ECCLESIASTICAL EMPIRE

"Those who know what Rome has once been,
are best able to appreciate what she is."
-- Hallam.

Alonzo Trevier Jones

REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING CO.
Battle Creek, Mich.

To
The common People
who heard our common Master gladly, and
whose silent, practical experience "throughout the
history of the Church has always been truer and has led the Church
in a safer path than have the public decrees of those who
claim to be authoritative leaders of theological
thought," this book is respect-
fully dedicated
by
THE AUTHOR

CONTENTS

1. AN ECCLESIASTICAL WORLD-POWER

THE Roman Empire had perished. "Never had the existence of a nation been more completely overthrown." -- Guizot.1 New peoples in ten distinct kingdoms, in A. D. 476, occupied the territory which for five hundred years had been Roman. These are the nations which, inextricably involved with the papacy, are the subject of the mediaeval and modern history of Western Europe, that we are now to trace.

2. The establishment, the growth, and the reign of the papacy as a world-power, is distinctly a subject of prophecy, as really as is the fall of Rome and the planting of the Ten Kingdoms upon the ruins thereof. Indeed, the prophecy of this is an inseparable part of the prophecy of the other. To any one who will closely observe, it will plainly appear that in the three great lines of prophecy in Daniel 7, and 8, and 11, the great subject is Rome. In the Scriptures in each of these chapters far more space is given to the description of Rome than is given to Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Grecia all together. And in Dan. 11 : 14 when the entrance of Rome upon the scene is marked, it is definitely and significantly stated "the children of robbers shall exalt themselves to establish the vision." That is to say: Rome is the particular object of the vision; and when Rome is reached and she enters upon the scene, the vision is established.

3. In Daniel 7, the four great world-empires -- Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome -- are pictured by four great beasts. The last characteristic of the fourth is that "it had ten horns." Then, says the prophet, "I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another LITTLE horn, before whom there were

three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things."2 This "little horn" the prophet beheld even till "the Judgment was set and the books

2

were opened." And then he says, "I beheld then [at the time of the Judgment] because of the great words which the horn spake. I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame."

4. Note that the prophet is considering the "little horn" in its career even to the end. But when that "little horn" comes to its end, it is not said, I beheld till the horn was broken; but, "I beheld till the beast was slain." At the time of the Judgment "I beheld then because of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld even till the beast was slain." This shows beyond all question that that which is symbolized by the "little horn" is simply another phase of what is symbolized by the great and terrible beast. The "little horn" is but the continuation of the beast in a different shape: the same characteristics are there: the same spirit is there: the same thing that is the beast continues through all the time of the little horn until its destruction comes; and when the destruction of the little "horn" does come, it is "the beast" that is slain and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame.

5. In Daniel 8 the thought is the same, except that both phases of this power which is Rome, are symbolized in "a little horn which waxed exceeding great toward the south and toward the east and toward the pleasant land;" that "waxed great even to the host of heaven;" who magnified himself even to the Prince of the host, and by whom the daily sacrifice was taken away and the place of His sanctuary was cast down." The further sketch of Rome in its whole career, and under whatever form, from its entrance into the field of the world's affairs unto the end, is given in verses 23-25: "And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand."

6. When in chapter 7 the angel explained to Daniel the meaning of these things, he said: "The ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings

3

that shall arise: and another shall arise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of times."3

7. Of the fourth great kingdom -- Rome -- the angel said that not only was it "diverse from all the kingdoms that were before it," but that it was "diverse from all kingdoms." Rome was diverse from all the powers that were before it, and also diverse from all kingdoms, in that it was a republic. It is true that this republic degenerated into a one man power, a terrible imperial despotism, in which it was also diverse from all that were before it, and even from all; yet, the name and form of a republic were still retained, even to its latest days.

8. That empire perished, and in its place stood ten powers which were called kingdoms. But, now of this other peculiar one which comes up amongst the ten, before whom three of the ten are rooted out -- of this one it is written: "He shall be diverse from the first." The first was diverse from "all;" and yet this is diverse even from that one. This shows, then, that the power here referred to would be diverse from all, even to a degree beyond that one which is plainly declared to be diverse from all: that it would be of an utterly new and strange order.

9. Note that of this power it is written that he should "speak great words against the Most High;" that he should "wear out the saints of the Most High;" and that he should "think to change times and the law"4 of the Most High. In the description of the same power, given in chapter 8 : 25, it is stated that "he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes." Throughout the book of Daniel the expression "stand up," where used in connection with kings, invariably signifies "to reign."5 This power, then, would reign in opposition to Christ; for only He is the Prince of princes.

10. Further information with respect to this power, is given by Paul in 2 Thessalonians 2, where, in writing of the day of the coming of the Lord he said: "That day shall not come except there come a falling away

first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God showing himself that he is God." And that this instruction is derived directly from the passages which we have quoted from Daniel 7 and 8, is clear from the fact that Paul appeals to the Thessalonians: "Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" When he was yet with them, and telling them these things, he "reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." The only Scriptures that they then had were the Old Testament Scriptures. And the only place in the Old Testament Scriptures where these things are mentioned which he cited, is in these chapters of the book of Daniel.

11. These specifications of scripture make it certain that the power referred to is an ecclesiastical one -- it deals particularly with "the Most High:" it reigns in opposition to "the Prince of princes." The specifications show that it is more than simply an ecclesiastical power: it is an ecclesiastical world-power, a theocratical world-kingdom, requiring worship to itself: putting itself above all else that is worshiped, even sitting "in the temple" -- the place of worship -- "of God, showing himself that he is God."

12. All this is emphasized by the further description of the same power: "I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. . . . And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus."6 These saints and martyrs of Jesus are in this same book symbolized by another woman -- "a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars" -- who "fled into the wilderness"7 while this terrible woman on the scarlet-colored beast is doing all in her power utterly to "wear out the saints of the Most High." The condition as thus revealed, is woman against woman -- Church against Church: a corrupt Church opposed to the pure Church.

13. The book of Revelation is the complement of the book of Daniel.

The book of Daniel has for its great subject national history, with Church history incidental. The book of Revelation has for its great subject Church history, with national history incidental. Accordingly, that which is but briefly mentioned in the book of Daniel concerning this ecclesiastical kingdom which takes such a large place in the world, is quite fully treated in the book of Revelation: and treated in both its phases, that of the true Church and that of the false; that of the faithful Church, and that of the apostate.

14. The line of prophecy of the Seven Churches of the book of Revelation, is a series of seven letters addressed by the Lord to His own Church in the seven phases of the complete round of her experience from the first advent of Christ unto the second. In each of these seven letters not only is counsel given in the way of right, but there are pointed out the dangers and evils that beset the Church, against which she must be especially guarded, and which, in order to remain pure, she must escape.

15. To the Church in her first stage -- the Church of Ephesus -- He says: "I have somewhat against thee because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works."8 This points definitely to the falling away that is mentioned by Paul to the elders of the Church at Ephesus (Acts 20 : 30), and that is again mentioned and dwelt upon by him in 2 Thessalonians 2, which falling away, when continued, developed "that man of sin," "the son of perdition," "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped" -- the ecclesiastical State now under consideration. The time of this phase of the Church is by the letter itself, shown to be the days of the apostles,9 and therefore ended about A. D. 100.

16. The letter to the Church in her second phase, is wholly commendatory. This shows that, while individuals had continued in the apostasy mentioned in the first letter, yet the Church herself had heeded the counsel given by the Head of the Church, and had repented and returned to "the first works." The time of this phase of the Church's experience is definitely suggested in the letter itself, by the statement that she should "have tribulation ten days."10 This refers to the ten years of persecution in the reign of Diocletian, from A. D. 303-313; which

was ended by the Edict of Milan, issued by the two emperors, Constantine and Licinius, March, A. D. 313.11

17. The letter to the Church in the third phase of her experience gives the key to this particular thought which is now before us -- the identification of that ecclesiastical State. In this letter Christ mentions with commendation the fact that His Church had held fast His name, and had not denied His faith, "even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr."12 This word "Antipas" is not a person's name, but is a term characteristic of the times. It is composed of two words, anti, and pappas. "anti" signifies against, and "pappas" signifies papa, which is our English, and also the universal, word for "papa." And this word "papa" is but the repetition of the simple word "pa," and is the original of the word "pope."

18. Therefore, the word "Antipas" -- "against `pas' or `papas'" -- shows the growth of the papa-cy in the period immediately following A. D. 313. This was the period of Constantine and onward, in which the papa-cy itself was distinctly formed. And history records that in that time, while the other principal bishops of the Church bore the title of "patriarch," the bishop of Rome studiously avoided that particular term, as placing him on a level with other "patriarchs." He always preferred the title of "papa," or "pope" (Schaff13): and this because "patriarch" bespeaks an oligarchical Church government -- that is government by a few; whereas "pope" bespeaks a monarchial Church government -- that is government by one.14 Thus the history, and the word of the counsel of Christ, unite in marking as the characteristic of that phase of the Church's experience, the formation of the papa-cy, and the assertion of the authority of the pope.

19. And thus, beyond all question, the papacy is identified, and that by the very Word of God itself, as that ecclesiastical State, that church-kingdom, sketched by Daniel, in chapters 7 and 8; described by Paul, in 2 Thessalonians 2: and fully traced by John, in the Revelation. The time covered by this third letter of Christ to His Church is, by that letter itself, shown to be the time of the making of the papacy; and to the words of that letter correspond exactly the facts of the history in the period

reaching from the Edict of Milan to the ruin of the empire. The "falling away," the leaving of the "first love," mentioned in the first letter, had, in this time of the third letter, culminated in the formation of the papacy.

20. Now this same course is traced on the side of the apostasy, in the first three steps of the line of prophecy of the Seven Seals of the book of Revelation. Under the First Seal there was seen going forth a white horse (Rev. 6:2), corresponding to the Church in her first phase -- that of her original purity, her "first love." But the counsel of Christ in His first letter said that there was even then a falling away from that first love: and this is

signified in the Second Seal, at the opening of which "there went out another horse that was red."15 And, under the Third Seal "I beheld, and lo a black horse!"16 Thus the symbols of the seals, passing in three steps from white to black, mark identically the course of the apostasy in the three steps, from the first love, in which Christ was all in all, in the first stage of the Church, to the third stage, in which, "where Satan's seat" was, and where Satan dwelt, a man was put in the place of God, in that which professed to be the Church of God, "passing himself off for God."

21. The immediate effect of this apostasy, which developed the papacy in the Roman Empire, was the complete ruin of the Roman Empire. And, this consequence of the apostasy, which is traced in the first three steps of the two lines of prophecy of the Seven Churches and the Seven Seals, is sketched in the first four trumpets of the line of prophecy of the Seven Trumpets. And here it is -- in the Seven Trumpets -- that national history enters, as an incident, in this book of Church history; as in the rise of the little horn amongst the ten, in the book of Daniel, there enters Church history, as an incident, in that book of national history. The Seven Trumpets aptly enter here, because the trumpet is the symbol of war; and it was by the universal war of the floods of barbarians from the north, that there was swept away that mass of corruption that was heaped upon the Roman Empire by its union with the apostate Church, in the making of the papacy.17

1[Page 1] "History of Representative Government," lecture xxii, par. 9.

2[Page 1] Verse 8.

3[Page 3] Verses 24, 25.

4[Page 3] R. V.

5[Page 3] Chap. 8: 21, 22, 23, 25; 11: 2, 3, 5, 7, 20, 21; 12: 1.

6[Page 4] Rev. 17: 4-6.

7[Page 4] Rev. 12: 1, 6, 14.

8[Page 5] Rev. 2: 4, 5.

9[Page 5] Rev. 2: 3.

10[Page 5] Rev. 2: 10.

11[Page 6] "Great Empires of Prophecy," chap. xxviii, par. 9 to end.

12[Page 6] Rev. 9: 13.

13[Page 6] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. iv, par. 7, note.

14[Page 6] Id.

15[Page 7] Rev. 6: 4.

16[Page 7] Rev. 6: 5.

17[Page 7] See "The Great Nations of To-day," Review and Herald Publishing Co., Battle Creek, Mich.

2. THE VISIGOTHS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

THE Ecclesiastical Empire is the grand center of the history that we are now to study. Yet with this there are inseparably connected other empires, and the Ten Kingdoms of Western Europe. In the nature of the case, these will have to be considered to a greater or less extent. Therefore, in order that each of these may have its due attention, as well as that the history of the Ecclesiastical Empire itself may be followed uninterruptedly and the more intelligently, it will be best first to sketch the kingdoms of Western Europe through the Middle Ages.

2. The Ten Kingdoms could not continue in either undisturbed or undisturbing relations, even among themselves. As ever in human history from the day of Nimrod, the desire to enlarge dominion, the ambition for empire, was the chief characteristic, the ruling passion, among these.

3. The first to make their power predominant among the Ten Kingdoms was the Visigoths. It will be remembered1 that under Wallia the Visigoths as early as A. D. 419 had gained a permanent seat in Southwestern Gaul, from the Mediterranean Sea to the Bay of Biscay, and from the River Loire to the River Rhone, with their capital at Toulouse. There the newly established kingdom "gradually acquired strength and maturity." "After the death of Wallia [A. D. 419], the Gothic scepter devolved to Theodoric, the son of the great Alaric; and his prosperous reign of more than thirty years [A. D. 419-451] over a turbulent people, may be allowed to prove that his prudence was supported by uncommon vigor, both of mind and body. Impatient of his narrow limits, Theodoric aspired to the possession of Arles, the wealthy seat of government and commerce; but" this enterprise failed.

4. "Theodoric, king of the Visigoths, appears to have deserved the

love of his subjects, the confidence of his allies, and the esteem of mankind. His throne was surrounded by six valiant sons, who were educated with equal care in the exercises of the Barbarian camp, and in those of the Gallic schools: from the study of Roman jurisprudence they acquired the theory, at least, of law and justice." "The two daughters of the Gothic king were given in marriage to the eldest sons of the kings of the Suevi and of the Vandals, who reigned in Spain and Africa." -- Gibbon.2 This domestic alliance with the house of the king of the Vandals was fraught with far-reaching and dreadful consequences. The king of the Vandals at that time daughter-in-law had formed a conspiracy to poison him. With Genseric, his own suspicion was sufficient proof of guilt, and upon the hapless daughter of Theodoric was inflicted the horrible penalty of cutting off her nose and ears. Thus mutilated, she was sent back to the house of her father.

5. By this outrage Theodoric was stirred up to make war upon the king of the Vandals, in which he was widely supported by the sympathy of his neighbors. To protect himself and his dominions from this dangerous invasion Genseric by "rich gifts and pressing solicitations inflamed the ambition of Attila," who, thus persuaded, marched, A. D. 451, with an army of seven hundred thousand men in his memorable invasion of Gaul. This required that not only the forces of Theodoric, but all the power of the whole West should stand unitedly in defense of their very homes. The battle that was fought was the battle of Chalons. "The body of Theodoric, pierced with honorable wounds, was discovered under a heap of the slain: his subjects bewailed the death of their king and father; but their tears were mingled with songs and acclamations, and his funeral rites were performed in the face of a vanquished enemy. The Goths, clashing their arms, elevated on a buckler his eldest

son, Torismond, to whom they justly ascribed the glory of their success; and the new king accepted the obligation of revenge as a sacred portion of his paternal inheritance." -- Gibbon.3

6. Torismond was murdered in A. D. 453 by his younger brother, Theodoric II, who reigned till 466. In 456 he invaded Spain in an expedition against "the Suevi who had fixed their kingdom in Gallicia,"

and who now "aspired to the conquest of Spain," and even threatened to attack Theodoric under the very walls of his own capital. "Such a challenge urged Theodoric to prevent the bold designs of his enemy: he passed the Pyrenees at the head of the Visigoths: the Franks and the Burgundians served under his standard. . . . The two armies, or rather the two nations, encountered each other on the banks of the River Urbicus, about twelve miles from Astorga; and the decisive victory of the Goths appeared for a while to have extirpated the name and kingdom of the Suevi. From the field of battle Theodoric advanced to Braga, their metropolis, which still retained the splendid vestiges of its ancient commerce and dignity." -- Gibbon.4 The king of the Suevi was captured and slain by Theodoric, who "carried his victorious arms as far as Merida," whence he returned to his capital.

