- and indeed in papal history -- was thus beginning, the Borgia family's matrimonial history was also enlarged. Lucrezia was married on July 21 to Alfonso of Bisceglia, a son of the late King of Naples, [] and an effort was made to secure Carlotta, daughter of the reigning king, for Cesare, when his several resignations should have been allowed. But the lady refused, afraid, so she said, of the time it would take her to live down what her husband had been; she did not want to be known as the cardinal's wife. But on August 17, 1498, Cesare was at last free of his ecclesiastical rank, his orders [] and their obligations. The French king -- his nullity suit not yet terminated -- was granted the dispensation to wed the Duchess of Brittany, should his marriage to Jeanne be declared null, and he soon agreed to find a wife for Cesare, whom he created Duke of Valentinois, from among the women of his own family. On October 1 the new duke set out for France, with an outfit that cost his father 100,000 ducats, and a vulgar parvenu display that brought amused smiles to the face of the parsimonious French king. Louis offered him the choice between two ladies, and Cesare chose Charlotte d'Albret, the sister of the King of Navarre. In December Louis XII's marriage with Jeanne was declared null, he was free to marry Anne and rivet Brittany anew to the crown of France. The Colonna might once more rise against Alexander, and combine with Naples against him; the Spanish and Portuguese ambassadors might, to his face, reproach him for his evil worldliness, and utter threats; the King of France was now his fixed and most powerful ally, and even his kinsman. When next the French invaded Italy, they would come to conquer Alexander's enemies too. When the news reached Rome, on May 24, 1499, of Cesare's marriage, the pope's joy knew no bounds. His Italian policy was reversed, the full half circle, but this time to his certain profit. In July a French

army again crossed the Alps.

The four years between the invasion of 1499, and Alexander's death, four years packed with incident, are wholly dominated by the pitiless craft and violence of Cesare Borgia. It had been agreed that Louis XII would aid his new cousin's campaign to subdue the Romagna. The pope issued a series of bulls declaring forfeited the fiefs of Rimini, Pesaro, Imola, Faenza, Forli, Urbino and Camerino, and in the autumn of this same year Imola and Forli fell to the Duke. In the spring of 1500 Louis' victory at Novara [] secured his hold on Milan and the North, and in the autumn Cesare opened his second campaign in the Romagna. The lords of Pesaro and Rimini did not await his attack; he took Faenza (April 1501) and had its lord and his heir murdered. The pope now created him Duke of Romagna; he and his descendants were to be lords of the finest province in the Papal State. Cesare next turned his power against the barons of the Campagna, and in June 1501 he forced the surrender of the Colonna fortresses and confiscated the possessions of the Savelli. When he threatened Florence the republic hastily bought him off with 36,000 ducats and an engagement not to hinder his attack on the maritime principality of Piombino. This, with its great fortress of Orbetello, fell to Cesare in September.

Alexander now divided the spoil. Piombino went to Cesare, and the Colonna lands were formed into two new duchies, Sermoneta, which went to Lucrezia's son Rodrigo, and Nepi, given to another tiny child of three or four, a Juan Borgia who may have been Cesare's son or perhaps Alexander's. [] Lucrezia herself was about to make a third marriage, [] to the heir to the Duchy of Ferrara, so that there also the future dukes would be Borgia. Practically the whole territory of the states of the Church had now been made hereditary in this family, and future popes, if all went well, would rule their states by grace of the descendants of Alexander VI.

Cesare's next objective was Tuscany, the republics of Siena and Florence, and the reduction of the great Romagna city of Bologna. In March 1502 he began his elaborate operations. But success, this time, was to be conditioned by the circumstance that the French king was no longer the sole great military power in Italy. Eighteen months before Cesare began his preparations for these new conquests Louis XII in November 1500, had had

no alternative but to accept Ferdinand of Spain as a partner in the enterprise of conquering Naples. [] The two had agreed to partition the kingdom, and in the following June [] Alexander had ratified the treaty, and had obliged the partners by declaring the King of Naples, Federigo, deposed. Federigo, understanding perfectly that there was now no hope at all, abdicated in August. And now, six months later, the two robber powers were at issue over the spoil. In July 1502 war began between them, a momentous new war, the first of many, between France and Spain for the possession of Italy and fought on Italian soil.

By the time this war had begun, Cesare, drawing huge sums from the papal treasury for arms and munitions of war, had opened his own campaign in Central Italy. Such was the terror his cruelties inspired that, as his army advanced, the people fled, "as from a hydra". He was soon master of Spoleto, and of Urbino too, and of Camerino, and he began to plan the attack on Bologna. But now, October 1502, his captains conspired to put him out of the way, before he had murdered them. For a moment Cesare was in great danger. But the help of Louis XII, and his own craft and courage, saved him. He captured Sinigaglia, on the last day of the year, and massacred there those of the conspirators whom he had induced to desert. Then he made for Perugia to deal with the rest (January 1503).

In Rome, meanwhile, Alexander dealt with the Orsini. He had the Orsini cardinal arrested, and so many of the clan's supporters with him, that Rome was panic-stricken and the pope had to reassure the civil authorities personally that he meant to do no more. On February 22 the cardinal died; not improbably he was poisoned. In the country the Orsini, as always, made a good fight. They lost their fortress of Cere (April 4, 1503), but Bracciano held out once again. Alexander had to consent to an armistice. And while the pope and his son were thus striking down the last of their enemies, the Spaniards were beginning to defeat the pope's French ally in battle after battle. From the beginning Ferdinand's generals had profited from the traditional Aragonese command of the western Mediterranean. It was a great blow to Louis when, in March 1503, his fleet was destroyed in a great battle at sea. Then followed two more French defeats, at Seminara (April 20) and Cerignola (April 28), and on May 16 the Spaniards entered Naples, to be rulers there for the next two hundred years and more.

Cesare's fortune, built so far on the favour of the French, was gravely menaced. But he now planned to play off France against Spain. All he needed was a better army of his own and -- of course -- more money. One way to get the money was for Alexander to create, on March 29, eighty new court offices to be sold at 760 ducats apiece; another was to poison the extremely wealthy Venetian cardinal Giovanni Michele and seize his possessions (April 10); [] a third way was to repeat the iniquity of the consistory of 1500 [] and, by the creation of nine new cardinals for a consideration -- bring into the treasury some 120,000 ducats. Alexander began to negotiate, with the emperor, Cesare's nomination as sovereign of Pisa and Siena and Lucca, while the duke made himself master of Perugia. The future seemed once more secured. But though Alexander at seventy was, like Queen Elizabeth, just a hundred years later, active, gay and even frisky, his end was near. "Il papa sta benissimo, " a Mantuan correspondent told his sovereign in May. But ten weeks later he was dead (August 18, 1503) and Cesare, at the same time, so ill as to be in danger of death. For the circumstance of Alexander's death Cesare was prepared, and had, no doubt, his arrangements made. But, as he told Machiavelli later, [] the one contingency for which it had never crossed his mind he need prepare was, that when the pope died, he, too, would be at the point of death. This was surely the providence of God.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



JULIUS II

Four weeks and a day after Alexander's death thirty-seven cardinals went into conclave. Two were French, there was a block of eleven Spaniards, and twenty-two very divided Italians. Had Cesare Borgia been able to act, he might have imposed a pope of his own choice. But the cardinals, aided by the ambassadors of France, Spain and the emperor, were able to induce the sick man to make terms. His army was but one of three in the neighbourhood of Rome, and, the cardinals guaranteeing him his possessions and a free passage to them with his forces, and the French and Spanish ambassadors pledging that the armies of their sovereigns would not move nearer to Rome while the conclave debated, this most dangerous enemy of religion left Rome on September 2, still so ill that he was carried in a litter. Two days later the solemnities of the late pope's funeral began. On September 5 Giuliano della Rovere came back to Rome, after his long exile, and on the sixteenth the conclave began.

Giuliano made no secret that he meant to be pope himself. Two other powerful men were equally determined to be elected; Ascanio Sforza and the French king's chief minister, Georges d'Amboise, Archbishop of Rouen. For the cardinals, after the disgraceful history of the last thirty years, to elect another Italian or Spaniard and disregard the wishes of Louis XII would, so the French considered, be an unbearable insult. "Our generals, said this French Wolsey, "are aware of these intrigues, and they will not patiently endure such a slight to their king. "

For five days the conclave was hopelessly deadlocked, despite Giuliano's success in winning the Spanish cardinals to his side. Then d'Amboise and Ascanio joined forces to propose a quiet, neutral man against whom none had a word to say, the senior member of the college, Francesco Piccolomini, the nephew of Pius II. The whole college rallied to him, and on September 22 he was proclaimed as Pius III. He was indeed a colourless personage, though not a weakling of the type of Innocent VIII, and he was a man of unblemished life. [] Hopes of reform accordingly ran high, especially when he promptly announced that he would summon a General Council. But Pius III, sixty-five

years of age, and like his uncle a lifelong martyr to gout, was indeed a very feeble old man. The long ceremonies that followed his election -- his ordination (for he was only a deacon), [] his consecration as bishop and his coronation -- and the first rush of routine business, were too much for him. He very soon fell ill, and in less than four weeks after his election he was dead. In October 1503 the competitors of September took up again their round of busy intrigue and, this time, of bribery and simony too. Cesare Borgia had now returned to Rome. On the eve of the conclave he made his bargain with Giuliano della Rovere. The cardinal was to have the votes of the Spaniards, and he was to confirm Cesare in his possessions, and in his post of commander-in- chief. A short conclave of a few hours' duration sufficed to elect Giuliano, and on November 1 he was proclaimed as Julius II.

The new pope had reached just to the end of his sixtieth year. He was notoriously violent and self-willed, restless, a politician who, when not in office, had always been a rebel; and during the greater part of the reign of Alexander VI he had been the pope's most dangerous enemy. What his contemporaries saw in the election was the emergence of a strong pope, and they looked forward to a time of order, good government and peace. This last hope was not to be fulfilled, and Giuliano della Rovere was to show himself in a new role as Pope Julius II, for his immense energy was to work itself out in military expeditions quite as much as in diplomatic manoeuvres. There was, of course, little that was lamblike in such of the pope's contemporaries as Ferdinand of Spain, Louis XII of France, our own Henry VII, the Emperor Maximilian or the Venetian Senate. It was a world of hard lying, of perfidy, of cruelty and violence that the pope had known, and worked in, during the thirty years since, at the invitation of his uncle, Sixtus IV, he had left his Franciscan cell to become a cardinal and man of affairs. He did not propose to retire from that world now, nor to shrink from using in defence of his rights the only argument whose force that world would appreciate.

Julius II found Cesare Borgia installed as the actual ruler of the greater part of his state, a vassal more powerful than his suzerain; and what cities of the Romagna were not in Cesare's power, Venice, in these late disturbed years, had laid hands on. But, in fact, Cesare Borgia's position was critical. His French

patron's star had declined; and he was not himself well established, as yet, with the Spaniards. When the terrible condottiere betook himself to Naples, as a first step towards making himself once again a reality in Italian politics, his admiring friend the viceroy, Gonsalvo de Cordova, was nevertheless compelled, by Ferdinand's instructions, to arrest him. When the pope now suggested to the King of Spain that Italy would be a happier place for all its princes were Cesare out of it, Ferdinand readily agreed, and under a strong guard the most dangerous of the Borgia returned in 1504 to his native land. Like many another of his kind he ceased to be terrible from the moment he came up against superior force and equal determination.

By this time Julius II had regained the most of the Romagna towns where Cesare Borgia had been lord. But the Venetians, with a polite kind of contempt, refused to take seriously the pope's repeated demands for a restoration of what they held, such great cities as Rimini, Faenza and Ravenna. And their intrigues to seduce from him the newly-acquired Romagna never ceased. The pope began to look round for allies; Venice was a power far beyond what his slight resources could hope to subdue. And the pope no longer looked to the other Italian states. Naples was now ruled by Spain, Milan by France. The new papal diplomacy must be international; the next war, if war there must be, would be a general European war. But while France and Spain were still at war about Naples, the pope's great schemes had to wait.

In the next two years (1504-1506) the pope secured from Venice a few small towns -- surrenders made in a manner that emphasised the Venetian determination to keep the main strongholds, and also the Venetian sense of the pope's helplessness -- and he took back the papal fiefs in the Campagna which Alexander VI had granted to the Borgia. Then, by three diplomatic marriages, he sought to bind to the Holy See the most turbulent of his own barons; one of his nieces married a Colonna, while, for a nephew and for one of his own daughters he arranged marriages with the Orsini. In October 1505 France and Spain finally came to an accord about Naples, [] the pope's diplomacy completed his alliances with the Italian states, [] his last preparations were made, and in the summer of 1506 he announced his plan. It was to reduce his own two cities of

Perugia and Bologna, neither of which had ever been more than nominally subject to the popes. Despite the opposition of Venice, and of France, the expedition started, August 26, 1506, and Julius II led it in person. It was almost three years since his election. The remaining six years of his reign were to see almost continuous war.

The pope was absent from Rome for just seven months, and the event justified his courage. As had more than once happened in the days of the ruthless Cesare Borgia, the tyrants did not wait to try a fall with fate. While Julius halted at Orvieto (September 5-9), the Baglioni came in from Perugia to surrender at discretion. The pope took possession of the town four days later. He reached Imola by October 20, and while he planned there his last moves against Bologna, the news came that the tyrant -- Bentivoglio -- had fled. On November 10 Julius entered the city, the first pope to be really its lord. He remained at Bologna, reorganising the government, until after the New Year and returned to Rome on March 27, 1507. It was the eve of Palm Sunday, and the next day Julius made his ceremonial entry in the most magnificent procession known for years, under triumphal arches, and amid showers of flowers, with choirs singing in his honour the hymns from the day's great liturgy -- to the unconcealed scandal of the pope's master of ceremonies, who said openly to Julius that this was a scandalous way for a pope to begin Holy Week. []

The next objective of the victorious pope was Venice. But a new obstacle now blocked the plan of a grand alliance. Ferdinand of Spain was introducing into his new kingdom of Naples that system of royal control over Church affairs which was one of the characteristics of his rule in Spain, where the king was all-powerful in appointments to sees, and where without his leave none dared, under pain of death, bring in any bulls or other documents from the Holy See. And while this trouble was yet unsettled Ferdinand, to the pope's chagrin, not only made his peace with Louis XII in a personal interview at Savona (June 1507), but refused to meet the pope. However, by the end of the next year, 1508, the needs of the Emperor Maximilian had brought about the long desired league against Venice. On December 10, 1508, the emperor and the King of France signed a pact of alliance at Cambrai -- a peace-treaty between the two powers and a league against the Turks. But secretly they had

come to an agreement to attack Venice and to partition the republic's possessions on the European mainland, offering an appropriate share of the spoil to all interested. If the pope joined the league -- he was not represented at Cambrai -- he was to bring against Venice his spiritual powers also, and he would receive at the peace his own Romagna cities that Venice still detained. It was not until nearly four months later that Julius joined the league, until after the Venetians had repeatedly, and with their usual scorn, refused his new demands for the return of his territories. When the news came that the pope had joined the alliance they offered restitution. But Julius now stood by the pact, and on April 27 he laid an interdict on the republic.

The first act of the long war which followed was soon over. On May 14, 1509, the Venetian army was scattered like chaff at the battle of Agnadello. Venice was, for the moment, at the mercy of the league, and evacuating immediately the papal cities of Ravenna, Cervia, Rimini, and Faenza, the republic appealed to the pope for mercy. The envoys had a grim reception (July 1509), for almost the last act of Venice before the disastrous battle was to appeal against the pope to a future General Council. Before the pope would discuss the desired absolution from excommunication and interdict, the Venetians must accept his terms, promise to abandon their habit of installing bishops without the pope's consent, for example, or of levying taxes on the clergy. Moreover, the Venetians must restore all their Italian conquests of the last eight years and more. While the pope held out, the fortunes of war suddenly changed; Venice, within a few weeks, had regained Padua and captured the pope's chief general. Julius, at the news, went off into one of his rages, throwing his biretta to the ground, cursing and swearing violently. The republic broke off the negotiations. And then the pope set them going once more. What brought the pope to approach Venice was a new fear of France, not only dominant now in northern Italy, but showing itself unpleasantly able to force from the pope new concessions in jurisdiction. On February 15, 1510, the pope made peace with Venice, and so deserted the league. The Venetians gave way on all points, and Julius reduced the humiliating ceremony of the reconciliation to a thin formality. But, in their hearts, the Venetians still held out. Nine days before the act of submission, the Council of Ten had drawn up a secret declaration that they would not hold themselves bound by what, so they declared, they only signed

under compulsion. The gains of the war would be the pope's only so long as he had strength to keep them; and meanwhile he had mortally offended his allies, especially the French.

To Julius II this last particular was welcome rather than otherwise, for the pope now proposed to crown his career by driving the French out of Italy once and for all. If he did not actually utter the famous words "Out with the barbarians, " the sentiment was, from now, for ever on his lips. The year 1510 opened with the certainty of a speedy new war between the pope and France. He could not eat nor drink, nor sleep, he said, for the thought of the French. It was obviously the will of God that he should punish their ally, the Duke of Ferrara, and free Italy from their power. The first stage in the business was for the pope to destroy this powerful vassal, the Duke of Ferrara, who had disregarded the papal command to desert his French ally, and who was still harassing the Venetians. On August 9, 1510, Julius II excommunicated him, in a bull of staggering severity, and declared his fief forfeited. Then, at the end of the month, the pope once more left Rome at the head of an army marching north.

The French king had not passively awaited the pope's assault, but he was gravely handicapped by the loss of the shrewdest of his advisers, the cardinal Georges d'Amboise, [] whom a personal hatred of the pope stimulated to brave any extremity, and who was the one force that could keep the king's own vacillating will fixed and true to its purpose. And while the pope made an alliance that secured him the invaluable Swiss -- rightly reputed the finest soldiers of the day -- Louis XII fell into the abysmal mistake of attacking the pope through the spiritual arm. It was perhaps a natural kind of reprisal for Julius II's lavish use of excommunications to forward his plans. But all history was there to show how, in the hands of a Catholic prince, this weapon breaks sooner or later. To such contests there is but one end, submission and retraction on the part of the prince -- unless the prince turns heretic and leaves the Church, in which case all hope of dominating the Church is at an end.

But Louis XII was ill-advised, and Julius knew it. While the pope watched the French cardinals narrowly, imprisoning one of them and threatening to behead him, Louis, so Machiavelli, now Florence's ambassador in France, wrote home, was resolved to

renounce obedience to the pope "and to hang a council round his neck. " Julius II was to be annihilated, in spirituals as well as in temporals, and another set in his place. This was on July 21, 1510, and nine days later the French king sent out to the bishops of France a summons to meet and arrange the preliminaries of the council. The technique for dealing with awkward popes invented by Philip the Fair, and by now a tradition with the French kings, was beginning to function. On August 16 a royal edict forbade French subjects to visit Rome, and in September, at a great meeting at Tours, the bishops gave Louis their support, and voted a generous subsidy to help the expedition that was to invade Italy once more and, this time, depose the pope.

By now Julius II was nearing Bologna, and there misfortunes crowded upon him. On October 17 he heard that five of his cardinals had gone over to Louis, and the next day the sickness, under which he had been labouring for some time, took a sudden turn for the worse. He fell into a delirium and raved that rather than fall into the hands of the French he would kill himself. The cardinals expected his death, and began to think of the conclave. Meanwhile the French were within ten miles of the city, and Cardinal Alidosi, the pope's favourite, was treasonably negotiating with them.

But the old pope recovered as speedily as he had collapsed. He managed to keep the French away by a feint of negotiations and then, as the Venetians and Spaniards arrived, the French fell back. By the end of the year 1510 the initiative had once again passed to the pope, his armies were besieging the fortresses of Concordia and Mirandola that were the keys to Ferrara, and, scorning the doctors, he pressed on to take his place in the front of the attack (January 2, 1511). Never was the fiery spirit of Julius II so satisfied as in these weeks. Since his dangerous illness the pope had grown a great beard, and wearing his armour he stamped through the deep snow before the walls of Mirandola, delighting the soldiers with his familiarity as he mixed with them round the camp fires, and by the blunt, coarse language in which, from time to time, he raged at the incompetence and over-cautiousness of his generals. Men were killed at his side and the roof of the farmhouse where he lodged was shot away as he sat there. But the pope hung on, promising the soldiers the sack of the city once they had taken it. On

January 20 Mirandola fell, and Julius made his way in with the troops up the scaling ladders and through the newly-opened breach.

But soon the Duke of Ferrara had beaten the papal army in open battle (February 28), the French were once more masters in Bologna, and the pope only just got away in time to Ravenna. Here there were violent scenes between Julius and his nephew, the Duke of Urbino, whom the pope blamed for the loss of Bologna, and who in turn blamed the favourite Alidosi. On May 27 the duke and cardinal met in the streets and, as the cardinal smiled contemptuously at him, the passionate young man cut him down and finished him off with a dozen wounds. The pope had, however, no time to indulge his sorrow, or his rage, nor to repress the unconcealed delight of all his court and cardinals at the disappearance of the wretched traitor. He had now to fly to Rimini, and there he found, fixed to the doors of the church with due formality, a summons from the rebellious cardinals citing him to a council which would meet at Pisa in the coming September; and not only the King of France, but the emperor too, supported them. The glories of Mirandola were ended indeed, and with all possible speed the pope made his way back to Rome. [] It was a dark hour in his life; Julius II was isolated, and the coming council would no doubt "depose" him.

But the religious situation was not so bad as it seemed. Although, in France, the University of Paris was once again stirred up to popularise that theory of the pope's subordination to General Councils which had already done the French kings such service, and although, along with this, a campaign was organised, in the press and on the stage, of anti-papal calumny and ridicule, the scheme for a great council at Pisa died almost at birth. The emperor found it impossible to persuade Hungary and Poland to join him; the English held aloof, and so did Spain. But it was the reply which the pope made to the rebels that killed the movement. For, on July 25, 1511, just a month after his return to Rome, Julius II made the plan of the rebels his own, and summoned a General Council which should meet at Rome on April 19, 1512. And during the summer his diplomacy managed to knit a new combination against France -- the Holy League, for the protection and defence of the pope. This was signed on October 4. On November 17 the new young King of England, Henry VIII, joined it and in the first week of the New

Year the war began again.

Meanwhile, on November 1, 1511, the four rebel cardinals arrived at Pisa, with a dozen or so French bishops in support, to find that no one in the town would lodge them and that the canons had locked up the cathedral. In the next fortnight they managed to hold three pretentious sessions, where, with a wealth of declamation, they reaffirmed the ideals of the famous fifth session of Constance, and then, all but chased out by the townsfolk, they declared the council transferred to Milan, where Louis XII still reigned as duke.

The new anti-French offensive opened well. The Venetians took Brescia (February 2, 1512) and the Spanish and papal army laid siege to Bologna (January 26). But there now appeared one of the greatest military geniuses of all time, Gaston de Foix, a kinsman of Louis XII, twenty-three years of age, and in a few brief weeks he all but destroyed the league. He managed to make his way into Bologna (February 5) and forced a raising of the siege. On February 18 he retook Brescia, and on April 11 -- Easter Sunday -- he inflicted on the Venetians and Spaniards the terrible defeat of Ravenna. It was the bloodiest battle fought in Italy for a thousand years. The vanquished lost 10,000 killed, and a vast horde of prisoners, among them the Papal Legate Cardinal de' Medici. But the victor was himself slain in the battle.

When the news of the defeat reached Rome there was universal panic. Even the pope' for a moment, gave way. The French were masters of the key' province of his state. How long would it be before Julius was in their hands? And at Milan the rebel cardinals, on April 21, declared him suspended from his office, that all his acts henceforth were void in law, his appointments also; and they explicitly forbade him to create any new cardinals.

The ultimately decisive event, however, was not the victory at Ravenna, but the death of Gaston de Foix. This the Cardinal Legate shrewdly foresaw, and he managed to send his cousin, Giulio de' Medici [] to the pope to impress upon him the difference this must make. While the emperor recalled the troops he had sent to serve under Gaston -- the German professional mercenaries who had been a main element in the victory -- the Swiss now descended on Verona. The French, utterly

disordered, led now by a weak and incompetent commander, and beyond the reach of reinforcements, were forced to retreat or see their line of communications cut. The pope now looked on at the most amazing spectacle of a victorious army in full retreat. Like mist before the sun the great threat disappeared. The Romagna, Bologna, Pavia, Milan itself, were abandoned, and in ten weeks after the victory of Ravenna the victors were back in France, a broken remnant. Somewhere in the rout were the cardinals and bishops of the rebel council. " Papa Bernadin " [] was finished. Meanwhile, on May 3, only a fortnight after the appointed date, the General Council which the pope had summoned, assembled in the basilica of the Lateran.

In August the allies met at Mantua to regulate the future of Italy. Milan, now recovered from the French, was given back to the Sforza, and Florence to the Medici. But from Milan were detached Parma and Piacenza, handed over to the pope, who also received Reggio. One awkward question defied settlement, the claim of the emperor on Venice for Verona and Vicenza. The pope was most anxious to win Maximilian's support for the council and he now, for the third time in his short reign, reversed his policy. On November 19, 1512, he made a treaty with Maximilian against Venice, his late ally. The emperor was to support the council, and to hand over Modena to the pope -- whose new territories were thus linked to the old -- while Julius was to join in compelling Venice to give up the fiefs which the emperor claimed, and to use on behalf of his new ally spiritual weapons too. This treaty was made public on November 25. Its effect, of course, was to drive Venice to seek help from France, and in March 1513 a new alliance was negotiated between them and a new war began. But by that time Julius II was no more.

Towards the end of 1512 the pope -- he was close on seventy -- began to fail rapidly, and he was apparently the first to realise that, this time, it was the end. His last days were harassed by the realisation that while he had destroyed the hold of the French on Italy, the Spaniards had very effectively taken their place. "If God grants me life, " he had been heard to say, "I will free the Neapolitans from the yoke which is now upon their necks. " Whether such feats were a proper occupation for popes, whether indeed, Julius seriously meditated such a war, death found him still restless and anxious about the menace of Spain. One thing he impressed on the cardinals who stood round his

bed, that they should observe the new law he had just made about simony in the conclave. In the night of February 20-21, 1513, he passed away.

Julius II had died at a critical moment in the complicated international life of which the pope was now a principal figure. There was no certitude that his successor, even if faithful to his ideals, would choose the same alliances through which to realise them. All Europe would watch the conclave with even more interest than usual. The dead pope was sincerely mourned by his subjects, a new feature of papal obsequies, and it was a testimony to his administration that, for the first time in fifty years, the cardinals assembled in a city of unbroken calm.

There were twenty-five of them, in all, to go into conclave on March 4, 1513. Those lately in active rebellion against the pope were excluded. There were no outstanding personalities among the cardinals, no intriguers of genius, and no well-defined groups. In a leisurely way they first drew up the usual pact to secure from the new pope what they thought their due share of money and offices and privileges. On March 7 the impatient guardians of the conclave reduced their rations of food, to hasten their deliberations, and reduced them still further three days later. The only line of conflict in the college was, seemingly, that of age, the older cardinals against the younger men, Riario Sansoni, a cousin of the late pope, against Giovanni de' Medici. It was evident that no Venetian could be chosen, still less a Frenchman. At the first ballot -- March 10 the votes were well scattered. Then Sansoni and Medici met, the son of the all-but-murdered Lorenzo de' Medici and the cardinal whom the murderers had used as a decoy and in whose presence the crime had been committed. The older man had too many personal enemies for his own election to be possible. He agreed that his friends should support Medici. A second scrutiny, pro forma, confirmed the pact, and on March 11 Medici was proclaimed as Pope Leo X, to the surprise of Rome and of the whole Christian world.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)

▪ [Forward](#)



LEO X

The new pope was only thirty-seven, but a chronic invalid, operated on in the very conclave for a fistula, popular for his easy-going ways and his generosity, likely to strengthen the international position of the papacy for the next few years since he was virtually the ruler of Florence. Pomponius Laetus, Poliziano, and Marsilio Ficino had been his tutors, and in the wealthy cultural palaces of Lorenzo de' Medici he had been fashioned after all the literary and artistic ideals of the age. Though he was not yet a priest he had been a churchman from babyhood. At eight he had been given an archbishopric, [] at thirteen he was a cardinal. Then, when he was barely nineteen, the revolution of 1494 had driven his family from Florence, and the cardinal for some years wandered about France and Germany. Alexander VI's court he had only known in the last two or three years of the reign. To Julius II he had been of great political importance, once the Florence dominated by his family's enemies had supported the schismatical Council of Pisa. It was Julius II who had restored the Medici rule in Florence, and now Giovanni, the eldest surviving son of Lorenzo, was pope.

Only twelve days after the election the threatened alliance between France and Venice (against the new Papal-Imperial pact made by Julius II) was published. How would Leo X react? Muratori has well described his general line of conduct, saying that he always steered by two compasses. A more recent Italian scholar, more familiarly, sees him as an eel slippery beyond belief, ever writhing and twisting to escape the hand that would grasp it. Hardly ever, in fact, was Leo X to make an agreement with any power without simultaneously coming to an understanding with its rivals. He realised fully how weak in resources his state really was, and even at the last extremity he shrank from definitely committing himself to political action. Even in the last agonies of a crisis, he would decide and reverse his decision, and reverse yet again. Secretive, bland, affable, every one's friend, he strove to maintain himself by smiling in silence as the inevitable awkward questions were put.

So now, when Henry VIII and Maximilian formed a new league

that would check the Franco-Venetian alliance, the pope did not join it at once, although he approved, and sent subsidies. Whichever side won he proposed to have claims on its gratitude. On June 6, 1513, the French were heavily defeated on that field where so many armies met, at Novara, and their armies were once more driven out of Italy. Leo exerted himself to prevent their foes from being too completely victorious. But the English also had invaded France. They had taken Terouanne and Tournai, and they had won the battle of Spurs, and also, against the French king's Scots allies, the bloody fight of Flodden. Then in the autumn, Louis XII made his peace with the pope, repudiated the schism and acknowledged the council in session at the Lateran (December 19, 1513).

But when Louis, exhausted now, proceeded to make with Spain a peace that was definitive, and to offer Ferdinand, as dowry with one of his daughters, the French claims on Milan and Genoa, and to renounce in his favour the French claim on Naples, the shock to the pope was paralysing. The sole result for him would be King Stork in place of King Log. The Spaniards would be masters of Italy in the North as well as in the South. Hence the eagerness of the pope, now, to see peace made between Louis and Henry VIII, his despatch to England and to France of the most experienced diplomatist in his service, [] and his joy at the treaty that followed, the peace sealed by the marriage of Henry's youngest sister to the French king. Louis was now tied to the English instead of to Spain (October 1514). But by this treaty of London the English king acknowledged his brother-in-law's rights in Italy ! So, once again, a new anxiety for the pope. Would Louis XII plan yet another invasion of Italy, with the security, this time, that the English would not attack his rear? However, on New Year's day, 1515, Louis XII died, killed by his endeavours to live up to the gaiety of a wife thirty years his junior; and it is on record that the superficial, short-sighted politician in the Vatican rejoiced. In the nature of things no relief could be more than momentary to so folly-ridden a ruler. Louis XII had no son, and so it was that, instead of that elderly broken man, Leo X had now to face a young king of twenty, valorous, ambitious, and capable, Francis I.

There is not space here to set out in detail all the sinuous writhings of the pontifical diplomacy in these years. The pope's chief confidant was Bernardo Dovizzi, called the Cardinal

Bibbiena, his one-time tutor and secretary, a humanist of distinction, but utterly inexperienced in affairs of state, and as cocksure as he was incompetent. While Francis I was preparing a greater army than ever for the conquest of Italy the cardinal laughed at the news as mere gossip, and spoke of the lesson which his new league would soon be teaching the king. But when Francis moved, in July 1515, the pope, whose squandermania had already in two years exhausted the treasure Julius II had left behind, was soon at his wits' end. As to the league, Leo had at last brought himself to sign the pact, but would not have it published, in a desperate hope that he might still, somehow, charm away the advancing French. On August 12, however, by the victory of Villa Franca, they drove a wedge between the Swiss armies that were Italy's only hope. Ten days later Alessandria fell to them; and still the pope, while writing urgent commands to advance, to Bibbiena's twin in incompetence, the Cardinal Giulio de' Medici -- legate with the army -- was sending secret apologies to the French. First he sent an envoy to Francis, and then he hoped the legate would detain the envoy; and then the envoy, and his papers, fell into the hands of the pope's allies. Never was there such incompetent tergiversation since first priests set themselves to play the politician and the soldier.

But on September 8 the crushing victory of Francis I in the bloody two days' battle of Marignano tore these preposterous activities to shreds. All the north and centre of Italy lay at the mercy of the French, and the pope knew it. The king's terms were hard, but Leo had no choice. In December the two met at Bologna. What passed between them in their several long interviews has never transpired. But the pope lost all the conquests of Julius II, Piacenza, Parma, Reggio, and Modena. He had to forbid the Swiss to molest the king in his duchy of Milan, and he even offered the king a hope of the succession to Naples -- Ferdinand of Aragon lay dying at this moment [] -- Francis pledging himself to maintain the Medici in Florence; and the pope came to that arrangement about French ecclesiastical affairs, the Concordat of 1516, which practically placed at the king's mercy the whole system of appointments to abbeys and sees; that the pope also gave the king the right to tax the clergy -- a crusade tithe ! -- to the tune of 400,000 livres in two years is, beside this, a detail. To such disaster had the Medici finesse brought the Church in three short years. []

Leo's own war was not yet over, however. His vassal the Duke of Urbino had failed to support him against the French, being in secret communication with Francis. At Bologna the victorious king had to leave him to the mercy of the pope. Leo -- despite the debt his family owed the duke, who had given them shelter in the days of their exile from Florence -- determined to destroy him, and to give the duchy to his nephew Lorenzo. The duke, Francesco Maria della Rovere, did not wait to be defeated by the combined forces of the pope and Florence, but fled to Mantua, where the duke his father-in-law took him in. By the end of June 1516, the Medici were lords of Urbino and Pesaro and Sinigaglia. The King of France had been too caught up with other affairs to be able to prevent it, but he warned Leo not to make any attempt on the other great papal vassal at Ferrara, reminding him that Reggio and Modena were to be surrendered to Ferrara. Then, in January, 1517 the dispossessed Duke of Urbino returned, with a force of Spanish and German mercenaries, unemployed since the recent general peace. Everyone helped him who hated the Medici, the French viceroy in Milan, the Gonzaga in Mantua, the Duke of Ferrara too. The pope was by now all but bankrupt, his army mutinous for lack of pay, and he had no real generals. Nor did Cardinal Bibbiena avail greatly as a peacemaker among the papal mercenaries. And at this moment, at Rome, a plot was discovered to murder the pope, and the chief plotters were cardinals.

Leo X had been pope now (April 1517) for a little more than four years; he was half-way through his reign. The whole spirit of the papal court had already, in that short time, been transformed. Under Julius II, if it had not been religious and spiritual, it had at least become decorous. The wild scandals of the previous twenty years had been checked, and the pope's understanding of the gravity of the tasks before him effected a certain seriousness everywhere. With the election of Giovanni de' Medici there was a rapid return to the days of Alexander VI, and the young pope led the rout. He had indeed been born, and he now showed it, one of the spoiled darlings of fortune. The years of wandering and exile that had followed upon his brilliant introduction to the high places of life, were now to find their compensation. "Everything unpleasant was removed as far as possible from him, for an insatiable thirst for pleasure was his leading characteristic." [] His chosen friends were the young

cardinals who had brought about his election. Hardly one of them led a life that was not disreputable, and of the friends whom later he himself promoted to the Sacred College the greater part were, like himself, worldly triflers, wealth-devouring amusement hunters. [] Leo was passionately fond of music, and he loved equally that newest of cultural amusements, the theatre. In the Vatican the revels were indeed more seemly than in the heyday of the Borgia -- sexual irregularity was not among Leo's vices -- but the comedies performed before the pope could include such indecencies as the *Mandragola* of Machiavelli and the *Calandria* of Leo's bosom friend Cardinal Bibbiena. In the summer the pope would leave Rome for the country, and sport was now the all-absorbing occupation. To give, to scatter money indiscriminately to all who asked for it, was one of his greatest pleasures. Merit, well-studied needs, played little part in the directing of this largesse. Buffoons, comedians, the chance passer-by, the beggar who happened to move his sympathy, the servant who attracted his notice, all these were welcome to whatever the pope had in his pocket. And others too, with real claims upon the money, if they happened to be there at the lucky moment.

This was the setting against which the new papal game of false and double-dealing diplomacy was played which, to the great world of Christendom, was now the papacy in action. The pope, says Pastor, "was not a man of deep interior religion." This would seem likely. But he fasted three days each week, and if he said mass more rarely than, for generations now, has been the normal practice of all priests, he was careful to hear mass every day, and whenever he did celebrate he prepared himself by first making his confession.

The Petrucci conspiracy of 1517 is a violent reminder of the truth that morality is a single whole, and that to tamper with one particular precept is to risk bringing down the whole arch. . . One of the many mischievous novelties in papal practice since the election of Sixtus IV was the way in which the kinsmen of reigning princes were made cardinals simply as an act of favour to the prince. At the death of Alexander VI, in 1503, there was hardly a state in Italy whose ruler had not a son or brother who was a cardinal. Siena was one of the few states to lack such a court cardinal, and Julius II brought Siena into the system when, in 1512, he gave the red hat to Alfonso Petrucci, twenty years of

age, the brother of the lord of Siena. Petrucci, a few months later, played a great part in the election of Leo X and he was soon one of the new pope's intimates. But Leo, who was nothing if not false, was soon intriguing to displace Petrucci's brother in Siena, and to instal in his place another member of the family, who would be less of a hindrance to the Medici ambitions. [] The revolution succeeded, and the cardinal turned against the pope (1516).

He began to intrigue with the dispossessed Duke of Urbino, and to express his mind to other cardinals already discontented with Leo X. In 1516 he left Rome for the country, but continued to keep his party together, it would seem, through his steward in Rome, Marco Nino. Suddenly the steward was arrested, suspected of being a link in intrigues with the Duke of Urbino. A letter in cipher was found on him, and when put to the torture the steward surrendered the key. Cardinal Petrucci, so it was alleged the cipher made known, was arranging with a physician to poison the pope. This doctor was, or claimed to be an expert in the treatment of fistula. He was to be introduced to the pope as a specialist and then make away with him. By a trick the pope now induced Petrucci to come back to Rome. He was immediately arrested and with him another cardinal, his friend Sauli, also young, and a one-time intimate of Leo. This was on May 19, 1517, and that same day the pope explained to the consistory what had happened and appointed three cardinals to study and report on the findings of the enquiry that would now open. The enquiry itself was in the hands of the pope's law officers.

Meanwhile Florence had obligingly arrested the physician and handed him over to the pope. He was speedily put to the torture, and so, it would seem, were the two cardinals. On May 29 there was a second consistory, to hear the interim report of the three cardinals; and now a third cardinal was arrested and thrown into St. Angelo. This was Riario Sansoni, that great-nephew of Sixtus IV whose life had already been so tragically interwoven with that of Leo X. Petrucci and Sauli had confessed that he was in the business too. Ten days later still, there was a third consistory. The pope had now before him fresh admissions from the prisoners, and the names of two more cardinals. He did not immediately announce these, but craftily tried by promises and threats and a general accusation -- "Some of you sitting here

were in it too, and I know who," was the line he took -- to gain yet more information. None was forthcoming, however, and the names of the two new accused had to be read out. They were Soderini and Adriano de Castello, two cardinals of Alexander VI's last promotion in 1503. Soderini, with tears, confessed his guilt and asked for mercy. The other admitted that Petrucci had spoken to him of his wish to see the pope put out of the way, but said that from the way the young man spoke he had not taken it seriously. The three cardinals of the commission decided that these two should be fined, each of them, 12,500 ducats; and on their pledging themselves to pay this, and not to leave Rome until they had done so, the pope forgave them.

This seems an extraordinary way for a sovereign to deal with accessories in a plot to murder him. But still stranger was the fact that, when the cardinals paid the enormous fines, they were told that the pope now wanted as much again from each of them. This was on June 18, and two days later the two cardinals, no doubt unable to raise the new fines, fled from Rome.

On June 22, in a fourth consistory, the result was announced of the trial [] of the three cardinals imprisoned in St. Angelo. The pope declared that they had been found guilty of treason: for plotting during a pope's lifetime to make one of their number pope, for plotting the pope's murder, and for their dealings with the Duke of Urbino. The debates in the consistory were very long and stormy. For nine or ten hours pope and cardinals remained together, the sound of their voices, as they shouted and interrupted one another, heard by the attendants in the anticamera without. Finally the cardinals [] voted that the guilt of the three accused had been proved, and asked the pope to show them mercy. But Leo was inexorable, and confirmed the sentence demanded by the prosecution. Their goods were to be confiscated, they were to be degraded, and to be put to death.

Five days after this scene the lesser fry of the plot, the physician and the steward, were put to death, their flesh torn from their bones with red hot pincers at intervals during the procession to the place of execution, where finally they were hanged, drawn and quartered. On July 4 Petrucci was secretly put to death in St. Angelo, a Moor being employed for the purpose.

Now came another strange circumstance. The other two

cardinals who lay under the same sentence were pardoned, and even restored to their dignities, and all in a generous, even lighthearted way, confessing their guilt and that they were even more guilty than they had told already, but agreeing to pay enormous fines cash down. Sauli paid 25,000 ducats; but Riario, one of the wealthiest of the cardinals -- as he was one of the most venerated -- entered into a bond to pay really staggering sums. There was a fine of 150,000 ducats [] -- 50,000 of it to be paid immediately and the rest within six months -- and a bail of like amount to be found that he would not leave Rome without the pope's permission. These bonds [] were signed on July 17 and in a consistory seven days later Riario was restored, Leo receiving him almost affectionately. But Riario was finished. He lingered on in a kind of chronic melancholia until he died, July 7, 1521. Five months later Leo also died, so deeply in debt, so well and truly plundered in the short interval between death and burial, that the only lights they could find to burn round his coffin were the remains of the candles that had served for Riario. []

The conspiracy, and the judicial proceedings at Rome, extremely scandalous surely, have also this interest that they fall between the closing scenes of the General Council and the appearance of Luther. [] They are, indeed, almost the last thing to occupy the pope's attention before the Reformation came to force purely religious questions violently upon it. But one last political problem there was. It coincided with the beginnings of Luther's demonstration, and such was its importance that the politically-minded pope hoped, by solving it, to settle also the little matter of Luther. The problem was who should be emperor when Maximilian, old beyond his years and now obviously breaking up, should come to die. In many respects the high office had, for centuries now, been little more than a great ceremonial distinction. An emperor was effective just to the extent that he could persuade the myriad princes of Germany to support him. The dignity was not hereditary, but for the last eighty years it had remained in the family of Habsburg, which as yet was not of any great territorial importance. It was indeed so poor a family that the contrast between Maximilian's pretensions and his resources had been one of the jokes of Europe during all the time he reigned (1493-1519). His only son had died in 1506 and the old emperor greatly desired, and was actively working for, the election of his eldest grandson Charles. This was the young

man of eighteen who, since 1506, had been Duke of Burgundy, ruler that is of the Low Countries and of Franche Comte, and since 1516 King of Spain and of Naples. Upon Maximilian's death he would inherit the German domains of the Habsburgs, not only Austria proper but provinces which, for a hundred miles or more, had a common frontier with Venice. Were a prince so splendidly dowered with hereditary possessions to become emperor, who could say what new reality might not be infused into the ancient title? And how could the future of Italy not lie entirely in his hands? No pope could be indifferent to such a possible menace, nor could the Medici pope be indifferent to the effect upon his family's precarious hold on Florence of the appearance of an emperor who was already such a power in Italy.

It was, then, inevitable that Leo X should work against the candidature of the young King of Spain. The event was a striking demonstration how weak was the pope's political influence. Maximilian died on January 20, 1519, there followed six months packed with diplomatic manoeuvre, and on June 28 Charles was unanimously elected. As the emperor Charles V he was to reign for thirty-seven momentous years.

In these manoeuvres Leo played his wonted part. The new King of France, Francis I, was also a candidate for the succession, and when, in April 1518, it became evident that there was some opposition in Germany to the election of the King of Spain, the pope began to negotiate with Francis and to persuade him to offer himself in opposition to Charles. On January 20, 1519, he made a treaty with Francis that was really a pledge of support; and, characteristically, he made a secret treaty, of the same kind, at the same time, with Charles. But from the moment when Maximilian's death made the matter urgent, Leo gave up his pretence and began strongly to oppose the King of Spain. He still, however, had a double game to play. The pope did not in reality wish to see the imperial prestige in the hands of France. This would have been as dangerous a combination as the other. The pope had a candidate of his own, the Elector of Saxony, Frederick the Wise, ever since, in September 1518, this prince had declared himself opposed to the election of Charles. And since that date Leo had been secretly working for him. He still, in the spring of 1519, worked for Francis, offering the cardinalate to two of the electors should the King of France be chosen, and

a legateship for life to the third archbishop-electors -- the Archbishop of Mainz -- who was already a cardinal. He even went so far as to say that if they alone should vote for Francis -- three out of the seven electors -- he would recognise the election as valid. But he only received snubs from these ecclesiastical princes, who denied his power to interfere with the procedure of the election.

By the end of May the pope realised that there was no chance for Francis I. By now it was hardly safe for a Frenchman to show himself in Germany, and the pope's nuncio had to flee for his life from Mainz. Leo turned to work for his own candidate. On June 7 he wrote declaring that if the Elector of Saxony could persuade two others to vote for him, and would add to these his own vote, the pope would recognise him as emperor. The Elector was Luther's sovereign, and nine months before this he had firmly refused the pope's request to arrest Luther and send him to Rome. The imperial dignity was now to be his through the pope's intervention -- such was Leo's really childish plan -- and Frederick, in gratitude, would hand over the heresiarch. And to keep Frederick in good humour all these nine critical months, the pope had, to all seeming, let the business of Luther fall into the limbo of forgotten cases.

Nevertheless Frederick was not to be caught. By June 17 Leo understood how powerless he was. He would not, he said, run his head against a stone wall. He removed the long-standing papal prohibition -- it went back to Clement IV and the now far-off days of Charles of Anjou -- that his vassal the King of Naples should accept the imperial crown, and when the news of the election reached him, he offered the accustomed words of approbation and good will. What had he effected, except to root in the young king's mind an idea which he would never lose that popes were politicians, to be treated as such? and in the minds of Catholics in Germany a suspicion that religion, for the pope, was secondary to the needs of politics? Nor was this, even yet, the end of Leo's duplicity. In September (1519) he made yet another secret treaty with France, pledging himself not to recognise Charles as King of Naples so long as he retained the imperial crown. Then, relations with Francis -- youthful, arrogant, bullying, and as crafty as the pope -- growing steadily worse, the pope again negotiated simultaneously contradictory treaties with him and with the emperor (January-April 1521). The

problem of Luther could not possibly be solved without the emperor's cooperation. The Spanish ambassador in Rome explained to Charles how useful the pope's fear of "a certain monk known as Brother Martin" might be to extort concessions; and, indeed, for the last eighteen months of the pope's life, anxiety about the new heretic wholly filled his mind.

Leo's death found him again at war, despite all diplomacy, and the ally of Charles V against France. The war began in the summer of 1521, and after some setbacks and delays that greatly tried the pope's anxious soul, the French were driven from Milan, and Piacenza and Parma were reconquered. This was better news, said Leo, than even the news of his election as pope. Arrangements were in progress for a great thanksgiving service, when the pope fell ill (November 26). He had taken a chill as he sat watching the fireworks with which his Swiss were celebrating the victory. In the evening of December 1 he suddenly collapsed, and by midnight he was dead, at forty-six.

The pope's sudden death caused a financial panic. For nearly nine years he had lived with the utmost extravagance; there had been the expenses of the war of Urbino to meet; and now the still heavier expenses of the war against France. To cover the deficit every expedient had been used. Over 1,300 new offices and distinctions had been created, the sale of which brought in a sum equal to two years of the annual revenue. By 1521 the total number of these saleable offices was 2,150, their capital value 3,000,000 ducats -- seven times the annual revenue. [] Great sums had been raised at the creation of the numerous cardinals, there had been the astronomical fines of the cardinals involved in the conspiracy of 1517. Then the pope borrowed -- from his friends, his officials, his cardinals, and the banks, paying as high an interest as 26 per cent for six months. And he pawned whatever he could, plate from his table, jewels, the silver statues from his chapel. Meanwhile the troops went unpaid, the brilliant corps of scholars recruited for the pope's university, the artists, even Raphael and San Gallo. The pope died 850,000 ducats in debt, owing amongst others the Bini bank 200,000, and -- one is glad to know it -- his friend and kinsman, and evil genius, Cardinal Lorenzo Pucci [] 150,000.

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



2. CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THOUGHT, 1471-1517

Just one hundred years separate the beginning of Martin Luther's assault on the papacy from the election of Martin V at Constance, the first pope for forty years recognised as such by the whole Church. During the last fifty years of that century, of the major anxieties which, from the time of that pope, never ceased to menace the peace of religion, one in particular, the problem how to make the Papal State a real guarantee of papal freedom of action, had thrust the rest well into the background. But the preoccupation of all the five popes from Sixtus IV to Leo X with this undoubtedly critical matter is not, of course, the whole history of the Church in their time. It will perhaps make that history more intelligible as a unity if, as we pass from the story of the diplomatic and military activities of these popes, something is said of all this as it appears related to the general political life of the time. For impatient as we may be at the spectacle of the pope turned prince, and impatient that the pope yielded so much to the pressure of the time, to be aware of the spirit of the time, and of its reality as a compelling force, is a first condition for understanding the gravity of that papal surrender.

That spirit was not a papal creation; the papacy is victim, here, of something older than itself. In these last generations of the Middle Ages there had thrust into the life of Christendom a force very well aware of its own nature, very clear about its objective, and which now began to impose upon the whole of that life its own peculiar pace and rhythm. " The stubborn persevering progress of the State in its slow reconquest of its attribute of sovereignty is, as the sixteenth century rises above the horizon, the essential phenomenon of public life. This is the sign under which the Reformation is born." []

The hold upon the human spirit of its ancient enemy, the absolute state, had been loosened and then shaken off, once the Catholic Church overcame the empire of the Caesars. From time to time there had been desperate attempts by one prince or another to restore that state and reimpose its yoke, but always, so far, those attempts had been foiled. Now, from the end of the fifteenth century, the attempt to renew it became a more serious

menace than ever, because the attempt was made under conditions more than ever favourable; the atomised states of the Middle Ages were now coalescing into the great monarchies of modern times. Since the marriage of the King of Aragon to the Queen of Castile in 1479 there was a united kingdom of Spain, and since 1505 its ruler was also King of Naples; since Louis XI (1461-1483) the French king was really master of all France; since the battle of Bosworth in 1485 there was a new monarchy in England. There still remained in face of the new assault the three great obstacles on which the earlier assaults had broken, the fifteen hundred years-old Catholic habit of mind, more especially the peculiarly Christian ideal of the sacredness of human personality, and finally the organisation of Christianity in that Catholic Church whose sovereign independence all princes and states acknowledged. But in the new states, leaders of new boldness and of a new political capacity are about to appear -- Charles V and Henry VIII for example, and their counsellors of genius. The scale of the conflict is suddenly magnified. It is in the modern world that the duel will be fought out. And popes of a new boldness and a new political capacity will also appear, popes also of a new personal rectitude and with something of the purer spirit of St. Gregory VII. []

This needed combination, of courage and capacity and otherworldliness, neither the Renaissance popes had possessed, nor the most part of their predecessors for two hundred years. It ought not to need proving that once the administrative system created by the medieval popes was permanently established, the presence of very great natural gifts in the popes was imperative for the well-being of religion. [] The pope is now very truly Dominus Ecclesiae, chef d'orchestre and composer too, since he has so centralised his administration and taken so much even of local affairs into his hands. Lacking a commanding intelligence in its chief, a machine so elaborate tends to become the sport of officials, its operation a matter of precedent merely and routine. In a state called into existence solely to promote the spiritual, such mechanisation means stagnation akin to death. Of the thirty-four popes whose reigns cover this period between St. Thomas and Luther, how many are there who rise above the mediocre? What has the office a right to demand of them? Holiness -- of course; then competent learning, in the sacred doctrine first of all, and next in the traditional lore of the religious ruler's art, the canon law; then

judgment, and ability. Of all these thirty-four popes none has, so far, been canonised, [] but four have their place in the calendar as beatified. [] That almost all these popes are recruited from officials in the curia is but the continuance, in the closing centuries of the Middle Ages, of a most ancient, and very natural, tradition. The time had not yet come when the cardinalate was regularly conferred on resident diocesan bishops. It is only now, in the fifteenth century, that we see the beginning of this practice. The cardinal was still, in fact, the actual counsellor and trusted man of the pope, and the cardinal lived where the pope lived. [] And of course the overwhelming majority of the popes were chosen from among the cardinals. [] Of the first popes in our period, those who close the great century of Innocent III, four had risen to fame in the great world of Scholasticism. [] Boniface VIII, renewing the tradition of the first half of his century, is an eminent canonist; and so are almost all the French popes whose reigns make up the tale of Avignon. The great exception here is Benedict XII -- one of the most competent theological scholars of his generation; and he is the last constructive legislator among the popes, on the grand scale, until the Council of Trent. With the Schism the decline in personality is very marked. The only really outstanding figures of the century that follows it are the two humanist popes, Nicholas V and Pius II; and their reigns are too short, and their bodies too broken, for their personality to be really effective. Then comes the lamentable time at which the story has arrived, an age inaugurated indeed -- such is the incredible fact -- by a Franciscan [] who was also a theologian of real merit, to whom succeed in turn the weakling Giovanni Cybo, a competent bureaucrat -- Rodrigo Borgia, a lifelong political intriguer of no particular training -- Giuliano della Rovere, and the superficial dilettante Leo X, who closes the series.

Reviewing all this history the impression deepens that consistently, in one generation after another, the popes fail to read the signs of the times, and a study of the papal personalities helps to explain the failure. They do indeed discern a mortal foe of all they stand for in, for example, Marsiglio of Padua (though, so it would seem, they judge Ockham, as a speculative thinker that is to say, far too lightly). Repeatedly they do indeed point out to the faithful, with unmistakable clarity and vigour, how dangerous to faith Marsiglio's theories are; and to the best of their ability they prevent the circulation of his

highly mischievous book. But never do they meet, with any constructive organisation of Catholic thought, the important fact which the *Defensor Pacis* and its sequel should surely have revealed to them, the fact namely that lay resentment at the cleric's desire to control the public life of Christendom is now beginning to crystallise into a system of "philosophy," a *Weltanschauung* even; and that Marsiglio speaks for a whole multitude of disgruntled, and educated, Catholic contemporaries. We are, in fact, here making early acquaintance with what is to become for centuries one of the permanent diseases of Christendom, the anti-clerical (and even anti-religious) spirit of the educated middle classes, burning somberly below deceptive ashes, its existence ignored, and implicitly denied, by a clerical regime that seems only aware of the surface of Catholic life.