7. In A. D. 466 Theodoric was assassinated by Euric, who reigned till 485. Immediately upon his accession he renewed the Visigothic invasion of Spain. "He passed the Pyrenees at the head of a numerous army, subdued the cities of Saragossa and Pampeluna, vanquished in battle the martial nobles of the Tarragonese province, carried his victorious arms into the heart of Lusitania, and permitted the Suevi to hold the kingdom of Gallicia under the Gothic monarchy of Spain" which he made permanent.5

8. "The efforts of Euric were not less vigorous nor less successful in Gaul; and throughout the country that extends from the Pyrenees to the Rhone and the Loire, Berry and Auvergne were the only cities, or dioceses, which refused to acknowledge him as their master." "As soon as Odoacer had extinguished the Western Empire, he sought the friendship of the most powerful of the barbarians. The new sovereign of Italy resigned to Euric, king of the Visigoths [A. D. 476-485], all the Roman conquests beyond the Alps as far as the Rhine and the ocean; and the Senate might confirm this liberal gift with some ostentation of power, and without any real loss of revenue or dominion.

9. "The lawful pretensions of Euric were justified by ambition and success; and the Gothic nation might aspire, under his command, to the monarchy of Spain and Gaul. Arles and Marseilles surrendered to his arms; he oppressed the freedom of Auvergne; and the bishop condescended

to purchase his recall from exile by a tribute of just, but reluctant praise. Sidonius waited before the gates of the palace among a crowd of ambassadors and suppliants; and their various business at the court of Bordeaux attested the power and the renown of the king of the Visigoths. The Heruli of the distant ocean, who painted their naked bodies with its cerulean color, implored his protection; and the Saxons respected the maritime provinces of a prince who was destitute of any naval force. The tall Burgundians submitted to his authority; nor did he restore the captive Franks till he had imposed on that fierce nation the terms of an unequal peace. The Vandals of Africa cultivated his useful friendship: and the Ostrogoths of Pannonia were supported by his powerful aid against the oppression of the neighboring Huns. The North (such are the lofty strains of the poet) was agitated or appeased by the nod of Euric; the great king of Persia consulted the oracle of the West; and the aged god of the Tyber was protected by the swelling genius of the Garonne."6

10. The reign of Euric "was the culminating point of the Visigothic monarchy in Gaul." -- Guizot.7 He was succeeded, A. D. 485, by his son, Alaric II, at the time "a helpless infant." Though Alaric II reigned twenty-two years, he so "gave himself up to the pursuit of pleasure" that his reign "was the epoch of the decay of the Visigothic monarchy in Gaul," which indeed ended at the death of Alaric II by the hand of Clovis the Frank, in

the battle of Poitiers, A. D. 507. Alaric II was succeeded by his infant son, Amalaric, who was taken into Spain. And though the Visigoths still held in Gaul "a narrow tract of seacoast from the Rhone to the Pyrenees," from this time forward their dominion was properly in Spain, to which country it was limited, and wherein its seat was permanently fixed in the reign of Theudes, who succeeded Amalaric in A. D. 531, and reigned till 548.

11. The kingdom of the Visigoths continued to flourish in all Spain until A. D. 711. By that time luxury had so enervated them, and their despotism and persecutions had so estranged the subject peoples, that in a single year, 711-712, Tarik, the Saracen commander, conquered the country from the Straits of Gibraltar to the Bay of

Biscay, a distance of seven hundred miles. This can be easily understood from the fact that to the great and decisive battle against the invading Saracens, Roderick, the king of the Visigoths, went "sustaining on his head a diadem of pearls, incumbered with a flowing robe of gold and silken embroidery, and reclining on a litter or car of ivory, drawn by two white mules." -- Gibbon.8

12. The remnant of the Visigoths, "a scanty band of warriors, headed by Pelayo, probably a member of the Visigothic royal family, found refuge in the cave of Covadonga, among the inaccessible mountains of Asturias" in the extreme northwestern part of the peninsula, "Their own bravery and the difficulties of the country enabled them to hold their own; and they became the rallying point for all who preferred a life of hardship to slavish submission."9 This little band of warriors, never subdued, continued to hold their own, and to grow in strength and success. Little by little they pushed back the Saracens, enlarging their territory, and holding all that they gained. This they steadily continued for seven hundred and eighty years, when, in A. D. 1492, the last vestige of Mohammedan power in Spain was broken, and the descendants of the original Visigoths once more possessed the whole country. The present -- A. D. 1901 -- child-heir to the throne of Spain is Alfonso XIII; and Alfonso I was the grandson of Pelayo, the intrepid leader of that "scanty band of warriors" who in A. D. 712 "found refuge in the cave of Covadonga among the inaccessible mountains of Asturias."

13. The year of the final recovery of Spain from the Mohammedan power, it will be noted, was also the very year of the discovery of the West Indies by Columbus -- A. D. 1492. This era of discovery and conquest opened by Columbus, and continued by Balboa, Cortes, and others, with an intricate complication of territorial accessions in Europe, suddenly at the beginning of the sixteenth century elevated Spain to the place of the leading power, and her king -- Charles I -- to the position of the greatest sovereign, then in the world. In fifty years, however, she had begun a decline which steadily continued till she was reduced, in 1898, to the bounds of the original kingdom of the Visigoths in the Spanish peninsula, with a few outlying islands.

1[Page 8] "Great Empires of Prophecy," chap. xii, par. 68.

2[Page 9] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. xxxv, par. 4.

3[Page 9] Id., par. 11.

4[Page 10] Id., chap. xxxv, par. 7.

5[Page 10] Id., par. 23.

6[Page 11] Id., chap xxxvi, par. 23; chap. xxxviii, par. 3.

7[Page 11] "Representative Government," lecture xxiv, par. 9.

8[Page 12] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. ii, par. 41.

9[Page 12] Encyclopedia Britannica. Art. "Spain," history, sec. iii, par. 7.

3. THE SUEVI IN THE MIDDLE AGES

ON the original and permanent settlement of the Suevi, in the Roman Empire, they occupied "the greater portion of Southern and Western Spain; and their capital was Astorga." In the period between the departure of the Vandals into Africa, A. D. 429, and the coming of the Visigoths into Spain, A. D. 456, the Suevi were "the only barbarian power left in the peninsula." -- Hodgkin.1 Though in the great battle with Theodoric, the Visigoth, in 456, they were signally defeated and their power was much weakened, yet the distinct Suevic kingdom continued until 587, when, by the power of Leovigild the Visigoth, it became entirely subject and tributary to the Visigothic kingdom.

2. During the time of the occupation of the peninsula by the Mohammedan power, 711, the Suevi, until about 1250, shared the fate of the Visigoths. As little by little the brave descendants of the unconquerable Pelayo pushed back the bounds of the Mohammedan dominion, the Suevi, inhabiting the territory of what is now Portugal and Galicia, was really the first to be freed. Indeed Alfonso I, grandson of Pelayo, not only drove the Mohammedans out of Galicia, but was able to advance "with his victorious troops" as far as to the River Douro. Alfonso III, 866-910, made expeditions as far south as to Coimbra and Lisbon, though his permanent southern boundary was still the River Douro.

3. Ferdinand the Great, king of Leon, Castile, and Galicia, 1055-1064, and his son, in 1065, carried the boundary southward till it included the present Portuguese province of Beira. Alfonso VI, 1072-1109, compelled the cession of Lisbon and Santerem, which was practically all that part of the province of Estramadura, which lies west and north of the River Tagus. In 1086 the danger that the Mohammedans would regain these territories was so great that Alfonso VI "summoned

the chivalry of Christendom to his aid. Among the knights who came to his assistance were Counts Raymond and Henry of Burgundy; . . . and in 1094 he combined the fiefs of Coimbra and Oporto into one great county," called Terra Portucalensis, or County of Porto Cale; and, with the hand of his daughter Theresa, conferred it upon Henry of Burgundy, who thus became Count of Portucalensis: Porto Cale: Portugal. And that the Suevi who at the first inhabited Southern and Western Spain and Galicia, were the root of this Portugal, is clear from the fact that "ethnologically the Galicians are allied to the Portuguese, whom they resemble in dialect, in appearance, and in habits, more than any other inhabitants of the peninsula."2

4. The history of Portugal as a kingdom, therefore, really begins with this gift by Alfonso VI, descended from Alfonso I, grandson of Pelayo the Visigoth, to Henry of Burgundy, in A. D. 1094. It must be remembered, however, that at that time Portugal was only a county, held in fief by Henry of Burgundy as vassal of Alfonso VI, king of Leon, Castile, and Galicia, who by reason of his great successes assumed the title of "Emperor of Spain." This grand title, however, vanished with him; and he was no sooner dead than Count Henry, his beneficiary, invaded the kingdom in a contest with four other claimants, to make himself king. He carried on this contest for five years, but failed; and died suddenly at Astorga in 1112, leaving his wife Theresa to rule the county of Portugal during the minority of his infant son, Affonso Henriques.

5. "Affonso Henriques, who, at the age of seventeen, assumed the government [1112-1185], was one of the heroes of the Middle Ages. He succeeded to the rule of the county of Portugal when it was still regarded as a fief of Galicia; and after nearly sixty years of incessant fighting, he bequeathed to his son a powerful little kingdom, whose independence was unquestioned, and whose fame was spread abroad throughout Christendom by the reports of the victories of its first king over the Mohammedans. The four wars of independence which Affonso Henriques waged against Alphonso VII, lasted more than twelve years, and were fought out on the Galician frontier with varying success, until the question of Portuguese independence was peaceably established and confirmed by the

valor of the Portuguese knights who overcame those of Castile in the famous tournament of Valdevez, and Affonso Henriques assumed the title of King of Portugal."3

6. It was not till the reign of Affonso III, 1248-1279, that the Mohammedans were finally expelled, and Portugal attained its ultimate European limits by the Portuguese conquest of all the territory west of the River Guadilquiver, and southward to the sea. Thus Portugal effected the expulsion of the Mohammedans from her dominions, two hundred and fifty years before Spain completely recovered hers. After this had been accomplished there was a long period of comparative peace, in which the kingdom and the people greatly prospered. About 1400 there was begun by the Portuguese an era of exploration and discovery, that is one of the greatest in the history of the world; that at that time led the world; and that brought to the king of Portugal "an income greater than that of any prince in Europe, so that he had no need of taxes."

7. This splendid era of discovery was begun by Prince Henry, son of King Joao, or John, who by his energy and success acquired the title "the Navigator." "Until his day the pathways of the human race had been the mountain, the river, and the plain, the strait, the lake, and the inland sea. It was he who conceived the thought of opening a road through the unexplored ocean -- a road replete with danger, but abundant in promise. Born on March 4, 1394, Prince Henry was a younger son of King Joao of Portugal, and of Philippa of Lancaster, the grandchild of Edward III; so that he was half an Englishman. Prince Henry relinquished the pleasures of the court, and took up his abode on the inhospitable promontory of Sagres at the extreme southwestern angle of Europe." His great aim was to find the sea-path to the then only known Indies. He did not accomplish it; but he did a great thing in destroying the terror of the great ocean, and so opening the door of courage to those who should come after. His ships and men reached the islands of Madeira and Porto Santo in 1418 and 1420, which were granted to him by the king, his brother, in 1433. They doubled the Cape of Bojador in 1433. In 1435 they went a hundred and fifty miles beyond Cape Bojador. In 1443 they went twenty-five miles beyond Cape

Blanco. In 1445 they reached the mouth of the River Senegal. In 1455 he passed Cape Verde and went as far as to the mouth of the River Gambia. Prince Henry, the Navigator, died Nov. 13, 1460.

8. The enterprise which Prince Henry, the Navigator, had so well begun, was continued after his death. In 1462 the Cape Verde Islands were discovered and colonized. In the same year an expedition under Pedro de Cintra reached a point on the Serra Leone coast, six hundred miles beyond the Gambia. In 1469 another expedition under Fernan Gomez reached the Gold Coast. In 1484 Diogo Cam reached the mouth of the Congo. In 1486 Barholomew Dias succeeded in rounding the extreme southern point of Africa, as far as to Algoa Bay. The cape he named Cabo Tormentoso, -- Cape Torment, -- but the king of Portugal, Joao II, cheered with the prospect that the way was now surely opened to India, named it Cape of Good Hope.

9. This continued series of successes had drawn to Lisbon, the Portuguese capital, adventurous strangers "from all parts of the world;" and among these there came from Genoa, in Italy, in 1470, Christopher Columbus. He entered the service of the king of Portugal, where he remained till 1484, making "several voyages to the coast

of Guinea." As early as 1474 he had determined in his mind that the world is round; that therefore India should be reached by sailing westward; and that he would sail in that direction to find it. His project he made known to King Joao II, who referred him to his Committee of Council for Geographical Affairs. The committee rendered a decidedly adverse report; but the bishop of Ceuta, seeing that the king was inclined to favor Columbus's view, suggested to him that he reap the advantage of it by sending an expedition unknown to Columbus. The king adopted the suggestion, sent out his expedition which from fear soon returned. Columbus, discovering the trick that had been attempted, in just indignation quitted Lisbon in 1484; and so the glory and the wonders of the discovery of the Western Continent, the New World, was lost to Portugal.

10. The Portuguese, however, having passed the most southern point of Africa, followed up the attempt to reach India by sailing eastward. In July, 1497, Vasco da Gama sailed from Lisbon. November 22 he rounded the Cape of Good Hope. Christmas day, as he was sailing along, land was sighted, which, in honor of the day, he named Natal. April 7,

1498, he reached Mombas, on the east coast of Africa, near the equator;
and May 20, 1498, the India problem was solved by his sighting the Malabar coast of Western India, and anchoring his ships before Calicut. March 9, 1500, another expedition left Lisbon, under the command of Pedro Alvarez Cabral, and April 22 discovered the southeast coast of Brazil, taking possession in the name of the king of Portugal. Cabral then sailed for India, arriving at Calicut in September, and continued his voyage southward as far as to Cananore, and finally to Cochin. In 1501 Joao da Nova discovered the island of Ascension, and Amerigo Vespucci discovered the Rio Plata and Paraguay. Ceylon was discovered in 1505. In 1506 Albuquerque "explored the coasts of Arabia and Persia, made the king of Ormus tributary to the king of Portugal, and sent embassies to Abyssinia." In 1510 he conquered Goa, on the Indian coast, a little north of Calicut. In 1512 the Moluccas, or Spice Islands, off the east coast of China, were discovered; and in 1517 the grand era of Portuguese discovery was fitly rounded out by the Fernam Peres de Andrade's discovery of China, and entering "into commercial relations with the governor of Canton."

11. These discoveries led large numbers of the Portuguese to emigrate in search of fortune; and the great wealth poured into the kingdom by the trade of the new lands, induced luxury and consequent enervation of those who remained at home: while there was also no immigration, and the soil was worked by slaves. These things of themselves weakened the kingdom; but as though to make its decline certain, in 1536 King Joao III established the Inquisition, which "quickly destroyed all that was left of the old Portuguese spirit." Because of these things at home and the tyranny and corruption of the governors in the colonies, "everything went from bad to worse." In 1578 the direct royal succession expired with King Sebastian. The kingdom fell for two years to the late king's uncle, who was old, and died the last day of January, 1580; and, in the confusion and intrigues of the several aspirants to the throne that followed, Philip II, king of Spain, was successful in seizing the kingdom and making himself also king of Portugal.