Thinkers of Marsiglio's calibre have always been rare, in any generation. And among those who, in his own age and the succeeding century, fed their discontent on his theories, there were no doubt far more who bandied about the catchwords of his doctrine than had ever studied the learned evangel itself -- as, in our own time, there are far more Marxists than there were ever actual students of *Das Kapital*. Such "Marsigliani" as these last would have disappeared speedily enough if the visible abuses in the ecclesiastical system which bred their discontent had really been corrected. Heresy, or a professed sympathy with the heretical reformer, is, in its early stages, only too often, no more than a readily-snatched-at chance to "rationalise" the concrete grievance against those in authority. It was the terrible, and lasting, misfortune of the Church that in these centuries, even when sincere reformers sat on the papal throne they merely tinkered with the trouble; reform rarely went beyond trite exhortations, and new decrees that re-enacted the old decrees; and never did it explore the roots of the abuses, consider the question whether the whole ecclesiastical machine did not stand in some need of re-designing. These popes, it is often said, had other things to do, they lived with a hundred crises crowding upon them. This is true; and it is the whole tragedy, that amid the welter of urgent daily business, with the danger of a real disruption of Christendom threatening for several generations, they had to make a choice where best to be active, and -- allowing them the best intentions and a real good will -- their choice too often relegated to the secondary what is the principal

task of popes at all times.

In some respects, one is tempted to think, the medieval pope had an impossible task before him. Nothing could, of course, be further from reality than the picture of the Middle Ages as a golden time of universal peace and charity. The turbulence is chronic, and it is by the immense progress realised since the dark chaos of the ninth and tenth centuries that the achievement should be judged. Nor was the Holy See ever really able to exert all the needed control. The eleventh-century popes successfully drew closer the links that bound to Rome the local episcopate, as a first means of purifying it and of strengthening the local religious leader against the local tyrant. But communications -- the most material factor of all -- were never, in all these centuries, as good as they needed to be for the centralisation really to function steadily and regularly. What was accomplished is, indeed, more than remarkable. But it was not enough; and more was scarcely possible. So, for generations, the huge affair creaked and groaned, and it broke down continually. Nor did the episcopate, as a whole, ever come up to what Rome desired -- and indeed needed -- that it should be. It was never, as a whole, so able or so apostolic as its Roman chiefs. The popes were far indeed from having that freedom in appointing to sees the men of their choice which, to-day, we take for granted. Time and again vested interests were too strong for them, the will of the princes in Spain and France and England, the determination of the nobles in the chapters of Germany. All through the Middle Ages the popes are building a system -- and finding, all the time, opposition to their plans from vested interests, not infrequently the episcopate. Some popes are less able than others, than fifty sees were given to youths below the canonical age for consecration. These included the primatial sees of Poland, Hungary, and Scotland. Leo X gave Lisbon (and two other sees at the same time) to a child of eight, and Milan to another of eleven: both were children of reigning princes. [] Of the eighteen cardinals who elected Sixtus IV in 1471, four were non-resident diocesan bishops. At the next conclave (1484) the absentees were ten out of twenty-five, in 1492 they were eleven out of twenty-three, and in 1503 twenty-six out of thirty-seven. This grave abuse was, in the Sacred College, fast becoming the rule. Everywhere, by this time, there were powerful clerical vested interests to oppose reforms, not indeed by voting them down, but by systematically neglecting to put the decrees into

execution. This is particularly true of the prince-bishops of Germany, of the episcopate in France, of the College of Cardinals and the Roman Curia, which last institution was to defy for years even the zeal of the reforming popes of the Counter Reformation. []

Nothing could be more important than that there should be good bishops in all the seven hundred sees of the universal Church -- and that the popes should concern themselves with the quality of the men nominated would seem the most elementary duty of their universal administration. [] But the popes must first of all enjoy, in fact, a real freedom to appoint whom they chose. The sphere in which they were thus free was, all through the fifteenth century, steadily shrinking; and it shrank in part through the acts of the popes themselves. To free the future of the episcopate from the malign influence of such close corporations as the cathedral chapters had very often become, the popes built up the new system of appointment by papal provision. And now, as the rights of chapters to elect became a dim memory, the princes began to covet the power to name bishops which princes of the age before Hildebrand had enjoyed. At times the popes granted the right -- well limited -- as a favour or a privilege, and at times they did so in scarcely veiled surrender to threats. The period of the princely popes was naturally rich in such surrenders.

Already, in England, by the middle of the fifteenth century, the Statute of Provisors had paved the way for a system where the popes always came to name as bishop the man whom the king recommended. And the emperor had gained from Eugene IV in the last days of the Council of Basel, and its anti-pope, extensive rights over half a dozen important sees. [] In France the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438, often condemned and ceaselessly reprobated, functioned nevertheless, and the popes had to put up with it, since to fight the king would have renewed all the chaos of the forty years' Schism, and possibly lost France to Catholic unity in the fifteenth century as so much of Germany was lost to it in the sixteenth.

Sixtus IV was then, once more, only typical of his decadent century when in 1473 he made over to the emperor the right to present to some three hundred benefices, and in 1478 increased the number of sees in his patronage. In 1476 the Dukes of

Saxony were similarly favoured and in 1479 the city of Zurich. Three years later, in 1482, the new Spanish monarchy also, after a fight in which the Catholic kings threatened to revive the Council scheme, was given new rights to name bishops. The next pope, Innocent VIII, although he fought off the claims of Portugal to hold up papal decisions and appointments, was defeated in his battle with Florence and other Italian states about the right to tax church revenues; and he further extended the rights of Spain when he gave to the crown rights to name bishops in the kingdom of Granada and in Sicily too, and indulged them in Sicily with that right to veto episcopal appointments which was to harass the popes in that kingdom down to our own time. [] Alexander VI has not to his charge, it would seem, any such surrenders; but Julius II, caught in the toils of political necessity, gave Spain extensive rights of patronage (in the West Indies) in 1508; and Portugal also profited from the mistaken liberality of Leo X, who gave the king various rights over the three military orders of the kingdom. The Lutheran crisis, in which Leo's reign ran out, was of course a golden opportunity for the princes of Germany to extort concessions.

The newest phase of this surrender of direct control over the life of the local church, the most mischievous of all, was the appointment of one of its bishops, a cardinal, as legate a latere for the whole country, with faculties so ample that he became a kind of vice-pope and a final court of appeal. So Georges d'Amboise, Archbishop of Rouen, was appointed for France by Julius II in 1503; and so Wolsey, Archbishop of York, was appointed for England by Leo X and re-appointed, for life, by Clement VII. And Albrecht of Brandenburg was offered a like appointment for Germany. This mischief was all the greater because these prelates were the principal ministers of their sovereigns; it was the king's prime minister who was made the vice-pope, and he received his powers at the king's request. The one man was, locally, supreme in Church [] and state, free to manage the whole as a unity, for the king's profit. And meanwhile the local church would grow accustomed to the Roman authority being no more than a distant splendour.

It was upon a papacy already slowly stripping itself -- under compulsion -- of its control of the distant provinces, that the new blow from Germany would presently fall. The most striking

surrenders, however -- because not made to satisfy powerful prelates but creative of new institutions -- are those of Sixtus IV to Spain and of Leo X to France, the establishment in 1479 of the Spanish Inquisition, and the Concordat of 1516 with Francis I.

The story has already been told [] of the first establishment of the Inquisition, two hundred and fifty years before the time of Sixtus IV -- a special new tribunal set up, for the detection and punishment of concealed heretics, in a place and at a time when the doctrines propagated and the hidden organisation of believers were considered, and correctly, to be a real danger to civilised life, and a menace to be destroyed before it destroyed all that was good and natural and free. The Spain of 1470-1500 was, in some ways, such another land as the Languedoc of the Albigensian wars. Here, too, was a large body with non-Christian traditions, Jews and Mohammedans; and here, too, it was suspected, there were among the Catholic population, and amongst those highly placed, many who at heart were still, like their ancestors, Jews and Mohammedans. For centuries, a] most from the morrow of the Moorish conquest of Spain in the eighth century, the great effort of Christian Spain to throw out the infidels had never really ceased. Never had the various Christian races accepted the conquest as a permanent state of things to which they must now be resigned. For nearly seven hundred years, in that grim land, the fight had gone on, with very varying fortunes, of course, but with steady recovery of territory from the Moors. It was the great national achievement, the epic and the boast of a proud and military people. By the end of the fifteenth century only the Kingdom of Granada remained in Mohammedan hands, a strip of territory across the south-east corner of Spain, Granada its capital. In 1492 the armies of Ferdinand and Isabella conquered Granada too. For the first time since 711 the whole of Spain was under Christian rule.

The reorganisation of the Inquisition in Spain as a means to rid the country of crypto-Jews and crypto-Moors -- Marranos and Moriscos -- was the act of Sixtus IV, [] done at the request of Ferdinand and Isabella. The chief novelty was that it left the choice of the inquisitors to the sovereign. In September 1479 the new tribunal began its operations, and very soon appeals against the way it worked began to pour into Rome. Whereupon the pope protested [] to the Catholic Kings, and reminded them of their duty to be merciful. But he did not refuse their petition

for the extension of the system to Castile and Leon, and he consented that, for the future, the appeals to his own tribunal should be heard and finally decided in Spain, by the Archbishop of Seville (1483). But any decisions given in Rome were to be valid in Spain. The next step was the appointment of a Grand Inquisitor, who should be the pope's representative, and hear the appeals made to Rome from the tribunals in Spain. On the presentation of Ferdinand, the pope named to the new office the Dominican Thomas Torquemada, whose name has since been, for many people, almost a synonym for the tribunal he directed. Then the kingdom of Aragon, also, was brought under its authority. The Inquisition was by now an ecclesiastical machine set up by the pope's authority, and manned by ecclesiastics -- but at the king's service and, in fact, very much what the king wanted it to be. The day would come when the king would use it for all purposes that seemed good to him.

Once the new tribunal got to work there was a steady exodus of Jews from Spain, to Portugal and to Rome, where the popes received them kindly enough, to the no small discontent of the Spanish sovereigns. In Spain there was for a time a state of war, the high peak of which was the skilfully planned murder of one of the inquisitors, a Canon Regular, Peter Arbues (September 15, 1485). [] Then, in 1492, it was determined to expel from Spain all the Jews who were not Catholics. They were given four months to choose between conversion and exile. Whereupon there was another exodus, and a certain number of conversions, whose sincerity no doubt varied from case to case.

The year that followed this edict saw the election of one of Ferdinand's own subjects as pope -- Alexander VI. For a time the spirit of Spain seemed about to take hold of Rome too. There were arrests of suspected crypto-Jews and trials. But all the accused cleared themselves, or recanted, and there were no severities save the imprisonment of a bishop and his son. Alexander VI was far from being a persecutor; the reason for this activity was political, the need to reassure Ferdinand of the pope's sympathy for Spain. But Alexander stands recorded as granting to the king for his Inquisition, privileges that went far beyond what a pope should have granted. [] His successor, Julius II, had to see Ferdinand introduce the new system into his kingdom of Sicily (1500). But when the king went a step further, and in 1510 brought Naples, too, under it, the people resisted

violently and successfully, and the pope is thought secretly to have encouraged the resistance. So great a diminution of papal authority so near to Rome would hardly have been welcome to such a pope as Julius II. Leo X, however, returned to the policy of surrender to Spain, and after the election of the new king, Charles, to be emperor also, he withdrew (though very reluctantly) those briefs of his predecessors which hampered the king's use of the Inquisition in Aragon.

It was to matter enormously to the fortunes of the Catholic Church that, in the coming century of the Reformation, the monarch who ruled Spain and the Low Countries and a good half of Italy, and who was also emperor in Germany, remained true to the old religion. But it was a very real tragedy that, from the beginning of his reign, Charles V had reason to expect from popes, compliance, and, indeed, subservience on the grand scale. And had Leo X -- for example -- persisted in his first refusal of concessions about the Inquisition, Charles could have pointed to the pope's recent surrender to France, the greatest surrender of direct control which the papacy has ever made, the Concordat of 1516.

The Concordat, a great papal surrender, it is true, but one that was balanced by an important royal renunciation, was a kind of sequel to the political revolution in northern Italy that followed on the great French victory of Marignano in 1515. The unlucky Leo X had been on the wrong side yet once again, as his cousin Clement VII was to be on the wrong side when, ten years late at Pavia, the French were beaten. The meeting with Francis I at Bologna in December 1515 was arranged, as Leo explicitly said, so that the pope could throw himself on the French king's mercy and remind him of the pope's claims on a victor who was yet a Catholic. But when, on December 11, Francis I suddenly asked the pope to confirm the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438, the scope of the negotiations, and their tone, was changed entirely. The great question that had divided one council after another -- the question of the relation of the papacy to the episcopate -- and which ever since the days of Peter de Luna had seethed and fermented in the churches of France especially, was now placed fairly and squarely before the pope. To confirm the act of Bourges was to acknowledge as good in law all those decrees of Basel which the popes had never confirmed and always repudiated, and it was to accept explicitly the theory that in the

Church the General Council is the pope's master; it would also be an acknowledgment of the right of the king to regulate Church affairs -- without any authorisation from the pope. Not even Leo X could confirm such an usurpation, not even for Francis I after Marignano. The pope countered the embarrassing demand with the offer of a concordat -- a treaty about ecclesiastical matters. Francis accepted the idea, and soon the legal experts of both parties were busy discussing the bases of the pact, the king's chancellor, Antoine Duprat, one of the most celebrated jurists of the day [] and, for Leo, the two cardinals Lorenzo Pucci and Pietro Accolti.

By February 1516 the principles of the arrangement were mutually agreed; and no sooner were they known than opposition began to show, from all sides. The king was to abrogate the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438, and the pope was to grant him the full right to nominate to all the sees and abbeys of the kingdom; the whole system of rights to future appointments -- expectations, reservations -- was to be abolished entirely. From the French side came strong protests, the jurists objecting to the surrender of the position assumed in 1438, the university hostile to the implied repudiation of what it had achieved at Constance and Basel, the higher clergy opposed to the final disappearance of the system of elections. The pope had to face at Rome criticism that was just as strong, from the cardinals, who thought the scale of the concessions to the King of France extravagant and dangerous. For another six months both the principals laboured hard to persuade their own supporters, and the opposition from the other camp; and in the interval, the pope won the important concession that the Concordat would contain the king's explicit repudiation and annulment of the Pragmatic Sanction.

On August 18, 1516, the Concordat was signed: it regulated the religious life of France down to the Revolution. As finally agreed it gave the king the right to present to the pope for his confirmation the future bishops of the ninety-three sees of the kingdom and the abbots and priors of the 527 monasteries. Those presented for bishoprics were to be twenty-seven years of age and graduates in theology or law, those nominated for the monastic benefices were to be at least twenty-three and to belong to the religious order to which the abbey or priory belonged. If the nominee was a blood relation of the king, or a

nobleman, he need not possess the stipulated qualifications. So there passed into the hands of the king, the all but absolute control of nomination to posts whose total income was almost equal to that of the state itself -- and to the French state this was, in 1516, the most important element in its victory. But it was not by virtue of any royal presentation that the bishop was bishop; the bishop's right still came through his appointment by the pope. If the pope, henceforward, placed his authority in this matter at the service of the king he did not, for all that, abdicate that authority; nor did the king deny that authority. Concession may have been pushed to the full extent of grave abuse, but there was never -- on the part of king or pope -- even a hint of the graver matter of a breach in the doctrinal trust. The difference between a system such as this and that which, twenty years later, the English king who saw the Concordat signed was to erect for his own realm, is one of kind, not of degree.

The system of expectations and reservations was abolished, and it was agreed that, save for *causae maiores*, all appeals from episcopal tribunals were to be heard in France. There were, however, two notable omissions in the text. Nothing was said about the proposed abolition of that papal tax on collations to benefices called *annates*; and there was no mention of the theory of the supremacy of the General Council, no explicit repudiation of it, and therefore every chance for those who later would wish to revive the theory.

At the end of the year, on December 19, 1516, the pope brought the Concordat before the General Council then sitting at Rome. It was now set out in the form of a bull -- *Divina Disponente Clementia* -- and the pope had the bull read in the council, meaning that it should go to the world as the council's act also. Even now, and in Leo's very presence, opposition showed itself. But a speech from the pope on the advantages that must come from the French king's surrender of such a weapon as the act of 1438, won general assent to the bull. And of no less effect was the fact that, in the same session of the council, immediately after the bull ratifying the Concordat, there was read a second bull -- *Pastor Aeternus* -- which condemned and utterly annulled the Pragmatic Sanction, repudiated the claim that a General Council (Basel) had sanctioned it, and took occasion to affirm with great energy that the pope's sole and supreme right to control General Councils was the age-long traditional belief of

the Church. []

These bulls were sent to Francis I together, and the king, in the next fourteen months, had to fight hard before he finally beat down the alliance of jurists, the university and the higher clergy -- the university of Paris even going so far as to demand an appeal to a future council, the infallible council now in session not being of the university's opinion. However, under the strongest pressure from the king, the Parlement of Paris finally gave way, and on March 22, 1518, registered the Concordat as law. Three weeks later, on April 14, the king by royal edict repealed the Pragmatic Sanction.

On balance, was the Concordat loss or gain for the cause of religion? We inevitably study the act through our knowledge of the way the French kings abused it -- and were by compliant, necessity-driven popes, allowed to abuse it. Had the scheme been fairly worked, by kings not necessarily saints like Louis IX but even faintly interested in the spiritual, or had the times been such that popes could have refused the impossible names presented to them, the new system might not have done more harm than the old arrangement under which, for a good hundred years and more, the elective regime in France had bred a rich progeny of feuds, riots and schisms. [] There was never again to be a St. Louis, few indeed were the kings who in the next two hundred years were even respectably religious, and for the first fifty years of the new system [] the kings were allowed to name whom they would, with disastrous results to more than one French see and with indescribable results to the life of the religious houses. These are results which concern rather the later history of the Church, and which cannot, of course, be laid to the charge of Leo X. One last remark may be allowed which also concerns that later history, namely that the story of the French opposition to the Concordat of 1516 reveals the strong, deep-rooted attachment of many powerful interests in France to the idea that the pope ought to be controlled and managed in his government of the Church. This is an idea that never disappears; it continues to be active, indeed to be a dominant force in French life, down to 1789, and beyond.

The tale of what these popes of the generation that bred Luther and Zwingli and Crammer and Henry VIII, as well as Fisher and More and Erasmus and Cajetan, did for the reform of abuses and

the regeneration of the life of the Church is, alas, soon told. In the work of their classic historian the religious activities of Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, Alexander VI, Julius II and Leo X fill but a few dozen pages out of thousands. The thirteen years' reign of Sixtus IV, whose chief achievement was the bull *Quoniam regnantium cura* that never got beyond the stage of being drafted, produced some half-dozen briefs to various monasteries bidding them amend their ways, "isolated decrees", and that was all. Under Innocent VIII there was no reform of ecclesiastical abuses.

Alexander VI, it may be thought, was hardly in a position to inspire belief that reform was necessary or that good living mattered. The great event of his reign, from this point of view, was the appointment in 1497, on the morrow of the murder of the Duke of Gandia, of a commission of cardinals to draft a scheme of general reforms. That scheme, worked out in detail through months of competent labour, was indeed never put into force, but it survives and, in the long train of curial weaknesses listed for correction, it is a terrible indictment. In the crucial business of episcopal appointments simony is to be put down, reservations abolished and also the bogus coadjutorships by which bishops secured, in their lifetime, that their see would pass to a relative; and bishops, it is laid down, are not to be translated against their will. The cardinals' way of life is to be altered; gaming and hunting are to cease, and none is to have a household of more than eighty, nor more than thirty of a mounted escort. Musicians, actors and youths are to be banished from their palaces, and there is to be no corruption in the conclave. Then the various curial offices are scrutinised, and in all of them, the bull insists, the opportunities for "graft" are to be abolished. Absentee bishops are to be punished and so are those who keep concubines. A new severity awaits "apostate" religious -- that is to say those who have abandoned their monasteries -- while, on the other hand, it is provided that monastic vows made by children are not binding. Princes are no longer to be granted tithes. Other evils noted are the granting of abbeys in commendam, the overriding of the rights of the patrons of livings, the changing of the destinations of pious legacies, and the alteration of conditions laid down in wills about pious foundations. So the list goes on, 127 headings in all, that cover every aspect of curial practice. The programme of things to be put right might have daunted St. Gregory VII

himself. Alexander VI went no further than to read it.

Julius II is the author of one really great reform, the bull (1503) which declared that simony in the election of a pope invalidated the election. [] He, too, appointed a reform commission of six cardinals, in 1504; but it is not known whether they even got so far as to draft a scheme. And finally, Julius, who was originally a Friar Minor, gave some attention to the condition of the religious orders. He encouraged Cajetan in his efforts to reform the Dominicans, and he strove, unsuccessfully, to reunite the warring parties in his own order.

Leo X, it may well be, "never gave a thought to reform on the great scale which had become necessary." But like Sixtus IV and Julius II, he did give some attention to the state of the monasteries and convents. Nine of his briefs that treat of this most serious weakness are listed and many more await publication. [] And, successful where Julius II had failed, Leo X in 1517 brought to a final end the contentions about the rule which had divided the sons of St. Francis ever since the death of the founder. It has been told how John XXII cut the knot by measures which amounted almost to a new foundation of the order, a remodelling in which that attitude to ownership which was the speciality of St. Francis had no longer any official standing. But the spirit of St. Francis it was beyond the power of any regulation utterly to extinguish. Very soon a new movement for the primitive observance had begun within the remodelled order. It had the great advantage over the older " Spiritual" movement that it was not bound up with such unorthodox theories as the reveries of Joachim of Flora. Nor did those attached to it maintain that their special way of living the Franciscan life was the sole way of salvation. The new Observants -- as they were called -- were in nothing more truly the brethren of the first friars than in their charity. Their more rigorous interpretation of the ideal was never a stick with which pleasantly to belabour the rest of their brethren, and gradually the new movement gained a permanent hold in one convent after another. Whole convents were gained over to it, great saints appeared in its ranks, Bernadine of Siena, for example, and John of Capistrano, and James of the March, preachers and itinerant missionaries of immense power and wide influence. The friars who followed the Observance were gradually allowed to be organised, within the order, under a special vicar of their

own, and the independence of their General was now carefully protected by one pope after another. By the end of the fifteenth century the majority of the Friars Minor were Observants, and the problem before the order now was rather the fate of the Conventuals, the official Franciscans -- one might say -- ever since the time of John XXII. Here was a paradoxical state of things indeed. Leo X solved it by separating the two types of friars, and organising each in a separate religious order, both of which were to be called, and with equal right, Friars Minor. But it was to the General of the Observants that he ordered that the seal of the order should be made over, and the title "successor of St. Francis" be given.

This reorganisation of the great order was perhaps the most beneficent act of Leo's reign. Two other laws that call for mention are his bull forbidding the Latins in the East to change or suppress or hinder the Greek ritual of the Catholics of the eastern churches, and the bull against the enslavement of the natives of the newly discovered Americas.

More spectacular than any of these, however, was the General Council held in the Lateran 1512-1517. Its most important act was a dogmatic definition, about the immortality of the human soul, which explicitly referred to the relations between natural knowledge and revealed, a vital topic with Christian thinkers for centuries now, and one on which St. Thomas had long ago -- all too unheeded -- said the decisive word. Of the plight that befell Catholic thought, once it went back on the great progress realised by the Dominican saint's theory of knowledge and his careful distinction of the spheres of reason and faith, something has already been said. And before we come to the Lateran definition, and to the other activities of the council, that account needs to be supplemented by some reference to the last phases of the philosophical and theological decline, in the century since the Council of Constance, and to a new birth of the thought of St. Thomas.

For the generation to which the fathers of Constance belonged, and to its successor, it was Gerson who, undoubtedly, stood out as the great religious thinker and preacher and writer. [] No other had anything like the prestige of this most attractive man who had been Chancellor of the university of Paris in the hour when the university really dominated the whole life of

Christendom. He had played his part faithfully at Constance, he had shown himself a man of really pious life and marvellously void of ambition. All through the last twelve years of his life, when, an exile at Lyons, his chief occupation was the religious formation of the children he gathered round him from the streets, Gerson continued to influence the whole Church. As a thinker he must be classed, like Peter d'Ailly, among the Nominalists. But Gerson was not by nature a speculative. It was the practical aspect of religious truth that most attracted him, the rules of good Christian living, the itinerary of the soul's way to God. Hence in Gerson's sermons and in his writings there is a great deal of needed correction of current popular errors and superstitions, and a merciless exposure of bogus saints and mystics.

This practical direction was his greatest service to the spiritual life of his own time, and indeed of all the following century. The forty years of the Schism had been a very springtime of false visionaries and crazy doctrines about the mystical life -- about the inner life of the soul in communion with its Creator and its relation to ordinary conduct. The tide of false mysticism was, indeed, rising so high as to threaten to swamp the ideas of genuine Christian piety. And, usually, the danger was a development of that Beghard teaching which, through all the later Middle Ages, was at work, secretly and persistently, never really out of sight, a kind of caricature of the classic Christian idea of asceticism and prayer as the way to union with God.

What the Beghards were can be read in the great condemnation of their doctrines decreed at the General Council of Vienne in 1311. Man can in this life, they taught, attain to such a degree of perfection that he becomes unable to sin. When he reaches this stage, man is no longer bound to pray nor to fast, his sense nature being now so perfectly subjected to his spirit and his reason that he can freely grant his body all it desires. Again, once man has reached this stage he is not bound to obey any human authority, nor to keep any commandments of the Church. Where there is the spirit of God there is liberty, and the practice of the virtues is a mark of the imperfect man: the perfect soul emancipates itself from the virtues. From which seemingly remote abstractions the Beghard comes down to everyday life with a practical illustration and example, also condemned by the Council, to wit that whoever kisses a woman, unless led by

sexual impulse, sins mortally, while no sexual act is sinful if it is done from a sexual impulse; such acts are especially free from blame if they are a yielding to temptation. []

These are ideas that have never ceased to have a certain vogue in out-of-the-way places, giving life to a host of cults that might be called "curious". In Gerson's time, and for long after, they were much more than that. The early years of the Reformation were to see such theories the inspiration of armed hordes and carrying all before them, the basis of the new Jerusalem, established in concrete fact in the lands beyond the Rhine.

Gerson [] has left behind a mass of writing about this urgent matter. There are works of instruction and direction for those who feel called to set all else aside but the life of prayer, and there are treatises which criticise and attack the false mysticism and explain by what signs the tendencies towards it are to be recognised. To the exaggeration of those who declare "We can know nothing about God", he opposes the fact that the Faith teaches us much about Him. He will not allow that the contemplative life is meant for all; the divinely created differences of temperament are facts that must be reckoned with and allowed for, and differences also of duties. He notes acutely, as a matter that can be observed every day, the contemplative's temptation to be his own guide. Everyone knows, he says, how obstinately they hold to their own ideas, to false and absurd ideas at times; and how much more easily than others they fall victims to such ideas. The great examples here are the Beghards. Another pitfall is sentimentality. There are many who tend to imagine themselves devout, and called to the life of contemplation by experiences that are nothing else than their own emotional upheavals; if such is the basis of their spiritual life the end is certain, and Gerson notes how often false mysticism and a certain looseness about sex- morality go together. At the other extreme are those interested with a merely intellectual interest in the activities of the spiritual life, in prayer, and devotion; and contemplation as human activities and for their own sake, experts in the art of conversing on these topics, hard, proud, insubordinate amid all their spiritual learning. There are the quietists who neglect everything to drift in their spiritual day dreams, and those who assert that the last thing there is any need to be anxious about is one's own salvation.

Against all these chronic maladies -- now for the first time studied, as it were systematically, on the grand scale, and therapeutically, Gerson's remedies are simple. The first need of the contemplative is knowledge; true knowledge, to be got from the approved doctors and the teaching of the Church. As for the credentials of the new prophets, the moral standard of the disciples is one good test of the master's orthodoxy. But the only real judge whether the mystic's ideas are orthodox is the theologian. Finally, Gerson constructs a whole theology of practical spiritual direction, basing himself largely on St. Bonaventure [] -- whom he so closely resembles -- and on the writer still held to be Denis the Areopagite.

Nothing could be wiser, more orthodox, than this practical apostolate of Jean Gerson. He was by nature practical -- not a speculative. His speculative ideas he took from his age, and, like his age, in one fundamental matter Gerson was seriously in error. The essence of morality, for him as for others of the family of Ockham, was in the divine will. Actions that are good are only good because God has so decreed. Gerson was not the only theologian to be saying this in the early years of the fifteenth century, but no other had anything like his prestige, and none, for generations, had his influence as a moralist and spiritual guide. It is very rare that active minds who turn their back on speculative thought -- who, for one reason or another, refuse to think things out, or to have things thought out for them -- escape serious blunders; and these, only too often, vitiate all that their generous practical activity produces. Gerson was not alone in his error of enthroning the practical reason above the speculative, and in every age since there have been hundreds to imitate him. In his case this mistaken line of conduct made it impossible for the greatest spiritual force of the time really to be certain about the bases of his own action (and of the action he urged upon others); and it helped on, very considerably, the attitude to speculative theology now becoming fashionable among men who proposed to lead a holy life.

Jean Gerson died in 1429, living just long enough to hear of the marvellous events that centred round St. Joan of Arc and to express his belief in the reality of her visions. Four years later, at the Council of Basel, the new genius appeared who was to carry on his work as an apostle, a reformer and a Catholic thinker. This was the Rhinelander, Nicholas of Cusa, and here was

another to whom the best traditions of scientific theology had not spoken, or had spoken in vain. Of the work of reform which this great ecclesiastic accomplished, some account has been given already. What of his role as a teacher and guide of the Christian intelligence?

Nicholas of Cusa is the first complete species of the Renaissance man born and bred north of the Alps. Though his first formation, his professional equipment, is juristic, there is no learning that he has not sampled and delighted in. He sympathises with all the anxieties of his age, and willingly slaves to remove them. He possesses the new cult for the ancient literatures, and he has distinguished himself beyond measure by discovering twelve lost comedies of Plautus. He is a scientist also, and perhaps the first to put out the complete hypothesis of the revolution of the earth round the sun. In his writings all the elements of the varied intellectual life of the time find their place.

The two leading, original, ideas in what -- yet once again -- is a practical doctrine, a programme to be followed, a methodology rather than a philosophy, are the *docta ignorantia* as the beginning of wisdom and the vision of the " coincidence of contradictories " as its peak. The intelligence -- the reasoning reason -- is the lowest of man's powers of knowledge, and it is not able to grasp reality. Knowledge of its own powerlessness is the highest knowledge it can achieve - - this is *docta ignorantia*. Why this powerlessness? Such is the nature, in the first place, of truth, and next, of knowledge. All knowledge can but be approximation and conjecture. But in God all can be known, and in Him can be seen the ultimate coincidence of contradictories. The great good for man, then, is to come to the point where he will see this coincidence, and thus really know; and man arrives at this by rising above the reasoning intelligence, and by knowing through his higher faculty of intuition. How is all this to be? Nicholas does not know; but he continues to "speculate," to gather views, to try out ideas; and, in a matter where words are of so little service, he makes use of symbols, and especially of geometrical symbols. All things are in God, and what is implicit in God becomes explicit in His creation. Every thing is a reflection of every other thing, all is contained in all. Of no creature is this so true as of man; and man, if ever he comes to a full understanding of himself, will know and possess all else.

There are many ideas suggested here that will have a famous history in later centuries, but it will be a history well outside the tradition of thought that is Christian. From Nicholas of Cusa as a thinker the cause of the classic synthesis of Faith and Reason, labouring now all these years in adversity, had not much to hope.

Nicholas of Cusa is the last great "original" of the Middle Ages. Next, in order of time, there appear those Florentine Platonists [] who have been noted in their more fundamental character as men of letters. And the century closes with Gabriel Biel, [] who would be a celebrity for this, if for nothing else, that he is the one scholastic for whom Luther seems to have had a good word, the master indeed of Luther's own masters. It cannot be said that there is anything strikingly new about Master Gabriel, but he is beyond all doubt an Ockhamist; and, a teacher of great personality, he imposed the via moderna upon the new university of Tubingen when, in 1484, a very old man, he was appointed its rector and began to teach theology there.

Gabriel Biel, in whose commentary on the Sentences Ockham's theology yet once again makes its appearance, "so openly, so systematised, and so completed," [] the chief theological luminary of the last half of the fifteenth century, is, however, the last Catholic theologian of his school; and this is perhaps his real significance for whoever studies the history of Catholic thought. The revolution was indeed already preparing, in the very years when Biel so successfully "Ockhamised" the theological teaching at Tubingen, that was to destroy the via moderna once and for all, so that it sank from Catholic theology with scarcely a trace. What was, in fact, imminent was the return of St. Thomas, and the first sign of the coming event was the substitution of the Summa Theologica for Peter Lombard, as the basic text of all theological teaching, by the Dominican masters in the University of Pavia in 1480, and the sanction given to this by the Dominican Chapter-General at Cologne in 1483. []

Meanwhile the via moderna continued in the enjoyment of its primacy, and for a long time yet such all-important principles as, for example, what has been called Voluntarism, continued to dominate fashionable theological thought. As we are about to see this principle developed in quite a new way, by another professor of theology, in yet another new German university,

Brother Martin Luther, and fashioned into an evangel that really is something new in Christian experience, the mention of Gabriel Biel is an opportunity to recall how the principle appeared in the last years before it was associated with the great heresiarch and his new kind of religion. And lest these controversies seem to be about abstractions, and remote from human life, the reminder may be allowed that they in fact concern the very basis of religious life, and that theology, however speculative, is in fact the science of salvation. []

We can take as a fair statement of the essence of the Voluntarist's view of God and man's relation with Him, the proposition of Duns Scotus, *Omne aliud a Deo est bonum quia a Deo volitum.* [] In all the Divine Life where This is directed towards created reality, it is the Divine Will which gives character and colour to the Divine Activity. And it is by means of his own will -- rather than by means of his intelligence -- that man will enjoy, once he is saved, the happiness of the absolute good that God is. Ockham -- in as full revolt against Scotus as the arch-Nominalist can be against such a realist -- maintains, however, and develops, this adherence to the general theory of "will rather than intelligence"; and he sums up in a marvellously concise phrase the relation of God as Creator to the goodness of created reality, *eo ipso quod ipse vult bene et iuste factum est.* [] The attention of the theologians all through the next hundred and fifty years after Ockham is more and more directed to the role of the Divine Will (and, indeed, of the human will, too) as against the intelligence. It becomes a general state of mind; another aspect of which is the revival of the ancient notion -- long ago condemned -- that, in the matter of salvation there is nothing beyond the power of man's will to accomplish. Man, say the theologians -- Gabriel Biel notably in this generation -- has a natural capacity for loving God above all else; for to love God thus is what reason rightly instructed bids man do; and to all the commands of reason rightly instructed the will, by its own natural forces, is able to conform itself. Against this point of contemporary teaching -- and the state of mind that goes with it -- and against Master Gabriel by name as an eminent promoter of it, Luther will now, very soon, violently revolt. It will be, for him, one reason to reject "the scholastic theology" outright.

If the tendencies of fashionable theological teaching in the latest and newest schools -- developments indeed of ideas now nearly

two centuries old -- were thus to aid the coming age of heresy, the erroneous philosophical doctrines held by many orthodox theologians, and their superficial grasp of the relation between theology and philosophy, were to prove a serious weakness in another way. Again we approach a vital doctrine, and again we need to go back some centuries and to see first a false view of it; then the error corrected thanks to a mind philosophically well formed; and finally, as this last philosophical position is abandoned, a chronic malaise in the mind of the theologian who, believe he never so sincerely, yet must continue, being a man, to think.

The point at issue is the extent of man's share in the business of his salvation, of man's responsibility -- should he lose his soul -- for his own damnation; it is one of the topics on which Luther's divergence from Catholicism will be most evident and most far-reaching. Peter Lombard had taught, in the twelfth century, that the all-important grace which makes man pleasing to God, which "justifies" man as later theologians were to say, was charity dwelling in the soul, and that this divinely given, supernatural, charity was nothing else than God Himself, the Holy Ghost. [] "So highly," says St. Thomas, about to criticise the theory, "did the Master [] esteem charity." St. Thomas would have none of this theory. It was an impossibility. It could not ever be true. And for this reason, that man's love for God if it proceeded from such a Source and in such a way would be in no way spontaneous, his voluntary act; and therefore it would be devoid of merit. The act of any nature, says the saint, is perfect in so far as it proceeds from within that nature. Were the act of loving God, man's supreme activity, not to proceed from that free will which is at the heart of all that is human in man, it would be less perfect than man's other acts. Here, it is evident, the criticism of the Lombard and the solution of the difficulty that is offered, are wrapped up in a philosophy.

From that solution subsequent theologians did not move away. But they moved far indeed, the most of them, in the next two centuries, both from the philosophy and from St. Thomas's conception of the relation between philosophy and theology. While they maintained the solution as true, because it was of faith, they nevertheless declared that, philosophically speaking, it was no more than probable. God had acted this way; he might have acted otherwise; that he had not acted otherwise was at

any rate probable; and no more than probable. There is no need to labour the point that sooner or later such a division in the mind of the thinker must end either in the destruction of his belief, or the sterilisation of his power of thought. What is more nearly our business is to note that here is one of those philosophical speculations about what God might have done which we see taken, in Luther's mind, as what God actually did. What theologians of this type were doing was to fill the mind of the time with a host of such "probabilities," accompanying and associated with the certitudes of faith. It was only a matter of time before, in the mind of one or another of their hearers, the probability gained over what was only certain because taught authoritatively by the Church -- victory not for the probability which coincided with the faith as taught, but for its contrary which philosophically, was always probable so long as, in the mind of the thinker, the doctrine of faith was less than certain philosophically too.

On this most important point -- where Luther's divergence was to create the key doctrine of all Protestantism -- the Catholic theologians, of all schools, continued to teach that it is a nature that God has saved, and that it is saved not through a grace which works outside it, but through an activity of grace in which it has a real share. Charity is a virtue, through which man's salvation is operated by man's action too. Sanctifying grace -- the grace which, making man pleasing to God, justifies man -- is a real vital principle, whence acts proceed that really are man's acts; man's merit before God is a reality, as man's freedom to posit these acts is a reality, and as the supernatural efficacy of those acts when posited is real. And all the theologians defend too the great principle *Naturalia manent integra*: [] sin does not destroy human nature, because nothing can destroy a nature but God who called it into being by creation. Nothing could be more striking than this theological agreement, or than the general movement of theologians away from the immense authority of Peter Lombard when once he had gone wrong on this point. Nothing could be more directly opposed to all that was about to come in the wake of Luther. But it was a great misfortune that, for so long, so many theologians had testified to their faith, and to the traditional teaching, in an atmosphere vitiated by their enslavement to the probable.

In the early years of that dead time which followed the

disappearance from the scene of Nicholas of Cusa and Pius II, and within a short two years of one another, five very remarkable men were born. At Gouda in Holland in 1467 Desiderius Erasmus was born; at Rome in 1468 Alessandro Farnese, who, as Pope Paul III, was one day to sanction the Jesuits and to assemble the Council of Trent; in 1469 Machiavelli was born at Florence, Thomas de Vio -- Cardinal Cajetan -- at Gaeta, and at Beverley, in Yorkshire, St. John Fisher, the solitary bishop in the hundred years that lay between St. Antoninus of Florence and St. Thomas of Villanueva to attain canonisation. Nine years later, in London, St. Thomas More was born. From four of these men, in the last few years before Luther's entry into world history, came the most characteristic work of their genius, four books which have influenced all subsequent thought: Cajetan's commentary on the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas began to appear in 1507, Machiavelli's The Prince was composed in 1513, Thomas More's Utopia was printed in 1516, and Erasmus's edition of the Greek Testament that same year. With these works of these great men the tableau is complete of Christian thought as Luther's revolt found it. Erasmus and Cajetan are priests and religious; More and Machiavelli laymen. Erasmus and Cajetan are ecclesiastically learned, though after a very different manner; More and Machiavelli are directly interested in the common life of men, in the Commonwealth. Let us begin with the laymen.

The Utopia and The Prince are classics too well-known to need much description. Some study of them has been part of the general culture of western Europeans for centuries. The authors are finished humanists, both of them; More is the English character at its very best, Machiavelli the Italian almost at its basest. The Italian is already, however, a figure in the public life of the time, a diplomatist who knows by long experience the great world of princes that is the subject of his meditations: More is but on the threshold of his career.

At this moment the future martyr is thirty-eight years of age, by profession a lawyer and one of the most successful advocates in the English capital. He is a scholar of the new type, a wit, a family man, and a man of deeply religious life, about whose ways with God there has clung something of the Carthusian spirit ever since the years when, as a young man, he lived as a guest in their London cloister. More fasts regularly, he has

regular hours for prayer, he wears a hair shirt, he spends the midday hours of every Friday in meditation on the Passion of Our Lord, he not only hears mass daily but very frequently receives Holy Communion. Such is the man who in the Utopia uses brilliant and kindly satire to criticise the very foundations of his world. This he sees as a place where wickedness and greed flourish unchecked, and where the poor are more and more oppressed, despite the fact that rich and poor alike profess themselves believers in the doctrine that they are brothers in Christ, and that this fraternity is the one thing that matters. What a mess Christians are making of this Christian world, he seems to say. Even from pagans who knew only of God that He existed, more than this might be rightly expected. The book appeared in Latin, at Louvain in 1516, and it had from the beginning a great popularity. [] Thomas More was already known to humanists everywhere through the praise of his friend Erasmus; henceforward he was known, and as among the foremost of the humanists, in his own right.

Few books have suffered more from serious misunderstanding. This has been due, in part, to lack of knowledge about its author, and also to the prejudgment with which the critics -- friendly for the most part to More -- have begun their study of it. It is not a visionary book, nor an unpractical scheme of real living, but a philosophical satire upon the contemporary abuses of Catholic Europe, written by a passionately sincere Catholic. It does not discuss Catholicism, but it attacks the neglect of Catholics really to put into practice the faith which is their boast. As for the religion -- the natural religion -- of these Utopians, the remarkable thing is how closely, in some important points, it resembles Catholicism. Against two contemporary fashionable aberrations on the part of thinkers who are Catholics the Utopia is in violent reaction -- against Pomponazzi's philosophical trifling with the doctrine that man's soul is immortal, and against the a-moralism whose representative figure is Machiavelli. " Parts of Utopia read like a commentary on The Prince". [] More is all against the new emancipation from fundamental dogma, against the new statesmanship, against the autocratic prince, and against the idea of "nations as totally independent, gladiators in the European arena." He is filled with horror at such ideas, and at their practical consequence that there are now Christian states that will look on as spectators, with complacency and even with satisfaction, while the Turks destroy

the power of their own Christian neighbours.

The author of the Utopia is not blind to the acute general problem of religious disorder. But he is no destructive revolutionary. What he desiderates when, for example, considering the vexed business of the clergy's immunity from the law of the state, is not the abolition of the system -- which is a check on the tendency of the state to absorb the whole life of its people -- but a better clergy, " of exceeding holiness" indeed, and more carefully recruited and trained, who shall not need so frequently to shelter behind such immunities. As to another clerical matter, generally regarded as one of the great sores of the time, the condition of the monasteries, once again More is conservative. Monasteries -- good ones, of course - - are necessary; Monasticism is, indeed, the one European institution that the Utopians approve of.

There is hardly a single aspect of contemporary life -- even to the matter of colonising the newly discovered Americas -- that More's keen, kindly, humorous eye does not light upon. For each he has the appropriate comment, and for the innumerable victims of the social system, the new landless, rightless, proletariat, infinite pity. In Utopia there are no class distinctions, [] no slaves, no serfs, all men are free men, are workers, are students; and all at need are soldiers. By comparison with what is there pictured -- and with what could be, in this Catholic Christendom, were all really Catholic -- the commonwealths of the day are indeed "a conspiracy of rich men". []

The Prince, written three years earlier than More's Utopia, [] 8 and addressed to Leo X's nephew, Lorenzo de' Medici, lately become the ruler of Florence, was the work of a man whose political career had just come to an end, at the age of forty-four. In that career of nearly twenty years in the service of Florence, his native state, Niccolo Machiavelli had risen to be the head of a leading branch in what we might call the Ministry of the Interior, and he had also been employed in half a dozen most important diplomatic missions. He had been sent to Cesare Borgia in the duke's great hour when he was all but King of the Romagna; he was at Rome when disaster came to the duke with the death of Alexander VI; he was with Julius II in the famous march on Perugia and Bologna in 1507, and three years later he was with Louis XII of France, fanning the king's hatred of Julius and

advising him to stir up the Roman barons against the pope. With the restoration of the Medici at Florence, in 1513, Machiavelli fell. He was for a time imprisoned and tortured, but his life was spared. No public man is resigned, at forty-four, to the idea that his life is over, and *The Prince*, the first of Machiavelli's works, is in intention a first move to capture the good will of the Medici "tyrant" and gain a place in his counsels -- employment and money. For Machiavelli was not one of those philosophers who live only for thought. He was the Italian humanist at its best and worst, all the literary scholarship and skill, all the brilliance, all the scepticism, and all the vices, the deceit, the extravagance, the profligacy, and the cult of personal glory to the point of mania; the very antithesis in character of Thomas More.

The Prince is a slight pamphlet written in a new classical Italian prose, to be read in an hour or two, and meditated on for the rest of a lifetime. Its main theme is the way a prince ought to act who has lately become the master of a state which has previously been under the rule of another. The model for such a prince's imitation is, Machiavelli declares, Cesare Borgia; and the book is, substantially, an analytical account of the rise and fall of tyrants, with special reference to this hero, and with the moral always carefully drawn. The style is simple, unimpassioned, and for its power of irony beneath ordinary language and unimpeachable sentiments, the forerunner of Swift and Voltaire. Here is the political practice of contemporary rulers -- the state of things that provoked some of the most telling passages in the *Utopia* -- not now condemned for the bad thing it is, nor for the menace it holds for coming ages, but built into a doctrine, a kind of political religion, with villainy analysed and classified, its practice set out in appropriate maxims and precepts, and with warnings against using the right villainy at the wrong time. Well, indeed, may it be said that the little tract "marks the culminating point of the pagan renaissance." Here is the new gospel that, since the world is full of bad men, it is useless for the good to waste time considering what men ought to be, and dangerous to treat the wicked as only the good deserve to be treated. Bad men cannot be governed except by descending to their own level. Treachery, bad faith, cruelty, the careful affectation of the appropriate goodness, all these are called for, and must be studiously employed by the ruler who, in a wicked world, wishes to survive. And Machiavelli calmly debates the comparative usefulness of these vices, and explicitly enjoins his prince to

make use of them.

States need, too, a religion: there is no instrument more useful to the ruler than the religion accepted by his subjects. Whether the ruler himself believes in that religion or not, and even if he knows it not to be true, it is an elementary duty to his welfare to foster it. This ideal national religion, whose importance -- from the ruler's point of view -- lies in its power to unify the nation and serve as a means through which to govern it, could hardly be Catholicism. Nor does Machiavelli mean that it shall be. Catholicism, as the religion not of the hated popes merely but of Jesus Christ, a religion that teaches mankind to look elsewhere than in the state for the abiding city, can never serve the ends of the prince. Moreover its doctrines of love, of self-denial, of pity and of compassion tend to form a type of character than which nothing could be more hostile, nay fatal, to the state he has in mind. The ideal religion is that of pagan antiquity and Machiavelli explicitly says this. [] Paganism alone will, by deifying the state, crown the achievement of the good prince.

A later generation of Catholics was to see the by then notorious treatise placed upon the Index of books forbidden to be read. But addressed to the nephew of Leo X it brought no immediate reprobation on its author, and in 1515 the pope was asking him for advice in the dilemma caused by the schemes of the new King of France and the shifting papal diplomacy. The pope's cousin -- the Cardinal Giulio who was afterwards to be Pope Clement VII -- still stood between Machiavelli and a new employment at Florence, but in 1519 he too was consulting him, asking for a statement on the best way of governing the state, and in 1520 he obtained for him, from Leo X, the commission which produced the great History of Florence.

The Prince is, evidently, in every line and turn of phrase a Renaissance product, and the worst feature of the book, the final pessimism about human nature, [] is no doubt the effect upon a well-placed observer of the sight of such universal cynical indifference to the elements of morality in the conduct of public affairs. Even the popes, as rulers, had now descended to the level of the condottieri princes. But there is another, and more enduring reason, for the pessimism. It is a reflection in the political writer of the contemporary revival of Aristotle according to Averroes, of the movement which at Padua, under the

influence of Pietro Pomponazzi, was now carrying all before it with the youth of the university. Here, rooted in stern and compelling logic, was the old curse of the theory that man is wholly at the mercy of an impersonal world force, held in the grip of a fixed, unchanging, eternal cosmos. Everything has always been the same; it will always be so. Since this is the truth about life, and man's destiny, it is best to arrange life accordingly, and to crush out all talk of ideals and betterment and what we should call "progress," for beliefs of this kind can only cause activities in the state that are futile, fated to futility indeed, and a necessary cause of mischievous instability. Averroism, indeed, had never died despite St. Albert and St. Thomas, and Duns Scotus. And now, in the general disintegration, it was again in the forefront of life, threatening as always the very fundamentals of Christian belief. Its most evident assault was against the belief that the human soul is destined for a separate, personal immortality. []

A French scholar of our own time has linked Erasmus, with Machiavelli and Thomas More, as a pioneer in political philosophy, for Erasmus also wrote his Prince. [] But, without demurring for a moment to the great Dutchman's right to figure prominently in such a history, his main importance in Catholic history lies elsewhere. In 1516 Erasmus was close on fifty, and he had reached that position as an influence in European life which no man of letters before, and none since -- not even Voltaire -- has ever attained. [] For what was he known, in these last hours before the Lutheran controversies began? and whither did his influence upon educated Christians tend?

He had begun as an eager, and unusually gifted, student of classical Latin literature, in that monastery of Steyn where, in a kind of despair, this unwanted child of a long-dead priest had been over-persuaded, by guardians only too anxious to get him off their hands, to vow himself for life as an Austin Canon-Regular. The monastery was one of that congregation of Windesheim whose ideals and outlook have been described; its spirit for good, and for the less than good, was that of the *Devotio Moderna*. Erasmus was continuing here in the way of his early schooling under the Brothers of the Common Life, and there is no reason to doubt that he simply set down the facts when, in later days, he said of his brethren that among them "the least inclination for literature was then looked upon as little

better than a crime." However, Erasmus was professed, in the way then general, solemn vows after a novitiate of twelve months, at the age of nineteen or twenty.

It cannot have been long before he realised the scale of the mistake he had made. The patronage of the Bishop of Cambrai provided a first way out, and after serving some time in his household, Erasmus presently found himself in the schools of Paris. Then came the momentous first visit to England, in 1498, the meeting with Colet and Thomas More, and the realisation of what must henceforth be his life's work, the restoration of a religious spirit in the clergy through their better education; and to better their education the preparation of improved editions of the classic Christian literature. This was, in the end, to be the main work of his most industrious life, and it is by what he achieved here, and by the spirit that directed his efforts, that Erasmus must be judged. One of the great ideals of Nicholas V -- the new humanism perfected by religion, religion still more splendidly set out and defended by the new humanism, the application of the new scholarship to Christian literature -- was to be realised at last, in the face of a thousand difficulties and anxieties, by the genius and enthusiasm of this obscure religious.

Those difficulties left a permanent searing mark upon his spirit. Penury, first of all; dependence on patronage for the very freedom which the task called for; the utter inability to understand, on the part of those in whose power it lay to arrest the work at any moment -- to understand not only his own competence for it, but religion's need that the work should be done; and hanging over him, through all these years, the possibility of a recall to the unsuitable monastic life and its sterility, where his talent must run to seed for lack of intelligent employment by superiors, and his mind turn in on itself; of a recall which would leave, as the only alternative, disobedience and disgrace, the terrible fate which then awaited the apostate religious, a life of concealment and an ultimate return to the religious life via the monastic prison. Erasmus knew his age thoroughly. Not Machiavelli, nor Thomas More, was more familiar with the spectacle of clerical disorder in the high places, the spectacle of church revenues squandered on worldliness, and neither was so well placed for the contrasts to be such a torment. [] That it was the friendship of Thomas More which

made all the difference to this refined and much- tried spirit, no one will doubt. The meeting of 1498 was a turning point for Erasmus in more respects than one.

The first of Erasmus's books, the *Adagia*, appeared in 1500. It was a new kind of introduction to Latin studies, and an important factor in the development of a better method of teaching the classical language. Then, in 1502, studying Valla, the idea came to him of preparing a critical edition of the New Testament text, and Erasmus set himself to the study of Greek. It was not, however, until 1516 that the long awaited work appeared, dedicated not to his friend, the Bishop of Rochester, St. John Fisher, as Erasmus first intended, but to Leo X, who willingly accepted the dedication and wrote the famous enthusiastic praise of it which prefaces the third edition. Here was a critical edition of the text, with notes and a new Latin translation, and in the twenty years between its first appearance and the death of Erasmus, the bulky folio was reprinted sixty-nine times. And now, in succession, there appeared a series of new editions of the Fathers, St. Jerome, St. Athanasius, St. Basil and St. Cyprian (1516-1520), Arnobius, St. Hilary, Prudentius, St. John Chrysostom, St. Irenaeus, St. Ambrose and Origen, St. Augustine, Lactantius and St. Gregory of Nazianzen (1520-1531). And, of course, wherever he was, Erasmus formed others in the same way of scholarship.

But long before the tale of this gigantic work was completed, Luther had appeared, and Erasmus had become involved in the controversies about the new doctrines. In these controversies he satisfied neither side; and he won for himself the reputation as a doubtful kind of Catholic which he has, perhaps even yet, not lost. That reputation, which has too long over- shadowed his immense services, is also bound up with his strong, published criticisms of the abuses in the practice of Catholicism in his time. The most famous of the books in which these chiefly appear was *The Praise of Folly* dedicated to More, and published long before Luther had been heard of: but the other, a book designed to teach boys Latin conversation, the *Colloquies*, though also written in early life was only published, as a manual, in 1522. Here, in places, there is set out with biting satire the seamy side of ecclesiastical life in all its unpleasantness; here are all the scandals about which reforming councils, and outspoken popular preachers, have been occupying themselves

for generations, unworthy clerics, ignorant clerics, sinful clerics -- and monks, the debasing popular superstitions, the mechanical unintelligent use of religion; here it all is, in words of one syllable, set out in condemnation, and in warning; abuses smiled at, sometimes politely, sometimes ironically, sometimes with the bitterness of a good man not a saint who has come nigh to despair of the only human force that can correct it all; and the moral is continuously pointed out that true religion is far different from all this, that what now obtains needs to be purified and simplified, and that what a man needs is to know Christ as the Bible speaks of Him and to follow His way. On its positive side [] the spiritual direction is that of the *Devotio Moderna*; but, allied now with the hostile critique of so many Catholic practices and institutions, and lacking the needed reference to man's need of sacraments and of Church-taught doctrine, and with the seeming theory that private study of the Bible is all-sufficient, and given to the world under the author's name barely two years after Luther's condemnation and with all northern Europe now in convulsion, the book, henceforward, lined up Erasmus as Luther's ally in the minds of a host of the Catholic partisans. Erasmus crying "Back to Christ in the Bible" was too like Luther crying "The Bible only "

But the most fatal weaknesses of all arose from the total absence in the great scholar's own formation of anything at all of the classic theology of the schools. To Scholasticism, indeed, Erasmus was as much opposed as Luther himself, and with perhaps less understanding of what it was that he was opposing. It would be a waste of time to belabour Erasmus for this lack of knowledge, of time better spent in enquiring where a religious of his antecedents could have got the kind of knowledge of scholastic theology that would really have informed his mind. What kind of a spectacle, in fact, did the world of Scholasticism present to a young Austin Canon in a Dutch priory of the Windesheim group, in the closing years of the fifteenth century? or to the student in the grim *College de Montaigu* of the Nominalist-rotted university of Paris? In a sense there was too much Scholasticism, Thomists, Scotists, Ockhamists of a score of schools, all disputing against each other. Which was in the right? And with what else were the most of them busy but with sterile inter-scholastic disputation? A young Friar Minor studying in the convents of his order with an unusually good master might be made into a useful Scotist

thinker; or a young Dominican, if so lucky as to be taught by some Cajetan, might prove an effective Thomist. But outside these rare cases?