12. In 1640 the Portuguese revolted and were successful in casting off the yoke of Spain, in expelling the Spaniards from Portugal; and in re-establishing a kingdom of their own by crowning a king of their own

choice -- the duke of Braganza as King Joao IV. During "the sixty years' captivity" to Spain, however, the trade of her wide possessions, and a considerable portion of those possessions themselves, had been absorbed by other nations. From this Portugal never recovered; and has since had very little power or influence outside her proper European limits.

1[Page 13] "Italy and Her Invaders," book iii, chap. xvii.

2[Page 14] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. "Galicia," par. 2.

3[Page 15] Id., art. "Portugal," pars. 4, 6.

4. THE FRANKS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

IT was by the Franks, under the leadership of Clovis, that the Visigothic monarchy was broken and deprived of its possessions in Gaul, which it had held for nearly a hundred years. Thus, of the Ten Kingdoms, after the Visigoths the Franks were the next in order to make their power predominant, and even supreme.

2. As late as "thirty years after the battle of Chalons" the tribes of the Franks who had "settled in Gaul were not yet united as one nation." "Several tribes, independent one of another, were planted between the Rhine and the Somme; there were some in the environs of Cologne, Calais, Cambrai, even beyond the Seine and as far as Le Mans, on the confines of the Britons. . . . The two principal Frankish tribes were those of the Salian Franks and the Ripuarian Franks, settled, the latter in the east of Belgica, on the banks of the Moselle and the Rhine; the former toward the West, between the Meuse, the ocean, and the Somme. Meroveus, whose name was perpetuated in his line, was one of the principal chieftains of the Salian Franks; and his son Childeric, who resided in Tournay, where his tomb was discovered in 1655, was the father of Clovis, who succeeded him in 481, and with whom really commenced the kingdom and history of France." -- Guizot.1

3. As late as A. D. 486 there was a small portion of Gaul, embracing the cities of Rheims, Troyes, Beauvais, Amiens, and the city and diocese of Soissons, which was still fairly Roman, and was ruled by Syagrius, a Roman, under the title of Patrician, or, as some give it, king of the Romans. "The first exploit of Clovis was the defeat of Syagrius," in A. D. 486, and the reduction of the country which had acknowledged his authority. By this victory all the country of Gaul north of the Moselle, clear to the Seine, was possessed by the Franks. "The Belgic cities surrendered to the king of the Franks; and his dominions were enlarged

toward the east by the ample diocese of Tongres, which Clovis subdued in the tenth year of his reign." -- Gibbon.2

4. Until this time the Franks and the Alemanni had made almost equal progress in Gaul, and had made their conquests in that province, apparently in perfect national friendliness. But now both nations had become so powerful that it was impossible that two such fierce and warlike nations should subsist side by side without an appeal to arms for the decision of the question as to which should have the supremacy.

5. "From the source of the Rhine to its conflux with the Main and the Moselle, the formidable swarms of the Alemanni commanded either side of the river by the right of ancient possession, or recent victory. They had spread themselves into Gaul, over the modern provinces of Alsace and Lorraine; and their bold invasion of the kingdom of Cologne summoned the Salic prince to the defense of his Ripuarian allies. Clovis encountered the invaders of Gaul in the plain of Tolbiac [A. D. 496] about twenty-four miles from Cologne, and the two fiercest nations of Germany were mutually animated by the memory of past exploits, and the prospect of future greatness. The Franks, after an obstinate struggle, gave way; and the Alemanni, raising a shout of victory, impetuously pressed their retreat. But the battle was restored by the valor, and the conduct, and perhaps by the

piety, of Clovis; and the event of the bloody day decided forever the alternative of empire or servitude. The last king of the Alemanni was slain in the field, and his people were slaughtered, or pursued, till they threw down their arms, and yielded to the mercy of the conqueror. Without discipline it was impossible for them to rally; they had contemptuously demolished the walls and fortifications which might have protected their distress; and they were followed into the heart of their forests by an enemy not less active, or intrepid, than themselves.

6. "The great Theodoric congratulated the victory of Clovis, whose sister Albofleda the king of Italy had lately married; but he mildly interceded with his brother in favor of the suppliants and fugitives, who had implored his protection. The Gallic territories, which were possessed by the Alemanni, became the prize of their conqueror; and the haughty nation, invincible, or rebellious, to the arms of Rome, acknowledged

the sovereignty of the Merovingian kings, who graciously permitted them to enjoy their peculiar manners and institutions, under the government of official, and, at length, of hereditary dukes." -- Gibbon.3

7. The defeat of the Burgundians followed that of the Alemanni, A. D. 499. "The kingdom of the Burgundians, which was defined by the course of two Gallic rivers, the Saone and the Rhone, extended from the forest of Vosges to the Alps and the sea of Marseilles. The scepter was in the hands of Gundobald. That valiant and ambitious prince had reduced the number of royal candidates by the death of two brothers, one of whom was the father of Clotilda; but his imperfect prudence still permitted Godesil, the youngest of his brothers, to possess the dependent principality of Geneva.

8. "The allegiance of his brother was already seduced; and the obedience of Godegesil, who joined the royal standard with the troops of Geneva, more effectually promoted the success of the conspiracy. While the Franks and Burgundians contended with equal valor, his seasonable desertion decided the event of the battle; and as Gundobald was faintly supported by the disaffected Gauls, he yielded to the arms of Clovis [A. D. 500], and hastily retreated from the field, which appears to have been situate between Langres and Dijon. He distrusted the strength of Dijon, a quadrangular fortress, encompassed by two rivers, and by a wall thirty feet high, and fifteen thick, with four gates, and thirty-three towers; he abandoned to the pursuit of Clovis the important cities of Lyons and Vienna; and Gundobald still fled with precipitation, till he had reached Avignon, at the distance of two hundred and fifty miles from the field of battle. A long siege and an artful negotiation admonished the king of the Franks of the danger and difficulty of his enterprise. He imposed a tribute on the Burgundian prince, compelled him to pardon and reward his brother's treachery, and proudly returned to his own dominions, with the spoils and captives of the southern provinces.

9. "This splendid triumph was soon clouded by the intelligence that Gundobald had violated his recent obligations, and that the unfortunate Godegesil, who was left at Vienna with a garrison of five thousand Franks, had been besieged, surprised and massacred by his inhuman brother. Such an outrage might have exasperated the patience of the

most peaceful sovereign; yet the conqueror of Gaul dissembled the injury, released the tribute, and accepted the alliance and military service of the king of Burgundy. Clovis no longer possessed those advantages which had assured the success of the preceding war, and his rival, instructed by adversity, had found new resources in the affections of his people. The Gauls or Romans applauded the mild and impartial laws of Gundobald, which almost raised them to the same level with their conquerors. The bishops were reconciled and flattered by the hopes, which he artfully suggested, of his approaching conversion; and though he eluded their accomplishment to the last moment of his life, his moderation secured the peace and suspended the ruin of the kingdom of Burgundy." -- Gibbon.4

10. In A. D. 507 Clovis turned his arms against the Visigoths in southwestern Gaul, who were ruled by Alaric II. "At the third hour of the day, about ten miles from Poitiers, Clovis overtook, and instantly attacked, the Gothic army, whose defeat was already prepared by terror and confusion. Yet they rallied in their extreme distress, and the martial youths, who had clamorously demanded the battle, refused to survive the ignominy of flight. The two kings encountered each other in single combat. Alaric fell by the hand of his rival; and the victorious Frank was saved, by the goodness of his cuirass, and the vigor of his horse, from the spears of two desperate Goths, who furiously rode against him to revenge the death of their sovereign. The vague expression of a mountain of the slain serves to indicate a cruel though indefinite slaughter." -- Gibbon.5 In A. D. 508 a treaty of peace was made between the two peoples. "The Visigoths were suffered to retain the possession of Septimania, a narrow tract of seacoast, from the Rhone to the Pyrenees; but the ample province of Aquitain, from those mountains to the Loire, was indissolubly united to the kingdom of France."6

11. In A. D. 510, Anastasius, emperor of the Eastern Empire of Rome, sent to Clovis "at Tours a solemn embassy, bringing to him the titles and insignia of Patrician and Consul. `Clovis,' says Gregory of Tours, put on the tunic of purple and the chlamys and the diadem; then mounting his horse he scattered with his own hand and with

much bounty gold and silver amongst the people on the road which lies between the gate of the court belonging to the basilica of St. Martin and the church of the city. From that day he was called Consul and Augustus. On leaving the city of Tours he repaired to Paris, where he fixed the seat of his government.'

12. "Paris was certainly the political center of the dominion, the intermediate point between the early settlements of his race and himself in Gaul, and his new Gallic conquests; but he lacked some of the possessions nearest to him. . . . To the east, north, and southwest of Paris were settled some independent Frankish tribes, governed by chieftains with the name of kings. So soon as he had settled in Paris, it was the one fixed idea of Clovis to reduce them all to subjection. He had conquered the Burgundians and the Visigoths; it remained for him to conquer and unite together all the Franks. The barbarian showed himself in his true colors, during this new enterprise, with his violence, his craft, his cruelty, and his perfidy." By the basest treachery and by sheer murder he put out of his way the kings of these Frankish tribes; and "so Clovis remained sole king of the Franks: for all the independent chieftains had disappeared." -- Guizot.7

13. Clovis died, Nov. 27, 511; and his dominions were divided among his four sons -- Theodoric, or Thierry I, Childebert, Clodomir, and Clotaire I. Theodoric, or Thierry I, the eldest son, had the northeastern portion, which lay on both sides of the Rhine, with his capital at Metz. Childebert, the second son, held the central part, the country around Paris, with Paris as his capital. Clodomir, the third son, received western Gaul, along the Loire; and had his capital at Orleans. Clotaire, the youngest son, ruled in the northern part of Gaul, with his capital at Soissons. The Alemanni under the governorship of dukes, belonged with the eastern partition and were tributary to Theodoric. The Burgundians were still ruled by their own kings until 532, when the last Burgundian king, Sigismond, the son of Gundobald, was removed by being buried alive in a deep well, and the Burgundians, too, ruled by dukes, "were still permitted to enjoy their national laws under the obligation of tribute and military service; and the Merovingian princes peaceably reigned over a kingdom, whose glory

and greatness had been first overthrown by the arms of Clovis." -- Gibbon.8

14. The quadruple division of the dominions of Clovis ended in 558 by being merged in the sole rule of Clotaire I, who held the power till his death in 561, when it was again divided into four parts among his four sons -- Charibert, king of Paris; Gontran, of Orleans; Sigebert, of Metz; and Chilperic, of Soissons. The Burgundians fell to the portion of Gontran, who left Orleans, and fixed his capital in their country.

15. "In 567 Charibert, king of Paris, died, without children, and a new partition left only three kingdoms -- Austrasia, Neustria, and Burgundy. Austrasia, in the east, extended over the two banks of the Rhine, and comprised, side by side with Roman towns and districts, populations that had remained Germanic. [The Alemanni -- Suabians -- belonged in this division.] Neustria, in the west, was essentially Gallo-Roman, though it comprised in the north the old territory of the Salian Franks, on the borders of the Scheldt. Burgundy was the old kingdom of the Burgundians, enlarged in the north by some few counties. Paris, as having been the residence of Clovis, their common progenitor, "was kept as a sort of neutral city, which none of them could enter without the common consent of all." -- Guizot.9

16. In A. D. 567-570, the Lombards, who until this time had continued to dwell in Noricum and northern Panmonia, led by their King Alboin, removed to Italy.10 "The victorious Autharis [A. D. 584-590] asserted his claim to the dominion of Italy. At the foot of the Rhaetian Alps, he subdued the resistance, and rifled the hidden treasures, of a sequestered island in the lake of Comum. At the extreme point of Calabria, he touched with his spear a column on the seashore of Rhegium, proclaiming that ancient landmark to stand the immovable boundary of his kingdom." With the exception of the possessions of the Exarchate of Ravenna, and some cities on the coast, "the remainder of Italy was possessed by the Lombards; and from Pavia, the royal seat, their kingdom was extended to the east, the north, and the west, as far as the

confines of the Avars,11 the Bavarians, and the Franks of Austrasia and Burgundy." -- Gibbon.12

17. "In A. D. 613 new incidents connected with family matters placed Clotaire II, son of Chilperic, and heretofore king of Soissons, in possession of the three kingdoms" of Austrasia, Neustria, and Burgundy. Clotaire II "kept them united until 628 and left them so to his son Dagobert I, who remained in possession of them until 638. At his death a new division of the Frankish dominions took place, no longer into three but two kingdoms: Austrasia being the one, and Neustria and Burgundy the other." -- Guizot.13

18. In tracing this history farther it is essential to note the rise of a new character in these kingdoms, -- the Mayor of the Palace, -- which finally developed the era of Charlemagne. The last king of the line of Clovis, who displayed or possessed any of the characteristics of a king was Dagobert I. After his death in A. D. 638, the kings dwindled into insignificance, if not idiocy, and the Mayors of the Palace assumed sole authority, yet always in the name of the "do-nothing" kings; and the struggle for supremacy was kept up between the mayors, as it had been before by the kings. Finally, in A. D. 687, Pepin of Heristal, Mayor of the Palace, of Austrasia defeated Berthar, mayor of Neustria, at the battle of Testry, and so brought the contest virtually to an end. "From that time to the end of his life, in A. D. 714, Pepin of Heristal was unquestioned master of all Franks, the kings under him being utterly insignificant." Pepin of Heristal was succeeded by his son Charles, who in A. D. 732 won the name of Martel -- the Hammer -- by the crushing defeat which he gave to the Saracens under Abdel-Rahman at the battle of Tours.

19. Charles Martel died Oct. 22, 741, and left his dominions divided between his two sons, Pepin the Short, and Carloman. Pepin had Neustria, Burgundy, Provence, and the suzerainty of Aquitaine. Carloman had Austrasia, Thuringia, and Allemannia. Each, however, with only the title of Mayor of the Palace. In 746 Carloman abdicated his power, left his dominions to Pepin, had Pope Zachary to make him a monk,

and shut himself up in the monastery of Monte Casino. Thus in 747 Pepin the Short found himself sole master of all the heritage of Clovis, but still with only the title of Mayor of the Palace. At last in 751 he decided to put an end to the fiction. He sent an embassy to the pope to consult him "on the subject of the kings then existing amongst the Franks, and who bore only the name of king without enjoying a tittle of royal authority." The pope, who had been already posted on the matter, answered that "it was better to give the title of king to him who exercised the sovereign power." Accordingly the next year in March, 752, "in the presence and with the assent of

the general assembly" at Soissons, Pepin was proclaimed king of the Franks, and received from the hand of St. Boniface the sacred anointing. "At the head of the Franks, as Mayor of the Palace from 741, and as king from 752, Pepin had completed in France and extended in Italy the work which his father Charles Martel had begun and carried on from 714 to 741 in State and Church. He left France reunited in one and placed at the head of Christian Europe." -- Guizot.14 He died at the monastery of St. Denis, Sept. 18, 768.

20. Pepin, like his father, left his dominions to two sons, Charles and Carloman; but in 771 Carloman died, leaving Charles sole king, who, by his remarkable ability, became Charles the Great -- CHARLEMAGNE. "The appellation of great has often been bestowed and sometimes deserved, but CHARLEMAGNE is the only prince in whose favor the title has been indissolubly blended with the name. . . . The dignity of his person, the length of his reign, the prosperity of his arms, the vigor of his government, and the reverence of distant nations, distinguish him from the royal crowd; and Europe dates a new era from his restoration of the Western Empire." -- Gibbon.15

21. It seems almost certain that Charlemagne really aspired to the restoration of the Roman Empire. But one life was too short, and there was no second Charlemagne. Besides this, the prophetic word was written that when once Rome was divided into its ten parts, they should not be made to cleave one to another any more than could iron and clay.