The life had, in fact, gone out of the business, and almost everywhere the philosophers and theologians of the *via antiqua* did little more than repeat their predecessors. A new world of literature and imagination had developed, and they ignored its existence. Their own technical Latin had actually declined in quality, and taken on a new barbarity, in the very age when nothing was so characteristic of the educated man as a carefully polished, classical Latinity. And the scholastics made no use at all of the new literary forms of the vernacular languages. The new humanism had brought to the West, not only new texts of Plato and Aristotle, but the means whereby all might read the masters in their own tongue. But the scholastics were too indifferent to their own origins to seize the great opportunity. And despite the fourteenth and fifteenth century critics who had already demonstrated the inadequacy of the Aristotelian physics, the universities clung to them with a truly stupid determination, refusing utterly to consider the new sciences, deliberately ignoring the way of experiment. The once great movement was now, by its own choice, cut off from all that was alive in the world of thought; and the needed systematisation, the constant relating of the old knowledge to the new which is the real life of the mind, had long since ceased.

Erasmus was by nature anything rather than a metaphysician, but in an age of more reasonable Scholasticism he could have been taught enough of this first of the sciences to understand why it is the first, and how all else depends on it, and that, without it, the theologian soon finds himself in difficulties once he is beyond wading-depth in his speculation. For Erasmus the consequences were disastrous. He had too great a mind not to suffer cruelly wherever he was deficient, and his role was too high for his mistakes to be small matters. For his theological insufficiency, and his own unawareness of it, he paid again and again. Luther's theories of the will as enslaved, for example, filled him with horror. Erasmus attacked the German unsparingly, but with what weapons? Here was a philosophical question, and the humanist had done nothing about philosophy, all his life, but ridicule the miserable philosophers of his experience.

"Caught unprovided with any such technical formation," says a theological historian, [] of the controversy about Free Will, " [these humanists] had only their personal tastes to trust to, and their own powers of initiative, seeking shelter, for good or ill, behind such Greek writers as Origen and St. John Chrysostom, whose scattered views had never been formed into a systematic theory about these problems, nor enjoyed any appreciable prestige in the Church. The intervention of such improvised theologians had the effect of creating, inside the theological system of Catholicism, a new antithesis whose consequences were to be far reaching indeed. . . ." And Mandonnet instances Erasmus [] who; "without any study of the classical theology of the Church, improvises solutions, and despite his circumspection he comes to affirm such enormities as this ' That nothing comes about without the will of God, I readily allow; but, generally, the will of God depends on our will'." []

These controversies were however, in 1516, hidden in the unknown future. The pope had blessed the new work on Scripture and enthusiastically recommended it, and the only critics Erasmus had had to face, as yet, were obscurantist Catholics. But what these now were muttering, others, once the Lutheran storm broke, would soon be proclaiming loudly, and declaring that Erasmus, by his teaching about the role of Scripture, and his criticism of monastic life and devotional practices, was no better than Luther himself.

Under all the varied activity of this most industrious scholar, the single persisting aim is always evident, namely to bring men back to Christ; and this, Erasmus is persuaded, can best be done by setting before men Christianity as it first existed. His method is that of the humanist who would reconstruct Cicero's Rome or Plato's Athens, namely the critical use of the oldest literary monuments of the time that have survived. The one way back to Christ, in fact, is through study of the New Testament, and if our idea of Christ's doctrine gains in simplicity the more we read, this is a sure indication that we are on the right way. Here, in this craving for simplification, in a violent impatience with whatever is not grammatically self-evident, we have one leading motif of Erasmus's theological activity. He posits, in fact, of the inexhaustible content of revelation, the simplicity which

belongs to the assent of faith through which the content is made accessible. This simplicity of statement for which Erasmus yearns, he does not find in the theologians. What has destroyed it there, so he thinks, is the theologians' use of philosophy, of metaphysics, in their task of exposition. With the theologians as they face their eternal problem -- the need to determine what doctrines actually mean, to solve the apparent contradictions, to resolve the seeming opposition between them and what is reasonably known -- Erasmus has no sympathy at all. From such problems he shrinks; and he has a marked antipathy for those who face them, and immense scorn for their barbarous, unclassical Latinity, their carefully devised technical terminology, and their methods of logical analysis, and of strict definition.

His own method will not give any doctrinal precision, and he does not desire it from any other method. Doctrinal precision is, in fact, not necessary; zeal for it is a mark of Christian decadence, not of progress in knowledge of God. In the hands of Erasmus, Catholic dogma thins out until it vanishes to nothing; and he would meet the problem of the real need, of even the most ordinary of mankind, for knowledge of the mysteries appropriate to the level of their intelligence, by scrapping technical language on all sides. Precision in these matters, he thought, was not worth what it cost; and even, for example, such a vitally necessary tool as the term homoousion ought to go, ought never to have been devised. It is not surprising if, in his theology, there are mistakes, inexactitudes, contradictions, and this especially in the matters then so violently controverted, doctrines about marriage, confession, the monastic life, the Roman primacy. [] Nor is it surprising if the next generation, its theological mind formed by the greatest of scholastic revivals, and its adherence to the scholastic method intensified by the Church's life and death struggle with the Reformation divines, should come to hold in abhorrence the great mind which, in these important matters, seemed stricken so perversely. Upon Catholic theology Erasmus, then, left no lasting mark; nor did his failure to appreciate its importance do any damage or lessen its prestige. Here the contemptuous blows he struck fell upon the air. For one thing the revival had begun; and next, theology had already become what it has since remained, a technique that only interested theologians and clerics. The sole effect of his excursions into theology was to discredit Erasmus with the

theologians for ever. But the effect of Erasmus on the future of philosophy was very different. Philosophy had once been the occupation of all the educated, and it would in time become that again. Here, the scornful mockery of Erasmus for the Scholastics as he had known them, barbarous in diction, futile and sterile in act, came as a last blow from humanism in its classical age; and Erasmus, in this, helped enormously among educated men everywhere the prejudice from which, only in our own time, is the philosophy of the schools recovering. []

As we review the personalities and the effective work, of Machiavelli and Erasmus and St. Thomas More, we seem to have parted company entirely from the medievals and to have rejoined our own contemporaries. Cajetan, their contemporary, was undoubtedly a medieval; [] and yet, in him also, we make a contact with later times, with our own time indeed in the strictest sense, for the spirit we encounter in Cajetan is the Catholic intellectualism of this mid-twentieth century, the age of Maritain and Gilson, of Leo XIII and Pius XII. Here, in Cajetan, is a rebirth of St. Thomas; here are the beginnings of his effective primacy in the Catholic schools as doctor communis.

Cajetan is, by birth, James de Vio -- Thomas in religion; and, born at Gaeta, made a Dominican at Gaeta, Bishop of Gaeta, Cajetanus inevitably for all time. He entered the Friars Preachers at the age of sixteen, in that very year when the Chapter- General made the momentous decision that the lectors should use St. Thomas as the basis of their teaching instead of Peter Lombard. In 1488 he was sent to Bologna, still a student; and after his ordination in 1491, to Padua, then exceedingly alive not only with the contention between the Dominicans and the great Scotist, Antonio Trombetta, but with the controversies that centred round the revival of Averroism and the graceful culture of its high priest Pietro Pomponazzi.

It was at Padua that Cajetan began his career as a teacher, and that he finally received that form of the complete metaphysician which was henceforth to be the vital principle of all his intellectual activity. [] In 1494 he made a brief appearance before a greater world when, in the theological tourney which, in those days, enlivened the meetings of the General Chapter, he met and brilliantly jostled with Pico della Mirandola, the hero, it will be recalled, of the early manhood of St. Thomas More.

Cajetan was given the chair of Theology at Pavia in 1497; he went thence in 1499 to Milan, and in 1501 he was named Procurator-General of the order, its representative at the Roman Curia. Although, along with this, he obtained a chair in the Roman university, his career as a teacher was over, he was more important now as one of the order's superiors. [] In 1508, at the age of thirty-nine, he was elected Master-General of his order.

Cajetan held this office for nearly ten years, and showed himself in it as a reformer of great constructive power. Two things above all, he told his brethren, must be attended to, the restoration of a life that was genuinely a life in common -- a restoration, therefore, of monastic poverty -- and, at the same time, [] the raising of the level of Dominican studies. For other orders, he said, studies might be an ornament: for the Friars Preachers, they were life itself. "Once we cease to carry weight as teachers of theology," he said grimly, "our order's day is over"; and every novice has heard that other reported dictum that the Dominican who fails to study four hours a day is in a state of mortal sin.

But the Master-General was not kept exclusively to the service of his order. Julius II made all possible use of his genius in the theological controversy with the pseudo-council of Pisa, [] and Cajetan was a leading figure in the General Council of the Lateran, and not only as a theologian but also, once again, as a man who saw the rotten state of the spiritual city and how urgently drastic reform was needed. []

At the end of the council Leo X made him a cardinal. [] and in May 1518 sent him to Germany as Papal Legate. One of his tasks was to unite the princes into an effective opposition to the new Turkish offensive; after a respite of thirty years a great soldier had again arisen among the Ottomans, and Christendom was once more in danger. An equally important commission was sent on to him some four months later. [] It concerned Luther, by this time cited to answer at Rome a charge of heresy. Luther's sovereign -- Frederick III of Saxony -- had persuaded Leo X to allow the enquiry to be held in Germany, and Cajetan was now put in charge of it, with power to give a definitive sentence, and to absolve Luther should he retract; with orders to have him arrested and sent on to Rome did he prove obstinate.

The two met at Augsburg, October 12, 1518, Dominican and Augustinian, Thomist and Ockhamist, the Papal Legate and the rebel. Much has been written about that celebrated interview, amongst others by Luther himself. Nothing came of it in the way of reconciliation. No reconciliation was possible; and Cajetan did not succeed in having the heresiarch arrested. But at the interview he spoke to Luther as one scholar to another, as one religious to another, laying aside his high rank and treating Luther -- we have the Augustinian's word for it -- with marked kindness. But at Rome the legate seems, henceforward, to have been, for his superficial superiors, the man who had failed. One of his brethren of our own day has surely judged his action truly. "From the outset [Cajetan] realised, what many Catholics even after four hundred years have not grasped, that this was not just any kind of a revolt, but a revolt of the mind; that these demands of Luther were not a mere claim that the flesh should be emancipated, but demands in the domain of the spiritual, and, more particularly, demands in the domain of the theological. Cajetan was taken advantage of, and he was beaten; how could he possibly not have been? But this much at least must be said, that he did not touch the already gaping wounds of Christendom with hands that were not respectful and clean." []

But it is Cajetan's influence as a thinker that is our subject, his permanent influence on his own and later ages. [] Cajetan's chief importance to Catholic history lies not only in this that he was the first to publish a commentary [] on the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas, the classic masterpiece of Catholic theology, but in the spirit which informed that great commentary, still the classic commentary after four hundred years. Cajetan, considered in his own right, is the greatest theologian of his own time, and one of the greatest the Church has known. [] It was also his great merit that he understood the needs of his age, and that old methods must be adapted accordingly. His commentary on the Summa is the work of an original mind and it proved, from the first, a great originating work. What it first of all accomplished was the long needed reconciliation of the scholastic learning and the new culture of the humanists. The commentator understood his own time, realised fully the gross error of only too many theologians, to wit their indifference to the new critical scholarship and to the new positive sciences, and, so much a metaphysician himself that he

was scarcely anything more, he yet brought the new learning to the assistance of the old. In this he is indeed a second Aquinas, bringing into synthesis humanism and Aristotelianism as the thirteenth-century doctor had brought together Aristotelianism and the theology of St. Augustine.

It is in the long series of Scripture commentaries to which the last years of his life were given that the flexibility of Cajetan's genius is most evident, his readiness to use the new learning and his skill in its use. But this spirit is already to be seen, fully at work, in the great commentary on the Summa. Like the best of the humanists he makes a critical use of the Scriptures in his argumentation, keeping rigorously to the literal sense, and observing scrupulously his own critical rule of not mixing the literal and spiritual senses indiscriminately -- a fault to which the classic theologians of the Middle Ages often tended, [] and which was never more evident than in the works of the great encyclopaedist of the generation before Cajetan -- Denis the Carthusian. [] And wherever he can do so he makes it his business to study the whole work in which his opponents' views are expressed, by no means content to judge them on the mere opposition of a text. Cajetan again shows himself of the new age in his scrupulous re-thinking of the author he is explaining. Nothing, not even unanimity among other theologians, will dispense him from this. And in nothing else does he separate himself more from his contemporaries, and his immediate predecessors, than in his violent repudiation of their formalist treatment of St. Thomas. [] This, and his candour, make Cajetan a singularly attractive author. There is about him an independence and an objectivity that is new. Here is the wisdom of St. Thomas given new life, and speaking to the Renaissance in an idiom it can understand. Here at last among the scholastic theologians was a great thinker, sensitive to all the life of his time, his work free from all those faults which drew upon his profession the wrath of Erasmus and the mockery of Rabelais. It is something to know that Erasmus was not only aware of Cajetan's existence, but of the different kind of thing his great work was, that he praised it highly -- and disinterestedly -- only wishing that books of this sort could be written by the score. []

Cajetan was not an isolated figure in his own order. The Renaissance of St. Thomas's doctrine had begun about the time he entered the order, he was one of its earliest fruits. But almost

his contemporary was the gifted Francis de Sylvestris of Ferrara (1474-1528) who published in 1525 the first, and greatest, commentary on the Contra Gentiles; and only ten years younger than Cajetan was Francis of Vittoria (1480-1546), [] the Spaniard whose lectures on the State and on the moral aspects of political life are a main foundation of the modern science of International Law. [] It is Cajetan's work, however, which is the real foundation of all the later achievement; it is due to him above all others that there was a new living theology in the university world of the later sixteenth century, ready when the great opportunity came to serve those two great inventions of that time which have especially formed the modern Church, the diocesan seminary and the Society of Jesus. [] And if Cajetan is the progenitor of the theological scholarship of modern Catholicism, Erasmus too has his Catholic progeny, no less distinguished, no less necessary to the fullness of Catholic life, the critical scholars and historical theologians and the exegetes, the Benedictines of St. Maur for example and the Bollandists, Petavius, Mabillon and Papebroch.

The General Council summoned by Julius II (in what circumstances has already been described) [] to meet in the Lateran Basilica of Rome, came together on May 3, 1512, and it was not dissolved until almost five years later, March 12, 1517. Many things in its history make the Fifth Lateran a thing apart among General Councils. It met very rarely -- seven times only in the last four years; its activities are recorded not in the usual list of canons and decrees but in a series of papal bulls; the attendance was never large, and the eighty or ninety bishops present were almost all Italians, from the Papal State and the kingdom of Naples; and, finally, the reform decrees it enacted were often openly ignored, *sedente concilio*, by the pope himself. "Au total rien de serieux" says a French scholar, truly enough; and it is hard to see what more could have been expected of such a character as Leo X, upon whom the conduct of the council fell from March 1513.

The most immediate practical effect of the council was that it broke the nascent schism fostered by the King of France and the, emperor; it reaffirmed the declaration of earlier popes that General Councils are instruments of government subordinate to the pope, primate and ruler of the whole Church of Christ; and it secured the assent of the French king to the condemnation of

the Pragmatic Sanction as unlawful, null and void. [] And the council did a great service to the cause of the faith, and of right thinking, by its condemnation of the new Averroism of Pomponazzi, "pernicious errors concerning the nature of the rational soul, namely, that it is mortal and that it is the same [soul] in all men, and that this is true at least in philosophy." [] The bull goes on to say, " Since truth does not contradict truth, we declare that every assertion contrary to truth illuminated by faith is absolutely false," and it orders that those who lecture on these subjects in universities shall set themselves to refute the arguments of these philosophers, all of which will yield to reasoning. No cleric in holy orders shall, for the future, give himself in his first five years at the university to the exclusive study of philosophy or the poets; after that time, he may, as it were, specialise in them, provided always that, at the same time, he continues his study of theology and canon law.

There are two other acts of the council which show concern for the welfare of the Catholic mind, the bull on censorship [] and that on preaching. [] The first begins with a paean of thanksgiving to God for the recent marvellous invention of printing, and a recital of the new prospects thereby opened out to learning and to religion. The new art, however, is lending itself also to less worthy causes. Books are appearing filled with mistakes about the faith, and with all manner of harmful teaching, the very opposite of Christianity; and also books filled with slander, even of eminent personages. Whence this new law that, for the future, no one is to print anything before it has been sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority -- by the pope's officials in Rome, by the bishop or his diocesan officials elsewhere. Those who ignore this law risk a heavy complexity of penalties; the book will be confiscated, publicly burned, the printer fined 100 ducats, suspended from printing for a year and excommunicated.

The decree about preachers is interesting for what it reveals of current practices in the all-important office. It is indeed almost wholly taken up with them. Preachers are not to put their own personal interpretations on Sacred Scripture; they are expressly forbidden to predict future calamities in any definite way, or the coming of anti-Christ, or the end of the world. Those who have done this already are liars, and their wickedness is one reason for the contempt that has come upon preachers in general. Let

no one, for the future, preach that any particular future event is foretold in Holy Scripture, nor say that he has a revelation from the Holy Ghost to state this, or any other like inane divination. Preachers must keep to the Gospel, teach a hatred of vice and a love of virtue. They must be a source of peace, not sowers of dissension. Especially must they abstain from scandalous denunciation of the faults of bishops and other superiors, "whom not only imprudently, but intemperately, they lecture and worry in sermons before the common people and laity"; and they must abstain from open declarations of the wrongdoing of superiors, even mentioning their names. It is, of course, always possible that a preacher may really have a special revelation, and a divine commission to make it known. But it belongs to the pope's authority to judge whether this really is so, and before anything of this kind is publicly preached it must be submitted either to the pope or, if there is no time to consult the pope, to the local bishop, who, along with three or four theologians, will carefully examine the matter. For those who ignore the law there awaits the penalty of an excommunication from which only the pope can release them.

Three decrees treat of reform. The lengthy bull *Supernae dispositionis arbitrio* [] recalls and renews all the old legislation, going back to 1179, designed to ensure good bishops in all the sees of Christendom. The pope's responsibility is stressed, and the bull explicitly reminds him that at the last day he will answer to God for his appointments. All the vices which, at this moment, disfigure the system are listed, and it is announced that the law that bans from the episcopate minors and the ignorant, and that forbids favouritism, the use of commendams, appointments of administrators -- and, in fact, everything that Leo X was at the moment doing and would continue to do to the end of his reign -- is henceforward to be enforced. The decree makes no difficulty about saying that the failure to observe these ancient laws has brought the papacy into disrepute throughout the Church; and it also renews all the laws designed to prevent monasteries from being made a means to give prelates and cardinals an income, while the monks starve and religious life dries up. The cardinals are then mildly admonished, in stereotyped language that merely repeats what was said at Constance and after Constance, about their duty to live pious and sober lives, and a vast amount of space is given to regulations about their dress and that of their households, and

to set a limit to the expenses of their funerals -- 1,500 florins. There is a new law to punish blasphemy in clergy and laity, the obstinate sinner going to the galleys if he is a commoner, losing his nobility if he is a noble and, if a cleric, losing all his benefices. Concubinage, yet once again, figures as a custom that still flourishes, and bishops are warned not to let offenders off lightly on the plea that the custom is after all so general. There is a renewal of the old laws against simony, against encroachment on the rights and property of the Church, and against violation of the privilege of clerics. All this is, once again, little more than repetition. The legislation merely forbids and enacts penalties; the way has not yet been found to secure that the law will actually be put into force. [] And there is a special clause denouncing witchcraft and punishing those who resort to it, clerics and laity; and another clause calling for strict application of the heresy laws against pseudo-Christians.

A second bull [] strengthens the bishop's hand against the chapters and canons who resist his endeavours to correct them, on the plea that they are exempt from his authority; and it strengthens the prestige of the episcopal courts. Finally, the bishops are bidden to observe the law, which has long been a dead letter over four-fifths of the Church, that a provincial council should be held every three years.

The law that the bishops of every ecclesiastical province should meet in provincial council every three years was first made at the Fourth General Council of the Lateran -- the greatest of all the medieval councils -- by Innocent III in 1215. In the period 1270-1517 there were held, for the 74 provinces then effectively existing, 235 provincial councils: had the law been observed everywhere, throughout that time, there would have been more than 6,000 councils held. The purpose of the provincial council -- it must be remembered -- was not merely to make laws: it was designed by Innocent III as the instrument by which episcopal slackness and shortcomings were to be corrected by the bishops of the province. Herein lay the chief usefulness of Innocent III's invention; and in the utter inability of the popes to enforce this law lay, undoubtedly, one of the chief reasons for the steady decline of religion and the ultimate corruption of such masses. It is not without interest to note that never were fewer councils held than in the years of the so-called conciliar movement -- 63 councils in 30 provinces. In many provinces no

council was ever held. So, notably in Italy, where there were 29 provinces, councils were never held at all in 22 of them; in the rest there was one council in Benevento in 1378, one in Palermo in 1388, the fourth and last of Aquileia (i.e. held during these 247 years) took place in 1339, of Ravenna in 1317, of Grado in 1320, of Spoleto in 1344, of Padua in 1350. Of the 16 metropolitan provinces of France, most held councils, many of them at least once in an average man's lifetime; though at Arles, Embrun and Aix there was none after 1365, nor at Auch after 1387, though at Bordeaux the series ended in 1327, and at Toulouse in 1368, though Lyons (the primatial see) had but one council (after 1300) in 1376, and Reims only one in 111 years (1344-1455), and Rouen none in 140 years (1304-1445). The tale is much the same in Spain, although, at Toledo and Tarragona, councils were really frequent (six at Toledo and fourteen at Tarragona). In Germany, where there were seven provinces, councils were only regularly held at Prague and Magdeburg; Cologne had none from 1324 to 1423, Salzburg none from 1310 to 1409; Bremen had none at all after 1292, and Treves none after 1310. In Poland between 1285 and 1420 there was but one council, held in 1375; and there was but one in Portugal, held in 1436, in all the period 1270-1464. In Scotland, too, the law was a dead letter; a council was held in 1280 and the next was in 1436. Sweden went for 120 years without any provincial council (1275-1396), and Hungary for 130 years (1318-1449). Norway did not fare so badly until half-way through the fourteenth century, the council of 1351 being the last until 1436. In Denmark the series ends in 1389. In Ireland (where there were 4 provinces) there are only the two councils of Dublin in 1348 and 1351.

The third bull, [] of December 19, 1516, brings to an end the latest, and most clamorous, of all the struggles between the bishops and the mendicant orders, a quarrel so violent that the pope had to put off the next session of the council for months. "We are in the heart of a terrific storm," the general cf. the Augustinians [] wrote, " the attack upon us and upon all the mendicant orders by the bishops has now raged furiously for three years in the very council." The cause was the old, old cause -- the privilege which the Mendicants enjoyed of exemption from all authority but that of the pope. The bishops charged the friars with using the privilege to make money out of the laity at the expense of the parish and diocese, and charged them also with an abundance of wicked living; let them be

brought under the common law of the Church. The regulars riposted by a staggering catalogue of episcopal sins. "Before you call upon us to observe the common law of the Church," they said, "why not begin to observe it yourselves?" If it were not for the regulars, they boldly declared to the pope, the very name of Christ would be forgotten in Italy. Who else but the friars ever preached? The bishops pressed for the abolition at least of the privileges lately showered on the Mendicants by the Franciscan pope Sixtus IV, the bull called *Mare magnum*.

It was only the personal action of Leo X that saved the friars. [] He arranged a compromise, and the bull *Dum intra mentis arcana* of the eleventh session sets it out. Bishops were to have the right to make visitations in parish churches held by the friars and to enquire into all that concerned their parochial activity. Friars would need the bishop's approval before they could hear the confessions of his subjects. Friars were not to absolve from episcopal excommunications or other censures, nor were they, without leave of the parish priest, to administer Extreme Unction to the dying or give them Holy Viaticum. Laymen who wished to be buried in the habit of a religious order could be buried in the order's churches and cemeteries if they so desired. Bishops had the right to examine a friar's suitability before they gave him Holy Orders; and it is the bishop of the diocese who must be asked to give this sacrament, and also to consecrate the friars' churches, bless their bells, and perform all other episcopal functions they may need. Friars are not to marry any of the faithful without the leave of the parish priest; they are to be careful to remind those who come to confession to them of their duty to pay tithes to the parish priest; and, if the priest asks it of them, they are to make a point of this in their sermons. Members of the Third Orders who live in their own houses have no right to receive from the friars of their order the so-called parochial sacraments (that is Easter Communion, Extreme Unction, and Holy Viaticum), though they may confess to the friars, and be buried with them, and by them, should they choose. Such tertiaries are bound by the same obligations as other layfolk, and they are not free from the jurisdiction of lay judges. Nor can they, in times of interdict, hear mass in the churches of the order to which they belong. But if the members of the Third Order live a common life, in a convent, they enjoy all the rights and privileges of the order.

The recital of the details of the compromise shows how the life of the orders had, by now, penetrated minutely into every nook and cranny of the Christian republic. At every turn there was room for friction between the two systems of jurisdiction, the episcopal and the exempt. And even the roughest survey of the lives of the saints and holy people of the century between Constance and this act of Leo X, shows the mendicant orders as the great active source of almost all the sanctity of the time -- so far as sanctity is known to us.

A biographical catalogue of saints [] gives a total of 150 saints and beati/ae who "flourished" between the beginning of the Schism and the end of the reign of Leo X (1378-1521). The "causes" of the great majority have so far not proceeded beyond the stage called beatification: only 26 out of the 150 have been canonised. Of these 150, the mendicant orders can claim as many as 115. Four of these were bishops, 35 nuns, 9 lay men and women members of the various Third Orders, and the rest priests and lay brothers; Franciscans and Dominicans account for over two-thirds of them. [] This huge lead the mendicant orders maintain to the end of the period. In the fifty years which this last chapter covers, this age of Sixtus IV and Alexander VI and Leo X, 76 saints and beati/ae "flourished", and 55 of them belonged to the mendicant orders, 19 women and 36 men. This ultimate glory of so many of their subjects -- their Italian subjects [] -- was hidden indeed from the generals of the orders-- at that time, but how history has justified their reply to the bishops' assault made in the Fifth General Council of the Lateran !

There is yet another decision given by Leo X in the council which is of interest, not only in itself, but as the most important sign so far of the Church's recognition that the world has reached a new age in social and economic organisation; this is the bull *Inter Multiplices* [] which declares the new charitable pawnshops to be lawful, and protects them against the critics who had been denouncing the system as nothing else than usury. No crime, throughout the whole of the Middle Ages had been more continuously denounced by the Church than usury, and no sinners more severely punished. Nor did Leo X's sanction, given to pawnshops so organised that, while no interest was asked for the loan, a small charge was made to cover administration costs, alter in any way the definition of

usury or moderate the condemnation of the crime. But while reviewing once again the nature of the reprobated "contract of usury", the pope explicitly reprobated old-fashioned theologians who declared that whatever accrued to those who lent money must, in all circumstances, be usury.

Great changes, in progress by this time for a hundred years and more, had brought it about that money now had another use beyond that which all thinkers so far had considered could be its only use, namely, to be a means of making payments. In an economic system where, if money was not used to make a payment it was not, and could not, be used at all, all loans of money were necessarily unproductive loans. The money lent was as truly consumed in the borrower's use of it, as was ever a loaf of bread or a bottle of wine. Any charge made for any loan of money was, then, necessarily a usurious charge, the charge being inevitably a gain accruing directly from the mere act of loaning, and claimed as such.

But once industries began to be specialised and commerce to spread over a wider field, to pass from the transactions confined to one village, or town, and to take in first a whole country, then a continent and finally other lands at the very extremities of the world as known, a new use for money gradually developed. Any man could lend his money to these industrial and commercial pioneers, and legitimately qualify for a share in their profits -- as he also incurred a share in their risks. What such a man received from those to whom he lent his money was a share in what their use of the total moneys they controlled brought in; it was a fruit of industry and business capacity, not any longer a payment exacted simply for the loan of what could not be productive. To profits accruing from money used in this new way that the growth of commerce had made possible, the criticisms directed against usury could not apply. And it became necessary, in such a system as the Catholic religion, that those whose business it was -- whether by private or public direction of men's consciences -- to keep a clear idea of moral obligations before mankind, should take note of the new institutions which the changing circumstances of life were calling into existence.

The fourteenth century, which produced so much activity of a scientific kind -- and minds that, by preference, studied facts (and here, of course, Ockham's insistence on the importance of

the fact told very favourably indeed) -- saw the first reflections of these new developments in what has come to be called Moral Theology. Durandus of Saint-Pourcain, for example, studied the nascent credit system and raised the question, which increasingly agitates our minds to-day, whether the state should not organise so important an element of man's well being. Francois de Mayronnes pointed out how money was beginning to have more than one use, and asked the great question if interest could not therefore sometimes be lawful. Jean Buridan sketched a theory of value, of exchange, and of money. Nicholas of Oresme, whose place in the history of other sciences has been referred to already, wrote his book on Money, its origin, nature, rights and exchange in which Gresham's Law makes its first appearance. All these men were clerics, and their first interest was the ultimate end of their fellows. They did not study Political Economy for the mere interest of the subject, but to clarify doubts whether certain commercial activities were lawful or sinful. It is not surprising that these questions, from now on hotly debated in the country that was the centre of the new finance, Italy, attracted the attention of the missionaries of the new Franciscan reform movement -- the Observants -- who, for the moment, were there carrying all before them as reformers of Christian moral life. In their sermons, and notably in those of St. Bernadine of Siena, there is a new precision in what is said on these questions which so vitally affect man's chances of salvation: questions of usury, of interest, of mortgages. But the crown of all this new movement was the work of a Dominican, St. Antonino, Archbishop of Florence from 1446-1459, in the very height of the career of Cosimo de' Medici.

St. Antonino [] was a disciple of Bl. Giovanni de Dominici, the Dominican who organised the great reform in his order that produced the famous Congregation of Lombardy, and who as a cardinal stood by Gregory XII, almost alone, in the dark days of the Council of Pisa. The saint grew up in the new, reformed monasteries of Fiesole and St. Marco; he had served as a missionary, as prior and as the head of his group of houses, and he had won a great name as a canonist, when Eugene IV gave him the see of Florence in 1446. It was one of those rare appointments where the man was ideally right for the place and the time, thinker, ruler, saint, and understanding his age from life-long contact with all its actuality.

The great work for which St. Antonino is chiefly known, the four volumes of the *Summa Moralis*, was written while he was archbishop, and it was meant, of course, for the use of his clergy. It is a new kind of work in two respects. First it treats exclusively of theology as this relates to conduct -- it is the pioneer work of the science that has come to be called Moral Theology. And next, it is specially devoted to these new anxieties about commercial morality and the use of money, and the ultimate moral import of what we should call economic doctrines. Here is to be found dispassionate analysis and discussion of all manner of problems that are still with us; poverty in itself is an evil, though it may be an occasion for good; possessions are good and ordained by God for the service of man; to serve God as God wills He shall be served, man needs a certain freedom from anxiety, a certain leisure -- and possessions secure this for him. The saint considers wealth in its production, distribution, and consumption, and discusses the comparative importance of labour and capital in the production of wealth. There is a careful detailed study of various methods of commercial fraud, of the question of usury, of interest on bills of exchange, of the distinction between money as coin and money as capital, and of the lawfulness of taking interest for money lent to the state. There is an attempt to state a principle whereby to determine the just price of goods, just to the seller and to the buyer; an examination of monopolies, and trusts; of the duties of the state to its citizens, its duty to provide for the poor, the aged, the sick -- and even its duty to provide, for the poor, doctors paid by the state; of the duty of employers to pay a just wage.

Florence, in St. Antonino's time, was as much the financial capital of the world as New York or London has been in our own. The evils which he analyses and deplores are the product of the last two hundred years or so before the Reformation; and already, in the Low Countries as in Italy, and in western Germany too, "there was sometimes a capitalism as inhuman as anything which the world has seen, and from time to time ferocious class wars between artisans and merchants." [] It was not the least of scandals to the poor as Catholics that, among their oppressors, were highly-placed clerics. St. Thomas More, in the *Utopia*, notes, for example, that monasteries too are prominent in that wicked development that is turning farms into sheep runs and thereby increasing the horde of wretched

proletarians and vagabonds in the towns.

And it was another scandal that the popes had, for generations, made such use of the bankers. [] It was the skill of the French pope Urban IV, negotiating an agreement with the bankers of Siena in 1263, that had made possible the expedition of Charles of Anjou and the final defeat of the Hohenstaufen. Bankers played a great part in the supreme days of la fiscalite pontificale, during the Avignon regime. "In the first half of the fifteenth century the Medici or their representatives were always in attendance on the popes." [] John XXIII had Cosimo with him when he made the fatal journey to Constance in 1414, and he raised 15,750 florins from the firm on a magnificent mitre. Twenty-five years later Eugene IV, during the Council of Florence, raised a further 25,000 from the Medici on pledges of plate and jewels. Under Nicholas V the bank received the 100,000 gold florins which the pilgrims contributed at the Jubilee of 1450. By this time the great Florentine firm had branches everywhere, at Rome, Venice, Pisa and Milan in Italy; at Antwerp and Bruges; at London, Lyons, Avignon, Geneva, Valencia and Barcelona, and at Lubeck; and thereby it offered the pope a means to gather in revenues that was no doubt lawful enough in itself, but a means that lent itself easily to scandal. For example, " Fees had to be paid by any nominee to a bishopric or an archbishopric. The Roman house accepted the bull of nomination, dispatched it to that branch of the business which had, or was likely to have, business connexions with the new bishop, and this branch then delivered the bull on payment of the dues. If the dues were not paid, the bull was sent back." []

The bankers were also used to collect the money offered by those who sought to gain some of the indulgences, [] and the classic example of scandal here is the indulgence of Leo X as it was preached in Germany in 1516, the indulgence which gave Luther his opportunity to secure for the new theology its first notoriety outside the universities of Wittenberg and Erfurt.

The movement called the Reformation, when it came, was but one of several revolutions simultaneously active, and the latest of them in time. This attempt to picture the setting in which the first events of the Reformation took place needs, in order to complete it, some mention of the new importance of the middle classes, and for this I should like to borrow the words of a

recent French writer. The only "class to make any progress" -- he is speaking of the fifteenth century -- "is the middle class. The development of banking and industry, all that blossoming of capitalism which characterises the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries makes for the advantage of this class alone. On a par with this economic strength, is the hold which the middle class gains, little by little, on political life, the municipal authority and the parliaments. Well-established families dominate the municipal councils; in the Low Countries they take an ever-increasing part in public affairs, in Italy more than one of them rises to be ruler of the state. The other side of the picture is that, in all the large towns, a wretched proletariat already exists with no means to express itself in the national life; and this section of the community the great social and religious changes will toss about mercilessly. There is thus in formation, within the great industrial cities, a powerful commercial aristocracy, independent, critical of authority, with a tincture of literary tastes, of interest in law and theology, ambitious to exert its strength, to enforce its claims, a middle class seeking power and privileged status -- and there is a considerable mass of poor people, raw material for any revolutionary movement, just as ready to support the ambition of the middle classes, or the king's authority, or a peasant rebellion; to turn and sack the possessions of the clergy to-day or, to-morrow, to change sides and become a church-enthusiastic mob." []

Here the veil is lifted that still hangs over too much of medieval history, and something shows of the life and thought of the ordinary man, not only of him at whose expense history is so largely made, but of him whose scarcely recorded reaction to the direction of his betters often, at the turning points, makes history. It was to help this class that the Franciscan Observants had come with their invention of the Monts de Piete, protected now by Leo X in the General Council of the Lateran. What of the religious life of the ordinary man at this moment?

The movement of theology away from philosophy, more and more marked as the fourteenth century drew to an end, was more closely followed by a movement of devotional life away from theology -- though not, as yet, of devotional life away from the faith. It was not to the depths of the mysteries that men now turned for food for their souls, but to the mysteries as they had been shown to the senses. There is, from now on, an increasing

familiarity in the tone of men's commerce with the supernatural world, and they make greater use of their imagination in their effort to make a contact with that world. Their meditation on it is more colourful, the emotions play a greater part in their spiritual life than ever before. The change is reflected in a new development in religious art; there are new subjects for the painters and sculptors and a new treatment of the old subjects. It matters much now that the representation shall be picturesque. And the great catastrophe which came half way through the fourteenth century, the Black Death, gave a sudden impulse, more powerful than all the new philosophical developments, to man's new preoccupation with emotions and imagination, to the attainment of a new stage in his devotional life, and to hasten the coming age of Pathos. On the one hand new luxury and new lusts, and on the other a new deep-rooted melancholy. Then came the terrible trials of the Schism and of the long-drawn-out uncertainties of the duel of the popes with the councils. Here are catastrophes and crises that remind men violently how brittle a thing is worldly glory, how short-lived man's happiness and how far from Christian perfection most Christians are, even the most highly-placed. The new age is much preoccupied with the thought of sin and its consequences, and with death as the moment when merited punishment will begin. As well as being the age that created the new moving iconography of the Passion, such devotions as the Stations of the Cross and the Five Wounds, and such touching images as that of Our Lord awaiting the last torture of the cross or of the Pieta, this is also the age of the Danses Macabres. "It is only Death who dances, in the procession; the rest follow unresisting, drawn along wherever the fatal cortege goes. The buffoon who zig-zags at its head is more than man can bear to look upon closely, with his strips and scraps of rotting flesh, his mockery of likeness to a man, and the irreverent display of ' what should be covered up in the earth'. " Here are the extremes of the new plane in which the popular religion lives and moves, skirting too often the fringes of the morbid, through the hundred and fifty years between the Schism and Luther.

Meanwhile the Third Orders flourished, and in the towns the guilds continued to build their corporate life around the means of grace -- prayer, the sacraments, almsgiving, and works of charity. New monastic foundations were extremely rare -- how could more be needed, all possible wants were surely long ago

supplied? The charity of the munificent went now to colleges rather, to schools and to hospitals and to "homes" for the unfortunate; "homes" for orphans and foundlings and nursing mothers, for repentant street walkers; for old sailors, for pilgrims and for the poor of every sort. [] The poor are indeed not lacking. It is an age of "commercial expansion" and the tale of the ruined victims is considerable.

Another sign of spiritual vitality is the vast number of religious books, of all kinds, in the vernacular languages, diffused now through the new invention of printing, Soul's Guides, Ways to Heaven, Christian Missions and the rest. More important still are the Catechisms and handbooks of doctrine, such for example as the *Libretto della doctrina christiana*, *Kalendrier des Bergers*, *Espeio de bien vivre*, *Instructions for Parish Priests*. [] It is an age of preachers, in every country; and pious Christians make provision in their wills for the preaching of sermons and the maintenance of the preachers, "to assure them the leisure for the study they need." [] Sermons begin to be collected and printed. In Germany we know of a hundred such. But of all books (everywhere but in England) it is the Bible that is the most popular. It was translated into Italian by a Camaldolese monk Nicholas Malermi, and in Germany, by 1517, nineteen editions of German translations had appeared. "All Christians," say the editors of a Cologne edition, "should read it with devotion and reverence and in union with God."

An account of Christian life during these years when ideals were so gravely compromised by the bad example given in high places, would be singularly misleading did it say nothing of the violent reaction, open, at times defiant, when good men protested against the scandals of ecclesiastical life. In Italy "the upper and middle classes were in a ferment of hostility" [] to this papacy of princes. The "racket" was evident and bitterly resented. One who for years lived at its centre, and upon it, the servant of both the Medici popes, Leo X and Clement VII, has expressed in bitter words that resentment which, in all ages, is the most dangerous product of the ecclesiastic's unwillingness to allow that his administration can need criticism or reform -- namely that whatever the layman's loyalty to the Catholic faith, his impatience with clerical incapacity and self-sufficiency may lead him to welcome any movement which promises to shake up the clergy. Guicciardini -- for it is the great historian's words we

are about to quote -- was no doubt an embittered man when he put together his *Reminiscences* and, like many another educated Italian of his time, not too sure of his religion. But here he only says more forcibly what, in all such times and circumstances, men naturally say. After speaking of the clerical wickedness he had witnessed -- ambition, covetousness, excesses -- and the scandal it must give, he says that his relations with various popes made him prefer their greatness to his own interests. "Had it not been for this consideration" -- he is writing now in 1529, after the event -- "I would have loved Martin Luther as myself; not that I might set myself free from the laws imposed on us by Christianity, as it is commonly interpreted and understood, but that I might see this scoundrelly rabble (*questa caterva di scelerati*) confined within due limits, so that they might be forced to choose between a life without crime or a life without power." []

Guicciardini did not stand alone. Others of his contemporaries, who explicitly declare their attachment to the papacy, do not hesitate to complain about the scandal given by the contrast between what the office demands and the way those who hold the office conduct themselves. [] In England there are the profound criticisms scattered through the works of St. Thomas More; and St. John Fisher, the Bishop of Rochester, made his protest too. If the pope did not presently reform his court, said the future martyr, God would find a means to reform it for him. []

But by far the most striking protestation was that of the Dominican Jerome Savonarola, a very great figure indeed, and still the centre of lively controversy among Catholic scholars. [] Savonarola was born at Ferrara in 1452 and after a good humanist education in that centre of the Italian renaissance, sickened by the nascent paganism of life, and somewhat morbidly preoccupied already with the sinfulness of human nature, he offered himself to the Dominicans in 1475, joining, at Bologna, the austere reformed congregation of Lombardy. Fifteen years later, as the newly-appointed prior of San Marco at Florence, he broke into the Italian scene with the force of a thunderbolt. Yet once again the combination of a passionate austerity of life, of utter and absolute disinterestedness to all but the salvation of the hearer, of clear and exact theological understanding, and of the very perfection of the oratorical temperament and gifts, proved irresistible. Savonarola was, after

St. Bernadine of Siena, the greatest preacher of the Italian middle ages; and he was a pioneer in the new apologetic, the apologetic now beginning to be urgently necessary if the educated Catholics exposed to the seduction of the newly discovered pagan ideals were to be kept true to their belief. Within a couple of years the Dominican had conquered Florence. The gay, licentious capital had become a convent, said its cynical neighbours.

In no matter had Savonarola showed himself more outspoken and independent than in his condemnation of the Medici -- the founders and patrons of the very monastery he ruled, but, for the prior, the primary source of the city's sins, and the tyrannical oppressors of its liberties. And it was when the revolution of 1494 drove them out and Savonarola began, as the oracle of God, to be the inspiration of the new government of the republic, that there began also the stage in his career that could only end in tragedy. All Italy now -- save only Florence -- was combining to resist the French invader. The pope -- Alexander VI -- was naturally the leader in this combination, for Charles VIII not only menaced the Papal State, but, so it seemed, threatened immediately the pope's hold on the papacy itself. The king was urged on all sides to call a General Council, whose main business would be to depose the pope as a simonist and a man of evil life. And Savonarola, who had before this already begun to denounce in his sermons the pope's heinous sins, now began to preach that it was God's will -- revealed to him, Savonarola -- that Florence should be the French king's ally.

Alexander now summoned him to Rome (July 25, 1495) and when the Dominican managed to evade the summons, the pope forbade him to preach (September 8 and October 16). He even offered to make him a cardinal. [] For a while Savonarola was quiet, but after four months of silence he returned to his pulpit and took up again his mission to rebuke the sins of the pope. On May 12, 1497, Alexander excommunicated him. Whereupon the sermons against Alexander took a new turn. "Whoever excommunicates me," said the friar, "excommunicates God." In a series of letters prepared for the princes of Europe, [] he invited them to correct the pope's life and to thrust him out, for he was no pope, being elected by simony, and indeed not even believing in God; and the friar repeated the claim that his own mission was divine and that the excommunication was,

therefore, void in the sight of God. "If ever I ask absolution from this excommunication," he said, in sermons preached about this time, [] " may God cast me into the depths of hell, for I should, I believe, have committed thereby a mortal sin"; and again he declared that those who allowed that the excommunication had any force were heretics.

The illusion that had been the weakness of Savonarola's whole career was working out to the very fullness of its terrible possibilities. For, from the beginning, although his doctrine v. as always orthodox, Savonarola, in the whole of his preaching, gave himself out as a man directly inspired by God to say what he said and to direct the action of others. There must not ever be contradiction, or opposition, to what he proposed or ordered. He recounted in his sermons, as warrant for his assumption, his dreams and his visions, and he foretold in what events God would chastise this disobedient generation. Lorenzo de' Medici was shortly to die, and Innocent VIII also -- which came to pass. The French would come in and overthrow the sinful Medici tyranny; his own mission would last just eight years and he would then die at the stake and his ashes be cast into the Arno. This also came to pass. But the Turks were not converted in ten years, as he also had foretold, nor was Rome taken and sacked and filled with desolation.

This burning conviction of his divine call -- which no man must question -- had been the main force of all Savonarola's public action. It was the main secret of the amazing ascendancy over his own followers, which by 1497 had filled San Marco with a host of new Dominican recruits, [] and riveted upon Florence a kind of moral dictatorship, in which the prophet's followers were organised to observe and correct the vices of their neighbours, and children were trained to report the sins of their parents. All the exaggerations in Savonarola's views of human misconduct, and the crazy severity imposed indiscriminately for some years under his influence, bred of course an immense resentment. Under the surface Florence was seething with discontent. The Dominican's want of prudence, his wild, unmeasured denunciations, had been a source of anxiety to his own brethren -- and not merely to the relaxed monasteries of his order -- and his success had been extremely galling to the traditional rivals of his order, the Friars Minor. If ever his ascendancy were shaken, it would go hard with the Prior of San Marco. Long

before the time when he was convoking the Christian princes, half the city was watching for the chance to dethrone him. One defeat, and he would have no friend save his immediate disciples. And at Rome the pope knew, now, that when he chose to strike he could, with impunity, make an end of the embarrassing prophet.

In March 1498 the government of Florence -- threatened with an interdict by the pope -- induced Savonarola to desist from preaching. Alexander was not too pleased; they should have given an order, to which the friar ought obediently to have submitted. It was the scandal of his flagrant, rebellious -- and successful -- disobedience which, to the pope's mind, was the real crime. But although the Dominican was now silent, the controversy in Florence still raged, the Franciscans keeping up the attack and the Dominicans replying. Out of this pulpit warfare the final crisis suddenly flared. A Friar Preacher declared himself ready to go through fire to prove, by his survival, that his master was the prophet of God. A Franciscan publicly took his words at their literal value. He too would go through the fire. He would, he knew, be burned, but so would the other, and it was worth a life to expose the impostor. And so, on April 7, 1498, the government arranged the ordeal. An immense crowd gathered to watch. There were disputes about the procedure -- the Franciscans alleging that Savonarola might put a spell upon his champion; the Dominican demanding that he be allowed to carry the Blessed Sacrament as he walked through the flames. Out of this a theological dispute developed, and then came a storm and rain. Finally, to the disappointment of the crowds, the whole affair was put off.

The following day -- Palm Sunday -- the disappointed faction stormed the Dominican priory of San Marco, the authorities intervened, and arrested the prior and his two chief supporters in the community. When they sent the news to the pope, Alexander demanded that the accused should be sent to him for trial. This the republic refused, but they allowed Alexander's demand that the final sentence should be left to him. The prisoners were tortured, and on the admissions thus obtained -- Savonarola, it was said, confessing that he was an impostor -- condemned them. Then the pope sent to Florence as his commissaries Francisco Remolini, a Spanish canonist, who was his own kinsman, and Jerome Torrigiani, the aged and

vacillating Master-General of Savonarola's order. Once more -- May 19 -- the prisoners were tortured; once more there were admissions. The final scene took place on May 23, 1498. In the Piazza della Signoria, along with the scaffold, three platforms were erected. At the first Savonarola's fellow religious, the Bishop of Vaison, [] degraded the three [] from their priestly rank and religious status. Then the papal commissaries declared them proved guilty of schism and heresy -- and announced that the pope, in his mercy, offered them a plenary indulgence. Savonarola bowed his head in sign of acceptance. At the third platform were the civil authorities, to sentence the three to death. They were immediately hanged, their corpses burnt, and the ashes thrown into the Arno.

It was, of course, a terrible retribution for the wild, unmeasured language in which the Dominican had attacked the evil life of the monstrously bad man who then disgraced the chair of St. Peter, and for the endeavours he had made to dislodge him from it. But such were the ideas then, and for centuries yet to come, of the punishment appropriate to acts even less harmful socially than the calling in question of a ruler's right to the position he filled. Nevertheless, to choose the heresy process as the convenient instrument of the destruction of the friars was a scandalous perversion of justice -- it was the case of the Templars and of St. Joan all over again, but with the pope a leading agent in the wickedness.

There was no reaction to follow the death of the Prior of San Marco. A faithful few clung fast to all he had taught them, but the great commercial city continued on its even way, corrupted and contented, as did, for many years yet, the papal curia against whose scandals the great Dominican had witnessed.

The Church, in these opening years of the sixteenth century, is by no means a body devoid of spiritual life. In the seething Renaissance activity, spiritual forces are active, too; the supernatural finds a generous response. Abuses are extensive and no doubt a more potent cause of scandal in their actuality than can be realised by those who only know them in the two dimensions of the literary record -- but reform has definitely begun in more than one place; among the reformers there are serious men, high in authority? and the promise is good.

In Spain, for twenty years, there has been the great Franciscan primate Ximenes; in England St. John Fisher. If, in a monastery of the Austin Friars in Germany, Martin Luther is growing up to be the genius who will draw all the disease and discontent to a single blazing-point of revolt, in another house of the same order in Spain the young religious is maturing who, as St. Thomas of Villanueva, and Primate of Aragon, will atone for the long Borgia oppression of that see. In other centres in Spain other saints too are being formed, who will presently come forth to astound the world by their spiritual achievement, heroes of the authentic Christian type, men of prayer, utterly careless of self-interest or self-comfort (even in religion), wholly devoted to God, infinite in charity as in zeal: St. Peter of Alcantara, who will renew in all its splendour the authentic ideal of the Franciscans; St. Luis Bertrand, who will do as much for the Order of Preachers; St. John of God, who will found a new order of charitable workers; Blessed John of Avila, whose life as an evangelist will put new heart into the parochial clergy of Spain; and the Basque soldier in the service of Spain, now approaching the great moment of his conversion, Inigo Loyola. In England, in these same years, there is growing to maturity the generation of bishops which will presently apostatise, but the generation also of More and of Fisher, of the heroic Carthusians and the Friars Minor of the Observance. The weakest places are France and Germany and Italy. But in Italy there are signs of better things -- other signs besides those of indignation at the continued presence of abuses. In various cities of the north the saints are maturing who, within the next ten years, will found the much-needed new religious orders to face the new problems and needs: St. Jerome Aemilian founding the Somaschi, St. Antony Maria Zaccaria the Barnabites, St. Cajetan of Thiene -- from the very court of Julius II -- the Order of Theatines, whence was to come a whole new episcopate to be the chief executant of the reform. And, associated with this last saint, there has begun, so quietly that its early history is hard to trace, the as yet all but unknown Oratory of Divine Love. It is a brotherhood of priests and laymen, pledged to works of charity, meeting regularly for prayer in common. It began in Genoa in 1497, and now, in 1519, it is at work in Rome, where -- the happiest augury of all -- it has gathered in leading members of the curia of Leo X. In what seems universally agreed is the chief centre of all the mischief, there is set a pledge of better days. With all this, and with Cajetan and Erasmus and More in full active maturity of mind,

what prospects might not seem at last to be opening, after the dark days since Sixtus IV?

"Alors se leva Luther." []

▪ [*Back*](#)

▪ [*Index*](#)

▪ [*Forward*](#)



3. LUTHER

In no part of Europe was this flood of Christian life more turbulent than in Germany. Here indeed the waters were stormy, swirling over rocks scarcely hidden, and over deeps that no one suspected. Germany was tormented by its own special political problems: the fact of the hundreds of petty independent sovereigns who divided up the vast territories between the Meuse and the Vistula, and, its necessary consequence, the ceaseless ambitious rivalry of the half-dozen leading princely families to dominate the whole. In the countrysides there was the old social problem of an economy still based on serf labour; [] and in the towns the new social problem of a growing urban proletariat. In Germany, as in Italy and in the Low Countries, the new estate of the capitalist was rising rapidly to a place of first importance. [] Humanism was in its lusty springtide, a practical Humanism, impatient of old ways, eager -- with some -- to refashion the world by re-educating mankind after the model of the ancients, and in full emancipation from Christian restraints; while -- with others -- Humanism was going the way of Erasmus, planning a Christian revival in which the scandals that everywhere disfigured religious life should be made for ever impossible.

Nowhere, however -- so a practical man might have thought -- were the chances of religious revival more slender. Nowhere, for example, was there such anarchy in the lives of churchmen as in Germany. Here were two worlds of clerics, clearly marked off by a chasm hardly ever to be bridged: the bishops, abbots, prelates and beneficiaries of the innumerable chapters, princes and nobles always -- and the vast horde of the clerical proletariat. If we judged the lives of the generality of all these clerics by what, for hundreds of years now, has been the standard practice of the average cleric, we might feel it impossible to find words too black to describe its disorder. Certainly the situation was worse than in contemporary England or France, and even more dangerous than in Italy because it lacked the Italian levity about sacred things. In Germany all were in deadly earnest: the good men earnest against the wicked indifference of the ecclesiastical rulers, against their greed and their simony; the bad men earnest against the system which held them to obligations they

had for years neglected and broken through. As to the German attitude towards the Holy See, the whole nation, for generations now, had been consumed with resentment at what, seemingly, was now almost Rome's sole interest in Germany, its possibilities as a source of revenue for curial dignitaries. And if the German effort to reform the Roman Curia by shaking off its hold on Church revenues and Church appointments had ended long ago, so, too, the papacy had had to abandon, for the time, its long effort to break the monopoly of the German princes over nominations to high ecclesiastical office -- a first and main obstacle to religious reform, and one never finally overcome until the armies of the French Revolution swept away for ever all the last decayed remnants of the old medieval world.