22. Charlemagne reigned forty-six years -- forty-three from the

death of Carloman -- thirty-three of which were spent in almost ceaseless wars. He conducted, in all, fifty-three expeditions -- thirty-one against the Saxons, Frisons, Danes, Slavs, Bavarians, and the Avars in southern Germany, Bohemia, Noricum, and Pannonia; five against the Lombards, in Italy; twelve against the Saracens, in Spain, Corsica, and Sardinia; two against the Greeks; and three in Gaul itself against the Aquitanians and the Britons. Thus Saxony, Bohemia, Bavaria, Pannonia; the Lombard kingdom of Italy as far as the duchy of Beneventum; that part of Spain between the Pyrenees and the river Ebro; Burgundy, Alemannia, and all Gaul, were subject to Charlemagne.

23. He already wore the iron crown of Lombardy, in addition to bearing the kingship of all the Frankish dominions; and on Christmas day, 800, in the church of St. Peter, Pope Leo III placed a precious crown upon the head of this mighty king, while the great dome resounded with the acclamations of the people: "Long life and victory to Charles, the most pious Augustus, crowned by God the great and pacific emperor of the Romans." "And when in 801 an embassy arrived with curious presents from Harun-al-Rashid, the great caliph who held in the East the like position to that held by Charles in the West, men recognized it as a becoming testimony to the world-wide reputation of the Frankish monarchy." "For fourteen years, with less of fighting and more of organization, Charles the Great proved that he was worthy of his high title and revived office of emperor of the West."

24. But this honor, this power, and this glory were short-lived. Charlemagne died at Aix-la-Chapelle, Jan. 28, 814, and the unity of the empire which he had formed was at an end. "Like more than one great barbaric warrior, he admired the Roman Empire that had fallen, -- its vastness all in one and its powerful organization under the hand of a single master. He thought he could resuscitate it, durably, through the victory of a new people and a new faith, by the hand of Franks and Christians. With this view he labored to conquer, convert, and govern. He tried to be, at one and the same time, Caesar, Augustus, and Constantine. And for a moment he appeared to have succeeded; but the appearance passed away with himself. The unity of the empire and the absolute power of the emperor were buried in his grave." -- Guizot.16

25. Charlemagne was succeeded by his only surviving son, Louis the Pious, or Easy, upon whom he had fixed the succession in 813, about six months before his death. Louis passed his life in a struggle with an ambitious second wife, and three undutiful sons, who by constant rebellions abused his natural gentleness and goodness. In the quarrels and jealousies of his sons he was twice deposed and twice restored; and perhaps only escaped a third deposition, by his death, June 20, 840. This set his sons free to wrangle among themselves, which they did till the fearful battle of Fontanet, June 25, 841; and the treaty of Verdun, August, 843, put an end to their mutual struggles and "to the griefs of the age." Lothair, the eldest son, retained the title of emperor; and received the Italian territory, with a long, narrow strip stretching from the Gulf of Lyons to the North Sea, bounded on the east by the Alps and the Rhine, and on the west by the Rhone, the Saone, the Meuse, and the Scheldt. Charles the Bald had all the rest of Gaul. Louis the German received Alemannia and all the rest of the German lands east of the Rhine, with the towns of Mainz, Worms, and Spires, on the western bank of that river.

26. This division, though counted as marking the real beginning of the history of France and Germany as separate kingdoms, continued but a short time. For the emperor Lothair died in 855, and was succeeded in his possessions to the north of Italy by Lothair II, who died in 869, when Charles the Bald seized upon his territory. But Louis the German disputed his seizure of the whole prize, and in 870 they signed the treaty of Mersen by which Louis became possessed of most of Lotharingia, or, as it was now called, Lorraine; Charles the Bald the rest of it; and Lothair's brother, Louis II, was allowed to retain the possessions of his father in Italy. Louis II died in 875, and Charles the Bald managed to secure the imperial crown, and aimed at the possession of the whole empire with it. But Louis the German, at his death in 876, had divided Germany among his three sons, -- Carlman, Louis, and Charles, -- the second of whom, Louis, met Charles the Bald on the field of Andernach, and gained such a victory over him as not only to put an effectual damper upon his imperial aspirations, but to force him to give up the portions of Lorraine that had been ceded to his father by the treaty of Mersen. Carlman and Louis both soon died,

and the German kingdom passed to Charles surnamed "the Fat," the youngest of the three sons of Louis the German.

27. Charles the Fat, incompetent, indolent, and gluttonous, became, without any effort of his own, sovereign of all the dominions of Charlemagne, except Burgundy, which now became again an independent state. Alemannia -- Swabia -- he inherited from his father in 876; by the death of his brother Carlman, he received Bavaria, and became king of Italy, in 880; he was crowned emperor in 881; the death of his brother Louis of Saxony gave him all the rest of the Germanic possessions; and as Charles the Bald had died in 877, and had no successor who could relieve France from the scourge of the Northmen, Charles the Fat was invited to become the king of France, at the death of Carloman in 885. But instead of boldly meeting the Northmen with an army, he adopted the policy of buying off these bold savages who had plundered Cologne and Treves, and had fed their horses over the very grave and in the beautiful basilica of Charlemagne. And when they laid siege to Paris and Charles still pursued the same cowardly course, his disgusted subjects under the leadership of his nephew Arnulf, deposed him in 887, and in a week or two afterward he died. Charles the Fat was the last ruler who ever reigned over both France and Germany. After his deposition, the history of these two countries is distinct.

28. At the time of the deposition of Charles the Fat, France proper was already broken up into "twenty-nine provinces or fragments of provinces which had become petty states, the former governors of which, under the names of dukes, counts, marquises, and viscounts, were pretty nearly real sovereigns. Twenty-nine great fiefs, which have played a special part in French history, date back to this epoch." -- Guizot.17 This divided condition of things prevented any systematic defense of the land against the Norman invasions, which like wave after wave of a mighty tide flooded the land. After Charles the Fat had so signally failed them in their struggle against the Normans, the states of France chose from among themselves to be central ruler and king, Eudes, count of Paris. Before Charles the Fat had come to Paris with his army only to buy off the Normans, Eudes had demonstrated his ability and valor, in the defense of Paris against the terrible siege pressed

by the Normans led by Rolf; and he was now, A. D. 888, rewarded with the position and title of king.

29. The Northmen -- Nor'men, Nor'man, Normans -- were people of the far north: first of Scandinavia in general, later more especially of Norway. Their invasions of France began even in the time of Charlemagne. For when Charlemagne one day "arrived by mere hap and unexpectedly in a certain town of Narbonnese Gaul, whilst he was at dinner and was as yet unrecognized by any, some corsairs of the Northmen came to ply their piracies in the very port. When their vessels were descried, they were supposed to be Jewish traders according to some, African according to others, and British in the opinions of others; but the gifted monarch, perceiving by the build and lightness of the craft, that they bore not merchandise, but foes, said to his own folks: `These vessels be not laden with merchandise, but manned with cruel foes.' At these words all the Franks, in rivalry one with another, ran to their ships, but uselessly, for the Northmen . . . feared lest all their fleet should be taken or destroyed in the port, and they avoided, by a flight of inconceivable rapidity, not only the glaives, but even the eyes, of those who were pursuing them.

30. "Pious Charles, however, a prey to well-grounded fear, rose up from the table, stationed himself at a window looking eastward, and there remained a long while, and his eyes were filled with tears. As none durst question him, this warlike prince explained to the grandees who were about his person, the cause of his movement and of his tears: `Know ye, my lieges, wherefore I weep so bitterly? Of a surety I fear not lest these fellows should succeed in injuring me by their miserable piracies; but it grieveth me deeply that, whilst I live, they should have been nigh to touching at this shore; and I am a prey to violent sorrow when I foresee what evils they will heap upon my descendants and their people.'"

31. "The forecast and the dejection of Charles were not unreasonable. It will be found that there is special mention made, in the Chronicles of the ninth and tenth centuries, of forty-seven incursions into France, of Norwegian, Danish, Swedish, and Irish pirates, all comprised under the name of Northmen; and, doubtless, many other incursions of less gravity have left no trace in history." -- Guizot.18 It

was one of the greatest of these invasions, led by Rollo, or Rolf, that resulted in the raising of Eudes, count of Paris, to the kingship in 888. When questioned by a messenger of the Franks, as to their intentions, Rollo answered: "We be Danes; and all be equally masters amongst us. We be come to drive out the inhabitants of this land, and subject it as our own country."19

32. The contest between Eudes and Rollo was variable; but with the general gain in favor of the Normans. This because Rollo showed himself friendly to the people not found in arms, and treated gently those in the towns and country which he gained. Thus not only were the Franks kept from uniting solidly against the Normans, but some of the divisions were actually won to co-operation with them. In addition to this successful policy toward the people of France, Rollo held the lasting friendship of Alfred the Great, and his successor, Athel stane, of England. "He thus became, from day to day, more reputable as well as more formidable in France, insomuch that Eudes himself was obliged to have recourse, in dealing with him, to negotiations and presents."20

33. The provinces of southern France had not acknowledged Eudes as king. When he had quieted the Normans, Eudes ventured an attempt to compel the southern provinces to acknowledge him as king. Then the southern lords united with the disaffected parties in the northern provinces, held at Rheims in 893 "a great assembly," and elected as rival king, Charles the Simple. He placed himself under the protection of the Emperor Arnulf, of whose house he was; and Arnulf "formally invested him with the kingdom of France, and sent soldiers to assert his claims." In 898 Eudes died, and Charles the Simple was recognized sole king of France.

34. By this time, Rollo with his Normans had grown to be such a power in France "that the necessity of treating with him was clear. In 911 Charles, by advice of his councilors and, amongst them, of Robert, brother of the late king Eudes, who had himself become count of Paris and duke of France, sent to the chieftain of the Northmen Franco, archbishop of Rouen, with orders to offer him the cession of a considerable portion of Neustria and the hand of his young daughter

Gisele, on condition that he become a Christian and acknowledge himself the king's vassal. Rollo, by the advice of his comrades, received these overtures with a good grace; and agreed to a truce for three months, during which they might treat about peace." -- Guizot.21 At the end of the three months the Normans had concluded to accept in general the king's offer. A day was fixed for the formal settlement of the terms of the proposed arrangement. Rollo insisted on receiving much more territory than King Charles had originally offered. This, with all other matters, was made satisfactory to him and his warriors; and then came the fulfillment of their part of the compact -- their baptism, and Rollo's swearing fealty as vassal of the king. Rollo and his warriors were formally baptized, Rollo receiving the name of Robert; and duly receiving in marriage the king's daughter Gisele.

35. Then came the swearing of fealty. This was a ceremony which, in those times, was performed "whenever there was a change either of the overlord or of the underlord. The duke, count, or whatever he was, knelt down before the overlord; and, holding his hands, swore to follow him in war, and to be true to him always. The overlord, in his turn, swore to aid him and be a true and good lord to him in return, and kissed his brow. In return, the underlord -- vassal, as he was called -- was to kiss the foot of his superior. This was paying homage. Kings thus paid homage and swore allegiance to the emperor; dukes or counts, to kings; lesser counts or barons, to dukes; and for the lands they owned they were bound to serve their lord in council and in war, and not to fight against him. Lands so held were called fiefs; and the whole was called the feudal system." -- Yonge.22 The ceremony passed off all smoothly enough until it came to the point where Rollo should kiss the king's foot. This Rollo omitted. The bishops told him that one "who received such a gift as the duchy of Normandy, was bound to kiss the king's foot." But Rollo bluntly answered: "Never will I bend the knee before the knees of any; and I will kiss the foot of none."

36. However, at the special request of the Franks, and rather than to make a breach in the compact, Rollo consented that the king's foot should be kissed; but only by one of his warriors, and so gave order

to one standing by. The tall Northman, instead of kneeling and reverently performing the ceremony, simply stooped and seized the king's foot, and, standing "bolt upright," lifted it to his lips: with the result that the king, with his throne and all, was upset backward: "which caused great bursts of laughter and much disturbance amongst the throng. Then the king and all the grandees who were about him -- prelates, abbots, dukes, and counts -- swore, in the name of the Catholic faith, that they would protect the patrician Rollo in his life, his members, and his folk, and would guarantee to him the possession of the aforesaid land, to him and his descendants forever. After which the king, well-satisfied, returned to his domains; and Rollo departed with Duke Robert for the town of Rouen."23

37. Thus arose the duchy of Normandy, whose dukes and people played such a large part in the history of the later Middle Ages. There "the history of Normandy began. Hrolf becomes Duke Robert, his people become Frenchmen. The duchy soon grew into a compact and orderly state, prosperous and vigorous; Norman towns and churches sprang up on all hands; French manners and speech soon ruled supreme; and in all the arts of peace, in building, commerce, letters, the Normans forthwith took the lead. The noble Scandinavian race, destined to influence so large a portion of the world's history, herein made worthy mark on the soil and institutions of France.

38. "Soon after this time the French lords, headed by Robert, duke of France, the `king of the barons,' second son of Robert the Strong, rose against their Caroling king [A. D. 922], and shut him up in Laon, the last stronghold of his family; thence he fled into Lorraine. On the death of Robert, the barons made Rodolf of Burgundy their king, and continued the strife; and Charles, falling into the hands of Hubert of Vermandois, was held by him as a hostage till his death in 929. Rodolf then became undisturbed king till he, too, died in 936. The barons under the guidance of Hugh `the White' or `the Great,' son of Robert, the greatest man of his age, sent over to England for Louis the son of Charles, who had been carried thither by his mother for safety. This is that `Louis d'Outremer' -- `Louis from Over-sea' -- who now became king. After showing unusual vigor in a struggle with

Otho the Great of Germany, who claimed the kingship over France, he was recognized by all in 941.

39. "His reign could be nothing but the miserable record of a struggle against the great lords, Hugh the Great and Richard of Normandy. In this perpetual and wearisome strife he spent his latter days, and died, still a young man, in 954. He was the only man of energy among all the later Carolings. His son Lothair succeeded. His was a long and inglorious reign, ending in 986. His son Louis followed, ruling for a single year. He died childless in 987; and the only heir to the throne -- if the feudal lords chose to recognize an hereditary claim -- was his uncle, Charles, duke of Lorraine. The barons did not choose to be so tied. They set the Caroling prince aside, and elected Hugh, duke of France, to be king. He was afterward solemnly crowned at Rheims by Archbishop Adalberon. Thus did Hugh Capet, founder of a great dynasty, come to the throne. With him begins the true history of the kingdom of France: we have reached the epoch of the feudal monarchy."24

40. "Hugh Capet, eldest son of Hugh the Great, duke of France, was but a Neustrian noble when he was elected king. The house of the Carolings was entirely set aside, its claims and rights denied, by the new force now growing up, the force of feudalism. The head of the barons should be one of themselves; he should stand clear of the imperial ideas and ambitions which had ruled the conduct of his predecessors; he should be a Frenchman in speech and birth and thought, and not a German; but above all, he must be strong enough to hold his own. And among the great lords of northern France, the representative of the house of Robert the Strong held the most central position, and united in himself most elements of strength."25 That the king should be strong enough to hold his own, was indeed the greatest need, if there were to be any king of France at all. We have seen that at the time of the deposition of Charles the Fat, exactly a hundred years before, France was broken up into twenty-nine petty states. But at the time of the election of Hugh Capet, 987, the number of petty states had increased to fifty-five. And the temper of their rulers is

aptly indicated in the reply that one of them, Adalbert, count of Pergord, once made to Hugh Capet himself after he had been made king. In a tone of superiority, Hugh had asked: "Who made thee count?" Quick as a flash, Adalbert darted back the words: "Who made thee king?"