When, from the depths of such a world, Martin Luther in 1517 came forth to address the Church universal, he also brought a new strength to the growing movement of Germany's consciousness of itself as a nation with a unique destiny; to the princes he offered not only the chance of taking to themselves, once and for all, the vast properties of the Church and its many states, but all the opportunity that must come to the State when religion ceases to be universal and supra-national and becomes a local thing; most of all was his appearance appropriate to the condition of German politics in that he brought a new kind of support and propaganda for a theory about the place of the Church in the State that offered advantages to all -- except to the clergy -- and to none more than to the princes. No setting could have been more appropriate for the appearance of the great anarch; nor could any man living have better typified the most serious aspects of the general disorder and decadence of Catholicism at that time than this Austin Friar, professor of theology in a Catholic university, and now about to offer the Church as a solution for its troubles a version of Christian teaching that would empty it of all Christian significance, making man, not God, the real focus of religious activity, divorcing morality from piety, and present conduct from the prospects of future salvation. Luther as a Christian force was to prove sterile; there would not follow upon his activities any betterment of the moral lives of his disciples, any advance in learning, any new peace through social renewal. Here again, the heresiarch is true to the forces that bred him, and to his generation. []

The occasion of the false prophet's appearance in the public life

of his time was a scandal that derived directly from Rome and the curia of Leo X, the preaching of a plenary indulgence proclaimed in aid of the fund to rebuild the Roman basilica over St. Peter's tomb. The uproar about indulgences which now, by reason of Luther's act, suddenly filled all central Germany in the winter of 1517, was not due to any one single cause. Luther's fire fell upon a train long laid. With the bishops of Germany, for example, the preaching of Roman indulgences within their jurisdiction had long been a sore subject; more than once, during the previous hundred years, this matter had brought them into conflict with the Holy See. And the particular indulgence which now proved Luther's great opportunity, was one which bishops outside Germany too had opposed, even before the indulgence had been made available to Germany; the primate of Spain, for example, the great reforming Franciscan, Cardinal Ximenes, had forbidden it to be preached there.

Indulgences -- it perhaps needs to be said -- are not a forgiveness of sins, nor have they ever been understood to be such; it was not as though this was claimed for them that they were criticised by these bishops or attacked by Luther. Indulgences are a remission of punishment justly due to sin, punishment to which sinners may remain liable even when the mercy of God has forgiven the sin. According to Catholic teaching such punishment would in part be "worked off" by the sinner's willing performance of good actions that went beyond the goodness to which he was bound. In the indulgence system the Church associated herself officially and solemnly with a man's willingness to make such special and "unobliged" exertions; the Church made these good actions her own, and making over to the forgiven sinner, to supply for his own deficiency, some part of the treasure of the infinite merits of the Passion of our Lord and of the satisfaction made by the saints, [] declared him relieved, by the authority divinely committed to her, from some of the punishment due. Indulgences -- remissions only of temporal [] punishment due for sin, and never of eternal punishment -- are also "applicable" to the souls in Purgatory; that is to say, they can profit the dead who, preparatory to entering Heaven, are purging the imperfections in which they died. But the Church has only authority to remit guilt and punishment over those of its members who are still alive. Indulgences, therefore, are not applied to the dead by a judicial act of direct absolution from punishment; they are profitable to

the dead as an official suffrage on the part of the Church, an intercession in which the Church offers for the dead the treasury of merits just described. Indulgences indeed -- so far as the dead are concerned -- are then, truly, no more than "a solemn form of prayer for the dead." []

Now, although it is the whole point of the system that, by means of it, man profits from the infinite merits of Our Lord and the goodness of his brethren the saints, realising thereby (in the most literal sense) "the communion of saints," man does not so profit without an exertion that is also his own activity; and this exertion, in the nature of things, cannot be any merely material, or purely natural exertion. It must be the act of a man united and reconciled to God by repentance and forgiveness and his own determination to persevere as God's friend; an act informed and enlivened by the supernatural virtue of charity - - whence the condition generally laid down explicitly in grants of plenary indulgences that the good act to the performance of which the indulgence is attached shall be accompanied by a sacramental confession of sins and the receiving of Holy Communion.

That "good act," the work of super-erogation -- to give it its technical name -- varies with the indulgence. It may be the recitation of prescribed prayers, or a pilgrimage, or some act of penitential austerity such as fasting, or it may be -- what since the Council of Trent it has never been -- the giving of a money alms to some specified work of piety.

The Council of Trent, some forty-six years after the Lutheran explosion, [] reformed the practical working of the indulgence system. Had one, at least, of the practices then reprobated been abolished a century earlier, Luther would have lacked his great opportunity. For the scandal of the great indulgence of 1517 arose in part from its association with money, though also, in part, from a wrong theory about indulgences held and taught by the priest commissioned to preach that indulgence.

Wittenberg -- the little town in whose newly-founded university [] Luther was already, in 1517, a great figure -- lay in the diocese of Brandenburg and in the ecclesiastical province of Magdeburg. The Archbishop of Magdeburg was Albrecht of Hohenzollern, [] a young and dissolute prince of the reigning family of Brandenburg. He was, at the same time, Bishop of Halberstadt,

and he had also managed to acquire the greatest Church dignity in Germany, the archiepiscopal see of Mainz, which made him not only the titular primate of Germany but one of the seven prince-electors of the empire.

The expenses of this last success had, however, been enormous. For his dispensation to hold the see of Mainz while retaining Magdeburg and Halberstadt, Albrecht had had to pay the Roman Curia 10,000 golden ducats, and for the appointment to Mainz another 14,000. For these immense sums [] the young archbishop turned to the great banking house of the Fugger. [] And when he then had to face the problem how to pay the banker, it was a simple expedient to come to terms with the Holy See about the indulgence for the rebuilding of St. Peter's. Albrecht had, so far, not allowed this to be preached in his jurisdiction. This, now, covered a good third of Germany, [] and when the archbishop offered to lift the ban, on condition that he received one half the alms offered -- which half should go to the Fugger in repayment of the money borrowed to settle Albrecht's account with the Roman Curia -- the pope, Leo X, agreed. Presently the new indulgence began to be preached throughout central Germany.

But it was not yet preached in Wittenberg. Here there stood in its way another vested interest, another complication of popular piety and revenues accruing by reason thereof. The ruler in Wittenberg was the Elector of Saxony, Frederick III called the Wise, and when the cavalcade of the indulgence preacher reached the frontiers of his state it found them barred against it. In the castle church at Wittenberg, which was also the university church, there was preserved one of the most famous of all collections of relics. The Elector -- like the Archbishop of Mainz -- was, in fact, a keen collector of relics and the church was a great centre of pilgrimages; for Frederick had secured for the relics rich indulgences, that amounted [] up to 127,000 years. For the Elector -- Luther's sovereign -- the new indulgence was simply a rival attraction against which local interests must be strongly protected. However, by the end of October 1517, the rival attraction was in the neighbourhood of Wittenberg, just across the frontier in fact; the indulgence was the burning topic of the hour, and the greatest feast in the Wittenberg calendar was fast approaching, All Saints' Day, the patronal feast of the castle-church, when the pilgrims would come in to the city in

their thousands. This church served also, as has been said, as the church of the university; it was here that degrees were conferred and the great university sermons preached. When, therefore, on the eve of the feast, October 31, 1517, Luther, Professor of Theology in the university, nailed to the door of the church a sheet challenging all comers to dispute a series of ninety-five theses [] on the subject of indulgences, his routine professorial gesture -- an academic contribution to the morrow's festivities -- summed up and brought to a point, and symbolised, a whole complex of exciting events and interests, local, general, social, political, religious.

There were local circumstances about the preaching of this particular indulgence which might have shocked many at the time, which gave any critic of the system an obvious opportunity, and which certainly shock the Catholic of later days as he looks back upon them. Great indulgences [] were so preached -- at that time -- that the affair closely resembled what later times have called a "mission." The actual announcement of the indulgence was preceded by a series of sermons calling sinners to repentance, sermons on the moral evils of the time, on God as the reward of the good and the vindicator of unrepented sin, on hell and heaven, on prayer and the means of persevering in grace. Then came an explanation of the doctrine of indulgences, the details of the indulgence now offered and an invitation to make use of it. What was shocking about the indulgence of 1517 was that upon the preacher's platform, by the side of the great coffer into which the alms were placed, there was also placed the desk where sat the representative of the bank, noting down what went into the chest and the appropriate amount due to the Fugger. And also, the archbishop lent his authority to a theory of the day about indulgences which was false; and the official preacher of the indulgence, a Dominican John Tetzel, published this theory broadcast. If the indulgence was to be gained for one who was dead it was not necessary -- according to this theory -- that the person who gained it should be in a state of grace; [] again, it was said that nothing but an offering of money was required to gain the indulgence for the dead; and Tetzel also taught [] that indulgences gained by the living for the benefit of the dead were gained infallibly -- that is to say, once the specified indulgenceact was accomplished, the soul of the deceased profited from it to the full, infallibly and immediately. []

Conditions could hardly have been more favourable for such a public onslaught on the indulgence-system as now began. But the famous ninety-five theses were not, by any means, the starting point of Lutheranism. They were little more than a kind of particular practical conclusion to propositions already advanced as true, and already the subject of violent discussion in the narrow world of two minor German universities. And to those fundamental propositions Luther had come, not by any activity of pure speculation, but as one driven to speculate by his own inner conflicts. The private lives of great men have scarcely any place in text books of general history, but exception needs to be made for the Augustinian Friar who now accomplished the revolution of the ages by producing a version of Christianity in which piety was divorced from morality. On that day of the memorable gesture, October 31, 1517, Luther was within eleven days of his thirty-fourth birthday; he had been a professed religious for something more than eleven years, a priest for something more than ten. How he came to enter the monastery, the way in which he lived the monastic life, the whole character and temperament of the man who gave himself to religion, the intellectual formation he had then -- at twenty-one years of age -- achieved, and the quality of that which followed: some knowledge of all these is vital to the understanding of what was now about to begin. For although Luther did not create the conditions [] that made possible the dramatic success of his great assault, that assault, like others before it, would have been no more than a great historical incident, had it not been that the rebel, this time, was one of the Titans of history. The question what manner of man the Titan was is all important; and for more than fifty years now a vast new literature has been endeavouring to answer it.

At the time of Luther's birth [] his father, Hans Luther, was only a poor copper miner; but long before the son had found his monastic vocation, the father had left poverty behind and was a flourishing mine-owner. Nevertheless, Martin Luther really knew poverty as a child, and hardship and, the greatest hardship of all, an over-severe parental discipline. Nowhere, it is believed, does he ever speak of his mother with affectionate reminiscence. He was sent to various schools, and at one time to the school kept by the Brothers of the Common Life at Eisenach, which gives him a certain kinship with Nicholas of

Cusa and with Erasmus too. In 1501 he was entered at the university of Erfurt, his father resolute to make his son a lawyer. Here, for a while, he continued his education in polite letters, reading Ovid and Virgil and Horace, Juvenal and Terence and Plautus, but no Greek. And he now made his first acquaintance with Aristotle, studying the works on logic, the physics and the De Anima. In August 1502, Luther took his bachelor's degree; and then, in preparation for the master's degree, he spent a further two years in philosophical study, ethics now and politics, metaphysics, natural philosophy and general mathematics -- all according to the Via moderna, as might be expected in one of the new universities. Luther has come down to us reputed a good, hard-working student, moody, and something of a musician. In January 1505 he took his M.A. and entered the Law School.

Of Luther's studies in the Corpus Iuris Civilis we know nothing, except that they were to him uncongenial studies. They did not last long however, for in the July of that same year, to the dismay of his family and friends, and despite their strong opposition, Luther became a novice in the Erfurt house of the Austin Friars. It was, perhaps, the rashest act of his whole life, and certainly the most serious. There is not, so far as we know, anywhere, any hint of an inclination in Luther, either to the priesthood or to the monastic life, prior to July 2, 1505, on which day as this young law-scholar of twenty-one was riding back to Erfurt, after a visit to his home, now in Magdeburg, there was a sudden violent thunderstorm, and a bolt falling in a nearby field threw him to the ground. The moody, highly-strung Luther vowed to St. Anne in his terror that if he lived he would become a monk. The Augustinians, at that time, dominated the university of Erfurt. It was natural enough that Luther should offer himself to them, and -- incredible as the thing sounds to modern ears -- just fifteen days after the rash, and certainly invalid vow, they accepted the promising young man as a novice.

Luther, says the sympathetic and experienced religious who is one of the greatest of his biographers, [] was not made for the monastic life. He was, indeed, highly-gifted, he was generous, impulsive and his life as a student had been good and orderly and pious. But there was about him a permanent inclination to melancholy; he was fear-ridden, guilt-haunted, a natural depressive. It is the last temperament to find the monastic life

congenial, let alone helpful; and what if the motive for embracing that life is the wholly mistaken motive of fear, and fear that is natural and temperamental only? How long would such a subject last in the novitiate of any order to-day? How long would any order be willing to retain him?

Luther entered the novitiate dominated by his recent terrible, psycho-physical experience. His life-long agitation did not cease; the terrors that afflicted him did not disappear; the friar's habit worked no miracle of changing the material fabric of the unfortunate man. The moody, highly-strung student was a moody, highly-strung novice, with the violent alternations of hope and despair, of joy and depression, which characterise the type; and, always, his anxieties about himself were the main activity of his inner life.

One year after his reception the novice took the solemn vows that bound him for life (July 1506); in the autumn following he received the subdiaconate, and, on April 3, 1507, he was ordained priest, nine months after his profession, and less than two years after his first reception as a novice. He then began his theological studies. [] They really lasted no longer than eighteen months, for in the autumn of 1508 Luther was sent to Wittenberg, where, only six years before, a university had been founded, to lecture on Aristotle's Ethics, continuing to study theology at the same time. He was, however, given his bachelor's degree in theology in March 1509; and in the autumn of that same year he began himself to lecture in theology, as an assistant to the professor. He thus lectured as a bachelor for twelve months (1509-1510), first at Erfurt and then at Wittenberg. In the winter of 1510-1511 he made his famous visit to Rome, and upon his return he took up once more his Wittenberg appointment. On October 19, 1512, he received his doctor's degree, and was given entire charge of the Wittenberg school of divinity: he was now twenty-nine.

We are approaching the decisive moment of Luther's life. He is about to lecture, as a doctor, not on the text of Peter Lombard in the spirit of the *via moderna* but, according to his commission and in imitation of his predecessor and fellow- religious -- Johann Staupitz -- upon the text of Holy Scripture. It is not Ockhamist theology that will occupy him now, but more practical matters. Luther had found law uncongenial and

philosophy too, and also theology in the technical sense of the term -- sciences, all of them, which call for an activity that is intellectual. Luther, however, is the artist, the poet, the musician; he is the orator, the fascinating lecturer, the man of impulse and creative imagination. He has turned from the repugnant intellectualism, shirked the discipline by which alone man's mind can come to a knowledge of natures and essences, and of reasons why. And, like every other rational and sentient being, he has his difficulties and perplexities, fruit of his rational and sentient nature. Like many another Catholic thinker [] who is deaf to theology he is now about to look to a mysticism divorced from theology for the answers he stands in need of. His reading, henceforth, is the text of Holy Scriptures and the writings of the mystics, the one interpreted by the other, and the whole read, studied and understood by the light of the conflicting fires burning within his own breast; they are researches, also, where it is urgent for the student to have his answer quickly. The personal contrast with -- say -- St. Thomas could not be greater.

The way out, it seems to Luther, is through "mysticism", the "mystical" use of Holy Scripture. The amateur theologian -- for so, by any standard, Luther must surely be judged -- is about to use the mystics as a guide to life, and, inevitably, he is about to make a mess of the business. He will not use the only key, the theologian's explanation of the doctrines the mystics express in their own personal and more vivid fashion; and so, with the characteristic first vice of the imprudent man, he precipitates himself into Gerard Groote and the *Theologia Germanica*, [] into Tauler and pseudo-Denis. There will result a mysticism in which the cross has no place, a mysticism ordered to Luther's own most burning need, namely assurance and consolation felt and experienced in the heart; and ultimately -- the inevitable end of any such system -- he will fall victim to the spiritual fallacy called presumption, to the belief and even obsession that "I am called by a special way." It was with such an attention to "my special case" that the great and anxious research began. It is with this that it ends. But now what was at first an anxiety has been discovered to be, in reality, the foundation of God's system to save mankind; Luther's case is the case of all mankind, and the saved all pass through the same set of crises, viz., conviction of sin, temptation to despair, conviction and assurance: "I am saved".

By 1517, when the indulgence crisis arose, Luther's religious position was all but complete. It is gradually worked out in his Wittenberg lectures of the previous five years, lectures on the Psalms, on the Epistle to the Romans and on the Epistle to the Galatians. Before we come to the great principles in which that position is summed up, it needs to be pointed out against what a background of active life they were developed. Always one of the most striking characteristics of Luther is his tireless energy, the way in which he throws himself into a host of simultaneous and often unrelated activities. It was so in these critical last years of his Catholic life. As a student of theology he can never be said to have enjoyed over-much leisure to reflect on what he was learning; as a commentator discovering the true meaning of some of the stiffest books of Holy Scripture he was in no better case. The letter in which Luther himself describes the multiplicity of occupations with which his witless Augustinian superiors allowed this popular figure to burden himself, may be quoted once more. " I really ought to have two secretaries or chancellors. I do hardly anything all day but write letters. . . . I am at the same time preacher to the monastery, have to preach in the refectory, and am even expected to preach daily in the parish church. I am regent of the house of studies and vicar, that is to say prior eleven times over; I have to provide for the delivery of the fish from the Leitzkau pond and to manage the litigation of the Herzberg friars at Torgau; I am lecturing on Paul, compiling lectures on the Psalter, and, as I said before, writing letters most of the time. . . . It is seldom that I have time for the recitation of the Divine Office or to celebrate Mass, and then, too, I have my peculiar temptations from the flesh, the world, and the devil." []

Luther is not, here, writing a statement meant for the critical examination of a hostile court. It is a friendly letter to a friend, in which there is room for the exaggeration that will not deceive and that is not meant to deceive. Luther was, no doubt of it, as active as he was capable, but the groans are not, therefore, all to be taken at their full face-value. Nor need we fasten on the reference to the flesh, and, oversimplifying a very complex business, see in this the key that explains all. Luther was, later on, to coin the phrase *Concupiscentia invincibilis* and to say *Pecca Fortiter*, and to marry in despite of his monastic vow, and to speak with the most revolting coarseness of sex life in general and of his own relations with his wife. [] Nevertheless,

in his life as an Austin Friar, it was not in his body [] that the trouble was seated which, at times, all but drove him crazy, nor in his intelligence, but rather in his intensely active imagination. What never ceased to haunt him, seemingly, was the thought of eternal punishment; and not so much the thought that he might in the end lose his soul, as that he was already marked out for hell by God. Here was the subject of the long, often-repeated, discussions with Staupitz, his friend and one-time master and present superior. And it is, once again, a measure of the theological decadence in certain university circles that this professor was not able to dispel the young monk's fears by an exposition of the traditional teaching that no man loses his soul except by his own free deliberate choice, that God is not and cannot be the cause of the sin that merits hell. All Staupitz could do was to remind Luther of the infinite mercy won for man by the merits of the passion of Christ. But to the mind which, unaware of the nature of the problem, was wrestling, unequipped, with the mystery of man's predestination to grace and to glory, these counsels availed little. To one whose mind held the notion of a divine reprobation -- that those who went to hell went there, in ultimate analysis, because God destined them to hell when He created them -- the very thought of the Passion was an additional torture, and Luther has told us how, at times, he could not look upon the crucifix.

Here too, no doubt, is the secret of those terrible scenes, the convulsive panics that seized on him from time to time as a friar: the attempted flight from his first mass; the horror and terror in which he said mass, or walked in procession beside the priest who carried the Blessed Sacrament. [] It became the great anxiety and need of Luther's life that he should know that he was among those predestined to be saved, be free from all doubt that he could not lose his soul.

Once again, we must beware of over-simplifying. The genesis of the specifically Lutheran doctrines is, no doubt, not wholly to be sought in this dominant characteristic. But Luther's own needs -- which he came to see as the common problem of all mankind -- went undoubtedly for much, as he studied and put together the lectures on such classic treatises about God's grace as the Epistles of St. Paul to the Romans and to the Galatians. And once he had found his doctrine, if it was as an emancipator of mankind that he published it, it was, at the same time, with his

great cry of personal liberation that he gave it to the world.

Luther did not, of course, come to his study of St. Paul with a mind devoid of theological notions. His conception of God for example -- as a Being omnipotent and arbitrary -- he derived from his Ockhamist masters. [] And what they stated and discussed as ways through which God might have arranged the work of sanctification and salvation, Luther proposed as the ways God actually chose. " From the moment when Luther learnt Ockham's doctrine, he necessarily lost all definite notion of what the supernatural is, all understanding of the necessity, the essence and the efficaciousness of sanctifying grace and, in a general way, of the supernatural virtues." [] Nor could it have been otherwise. The whole of Ockham's influence is the history of the disappearance of certitude; of the end of all grasp of reality, and of clear, distinct thought. And it was from Ockham, also, that Luther derived one of the two main elements of his own peculiar system, the idea, namely, that the whole work of grace and of salvation is something altogether external to man -- in cause and in effect. It is, for Luther, wholly and purely the act of God. Man's action can have no share in it, except in so far as God accepts that action as meritorious. As things are, so Ockham declares, such human acts must be the acts of a personality united to God by supernatural charity, acts of a soul possessed by sanctifying grace; but only as things are. For God could, in His Omnipotence, just as well accept as meritorious acts done by his enemies, the acts of souls devoid of sanctifying grace, the acts of souls given over to unrepented mortal sin. From Ockham the tradition had come down through a succession of masters. Gregory of Rimini has the same teaching, so has Peter d'Ailly, so has Gabriel Biel. [] It is not inherently impossible for man -- so they all concur -- to be accepted by God as meriting, even though he does not possess charity. Man could, on the other hand, be God's enemy even though he does possess charity. And he could pass from the state of enmity to friendship without any change in himself -- for the whole basis of man's relations with God is God's arbitrary attitude of acceptance or non-acceptance of his acts.

All this -- said the Ockhamist tradition -- was possible; this could be the way in which all would happen. Luther, meditating the mystery, and his own problem, thought he saw that, if this possible way were indeed the actual way, his problem was

solved. He first seized on the notion of sanctification as a thing external to the soul; it resolved the difficulty arising from his position that man, by original sin, was wholly and for ever corrupted in his essence, [] incapable therefore for ever of any works really good. How could fallen man -- if this were his state -- do aught towards his sanctification? But, were sanctification something external to man's action, the cloak of the infinite merits of Christ thrown in pity around man's infinite wretchedness, to cover over his truly hopeless state -- did this indeed suffice, then the problem of man's own condition under the cloak would cease to be. Man's own sinfulness, the necessary effect of the poison of original sin working in him, can have no effect upon his eternal destiny once, clad in the robe of Christ's merits, he is accepted by God as justified. No sin, committed by such a man, would give the devil any hold upon him.

The Lutheran theory is not yet complete -- the all-important element is lacking which shall give man assurance, from outside the theory, that it is something more than a theory that seems to solve the terrible problem. But, even so, the logical, practical consequences of the theory are evident. If this doctrine be true, then the whole elaborate fabric of the theory and practice of good works as necessary for salvation is but a sham. Works of penance, in particular, are not only useless but blasphemous; they are acts based on a false theory, they are a standing contradiction to the saving truth. There is no point in prayer as a petition, and the whole sacramental system goes -- except as a sign or gesture affirming belief in God as Saviour. With the sacramental system there must disappear too, the clerical body, as a priesthood; as propagandists and teachers they may yet survive individually, and be organised. The very Church ceases to have any *raison d'être* as such.

Not all these consequences were immediately drawn out, either by Luther or by his opponents. The immediate discussion centred around the fundamental principles, and in the twelve months that preceded the appearance of Tetzel and the great indulgence drive, Wittenberg was filled with conflict. There was, for example, the disputation of September 1516, when a pupil of Luther officially defended theses to the effect that man's nature is utterly powerless to do good; there were the lectures on Galatians in which Luther developed his views, and more

lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews; there was, above all, the great disputation of September 4, 1517, on ninety-seven theses directed against Scholasticism, when " the bitterness of innumerable priests, monks, preachers and university professors that, for two centuries at least, had been accumulating against the Scholastic philosophy found at last its complete expression." [] Luther was carrying all before him; none could compete with him as a speaker, and the publication of the theses against Indulgences, only eight weeks later, is a measure of his success, no less than it is a testimony to his boldness; their publication also served, and it is the real importance of the event, to bring Luther's new version of the Christian dispensation before the whole Christian world. Long before Rome's solemn condemnation of it (June 15, 1520) [] Luther's theory was discussed and fought over in every university of Christendom.

And long before that -- within a few months, indeed, of the move against the doctrine of Indulgence -- Luther had found the last vital element for his teaching. How shall a man know whether he is accepted of God, predestined, and not marked for hell? This acceptance is something external to him; justification does not change him; he is not any better, once he has gained it. That he is no better is, indeed, no proof that he is not justified. But how can man know with certainty that he is justified, accepted? The test is simple; the touchstone is his possession of faith. For the just man lives by faith alone -- not by faith which is the assent of the intelligence to God revealing the sacred doctrines, but by faith which is a firm confident belief that God has predestined one to glory as one of the accepted. It is this faith alone, so Luther henceforth held, [] which makes man accepted by God. Possession of this faith is the proof that one is accepted. Possessed of this faith man lives. For those who so believe, salvation is certain. And all men who come to attain this belief come to it through a stage of anxious tormenting doubt and temptations to despair. Luther's case is the case of all mankind. The religious reflection of his almost congenital phobia is a stage in his understanding that he is saved. The "dark night" has not issued in any purification of sense, but in an assurance that impurities do not matter, in the certitude that whatever happens one is saved. The great discovery is complete. "Christianity is nothing but a perpetual exercise in feeling that you have no sin, although you committed sin, but that your sins

are attached to Christ" -- Luther's own summary of the matter. []

This is not an attempt to sketch even the outline of Protestantism, the religion of the churches that issued from the Reformation [] -- still less, of course, is it meant as a critique of Protestants. It is no more than an endeavour to explain Luther's own personal doctrinal invention; [] the starting point of his career as a destroyer of Catholicism and as one of the founders of the later Reformed Churches, the source of his strength and confidence and courage. The history of what he accomplished, of the evolution of a new church, of its immediate and willing subordination to the state, of the development of Lutheranism into Protestantism, cannot be separated from the later story of Catholicism, the story of the Catholic revival, of the Council of Trent and of the movement that has been called -- not too happily -- the Counter-Reformation; nowhere does the seamless web of history suffer greater harm than when the story of Luther is separated from that of our own modern age. It must therefore find its place in the concluding volume of this work. But something also needs to be said about Luther as the last of the medievals -- none the less truly a medieval man for being a great heretic.