41. "It was a confederation of petty sovereigns, of petty despots, unequal amongst themselves, and having, one toward another, certain duties and rights; but invested in their own domains, over their personal and direct subjects, with arbitrary and absolute power. This is the essential element of the feudal system: therein it differs from every other aristocracy, every other form of government. There has been no scarcity, in this world, of aristocracies and despotisms. There have been peoples arbitrarily governed, nay, absolutely possessed, by a single man, by a college of priests, by a body of patricians. But none of these despotic governments was like the feudal system. . . .

42. "Liberty, equality, and tranquillity were all alike wanting, from the tenth to the thirteenth century, to the inhabitants of each lord's domains: their sovereign was at their very doors, and none of them was hidden from him or beyond the reach of his mighty arm. Of all tyrannies, the worst is that which can thus keep account

of its subjects; and which sees from its seat, the limits of its empire. The caprices of the human will then show themselves in all their intolerable extravagance and, moreover, with irresistible promptness. It is then, too, that inequality of conditions makes itself more rudely felt: riches, might, independence, every advantage and every right present themselves every instant to the gaze of misery, weakness, and servitude. The inhabitants of fiefs could not find consolation in the bosom of tranquillity: incessantly mixed up in the quarrels of their lord, a prey to his neighbors' devastations, they led a life still more precarious and still more restless than that of the lords themselves, and they had to put up at one and the same time with the presence of war, privilege, and absolute power." -- Guizot.26

43. Politically, feudalism might be defined as the system which made the owner of a piece of land, whether large or small, the sovereign of those who dwelt thereon: an annexation of personal to territorial

authority more familiar to Easter despotism than to the free races of primitive Europe. On this principle were founded, and by it are explained, feudal law and justice, feudal finance, feudal legislation, each tenant holding toward his lord the position which his own tenants held toward himself. And it is just because the relation was so uniform, the principle so comprehensive, the ruling class so firmly bound to its support, that feudalism has been able to lay upon society that grasp which the struggles of more than twenty generations have scarcely shaken off." -- Bryce.27

44. From this point onward to the period of the Reformation, the history of France is so wrapped up in contentions with the papacy, with the Crusades, and with the "Hundred Years' War" with England, that it is not necessary to treat it any further separately. The dynasty founded in the election of Hugh Capet continues even to-day, in certain claimants to the throne of France, if only that throne were restored.

---

1 [Page 19] "History of France," chap. vii, par. 9.

2 [Page 20] Id., "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. xxxvii, par. 4.

3 [Page 21] Id., par. 5.

4 [Page 22] Id., pars. 8, 9.

5 [Page 22] Id. par. 12.

6 [Page 22] Id.

7 [Page 23] "History of France," chap. vii, pars. 4, 5 from end.

8 [Page 24] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. xxxviii, par. 10.

9 [Page 24] "History of France," chap. viii, par. 1.

10 [Page 24] "Great Empires of Prophecy," chap. xliv, pars. 17-19.

11 [Page 25] The Avars were a Scythian people of North Central Asia, who entered in the sixth century the territory that is now Hungary.

12 [Page 25] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. xiv, pars. 14, 15.

13 [Page 25] "History of France," chap. viii, par. 2.

14 [Page 26] "History of France," chap. ix.

15 [Page 26] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. xlix, par. 21.

16 [Page 27] "History of France," chap. xi, end.

17 [Page 29] "History of France," chap. xiii, par. 2.

18 [Page 30] "History of France," chap. xii, pars. 3-5.

19 [Page 31] Id., par. 10.

20 [Page 31] Id., par. 14.

21 [Page 32] "History of France," chap. xii, par. 14.

22 [Page 32] "The World's Great Nations," French History, chap. ix, par. 3.

23 [Page 33] Guizot's "History of France," chap. xii, par. 14.

24 [Page 34] Encyclopedia Britannica, art: "France," history, "Charles the Simple."

25 [Page 34] Id.

26 [Page 35] "History of France," chap. xiii, pars. 11-13.

27 [Page 36] "The Holy Roman Empire." chap. viii, par. 3.

5. THE ALEMANNI IN THE MIDDLE AGES

THE Alemanni and their Suevic brethren who followed them in the invasion and division of the Roman Empire took possession of all of the Roman provinces of Rhaetia and Vindelicia, and the territory of Agri Decumates. "Thus the Alemanni filled up all that southwestern corner of Germany and Switzerland which is naturally bounded by the Rhine as it flows westward to Bale and then makes a sudden turn at right angles northward to Strasburg, Worms, and Maintz." -- Hodgkin.1 They occupied the northern border of what is now Switzerland, as far south as Winterthur. To this territory to the eastward of the northern flow of the Rhine, they also added that part of Gaul which lay between the Rhine and Moselle, and the head waters of the Seine. Thus in all at the fall of the empire in 476 the Alemanni occupied the country which now comprises Alsace, Lorraine, Baden, Wurtemburg, greater part of Bavaria, and the southern of the large divisions of HesseDarmstadt.

2. When the Alemanni were defeated by Clovis, their Gallic possessions became the prize of the conqueror, but all the rest they were allowed to occupy, and were permitted by Clovis and his successors "to enjoy their peculiar manners and institutions, under the government of official, and at length of hereditary dukes." -- Gibbon.2 These,as well as the other German conquests of Clovis, "soon became virtually free. They

continued to acknowledge Frankish supremacy; but the acknowledgment was only formal. At the head of each confederation was its own herzog or duke. These rulers were at first appointed by the Frankish kings, or received their sanction; but in course of time the office became hereditary in particular families."3

3. Of the Alemanni the two principal dukedoms were Swabia and Bavaria; and it is under these two names that their future history is found. But as Swabia is the original, and as it has exerted a greater influence in the affairs of Germany than has any other confederation, it is the one about which most must be said; for the history of it is, in a measure, the history of Germany, especially after the treaty of Verdun, A. D. 843.

4. Thassilo, duke of Bavaria, had been on ill terms with Pepin, the father of Charlemagne. When Charlemagne came to the throne, Thassilo rendered very indifferent service. His repeated acts of treachery caused Charlemagne to remove him, and Bavaria was placed under the authority of the margrave of Ostreich. The "margraves" were "lords of the marches." The "marches" were formed of the border countries, by Charlemagne, over which he appointed "margraves" (markgrafen) "whose duty was to administer justice in his name, to collect tribute, and extend his conquests." Bavaria was ruled by margraves till about 900, when it again became a dukedom. The margraviate of Ostreich continued till 1156, when it, too, was made a duchy, and thus the march of Ostreich -- East domain -- formed by Charlemagne, was the origin of what is now the empire of Austria.

5. In the treaty of Verdun, it will be remembered, Louis the German received the whole of Germany east of the Rhine. And as he was the first sovereign who ruled over the Germans, and over no other western people, he is considered in history as the founder of the kingdom of Germany. At his death, his son Charles the Fat received from him Swabia -- Alemannia; and, as before shown, by the death of his two brothers, Charles inherited all Germany, was made emperor, and by invitation assumed the sovereignty of France, but was deposed, and Arnulf, his nephew, was chosen king of Germany in his place. Arnulf. like Charles the Fat, went to Rome and was crowned emperor. He returned in 890 and inflicted such a defeat upon the Northmen that "they never again returned in such numbers as to be a national peril."

6. Arnulf died in 899 and was succeeded by his son Louis the Child, six years old, who nominally reigned till 911. His reign was one of the darkest periods of German history. For, as soon as the Magyars -- the modern Hungarians -- heard that Arnulf had been succeeded

by a child, "they swept into Germany in vast numbers, and fearful was the havoc they caused in every part of the kingdom." "Where the Northmen had whipped with cords, these barbarians lashed with scorpions." And there was no leader around whom the nation could rally. At this time and for about three hundred years, Germany consisted of five duchies, -- Swabia, Bavaria Franconia, Saxony, and Lorraine.

7. Louis the Child died in 911. Even while he lived, the dukes were virtually kings in their duchies; and when he died, they could have been altogether kings, but that the dangers threatened by the Magyars, the Slavs, and the Northmen, obliged them to form a central government for the common defense. Accordingly, the nobles assembled at Forcheim, and upon the advice of Otto, the duke of Saxony, Conrad, duke of Franconia, was made king. But his election displeased the dukes of Bavaria, Swabia, and Lorraine. The duke of Lorraine rebelled outright. The dukes of Bavaria and Swabia yielded; but the bishops, jealous of their power, induced Conrad to force a quarrel with these as also with Henry, duke of Saxony. This fairly created al1 an anarchy all the days of Conrad; but on his deathbed, 918, he recommended that Henry of Saxony be chosen king in his stead.

8. With Henry began the rule of the house of Saxony, which continued one hundred and six years, 918-1024, through Henry I, Otto I, Otto II, Otto III and Henry II. Henry I delivered Germany from the scourge of the Magyars; and so thoroughly restored peace and order throughout the dominion that when he died, in 936, "every

land inhabited by German population formed part of the kingdom, and none of the duchies were at war with each other nor among themselves." Before his death the nobles had, in national assembly, promised Henry that his son Otto should be recognized as his successor, and the promise was kept. Otto I the Great reigned from 936-973. His half-brother, however, raised a rebellion, and was joined by the dukes of Franconia and Bavaria. But by the help of the duke of Swabia the rising was put down. A second rebellion was led by Otto's brother helped by the dukes of Franconia and Lorraine. This, too, was quelled, to the immense advantage of Otto.

9. Having secured peace in Germany, and made himself master of the kingdom, as none of his immediate predecessors had been, Otto

was by far the greatest sovereign in Europe. But not content with this, he decided to take a step that caused Germany ages of trouble -- he put himself into the hands of the pope, and became the "protector of the Church." The way in which it was brought about was this: Adelaide, the young widow of Lothair, the son of King Hugh of Provence, -- Burgundy, -- had refused to marry the son of Berengar, king of Lombardy. For this she was cast into prison and was cruelly treated. She appealed to Otto. Her appeal not only touched his sympathies, but aroused in him a strong ambition; for he saw the way thus opened to imperial authority.

10. At the head of a strong force Otto crossed the Alps in 951. He displaced Berengar, who, "in the extremity of his fortunes, made a formal cession of the Italian kingdom, in his own name and in that of his son Adalbert to the Saxon, as his overlord." Upon this Otto assumed the title of king of Italy. Besides this, he was so fascinated by young Queen Adelaide that in a few weeks he married her. His son Ludolf thought his rights threatened by this marriage; returned sullenly to Germany; and with the archbishop of Mainz formed a conspiracy against his father. Otto, hearing of their plot, hastened home, leaving Duke Conrad of Lorraine to attend to affairs in Italy. But Conrad restored the crown to Berengar, and returned to Germany and joined the conspiracy of Ludolf and the archbishop. War broke out. The majority of the kingdom were indeed opposed to Otto: being displeased with his ambitious designs in Italy. But Conrad and Ludolf basely invited in the terrible Magyars; which so disgusted the Germans that the whole nation, with one consent, rallied to the support of Otto. At the battle of Lechfeld, 955. Conrad was slain, and the Magyars received such an overwhelming defeat that the deliverance of Germany was complete. From that time the Magyars began to settle, and "adapt themselves to the conditions of civilized life in the country which they now occupy." and so arose the kingdom of Hungary.

11. Meantime, in Italy, Berengar and his son Adalbert had laid such exorbitant taxes, and had made themselves so tyrannical, that an embassy was sent by the most of the bishops and princes, as well as the pope, imploring Otto to come again and deliver them. The pope at this time was John XII. The legates of the pope "were enjoined

to offer the imperial crown to the king of Germany, provided he drove out the tyrants, and delivered the mother of all churches from the miseries she groaned under and could no longer bear." -- Bower.4 At this Otto went a second time into Italy, in 962, deposed Berengar, and was crowned emperor by the pope.

12. "The emperor, at the request of the pope, promised upon oath to defend the Roman Church against all her enemies; to maintain her in the quiet possession of all the privileges she had enjoyed to that time; to restore to the holy see the lands and possessions that belonged to St. Peter, as soon as he recovered them; to assist the pope to the utmost of his power when assistance was wanted; and lastly to make no alteration of the government of Rome without his knowledge or approbation. At the same time the emperor confirmed all the grants of Pepin and Charlemagne; but obliged in his turn the pope and the Romans to swear obedience to him, and promise upon oath to lend no kind of assistance to Berengar or to his son Adalbert, from whose tyranny he was come to deliver them."5

13. Thus in the year 962 was formed the "Holy Roman Empire," that mightiest weapon of the papacy in the Middle Ages. After Otto, the sovereign crowned in Germany always claimed it as his right to be afterward crowned in Milan with the iron crown of Lombardy, and in Rome with the golden crown of the empire. In 964 Otto returned to Germany, increased the number of the duchies and nobles, and as he was now the protector of the Church, and was set for the promotion of her interests, he immensely increased the importance of the prelates. "They received great gifts of land, were endowed with jurisdiction in criminal as well as civil cases, and obtained several other valuable sovereign rights." In 966 he went once more to Italy, where he remained till his death, May 7, 973.

14. Nothing of particular note occurred in the reigns of the three following emperors of the house of Saxony, except that the last one, Henry II, made a treaty with Rudolf III, king of Burgundy, by which at the death of Rudolf his kingdom was to be united to the empire; and showed himself so dutiful to the papacy that both he and his wife were made saints.

15. At Henry's death, in 1024, the great nobles met at Oppenheim, and elected Conrad II, a count of Franconia, king. With him began the rule of the house of Franconia, which continued one hundred years, through Conrad II, Henry III, Henry IV, and Henry V. Through the reigns of all, there were plottings, counter-plottings, and wars, civil as well as foreign, which kept the nation in a constant turmoil. In accordance with the above-mentioned treaty, Conrad, in 1032, received into the empire the kingdom of Burgundy; and in 1034 he received in Geneva the homage of its leading nobles. Conrad died in 1039, and was succeeded by his son Henry III, whom, as early as 1026, Conrad had caused to be elected king of Germany, and whom he had made duke of Bavaria in 1027, and duke of Swabia and king of Burgundy in 1038.

16. At this time the vices of the clergy all over Europe had become most scandalous: the popes setting the infamous example. Henry entered Rome with an army in 1046, summoned a council, deposed the pope who held the throne, and raised to the papal see, Clement II, who, in turn, crowned him emperor. In the succeeding ten years of his reign it devolved upon Henry to appoint three more popes in the succession; and as all of them were energetic administrators, and exerted themselves to carry out the policy of Henry, thus he did much to stay the tide of papal wickedness.

17. In 1056 Henry III died, and was succeeded by his son Henry, six years old, but who had already, at the age of four years, been crowned King Henry IV of Germany. He was under guardianship till he was fifteen years old, 1065, when he assumed the duties of government, and from that time till his death, forty-one years, between the fierce arrogance of the papacy and the ambitious jealousies of his own subject nobles, he never knew peace. During his reign was the first crusade, 1095; and he made Welf (or Guelf, or Guelph), of Altdorf in Swabia, duke of Bavaria.

18. Henry IV died in 1106, and was succeeded by his son Henry V. War with the papacy was renewed, in which Henry's chief friends were two Swabian princes of the Hohenstaufen family, Frederick and Conrad. Frederick had been made duke of Swabia by Henry IV; and now by Henry V, Conrad was made duke of Franconia, which had been

directly attached to the crown since the time of Otto I. Henry V was succeeded in 1125 by Lothair, duke of Saxony, and when he received the imperial crown, Innocent II claimed that he did so as the vassal of the pope. Lothair was succeeded in 1137 by the above Conrad, the Swabian duke of Franconia, who became Conrad III.

19. With Conrad III began the reign of the house of Swabia, or Hohenstaufen, which continued one hundred and seventeen years, and was the most glorious age of the mediaeval history of Germany. In 1146 went forth the second crusade, headed by the Emperor Conrad, and Louis VII of France. Conrad died in 1152, when

Germany passed under the rule of one of the greatest sovereigns she ever had, -- Frederick Barbarossa, duke of Swabia, -- who reigned thirty-eight years.

20. Here we must notice the rise of another Swabian family which has had a notable course in history, and which is inseparably connected with the reign of Frederick Barbarossa. Henry IV made Welf, or Guelf, of Swabia, duke of Bavaria. He was succeeded in the duchy of Bavaria by his son, Henry the Proud, who was invested with the duchy of Saxony. Henry the Proud rebelled against Conrad III, whereupon both his duchies were declared forfeited: Saxony was granted to Albert the Bear, a Saxon noble; and Bavaria fell to Leopold, margrave of Austria. Henry the Proud suddenly died, and his brother, duke Welf, continued the contest for his duchies. Welf, hoping to succeed Leopold in the margraviate, consented to a compromise by which Saxony, with the assent of Albert the Bear, was granted to Henry the Lion, the son of Henry the Proud. Instead, however, of the margraviate of Austria being given to Welf, it passed, in the end, to Henry Jasomirgott.6 Welf for years contended with his rival, but without avail, for Henry the Lion finally, at the head of an army, laid claim to Bavaria as his, by right of inheritance from his father, Henry the Proud. Frederick Barbarossa, through his mother, was allied to the Welfs; and he, having a personal regard for Henry the Lion, began his reign by promising to secure for Henry the duchy of Bavaria. The margrave Jasomirgott, however, persistently refused to give it up, till at last in 1156 Frederick detached the march of

Austria from Bavaria, made it a duchy with special privileges, and bestowed it on the stubborn margrave. This honor contented Jasomirgott, and left Frederick free to fulfill his promise to Henry the Lion; and so Henry received his paternal duchy of Bavaria, in addition to the duchy of Saxony which he already held. And from this Swabian -- Alemannian -- house of Welf, or Guelph, is descended in direct line through Henry the Proud and Henry the Lion, the house of Hanover, which has ruled England from George I -- Aug. 1, 1714 -- to the present Edward VII, "Rex Dei gracia."

21. Frederick Barbarossa received the German crown at Aix-la-Chapelle, March 9, 1152. In October, 1154, he descended to Italy and assumed the iron crown of Lombardy. Then, "after apprehending Arnold of Brescia, as an earnest of his purpose to support the papal cause," he was crowned emperor by Pope Adrian IV, June 18, 1155. From this time onward till 1186 the reign of Frederick was little else than a long contest with the Lombard cities and with the popes. By his marriage with Beatrice, daughter of the count of Upper Burgundy, he added that province to the kingdom of Burgundy and to the empire. He thus reasserted the imperial authority in Burgundy and received the homage of the Burgundian nobles. Having at last brought these struggles to an honorable close, he started in 1187 for Palestine at the head of the third crusade, but was drowned while crossing a small river in Pisidia, June 10, 1190.

22. Frederick was succeeded by his son, Henry VI, who was crowned emperor by Celestine III, March 31, 1191. Richard I of England, -- Coeur de Lion, -- as he was on his way home from the third crusade, had been arrested by the duke of Austria, Dec. 21, 1192, and in the following March was surrendered to the emperor Henry, who imprisoned him. With the money that was paid for Richard's ransom, the emperor was enabled to fit out a fine army, with which he succeeded in conquering the Saracen kingdom of Sicily. So great was the authority which he acquired that it is supposed to be almost certain that had he lived a little longer he would have achieved his great ambition of having the crown declared hereditary in his family. But this aspiration was quenched by his death in 1197. In his reign, about 1195, began the fourth crusade.

23. Upon Henry's death there was a double election. Philip, Henry's son, was favored by a large majority of the princes; while his opponents urged the claims of Otto, son of Henry the Lion. There was no hope for Otto, however, had not Innocent III cast into the scale in his favor all the influence of the papacy, which at this time was absolute. Even with the help of the pope, Otto's success was exceedingly doubtful until Philip was murdered, in 1208. This, of course, put a stop to the war, and Otto IV was crowned emperor.

24. As soon as Otto had been made emperor, he violated all the pledges he had made to the pope for the pontiff's favor, and began to act as an independent sovereign. This was what no sovereign could be suffered to do while Innocent III was pope. He accordingly played off against Otto, Frederick, the son of Henry VI. Otto, thinking to injure Frederick's chances by striking at the pope, went to the support of John, of England, against Philip Augustus, of France, but at the battle of Bouvines, July 27, 1214, he met a crushing defeat, and fled, a ruined emperor. He retired to his hereditary possession, the principality of Brunswick, and apart from that has no more place in history.

25. In the place of Otto IV, Frederick II "ascended the marble throne of Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle, and received the silver crown" of Germany, July, 1215; and Nov. 22, 1220, received at Rome, from the hands of Pope Honorius IV, the golden crown of the empire. In the estimation of his contemporaries, Frederick II was "the wonder of the world." Though perhaps not the strongest in all respects, he was the most brilliant of the German kings. In the beginning of his public career, in 1208, at the age of fifteen, he possessed but the crown of Sicily; and at his death, Dec. 13, 1250, the splendor of his position was such that it has never been surpassed in human history. For then he possessed in addition to his original and inherited crown of Sicily, the crown of Sardinia; the crown of Burgundy; the iron crown of Lombardy; the silver crown of Germany; the golden crown of the empire; and last, but in that age the most glorious of all, the crown of Jerusalem, with which he with his own hands had crowned himself, May 18, 1229, at the time of his recovery of the holy city from the Saracens and its restoration to the Church.

26. In A. D. 1245, July 17, Frederick was excommunicated by Pope

Innocent IV. When he heard of it he laughed, and said: "`Has the pope deposed me? Bring me my crowns that I may see of what I am deprived.' Then seven crowns were brought him -- the royal crown of Germany, the imperial diadem of Rome, the iron circlet of Lombardy, the crowns of Sicily, Burgundy, Sardinia, and Jerusalem. He put them on his head one after another, and said, `I have them still, and none shall rob me of them without hard battle.'"7 But though Frederick feared not the excommunication of the pope, the effect of such a thing was always to turn loose the elements of violence among men, and especially in Germany. Of that time an old historian says: "After the emperor Frederick was put under the ban, the robbers rejoiced over their spoils. Then were the plowshares beaten into swords, and the reaping hooks into lances. No one went anywhere without steel and stone, to set in blaze whatever he could fire."

27. During the reign of Frederick II the conquest of Prussia was begun A. D. 1230, under the leadership of the Knights of the Teutonic Order, who "after half a century of hard fighting, found themselves masters of the entire country." Also, in the beginning of his reign the fifth crusade was proclaimed by Innocent III, 1198; and it went forth in 1201.

28. Frederick II died Feb. 13, 1250, and was succeeded by his son, Conrad IV, who reigned only four years: and such was the condition of the empire through the contending factions of Germany and the intrigues of the pope that he was never actually crowned emperor. He died in 1254 and with him ended the line of Hohenstaufen emperors, whose rule formed the age " most interesting in the mediaeval history of Germany." "Women never held a higher place, nor, on the whole, did they ever respond more nobly to the honors freely lavished upon them." "The problems of government were seen in new lights, partly from the study of Roman law which passed from Italy to Germany, partly from the summaries of native custom in the `Sachsenspiegel' [Saxon law] and. `Schwabenspiegel' [Swabian -- Alemannian -- law]. Altogether, Germany has seen no more fascinating epoch, none more full of life, movement, and color."8

29. This age of glory was followed by one of misery, called the Great Interregnum, which lasted twenty years. "This was the saddest time that ever was in Germany. Every one did what he liked. The fist and the sword decided between right and wrong. The princes and the cities were in constant feud. The knights made themselves strong castles and lived in them on plunder and murder. From their fortresses they swooped down on the merchants traveling from town to town and robbed them, or levied on them heavy tolls. They went plundering over the level land; they robbed the farmers of their cattle, devastated their fields, and burned their houses. Moreover, the neighboring nobles and knights quarreled with each other and fought, so that the country was one battlefield."9

30. This period of anarchy was turned to account by the papacy through Pope Urban IV. Up to this time the election of the emperor had always been, virtually, by the leading princes, although each election needed the sanction of the whole class of immediate nobles. Now, however, mainly by the influence of the pope, the electorate was definitely settled upon only the archbishop of Mainz, the archbishop of Cologne, the archbishop of Treves, the margrave of Brandenburg, the king of Bohemia, and the princes of the house of Wittelsbach (Bavaria), and of the house of Saxony.

31. At the beginning of the Great Interregnum, William of Holland received a nominal allegiance for two years, when he died; then, about 1257, there was a double election, of Alphonso of Castile in Spain; and Richard, earl of Cornwall, brother of Henry III, of England. Richard was crowned, but he visited Germany only three times in the seventeen years; while Alphonso never visited it at all, although claiming all the time to be its sovereign. The influence of none of these tended in the least degree to check the disorder of the times. When Richard died, the princes showed no disposition to choose an emperor; for a condition of affairs that allowed every one to do as he pleased was exactly to their liking. But the northern revenues of the pope were seriously falling off, and this with troubles at home caused a papal longing for an emperor again who would be "the protector of the Church." The pope, therefore,

informed the electors that if they did not choose an emperor he himself would appoint one.

32. Accordingly the electors met in 1273 and raised to the throne Rudolf, count of Hapsburg, of Swabia. During the interregnum Ottocar, king of Bohemia, had acquired by marriage and conquest, a great territory beyond his native possessions; and his acquisitions included the duchy of Austria and its dependencies, Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola. This made Ottocar the most powerful prince in Germany, and he expected to receive the German crown at the election. Therefore, when the crown was bestowed upon Rudolf, Ottocar refused to acknowledge him as sovereign. War followed, and in the battle of Marchfield, near Vienna, A. D. 1278, Ottocar was defeated and slain. Austria, Styria, and Carniola were then granted in fief to Rudolf's son Albert. Thus Rudolf made himself memorable as the founder of the house of Hapsburg, which has ruled Austria from that time to this; which from his time has formed one of the most influential forces in the national life of Germany, and which gave sovereigns to Spain in the days of her greatest glory.

33. Rudolf of Swabia died in 1291, and was succeeded by Adolf of Nassau, who ruled till 1298, when he was succeeded by Duke Albert of Austria, Rudolf's son. Albert reigned till 1308, and was succeeded by Count Henry of Luxembourg, who reigned, as Henry VII, till 1313. Upon the death of Henry VII the electors could not agree, and the result was a double election -- Frederick the Fair, duke of Austria, son of Albert; and Louis, duke of Bavaria. War broke out and continued for nine years, when, at the battle of Muhlberg, A. D. 1322, Frederick's army was entirely routed, and in 1325 the two rivals agreed to rule in common. Frederick died in 1330, and Louis IV reigned till 1347.

34. At the death of Louis, Gunther, count of Schwarzburg, was elected; but Charles, king of Bohemia, by liberal bribes, bought off his supporters, and Gunther resigned his claim, and Charles IV reigned. The working of the imperial electorate had proved to be unsatisfactory; and it was reformed by Charles IV in 1356 by what is known as the Golden Bull. By this new arrangement the electorate was allowed to include, as formerly,

the three archbishops, the king of Bohemia, and the margrave of Brandenburg; but only the duke of Saxony, and the palsgrave, or count palatine, of the Rhine of the house of Wittelsbach.

Thus by Charles in the Golden Bull the electorate was confined to seven personages -- three archbishops, three lay princes, and one king -- and ever afterward the emperor was chosen by these officials, who are the ones so often referred to in the history of the Reformation, by the term "electors." Luther's protector, Frederick, was the "elector of Saxony in his day.

35. Charles IV added to the original possessions of his house of Luxembourg, Silesia, Lower Lusatia, and the margraviate of Brandenburg; and in his last days "he wore the crowns of Bohemia, of Germany of Burgundy, of Lombardy, and of the empire." He died at Prague in 1378, and was succeeded by his son, Wenceslaus. Wenceslaus was deposed and the crown was given to Rupert, elector of the palatinats A. D. 1400, who reigned till 1410, when he died and Sigismund, brother of Wenceslaus, and king of Hungary, reigned. This was the emperor Sigismund who gave up John Huss and Jerome of Prague, to be burned by the Council of Constance; which brought on the Hussite wars. Sigismund was a spendthrift and never had enough money for his wants; and for 400,000 gulden he granted to Frederick, count of Hohenzollern, of Swabia, first as a pledge but afterward as a permanent fief, the march of Brandenburg. With the death of Sigismund ended the Luxembourg dynasty, and the House of Hapsburg was restored.

36. Sigismund was succeeded by Albert II, duke of Austria, in 1438. Albert II was succeeded in 1440 by Frederick IV, and he, in 1493, by Maximilian I, and he, in 1519, by Charles V, before whom Luther stood for the faith of Christ; and before whom the German princes read the famous PROTEST.

37. Although the German crown remained elective from the time of Albert II forward, it was "always conferred on a member of the house of Hapsburg until the extinction of the male line;" and then it was taken up by the female in Maria Theresa, whose husband was elected emperor in 1745. He was emperor only in name, however; Maria Theresa's was the rule in fact. Maria Theresa's husband was succeeded in 1765 by her son, Joseph II. And in her line of the house of Hapsburg the imperial office remained till both the "Holy Roman Empire" and the German kingdom came to an end in 1806; and in her line the imperial office of the empire of Austria-Hungary remains to the present day.

38. Reference was made above to the march of Brandenburg, and

its sale by the emperor Sigismund, to Frederick of Hohenzollern, of Swabia. Frederick thus became one of the electors of the empire. It will be remembered, too, that it was the Knights of the Teutonic Order who made the conquest of Prussia. At the time of the Reformation, Albert of Brandenburg happened to be Grand Master of the Teutonic Order. He became a Protestant, dissolved the Order, and received in fief, 1525, from the king of Poland, the duchy of Prussia. Albert left two granddaughters. Joachim Frederick, Elector of Brandenburg, married Eleanor, the younger; his son, John Sigismund, married Anna, the elder; and thus the duchy of Prussia was secured to the family of the Elector of Brandenburg. Frederick William, called the Great Elector, was the grandson of John Sigismund and Anna. By the treaty of Wehlau, in 1657, the duchy of Prussia was declared independent of Poland. The Great Elector added largely to his territories, and in 1701 his son Frederick, who had succeeded him in 1688, having obtained the consent of the emperor, crowned himself king of Prussia. And thus, under the Alemannian house of Hohenzollern, arose the kingdom of Prussia, which, through Frederick I 1701-1713, Frederick William I 1713-1740, Frederick II the Great 1740-1786, Frederick William II 1786-1797, Frederick William III 1797-1840, Frederick William IV 1840-1861, has come down in direct descent to William I, king of Prussia, 1861-1871, and German emperor from Jan. 18, 1871, till March 9, 1888; Frederick, till June 15, 1888; and William II, German emperor of the present day.

1[Page 37] "Italy and Her Invaders," book i, chap. iii, par.4.

2[Page 37] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. xxxvi, par.5; xxxviii, par.5

3[Page 37] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Germany, p 477

4[Page 41] "Lives of the Popes," John XII.

5[Page 41] Id.

6[Page 43] So called from his inveterate habit of confirming his word by the addition, "Ja, so mir Gott hilf" -- Yes, so God help me.

7[Page 46] "The story of the Nations," Germany, chap. xxi., pars. 8, 9.

8[Page 46] Encyclopedia Britannica, art, Germany.

9[Page 47] "The Story of the Nations," Germany, chap. xxii.