There has never been any disposition, whether among Luther's critics or his supporters, from the reformer's time down to our own, to deny that he did much more than change people's purely religious beliefs and practices. Never, in fact, has there been a more striking demonstration than the Reformation that religion is the central activity of all human life. There is a lyrical description of Luther's accomplishment in one of the greatest of modern German historians, [] that will serve as an example of this view. It will also serve to introduce what still needs to be said in order to explain the monstrosity which Lutheranism seemed to the Catholics of Luther's time. "A new world," says this historian, "has come into being. One of the twin peaks of Christendom has crumbled away. . . . The spiritual power has disappeared. . . . Never before did man see such an overturning of political and juridical ideas. . . . All those ideas from which the State of modern times derives -- autonomy of the State's law, final sovereignty of the lay authority, the State's recognised exclusive hold on public action -- find in the Lutheran reformation their religious foundation and, thereby, their power to spread. The Reformation was not only a renewal of religion: it

was a rebirth of the world in every respect."

The final importance of Luther, indeed, did not lie in the new theological ideas he invented, but in the fact that by combining with them existing theologico-social ideas he gave to these last the authority proper to religious belief; they are as fatal to the full natural development of the human personality, as the theological invention was fatal to Christianity itself. The anti-Christian social ideas and ideals of the last two hundred years and more were now presented as Christianity itself, and were presently organised in a new Christian Church, which was the active rival and bitter foe of the traditional Church whose president was the Roman pope. To that new conception of Christianity first of all, and then to that new Church, Luther rallied the greater part of Germany and Scandinavia; in the next generation -- under other reformers of kindred spirit, attached to the same fundamental theological discovery -- Switzerland and Holland and Scotland and England were likewise "reborn," while a powerful attempt was made to secure France also for the new world.

What were the distinguishing principles of this world, what was the* relation to the essence of Lutheranism, and what was the first appeal of the system to the nation among which it was first published?

That appeal was something much more lasting than any implied mere general invitation to monks and nuns and priests to throw over their religious obligations, something much more fundamental than the prospect of unhindered moral licence; to such saturnalia -- and, of course, there followed in Germany an indescribable saturnalia [] -- there always succeeds a period of reaction; even the loosest of mankind is in the end too bored to keep it up. Nor was it by publishing broadcast his theological lectures on the Epistles of St. Paul, that Luther roused Germany to his support. He did it by attacking, with new skill, with humour, and new boldness, the pope's hold on Germany as a source of income; he satirised the pope's claim to be the Holy Father of Christendom while presiding over such an establishment as the Roman Curia and Court of those days could be made to seem, and in great part actually was; and he offered the ruling classes of Germany a practical programme that would make them supreme in German life, and that

appealed explicitly to the notion that it is Germany's destiny to rule mankind for mankind's greater good and happiness. It was in half a dozen writings put out chiefly in the years 1520 and 1521, that Luther laid the foundation of all that construction which the historian just quoted sees to have been built by later times. In the Sermon on Good Works, for example, the pope is denounced as the real Turk, exploiting the simplicity of Germans and sucking the marrow out of the national life. The Church, Luther explained in another tract -- On the Roman Papacy -- cannot need a visible head, for it is itself an invisible thing. That "power of the keys," possession of which is the basis of the pope's position, is in reality the common possession of all true believers; nor is it at all a power of government, but the assurance which Christians give to one another that their sins are not held against them, and thereby administer to one another the consolation and encouragement that sinners need as they face the fact of the divine moral law which it is beyond man's power to observe. This tract, like almost everything that Luther was now writing, is salted with vigorous, crude invective. But the classic instruments of this first propaganda were three pamphlets which appeared in 1520, the Address to the Nobility of the German Nation, the Babylonian Captivity of the Church and the Liberty of the Christian Man. []

The first of these [] sketches the main lines which the needed Reformation ought to follow. Annates are to be abolished and no more money sent out of Germany to Rome; no more foreigners are to be named to German benefices, and all papal jurisdiction in Germany, spiritual or temporal, is to be abolished; pilgrimages to Rome are to be abolished also, along with religious guilds, indulgences, dispensations, holidays that are feasts, and masses for the dead. All believers are priests -- Scripture says so -- and this principle is developed to show that the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and the clerical state, are merely human inventions and have no real place in the Christian Church. Excommunication, therefore, is but a meaningless word. Again, since the special institution of ecclesiastical authority has no justification (is, indeed, contrary to Scripture), it is the prince who must preside over the believers. It is the prince who will protect the true interests of the Church, reforming and correcting as is found necessary, and taking over the property held by the usurped authority of the self-styled ecclesiastical power. For centuries this ecclesiastical power, in the person of

the popes, has claimed certain rights over the emperors. The truth is that the empire alone is a reality, and the pope ought to surrender to it even Rome itself. If Christendom and the empire are, indeed, one, it is the emperor who is supreme and the imperial power is the heritage of the German race. The noble princes then must regain by force those benefices which the popes have " unjustly " taken to themselves; the monks must free themselves from their vows; the priests must "steal from the pope" their right to marry and live like laymen. Here we can see how Luther, the reformer of abuses in religion, incidentally makes provision for "all those immense, disorderly dreams which, for more than a hundred years, have been troubling the German heart: reform of the Church in head and members in the sense of a return to its spiritual, purely evangelical principle; reform of the empire in the sense of a State which shall be stronger, more organic, and capable, if not of dominating Europe, at least of guaranteeing to Germany full economic and cultural independence." []

The Babylonian Captivity, subject of the second pamphlet named, [] is the tyranny of the papacy over the Church of Christ. Its origins lie in the long falsification of Christian doctrine; and Luther sets out, in systematic opposition, his own teaching on the meaning of the Sacraments and their place in a Christian's life. There are but three sacraments in the real sense of the word, Baptism, the Holy Eucharist, and Penance, and their effectiveness is wholly a matter of the faith of the recipient. There is no sacrifice in the second of these sacraments, and the Mass is simple devilish wickedness.

More important, however, than the detail either of the abuses which Luther recommends the nobles to sweep away, or of the traditional doctrines and practices he now repudiates, is the teaching of the third and shortest of these tracts, The Liberty of a Christian Man. [] This is an eloquent plea for the central Lutheran doctrine that one thing alone is needed for justification-faith; [] that without this faith nothing avails. Luther's first target had been good works done in a Pelagian spirit, done, that is to say, with the idea that the mere human mechanic of the action secures of itself deliverance from sin. No one had had more to say about the spiritual worthlessness of such works than Luther's own contemporary and adversary Cajetan, and what Cajetan had to say was no more than a commonplace with

Catholic preachers and writers then as now, and indeed always. [] But Luther went far beyond this. Although the just man would do good works -- as a good tree brings forth good fruit [] -- there was not, and there could not be, any obligation on the justified believer to do good works. He did good works -- but freely, out of love for his neighbour, or to keep his body subject to his soul; he did them as the natural acts of a soul that was justified. To omit them -- a possibility which Luther, in this part of his theory, did not envisage -- would not have entailed sin: "It is solely by impiety and incredulity of heart that a man becomes guilty, and a slave of sin, deserving condemnation; not by any outward sin or work." [] This goes far beyond any mere reaction against such a false theory as that mechanical religious activities are sufficient to reconcile a sinner with God whom he has offended.

Here we touch again what one of Luther's German editors [] has called the divorce between piety and morality; for "Sin we must, while we remain here; this life is no dwelling place of justice. The new heavens and earth that shall be the dwelling place of righteousness we yet await, as St. Peter says. It is enough that we confess through the riches of God's glory the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world; from Him sin will not tear us away, even if thousands and thousands of times a day we fornicate or murder." [] Here is a truly revolutionary mischief, and it has its reflection in the new theory which Luther came to put out -- in the name of religion and as a part of Christian teaching -- about the kind of thing the State is, about man's relation to the State and the obedience he owes it; for in this theory there is a divorce between law and morality.

Luther is impatient of the old distinction between the spheres of what is known naturally and what can be known only by a divine revelation, as he is impatient of the careful scholastic delimitation of the spheres of nature and grace. He would, indeed, abolish the philosophical study of natures and causes and ends; Aristotle, because the chief inspiration here of such thinkers as were Christians, was the greatest of all mischiefs, "an accursed, proud, knavish heathen. . . . God sent him as a plague for our sins." [] His ethics, and his metaphysics, ought to be everywhere destroyed. [] The Christian, for an answer to his questionings about these matters, should go to Sacred Scripture and to Sacred Scripture only. Thither now went Luther. [] Like every other Catholic who has committed the blunder of

refusing the natural reason its proper place, and its rights within that place, he fell into the most egregious confusion between the natural and the supernatural and so, necessarily, proceeded to a catastrophic misunderstanding of the supernatural. Taking the Bible as a divinely meant source of knowledge about natural reality, and consulting it about that natural thing, the State Luther proceeded to apply what it had to say about the religious law of the ancient Hebrews to the civil affairs of Germany in his own time. He read in St. Paul that "The law is not made for the just man, but for the unjust and the wicked" [] and, combining what he thought to be the application of this text with his own theory about man becoming just by faith alone, he henceforth saw the state as made up of two kinds of men: the believers who were just, the good men, subject to no authority but that of the Holy Spirit -- and the unbelieving wicked. It was because of these last that there had to be princes and States and civil government. The good would always remain good, because justified. The wicked would never be anything else but wicked, and they would be in the majority always. Wickedness, in fact, is for Luther supreme in human life, and must be so; it is the very nature of things, mankind having by original sin become the possession of the devil and human nature wholly corrupt. States, then, there must be, not only for the protection of the good against the wicked, but for the conservation of some external moral order amongst the unbelieving wicked upon whom the Holy Spirit has no effect. The State is, in fact, God's agent -- His sole agent -- for the work of ruling mankind and keeping it from growing morally worse; [] it is the divinely founded guide of man in morals, and it is divinely authorised to punish man for his infractions of morality as the State proclaims it. If we look closer at this Lutheran State, it closely resembles the state of Marsiglio's ideal, in this at least that power is its very essence. The State is Authority; whatever it decrees is, by the fact, right and must not ever be resisted; and wherever there is power, there is authority. Authority is always right; the fact of punishment is a proof of guilt; and the prince has a duty to be habitually merciless, since his role is that of "God's executioner." The most fitting symbol of his authority is the naked sword: ". . . Christians are rare people on earth. Therefore stern, hard, civil rule is necessary in the world, lest the world become wild, peace vanish, and commerce and common interests be destroyed. . . . No one need think that the world can be ruled without blood. The civil sword shall and must be red

and bloody." [] Here, in all its simplicity, is the theory of the State as essentially a policeman, [] with its whole activity concentrated between the courthouse and the gallows; it is a theory that will dominate the political thought of all the Reformers. []

Let it be said that Luther did not work out this theory, which so exalts the State that its subjects must fall below the human level of responsible freedom, merely as so much compliment and flattery to the princes his protectors; any more than he worked it out as believing these princes to be men of personally holy, or even reputable, lives. It is all disinterested; it flows from the new truth; Luther is "sincere." And if the tiny minority of the just, almost lost among the wicked subjects for whom this monstrous power has been divinely devised, suffer from the severity of the prince -- it is always unjust in regard of the just -- they must be content to suffer, and reverently to see in it a manifestation of the just anger of God.

This is a barbarous notion of the State indeed; and what a regression it represents by comparison with the theories of Luther's contemporaries Erasmus and More. Its effect, in practice, must be the same as the effect of Machiavelli, but, in one highly important respect, Luther is more effective by far than the Italian atheist. For Luther is, in his own mind, and in the mind of the century that follows, a religious teacher. He does not so much devise political theories as present Christians with a new notion of their civic obligations as Christians, and present the princes with a new religious conception of their office as rulers. Once Luther saw all this as a main truth of religion, a truth closely related to and in part flowing from the doctrines he held to be central, he riveted it on all his people, as he won them over to the new conception of Christianity.

What will be the nature and office of law, in the Christian State as Luther conceives this? The new doctor will have nothing to do with the traditional Catholic conception of earthly justice as the reflection of -- and man's share in -- the objective eternal order of the Divine Intelligence, an order first communicated to man's intelligence through the natural law. The Lutheran doctrine that Original Sin has wholly corrupted man's nature makes any such sharing an impossibility: man is nothing but sin, enmity towards God and, moreover, his will is not a free will

but a will definitely enslaved, and captive to the devil. For such a being, the law in the Divine Intelligence is something too perfect ever to be fulfilled.

The order of justice divinely established is not an objective reality, not an actual equilibrium of actions objectively considered, belonging ad esse rei. [] And because it is wholly a matter of divine acceptation, the centre of all morality is the arbitrary will of God directing as it pleases the passive human hand. This notion of the will of God, as no less arbitrary than supreme, is reflected in Luther's ideas about human positive law.

Law is not subject to any consideration of morals or of reason. What it commands cannot be wrong nor unreasonable. Law only needs to be stated to have, immediately, all its power to oblige. As justice is whatever God likes, so law is whatever the prince likes; and, because it is the prince's act as prince, law is always an expression of the divine action upon the world, and so, sacrosanct -- although it remains no more than "a power to command and to compel" [], and cannot ever oblige a man in conscience. It can never be wrong for the prince to command wrongdoing, and to his commands the subject must always render external obedience at any rate. There is -- in this system -- no means by which the human reason can relieve the human subject of his obligations to submit to whatever the State decrees. *Ius divinum quod est ex gratia non tollit ius humanum quod est ex lege naturali* -- so the great synthesis of St. Thomas had proclaimed. Luther denied that there was such a thing as natural law; there could not exist any human right deriving therefrom. And as for the role, in human affairs, of the divine, Luther roundly stated the very converse of St. Thomas's liberating concept, declaring that "the Gospel does nothing to lighten human law." []

What we are now given, in fact, is a theory of the divine right of the *fait accompli* in public affairs, and of the duty of Christian man to put up with whatever is ordained for him. What an answer -- and a final one -- in the name of the newly- discovered evangelical Christianity, to the long claim of religion to fix a standard for princely conduct ! The ghosts of the Ghibelline legists must have rejoiced at the triumph of the new servitude, and smiled to see the State freed now from the control of

Christian morality in the very name of Christian revelation ! The religious peculiarities of Luther's revolution would, in the course of the centuries, suffer more than a sea change. They would pass, and be accounted of no importance, even to those heirs of Luther who continued, gratefully, to reverence his work and even his personality. But this at least would endure, the notion namely that the State, a lay thing, is exclusively sovereign because it stands alone as an authority representing the social order. As such the State has a moral and religious character and role, rendering needless the Church as a public thing. Here is the Reformation's essential political idea, [] the sole positive idea to we that vast transformation any real unity.

Throughout the fifteenth century the demand for the reformation of the Church had, in Germany, gone hand in hand with desire for political change. It was, then, in keeping with the spirit of the time, that the prophet, when ultimately he appeared, should be also something of a political philosopher. Quite apart from the undoubted fact that Luther, brought face to face with the papacy as a force bound to work for his destruction, realised that in the State was the papacy's own born enemy, [] there was a kind of inevitability in this development.

The State also could serve -- and could alone serve -- as an agent for the reform of religion. Here is the last element that completes the Lutheran new world, the subjection of religion to the State, the transformation of the State, indeed, into a kind of Church. To understand it we need to recall a distinction which Luther made between the real Church which is invisible (and subject to none but God) and all that organisation which comes into existence from the moment when a score of believers meet for worship, and by the very fact of their meeting, if only for the time of their meeting.

So far, down to these opening years of the sixteenth century, religion, in spite of many defeats and the constant hostility of the princes, had successfully maintained its place as the rightful, ultimate inspiration of the whole social order -- And by religion is meant an institution whose rights and supremacy as an institution were acknowledged by all princes, in all states, the Catholic Church; an independent, sovereign thing, to which all belonged, by which all were effectively ruled. This independence of religion was bound up with the admitted real distinction

between the two authorities, the temporal and the spiritual, both of them sovereign over mankind, each in its own domain; and although the conflicts between the two were frequent, even continuous along the frontier where they met, no State ever contested the principle that the Church, within its own sphere, was as truly sovereign as the State itself. In practice this meant that the State could never claim a sovereignty that was absolute; it must always take account of the rights of religion, and avoid action that would trespass on functions considered as indispensable to the Church's spiritual mission. [] It is this sovereign independence of religion as a visible public power, this place of the Church in the life of the community, that Luther attacks and, wherever his theories gain a hold, destroys. And he does this by denying the validity of the traditional distinction between the two authorities, and by his new theory that the State is absolute by right divine.

The real Church, for Luther, is an invisible thing and purely spiritual. It is subject to God alone and within it there is no law but only love. True enough, the Church is made up of men and women who are visible, and these come together and perform each his own appointed ritual part. But since all believers are priests, those who officiate are not clergy in the Catholic sense but only a corps of preachers and ministers of sacraments, chosen for convenience's sake to do for all what, in fact, each could do for himself. All believers are equal in their freedom to follow grace as they understand it, all are equal in control of their inner life. There is none who is the spiritual sovereign of his fellows, nor is the whole body a sovereign body. The Church -- as an external organisation -- does not possess authority; it cannot even make laws, still less enforce them. The control needed to keep it in being must come from some other source than the fact that the Church is thus organised; and this control is the business of the prince, part of his general duty to care for morality and good order. The Church -- in this new scheme of things -- really does quit this world, except as an indefinite number of individual believers. It has no existence as such, no authority of its own, no rights, no property. For all these matters it is the State which will now function; the great era of secularisation of Church property and usurpation of Church jurisdiction opens, the State lays hands on the monasteries, for example, and on all that relates to marriage. The State also controls worship and ritual, teaching and preaching; these are

but external manifestations of the Spirit. What about heretics? can there be such? Undoubtedly there can be those who openly contradict the articles of faith. Such men are public criminals, and it is the duty of the prince to punish them. As to the standard of orthodoxy -- what is the meaning of the faith -- it is for the prince to say what accords with Scripture and what does not. Who else, indeed, can decide, what other public authority is there but the State which, in virtue of its temporal power, is the temporal guardian of the divine law. Also, it is explained -- this will be readily understood -- that the State does the Church a service in undertaking these cares, for all these charges are material things, attention to which is fatal to the spirit.

So much, then, for the role of the prince as prince. But the prince has also his place in religion as an individual believer. He too is, thereby, a priest with the rest; and as all are priests in the measure of their gifts, the prince -- who has the unique gift, to wit his divine charge of ruling the State -- is most of all a priest, and in all crises and unusual circumstances it is he who will take the lead. He is not, indeed, the head of the Church -- no human being can be that -- but he is its principal member. [] As such, yet once again, it is for him to inaugurate needed reforms, and to organise the external appearance of the Church. In practice, the ancient maxim of St. Ambrose that sums up the whole long Christian tradition is wholly reversed, imperator enim intra ecclesiam, non supra ecclesiam est, and the dream of countless Ghibellines and legists is realised at last, "The State is the only legitimate authority the world knows. The State is truly sovereign." []

Below all the forces that make the Reformation a success is the powerful swell of the lay revolt against the cleric; it is wholly victorious wherever the Reformation triumphs, and in those other countries where, for yet another two centuries, the Catholic Church retains its precarious hold as a recognised sovereign power, the lay revolt is greatly heartened by that triumph. This hold of the State on the religious life of man is the most valuable conquest of all, and the last which any of these States will ever relinquish. [] The Reformation does bring freedom from the rule of the pope and his bishops and his clergy, from the sovereign spiritual state which the Catholic Church is. But, ultimately, the main freedom it establishes is the freedom of the State to do what it likes with man: and all in the

name of God. In place of the Catholic dogmas man must now accept -- wherever the Reformers triumph -- the new reformed dogmas; even the morality of private life will be brought under public control. In his heart man is indeed free to function as priest and prophet and consciously chosen and elected, justified, the friend whom no sin can separate from his Saviour -- and he is free to be faithful in his heart while yet, in obedience to the divinely established prince, going the other way to all appearances. It is the only freedom he does enjoy. Everywhere man is soon grouped in new churches; his religious life is as much regimented as ever; [] and in his life as a citizen he is -- unless he be wealthy -- little more than a pawn, whether the sovereign be the absolute Lutheran prince or the absolute Calvinist oligarchy. Of all who benefit from the destruction inaugurated by Luther's explosive thought, it is the prince who benefits most, and most lastingly. "None since the Apostles," said the Reformer, speaking of himself, "has done so much to give the civil authority a conscience; none, whether teacher or writer, theologian or jurist, has spoken so clearly, or in so masterly a fashion." [] The brag is characteristic, and not least in the naive innocent simplicity apparently all unconscious that the speaker comes at the end of four hundred years of the most intense discussion of human rights and political theory. And in the very years while Luther's exegesis is thus riveting the absolute State on Protestant Germany as a part of divine revelation, the Dominican Vittoria, in the absolute Spain of Charles V, is freely lecturing on the limitations of princely power, a task to be just as freely continued, a generation later, in that same country, under the absolutist Philip II by the Jesuit Suarez. [] In the most unlikely places, and at the most unlikely seasons, the true Church of Christ never ceases to battle for the real independence of the Gospel from every human fetter.

Luther, undoubtedly, scored a great initial victory. Then he was, definitely, checked. But not before that victory had produced an effect that still endures -- still dividing western Europe, and into two kinds of men, [] whom for convenience's sake we may call Protestants and Catholics. The story of the fortunes of the Reformation must be told elsewhere, and nowhere will any such impossible task be undertaken as to compare these Protestants and Catholics, in their lives at least. But at the risk of digressing into a much controverted theological matter, something needs to be said of Lutheranism as being the very inversion of

Christianity and of this as providing the main source of difference between Protestants and Catholics. The kind of difference this was must be stated, for it explains why henceforth they never really understood each other, and why with Luther all previous Christian history is brought up sharp; it explains how, to Catholics, Luther is most of all a revolutionary, and the new reformed religion not religion at all in the sense that Catholicism is a religion.

Briefly, what Luther did was to make man and not God the centre of those activities to the sum of which we give the term religion -- man's need of God and not God's glory. And the Scriptural paradox was once again fulfilled that he who would save his life must lose it. From the beginning of his own career as a friar at least, the human subject was to Luther of more concern than God -- not as a theory, but practically, that is to say in the order of mystical experience, in the conduct of what is called, in the special technical sense, the spiritual life. Luther's great achievement, from this point of view, was, in effect, the translation of his own, more or less native, " mystical egocentrism" into a foundation dogma of Christian belief.

His first mystical awakening was anxiety about the judicial wrath of the Almighty (as Luther misconceived Almighty God), a practical anxiety how, despite the invincible concupiscence that poisons -- wholly corrupts -- human nature itself and not merely Martin Luther, (again an enormous misconception of the effect of Original Sin) man can escape that wrath. The reformer's first pre-occupation is to work out a theological doctrine of salvation, and in the new scheme of things theological the main purpose of religion is precisely this, that it is the means by which man escapes from the devil. "Saving faith", and not charity, is now the first, principal, and characteristic virtue of the model Christian. And this faith -- an instrument divinely provided, by which man takes hold of the imputed justice of Christ our Saviour -- is not presented as (and it cannot ever be) a real participation in the Divine Life such as is sanctifying grace. Man's life is not thus grafted on to the Divine Life, in the Lutheran scheme of things; it remains a thing apart, and man is forever locked within himself. Man cannot make God the centre of his life, if he cannot believe that his life is actually one with God's life. From all possibility of such a union man is also cut off by his own ineradicable sinfulness, that fatal, inevitable state

of corruption, the effect of Original Sin, which not even divine grace can cure. And God being barred out from man's innermost self, who there is ruler and supreme if not man himself?

Of the resulting principle that a man's self is the ultimate standard by which all else must be judged, who better than Luther is the classic example? The exaltation of self bred in his contemporaries by that Renaissance of letters and the arts for which Luther had such bitter words, [] is as nothing to the exaltation of self bred by his own new theology. To the spirit of man justified by saving faith, found free as none was ever free before, all external constraint or law is an unendurable wrong. There is posited an essential opposition between the liberty newly revealed in Luther, between the interior life, between the "spirit" -- and all that comes to man from without himself. And so all those things which are in reality links between the inner man and the truth outside him, must henceforth be barriers -- or not realities, except with such reality as the inner man chooses to confer upon them. The Church and the sacraments, the hierarchy, the teaching papacy, the objective doctrine -- these are considered as so many barriers between the inner man and God. Faith and works are in opposition for Luther, the Gospel and the law, the inner spirit and the external authority. From without there is, then, no hope; and once the emotional alternations cease of spiritual terror and spiritual exaltation, or once they are seen for what they are, merely temperamental reactions, acts not wholly human, what remains? The intelligence was long ago expelled by the prophet from the garden of spirituality, with bitter curses indeed, and the most obscene revilings. Faith, true faith, the assent of the intelligence to truth divinely made known, has no place there.

And what when man is through with the tragi-comedy of the interior emotional gymnastic? It is the deepest criticism of Luther's famous theory -- and the explanation of the unending, ever-developing miseries that have come from it, and were bound to come from it -- that it goes against the nature of things, and against nothing more evidently than against the nature of the spiritual. The new religion introduced, or rather established as part of the permanent order of things, a whole series of vital antagonisms to perplex and hinder man already only too tried by his own freely chosen wrong-doing, to fill his soul with still blacker thoughts about the hopeless contradiction and futility of

all existence, to set him striving for centuries at the hopeless task of bringing happiness and peace out of a philosophy essentially pessimistic and despairing. It cut him off from all belief in the possibility of external aids, and in the very generation when Christian man needed nothing so evidently as a delivery that was divine, it handed him over to his own corrupt self, endowed now, for the task of self correction, with an innate omniscience and infallibility such as no cleric or pontiff or church had ever devised. []

For the many terrible evils from which Christian life was suffering, Luther brought not a single remedy. He could do no more than exhort and denounce and destroy. There was the problem of clerical worldliness: Luther, heir to the long line of faux mystiques for whom clerical ownership was sinful, abolished the cleric altogether. There was the problem of the scandal caused by rival philosophies and the effect of the rivalry on theology and mysticism: Luther, again the term of a long development, drove out all philosophy, and theology with it. The very purpose of the intelligence is knowledge, to enquire is its essential act: but in the sphere of all but the practical and the concrete and the individual, Luther bade the Christian stifle its promptings as a temptation and a snare; once again Luther is not a pioneer in the solution he offers. There was the problem of the Church itself; how it could best be kept unspotted, despite its contacts with the world: Luther's solution is to abolish the Church.

It is the surrender to despair -- in the name of greater simplicity, which "simplicity" is presented as the road back to primitive truth and the good life; to despair: as though true religion was incompatible with the two great natural necessities, the ownership of material goods and the activity of the speculative intelligence; as though material destitution and contented, uncritical ignorance were conditions sine quibus non for the preservation on earth of the work of that Incarnate Wisdom through Whom the Creator called the earth into being.

All those anti-intellectualist, anti-institutional forces that had plagued and hindered the medieval Church for centuries, whose chronic maleficent activity had, in fact, been the main cause why -- as we are often tempted to say -- so little was done effectively to maintain a generally higher standard of Christian life; all the

forces that were the chronic distraction of the medieval papacy, were now stabilised, institutionalised in the new reformed Christian Church. Enthronement of the will as the supreme human faculty; hostility to the activity of the intelligence in spiritual matters and in doctrine; the ideal of a Christian perfection that is independent of sacraments and independent of the authoritative teaching of clerics; of sanctity attainable through one's own self-sufficing spiritual activities; denial of the truth that Christianity, like man, is a social thing; -- all the crude, backwoods, obscurantist theories bred of the degrading pride that comes with chosen ignorance, the pride of men ignorant because unable to be wise except through the wisdom of others, now have their fling. Luther's own special contribution -- over and above the key doctrines which set all this mischief loose -- is the notion of life as radically evil.

When all has been said that can be said in Luther's favour, (and admittedly there is an attractive side to the natural man) [] the least harmful of all his titanic public activities was his vast indignation roused by abuses -- and by the sins of others. He gave it full expression and he did so very courageously. But the time needed more than this from one who was to restore it to health and to holiness, to holiness indeed first of all, in order that it might have health.

▪ [Back](#)

▪ [Index](#)