6. THE BURGUNDIANS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

IT will be remembered -- Chapter III, pars. 7-9 -- that the conquest of the kingdom of the Burgundians was begun by Clovis, and was completed by his sons in 532; and that in the quadruple division of the Frankish dominion in 561 Burgundy with some additional counties in the north fell to Gontran, who fixed his capital there. When the Frankish dominions, having been united under Charles Martel, were again divided between Pepin the Short and Carloman, Burgundy fell to the share of Pepin. And when Carloman became a monk, and Pepin became king by the grace of Pope Zachary, of course Burgundy was but a province of his kingdom, as it was also of the empire of Charlemagne, the son of Pepin. In the division of the empire of Charlemagne, by the treaty of Verdun, 843, Burgundy was included in the portion of the emperor Lothair, which, it will be remembered, reached from the Mediterranean to the North Sea, and included the Italian territory.

2. In the time of Charles the Fat, 877, Burgundy became again independent, under Boso, or Boson, husband of Ermangarde, the daughter of Emperor Louis II. This kingdom was called Provence as well as Burgundy, and sometimes Cis-Jurane Burgundy, or, as the real title ran, regnum Provinciae seu Burgundiae. It "included Provence, Dauphine, the southern part of Savoy, and the country between the Saone and the Jura" Mountains. There was formed another kingdom of Burgundy on the other side of the Jura Mountains. This was called the kingdom of trans-Jurane Burgundy, or by title, regnum Iurense, Burgundia Transiurensis, and was founded by Count Rudolph in A. D. 888, and was recognized by the emperor Arnulf the same year. It included the northern part of Savoy and all Switzerland between the Jura Mountains and the River Reuss.

3. In 937 Rudolph's son, Rudolph, traded for the Cis-Jurane Burgundy his rights to the Italian crown; and thus the two Burgundies --

the Trans-Jurane and the Cis-Jurane -- were united in the one kingdom of Burgundy or Arles, by title, regnum Burgundae, regnum Arelatense. This kingdom continued independent till A. D. 1032, when, in accordance with

a treaty which had been made between the emperor Henry II and Rudolph II, its last king, the kingdom of Burgundy was received into the empire by Emperor Conrad II; Rudolph III confirming it by will, as his niece Gisela was Conrad was Conrad's wife. The emperor thus assumed the Burgundian crown, and this "beautiful kingdom," "full of prosperous cities," became a part of the empire.

4. "The kingdom of Burgundy, or Arles, comprehended the whole mountainous region which we now call Switzerland. It was accordingly reunited to the Germanic empire by the bequest of Rodolph along with the rest of his dominions. A numerous and ancient nobility, vassals one to another, or to the empire, divided the possession with ecclesiastical lords hardly less powerful than themselves. Of the former we find the counts of Zahringen, Kyburg, Hapsburg, and Tokenburg, most conspicuous; of the latter the Bishop of Coire, the Abbot of St. Gall, and Abbess of Seckingen. Every variety of feudal rights was early found and long preserved in Helvetia; nor is there any country whose history better illustrates that ambiguous relation -- half property and half dominion -- in which the territorial aristocracy under the feudal system stood with respect to their dependents. In the twelfth century the Swiss towns rise into some degree of importance. Zurich was eminent for commercial activity, and seems to have had no lord but the emperor; Basel, though subject to its bishop, possessed the usual privileges of municipal government. Berne and Friburg, founded only in that century, made a rapid progress, and the latter was raised, along with Zurich, by Frederick II, in 1218, to the rank of a free imperial city." -- Hallam.1

5. In the northern part of what is now Switzerland, between Lake Constance and Lake Luzerne, and along the left bank of the Rhine, the Alemanni had settled when they first took the country from the Romans. The castle of Hapsburg was possessed by Rudolf, the Alemannian nobleman who was made emperor in 1273. His ambitious descendants, the dukes of Austria, endeavored to enlarge their authority and possessions at the expense of the cantons.

6. "Several changes in the principal Helvetian families took place in the thirteenth century before the end of which the house of Hapsburg, under the politic and enterprising Rodolph and his son Albert, became possessed, through various titles, of a great ascendency in Switzerland. Of these titles none was more tempting to an ambitious chief than that of advocate to a convent. That specious name conveyed with it a kind of indefinite guardianship, and right of interference, which frequently ended in reversing the conditions of the ecclesiastical sovereign and its vassal. . . . Among other advocacies, Albert obtained that of some convents which had estates in the valleys of the Schweitz and Underwald. . . . The people of Schweitz had made Rodolph their advocate. They distrusted Albert, whose succession to his father's inheritance spread alarm through Helvetia. It soon appeared that their suspicions were well founded. Besides the local rights which his ecclesiastical advocacies gave him over part of the forest cantons, he pretended, after his election to the empire, to send imperial bailiffs into their valleys as administrators of criminal justice."2

7. Some authorities make Frederick III the one who sent these bailiffs, but whether it was Frederick or Albert the facts are the same. One of these bailiffs was Gesler, whom William Tell resisted. "Their oppression of a people unused to control, whom it was plainly the design of Albert to reduce into servitude, excited those generous emotions of resentment which a brave and simple race have seldom the discretion to repress. Three men, Stauffacher of Schweitz, Furst of Uri, Melchthal of Underwald, each with ten chosen associates, met by night in a sequestered field, and swore to assert the common cause of their liberties, without bloodshed or injury to the rights of others. Their success was answerable to the justice of their undertaking; the three cantons unanimously took up arms, and expelled their oppressors without a contest. Albert's assassination by his nephew which followed soon afterwards, fortunately gave them leisure to consolidate their union (A. D. 1308). . . . But Leopold, duke of Austria, resolved to humble the peasants who had rebelled against his father, led a considerable force into their country. The Swiss, commending themselves to Heaven, and determined rather to perish than undergo that yoke a second time, though ignorant

of regular discipline, and unprovided with defensive armor, utterly discomfited the assailants at Morgarten (A. D. 1315).

8. "This great victory, the Marathon of Switzerland, confirmed the independence of the three original cantons. After some years, Lucerne, contiguous in situation and alike in interests, was incorporated into their confederacy. It was far more materially enlarged about the middle of the fourteenth century by the accession of Zurich, Glaris, Zug, and Berne, all of which took place within two years. The first and last of these cities had already been engaged in frequent wars with the Helvetian nobility, and their internal polity was altogether republican. They acquired, not independence, which they already enjoyed, but additional security, by this union with the Swiss, properly so-called, who in deference to their power and reputation ceded to them the first rank in the league. . . . The eight already enumerated are called the ancient cantons, and continued, till the late reformation of the Helvetic system, to possess several distinctive privileges and even rights of sovereignty over subject territories in which the five cantons of Friburg, Soleure, Basel, Schaffhausen, and Appenzell did not participate. From this time the united cantons, but especially those of Berne and Zurich, began to extend their territories at the expense of the rural nobility. . . . The Helvetic cities acted with policy and moderation towards the nobles whom they overcame, admitting them to the franchises of their community as coburghers (a privilege which virtually implied a defensive alliance against any assailant), and uniformly respecting the legal rights of property. Many feudal superiorities they obtained from the owners in a more peaceable manner, through purchases or mortgage.

9. "Thus the house of Austria, to which the extensive domains of the counts of Kyburg had devolved, abandoning, after repeated defeats, its hopes of subduing the forest cantons, alienated a great part of its possessions to Zurich and Berne. And the last remnant of their ancient Helvetic territories in Argovia was wrested, in 1417, from Frederick, count of Tyrol, who, imprudently supporting Pope John XXIII against the Council of Constance had been put to the ban of the empire. These conquests Berne could not be induced to restore, and thus completed the independence of the confederate republics. The other free cities, though not yet incorporated, and the few remaining nobles, whether lay or

spiritual, of whom the abbot of St. Gall was the principal, entered into separate leagues with different cantons. Switzerland became, therefore, in the first part of the fifteenth century, a free country, acknowledged as such by neighboring states, and subject to no external control, though still comprehended within the nominal sovereignty of the empire. . . .

10. "The affairs of Switzerland occupy a very small space in the great chart of European history. But in some respects they are more interesting than the revolutions of mighty kingdoms. . . . Other nations displayed an insuperable resolution in the defense of walled towns; but the steadiness of the Swiss in the field of battle was without a parallel, unless we recall the memory of Lacedaemon. It was even established as a law that whoever returned from battle after a defeat, should forfeit his life by the hands of the executioner. Sixteen hundred men, who had been sent to oppose a predatory invasion of the French in 1444, though they might have retreated without loss,determined rather to perish on the spot, and fell amid a far greater heap of the hostile slain. At the famous battle of Sempach in 1385, the last which Austria proceeded to try against the forest cantons, the enemy's knights, dismounted from their horses, presented an impregnable barrier of lances which disconcerted the Swiss; till Winkelried, a gentleman of Underwald, commending his wife and children to his countrymen, threw himself upon the opposing ranks, and, collecting as many lances as he could grasp, forced a passage for his followers by burying them in his bosom.

11. "Though the house of Austria had ceased to menace the liberties of Helvetia, and had even been for many years its ally, the emperor Maximilian . . . endeavored to revive the unextinguished supremacy of the empire. That supremacy had just been restored in Germany by the establishment of the Imperial Chamber, and of a regular pecuniary contribution for its support, as well as for other purposes, in the Diet of Worms [1495]. The

Helvetic cantons were summoned to yield obedience to these imperial laws. . . . Their refusal to comply brought on a war, wherein the Tyrolese subjects of Maximilian, and the Suabian league, a confederacy of cities in that province lately formed under the emperor's auspices, were principally engaged against the Swiss. But the success of the latter was decisive; and after a terrible devastation of the frontiers of Germany,peace was concluded [1499]

upon terms very honorable for Switzerland. The cantons were declared free from the jurisdiction of the Imperial Chamber, and from all contributions imposed by the Diet. . . . Though, perhaps, in the strictest letter of public law, the Swiss cantons were not absolutely released from their subjection to the empire until the treaty of Westphalia, their real sovereignty must be dated by a historian from the year when every prerogative which a government can exercise was finally abandoned."3

12. And thus the kingdom of the Burgundians of A. D. 407 is represented in the independent confederacy of the Switzerland of to-day.

1[Page 52] "Middle Ages," chap. v, sec. 20.

2[Page 53] Id.

3[Page 56] Id.

7. THE ANGLES AND SAXONS IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

FROM the time of the first permanent hold of the Jutes, the Saxons, and the Angles, on British soil until they really possessed the land, was about a hundred and fifty years.

2. The Jutes possessed Kent. These were the fewest of the three peoples; and therefore occupied the smallest portion of the land. "Their dominions took in only Kent, with perhaps for a while Surrey, and [the Isle of] Wight, with a small part of the neighboring mainland of Hampshire:" and the kingdom of the Jutes "never permanently outgrew the bounds of their earliest conquests."

3. On all sides of the Jutes landward, dwelt the Saxons: South and West were the South Saxons, from whom the land held by them derived the abbreviated name Sou'-Sax', and from that Sussex, which it has ever since borne; west of these, but more inland, dwelt the West Saxons, whose kingdom was called Wessex;north of Kent dwelt the East Saxons, their kingdom and land called forever, Essex; and between the East Saxons and the West Saxons -- between Essex and Wessex -- dwelt the Middle Saxons, their kingdom and land called forever Middlesex.

4. The Angles held all the land north of Essex, Middlesex, and Wessex, to the Firth of Forth. In the peninsula immediately north of Essex, dwelt the East Angles, their kingdom and country called East Anglia: those in the northern part of the peninsula were called Northfolk, and those in the southern part, South-folk, from which the descent through Nor'-Folk and Sou'-Folk, come the names that still remain -- Norfolk and Suffolk.

West of these dwelt the South Angles; immediately north of these the Mid Angles, reaching to the River Humber. From the Humber to the Firth of Forth the land was divided by the Angles into two almost equal portions, the southern of which was the kingdom of Deira; and the northern, the kingdom of Bernicia. The territory between Wales and Mid and South Anglia, being the border, was

58

at first a mark, or march; from which it became Marcia and Mercia. Its Anglican inhabitants were called Mercians, and their kingdom Mercia, which also included the Mid and South Angles.

5. The kingdom of the Jutes was established in Kent in A. D. 475; that of the South Saxons in 491; that of the West Saxons in 519; that of the East Saxons about 525; and by 552 the Angles had made the conquest of their part of Middle Britain to the march or border. This pressure of the Angles in Mid Britain enabled the South Saxons to push their conquests farther inland. "In 552 their capture of the hill-fort of Old Sarum threw open the reaches of the Wiltshire downs, and a march of King Cuthwulf on the Thames made them masters in 571 of the districts which now form Oxfordshire and Berkshire. Pushing along the upper valley of Avon to a new battle of Barbury Hill, they swooped at last from their uplands on the rich prey that lay along the Severn. Gloucester, Cirencester, and Bath, cities which had leagued under their British kings to resist this onset, became in 577 the spoil of an English victory at Deorham, and the line of the great western river lay open to the arms of the conquerors....

6. "With the victory of Deorum the conquest of the bulk of Britain was complete. Eastward of a line which may be roughly drawn along the moorlands of Northumberland and Yorkshire, through Derbyshire and the Forest of Arden to the lower Severn, and thence by Mendip to the sea, the island had passed into English hands. Britain had in the main become England. And within this new England a Teutonic society was settled on the wreck of Rome. So far as the conquest had yet gone it had been complete. Not a Briton remained as subject or slave on English ground. Sullenly, inch by inch, the beaten men drew back from the land which their conquerors had won; and eastward of a border-line which the English sword had drawn, all was now purely English.

7. "It is this which distinguishes the conquest of Britain from that of the other provinces of Rome. The conquest of Gaul by the Franks, or of Italy by the Lombards, proved little more than a forcible settlement of the one or the other among tributary subjects who were destined in the long course of ages to absorb their conquerors. French is the tongue, not of the Frank, but of the Gaul whom he overcame: and the fair hair of the Lombard is all but unknown in Lombardy. But the

59

English conquest of Britain up to the point which we have reached, was a sheer dispossession of the people whom the English conquered. It was not that Englishmen, fierce and cruel as at times they seem to have been, were more fierce or more cruel than other Germans who attacked the empire:.... what really made the difference between the fate of Britain and that of the rest of the Roman world, was the stubborn courage of the British themselves. In all the world-wide struggles between Rome and the German peoples, no land was so stubbornly fought for or so hardly won. In Gaul no native resistance met Frank or Visigoth save from the brave peasants of Brittany and Auvergne. No popular revolt broke out against the rule of Odoacer or Theodoric in Italy. But in Britain the invader was met by a courage almost equal to his own. Instead of quartering themselves quietly, like their fellows abroad, on subjects who were glad to buy peace by obedience and tribute, the English had to make every inch of Britain their own by hard fighting....

8. "What strikes us at once in the new England is this: that it was the one purely German nation that rose upon the wreck of Rome. In other lands, in Spain or Gaul or Italy, though they were equally conquered by German peoples, religion, social life, administrative order, still remained Roman. Britain was almost the only province of the empire where Rome died into a vague tradition of the past. The whole organization of

government and society disappeared with the people who used it... The settlement of the English in the conquered land was nothing less than an absolute transfer of English society in its completest form to the soil of Britain. The slowness of their advance, the small numbers of each separate band in its descent upon the coast, made it possible for the settlers to bring with them,or to call to them when their work was done, the wives and children, the laet and slave, even the cattle they had left behind them. The first wave of conquest was but the prelude to the gradual migration of a whole people. It was England which settled down on British soil, England with its own language, its own laws, its complete social fabric, its system of village life and village culture, its township and its hundred, its principle of kinship its principle of representation. It was not as mere pirates or stray war bands, but as peoples already made, and fitted by a common

temper and common customs to draw together into our English nation in the days to come, that our fathers left their home-land." -- Green.1

9. Of the three peoples -- the Jutes, the Saxons, and the Angles -- the Angles "occupied a much larger portion of the land" than did both the others; and so their name gave a new name to the land to which they had come -- Angle-land, Engel-land, England: while as to the kingdom itself, it was Wessex that "grew into England," and her "house of Cerdic" that "became the royal house over the whole land."2 However, this matter of one royal house over the whole land is another long story in addition to that of these three peoples taking possession of the land. For "though all spoke the same language and used the same laws, and though all were bent on winning the same land, each band and each leader preferred their own separate course of action to any collective enterprise." -- Green.3 This spirit caused them, though only three distinct peoples, to form themselves, in the occupancy of the land, into no less than eight distinct kingdoms. And no sooner were ended their wars with the Britons, that they might in quietness inhabit the land, than they began as desperate a struggle among themselves for the supremacy and the sole kingship of all England.

10. Thus in A. D. 597 there were in England the eight distinct kingdoms of Wessex, Sussex, Kent, Essex, Mercia, East Anglia, Deira, and Bernicia. Each kingdom was the result of the union of smaller divisions called shires, their chiefs "bearing the title of Ealdorman or Alderman, in peace, of Heretoga or Herzog, in time of war." The union of shires "formed a rice or kingdom; the chief of the group thus formed was a cyning or king. What, it may be asked, was the difference between king and ealdorman? . . . The ealdorman was a ruler in peace and a captain in war. The king was more. Among the English, at least, the kingly houses all claimed descent from the blood of the gods.4 Every king was a son of Woden. A vague religious reverence thus gathered round the king, in which the ealdorman had no share. He was also

the head of the highest political aggregate which the ideas of those days had reached. He was, as the name implies, the head of the kin, the nation. The rule of the ealdorman was tribal, and merely earthly; the rule of the king was national, and in some sort divine."5 Of the community there were three classes: earls, churls, and thralls. The earls were a class who by distinction of birth were held to be entitled to special respect and honor; and who, because of this, possessed certain political privileges. The churls were freemen, but had no honors or privileges above those of the general community. The thralls were slaves held in bondage or thraldom. "The earl, the churl, and the thrall are found everywhere. They are taken for granted; and legend represented the three classes as called into being by separate acts of the creative power of the gods."6

11. In A. D. 605 Ethelfrith, king of Bernicia, seized the kingdom of Deira; and as this gave them to all East Britain north of the River Humber, the enlarged kingdom thus formed was called Northumbria. Ethelfrith also made the complete conquest of the greater part of the land that was yet held by the Britons westward to the Irish Sea between the Firth of Clyde and the mouths of the Mersey and the Dee. This reduced the number of the English kingdoms to seven; and it is this that is the ground upon which writers treat the history of that time under the title of "The Saxon Heptarchy." When Ethelfrith seized Deira, Edwin, its rightful king, being but a child, fled

to East Anglia, where he was protected by King Raedwald. This served Ethelfrith as a pretext for an attempt to subdue that kingdom. He was vigorously resisted; and at the "River Idle, by Retford," he was defeated and slain.

12. Upon the death of Ethelfrith, the people of Deira were glad to have Eadwine return to his kingdom. By the conquest of Bernicia, Eadwine re-established and made permanent the union of Bernicia and Deira that Ethelfrith had formed. "The greatness of Northumbria now reached its height. Within his own dominions, Eadwine displayed a genius for civil government, which shows how utterly the mere age of conquest had passed away. With him began the English proverb so often applied to after kings: `A woman with her babe might walk

scathless from sea to sea in Eadwine's day.' Peaceful communication revived along the deserted highways; the springs by the roadside were marked with stakes, and a cup of brass was set beside each for the traveler's refreshment. . . The Northumbrian king became, in fact, supreme over Britain as no king of English blood had been before. Northward his kingdom reached to the Firth of Forth; and here, if we may trust tradition, Eadwine formed a city which bore his name, Edinburgh -- Eadwine's burg. To the west, his arms crushed the long resistance of Elmet, the district about Leeds: he was master of Chester, and the fleet he equipped there subdued the isles of Anglesea and Man. South of the Humbria, he was owned as overlord by the five English States of Mid Britain. The West Saxons remained for a while independent;" but they, too, were at last obliged to acknowledge "the overlordship of Northumbria." And "Kent had bound itself to him by giving him its king's daughter as a wife, a step which probably marked political subordination." -- Green.7

13. At this time Penda was king of Mercia; and the other kingdoms of Mid Britain recognized his overlordship, as he in turn recognized the overlordship of Eadwine. In 633 Penda formed an alliance with a Welsh king, Cadwallon, to break the power of Eadwine. "The armies met in 633 at a place called Haethfeld, and in the fight, Eadwine was defeated and slain." Bernicia at once "seized on the fall of Eadwine to recall the line of Ethelfrith to its throne; and after a year of anarchy, his second son, Oswald, became its king. The Welsh had remained encamped in the heart of the north, and Oswald's first fight was with Cadwallon." The forces met in 635 "near the Roman Wall. Cadwallon fell fighting on the `Heaven's Field,' as after times called the field of battle; the submission of the kingdom of Deira to the conqueror, restored the kingdom of Northumbria; and for nine years the power of Oswald equaled that of Eadwine."

14. "Oswald's lordship stretched as widely over Britain as that of his predecessor Eadwine. In him, even more than in Eadwine, men saw some faint likeness of the older emperors: once, indeed, a writer from the land of the Picts calls Oswald `emperor of the whole of Britain.'" In 642 Oswald led his army into East Anglia to deliver that kingdom

from the terrible rule of Penda, king of Mercia. The battle was fought at Maserfeld; Oswald was defeated and slain; and for thirteen years Penda stood supreme in Britain. Oswiu, younger brother of Oswald, succeeded to the kingship of Northumbria. In 655 the Northumbrians again met Penda "in the field of Winward by Leeds," Penda was slain, and because of a great rain which swelled the river over which the Mercians must flee, only a remnant of them escaped; and Northumbria under Oswiu stood to England as it had under Eadwin and Oswald. It so continued under Ecgfrith who succeeded Oswiu in 670; and whose "reign marks the highest pitch of Northumbrian power."

15. Ecgfrith in 685 carried an expedition against the Picts, but was slain, and his army was annihilated in a battle at Fife. The delivered the central and southern kingdoms from the domination of Northumbria. Mercia immediately regained her full power over all Mid Britain, while Wessex, under Ine from 688 to 714, gained full power over "all Britain south of the Thames;" and Ine's "repulse of a new Mercian king, in a bloody encounter at Wodnesburh in 714, seemed to establish the threefold division of the English race between three realms of almost equal power" -- Northumbria, Mercia, and Wessex. However, Ine, in 726, made a pilgrimage to Rome.

In his absence anarchy reigned in Wessex. In this Ethelbald, the Mercian king, was his opportunity: he penetrated to the very heart of the West Saxon kingdom, and his siege and capture of the royal town of Somerton in 733 ended the war. For twenty years the overlordship of "Mercia was recognized by all Britain south of the Humber." And since at this time anarchy reigned in Northumbria, the kingdom of Mercia became fairly the kingdom of England. This, however, was for only a short time; for in a desperate battle at Burford in 753, "a decided victory freed Wessex from the Mercian yoke. Four years later, in 757, its freedom was maintained by a new victory at Secandum."

16. Wessex had regained independence; but that was all. For Ethelbald, who was slain in the battle of Secandum, was immediately succeeded by Offa under whose long reign, 757-796, Mercia "rose again to all but its old dominion." Offa's "is the greatest name in Mercian history;" and his position "was as great as that of any English king before the final union of the kingdoms. In one way it was higher than that of any of them. Offa held not only a British, but a European position."

This because the mighty Charlemagne corresponded with him as with an equal. This was before Charlemagne was made emperor by the pope: and when he manifested a disposition to treat the king of Mercia as less than an equal, war was threatened between them. And after Charlemagne became emperor of Rome, Cenwulf, Offa's successor, 797-819, "put it clearly on record that neither the bishop of Rome nor the emperor of Rome had any jurisdiction in his realm of Mercia."8

17. By this time Wessex had so well employed her independence as not only to have regained, but enlarged and firmly established her power over "all Britain south of the Thames." This, Mercia was compelled to recognize; and Cenwulf could only preserve the immediate realm of Mercia as he received it. Thus, "at the close of the eighth century the drift of the English peoples toward a national unity was in fact utterly arrested. The work of Northumbria had been foiled by the resistance of Mercia; the effort of Mercia had broken down before the resistance of Wessex. A threefold division seemed to have stamped itself upon the land; and so complete was the balance of power between the three realms which parted it, that no subjection of one to the other seemed likely to fuse the English tribes into an English people." -- Green.9

18. Yet at this very time there were taking shape in Wessex the elements which presently developed a mighty impulse toward a national unity; and which in the former part of the tenth century, with but slight checks meanwhile, culminated in the actual union of all England under only one king. Among the rival claimants of the kingship of Wessex, after the regaining of her independence in 757, was a certain Ecgberht, or Egbert. The king who was elected in 786 sought to kill him, and he was compelled to flee the kingdom entirely. He first took refuge with Offa. The king of Wessex demanded that he be surrendered. Offa refused; but as he could no longer harbor Ecgberht without bringing into his own affairs continual trouble, he declined to assure him further protection. Then Ecgberht escaped to the Continent, and in 787 found refuge at the court of Charlemagne. There he went to Charlemagne's school in more senses of the word than one. In the year 800 Edburga,

the wife of the king of Wessex, prepared a poisoned drink for a young friend of her husband's; but both he and her husband drank of it, and both died. Then Edburga, being obliged to flee, likewise took refuge at the court of Charlemagne. Her coming there brought to Ecgberht the information that the throne of Wessex was vacant. He immediately returned to Wessex, and was promptly chosen to the kingship. "The day of Northumberland and the day of Mercia had passed: the day of Wessex had come. The single reign of Ecgberht (802-837) placed her forever at the head of the powers of Britain."10

19. Ecgberht's first exploit as king was the conquest of Cornwall, "the last fragment of the British kingdom in the southwest." In 825 the king of Mercia invaded Ecgberht's territory, but at the battle which was fought at Ellandum the West Saxons were victorious. This victory confirmed to Ecgberht all of England south of

the Thames; and also encouraged the East Anglians to revolt against the king of Mercia. The East Anglians were victorious in two great battles; and this, in turn, so weakened the king of Mercia as to encourage Ecgberht to venture even across the Thames in an invasion of Mercia. This he did "in 827, and the realm of Penda and Offa bowed without a struggle to its conqueror." But Ecgberht did not stop with the conquest of Mercia: he marched on toward the north. Northumbria had but lately been terrorized by an invasion of Danes, and unable to resist them alone, "its thegns met Ecgberht in Derbyshire and owned the supremacy of Wessex;" and, "with the submission of Northumbria, the work which Oswiu and AEthelred had failed to do was done, and the whole English race was for the first time knit together under a single rule." -- Green.11

20. This Danish invasion of Northumbria was but a part of that great movement of the Danes in this century, which reached even to France, and created Normandy; and it continued in Britain until it had covered practically the whole of the land occupied by the English. Ecgberht defeated one host of them which invaded the land from Ireland, which gave them a check until after his death in 839. He was succeeded immediately by his son, AEthelwulf. The Danes came again and were "beaten off only by years of hard fighting." But, a final victory at

Aclea in 851 "won peace for the land through the short and uneventful reigns of his sons, AEthelbald and AEthelberht. But the northern storm burst in full force upon England when a third son, AEthelred, followed his brothers on the throne. "The Northmen were now settled on the coast of Ireland and the coast of Gaul; they were masters of the sea; and from west and east alike they closed upon Britain. While one host from Ireland fell on the Scot kingdom north of the Firth of Forth, another from Scandinavia landed in 866 on the coast of East Anglia under Hubba, and marched the next year upon York. A victory over two claimants of the crown gave the pirates Northumbria; and their two armies united at Nottingham in 868 for an attack on the Mercian realm. Mercia was saved by a march of King AEthelred to Nottingham; but the peace which he made there with the Northmen left them leisure to prepare for an invasion of East Anglia, whose undertaking Eadmund, brought prisoner before their leaders, was bound to a tree and shot to death with arrows.... With him ended the line of East Anglian underkings; for his kingdom was not only conquered, but divided among the soldiers of the pirate host, and their leader, Guthrum, assumed its crown."12

21. By these victories of the Dance the power of Wessex north of the Thames was again absolutely destroyed. And "the loss of the subject kingdoms left Wessex face to face with the invaders. The time had now come for it to fight, not for supremacy, but for life. As yet the land seemed paralyzed by terror. With the exception of his one march on Nottingham, King Aethelred had done nothing to save his underkingdomsfrom the wreck. But the pirates no sooner pushed up the Thames to Reading in 871 than the West Saxons, attacked on their own soil, turned fiercely at bay. A desperate attack drove the Northmen from Ashdown on the heights that overlooked the vale of White Horse, but their camp in the tongue of land between the Kennet and Thames proved impregnable. AEthelred died in the midst of the struggle, and his brother AElfred [Alfred], who now became king, bought the withdrawal of the pirates and a few years' breathing-space for his realm. It was easy for the quick eye of AElfred to see that the Northmen had withdrawn simply with the view of gaining firmer footing for a new attack: three

years indeed had hardly passed before Mercia was invaded and its underking driven over-sea to make place for a tributary of the invaders. From Repton half their host marched northward to the Tyne, while Guthrum led the rest into his kingdom of East Anglia to prepare for the next year's attack on Wessex."13

22. From 874 and onward Northumbria and Mercia had been brought wholly under the power of the Danes. In 877 AElfred defeated one main portion of their host in his region and forced the surrender of another. In their surrender they bound themselves by an oath to leave Wessex, which they did. But, the arrival of a new horde of their kinsmen caused them to forget their oath; and, at the beginning of 878, the whole double host

again "marched ravaging over the land. The surprise of Wessex was complete, and for a month or two the general panic left no hope of resistance. AElfred, with his small band of followers, could only throw himself into a fort raised hastily in the isle of Athelney among the marshes of Parret, a position from which he could watch closely the position of his foes. But with the first burst of spring he called the thegns of Somerset to his standard; and, still gathering troops as he moved, marched through Wiltshire on the Northmen. He found their host at Edington, defeated it in a great battle, and after a siege of fourteen days forced them to surrender and to bind themselves by a solemn peace or `frith' at Wedmore in Somerset.

23. "In form the peace of Wedmore seemed a surrender of the bulk of Britain to its invaders. All Northumbria, all East Anglia, all central England east of a line which stretched from the Thames's mouth along the Lea to Bedford, thence along the Ouse to Watling Street, and by Watling Street to Chester, was left subject to the Northmen. Throughout this `Danelagh' -- as it was called -- the conquerors settled down among the conquered population as lords of the soil, thickly in northern Britain, more thinly in its central districts; but everywhere guarding jealously their old isolation, and gathering in separate `heres' or armies round towns which were only linked in close confederacies. The peace had, in fact, saved little more than Wessex itself. But in saving Wessex, it saved England. The spell of terror was broken. The tide of invasion turned. From an attitude of attack the Northmen were

thrown back on an attitude of defense. The whole reign of AElfred was a preparation for a fresh struggle that was to wrest back from the pirates the land they had won."14

24. This peace continued till 893, during which time AElfred continually strengthened the defenses of his kingdom. He built a strong fleet; and gathered all the freemen of his realm into an organized force. He had a son and a daughter, Eadward and AEthelflaed, who both grew up to be efficient warriors. AEthelflaed was married to AEthelred, "an ealdorman of the old royal stock," who also was an able warrior. This gave to AElfred three strong supporters in the building up of his power of defense against the Danes. AEthelflaed and AEthelred, her husband, were made lord and lady of AElfred's portion of Mercia. When in 893 there was a new invasion of the land by the Danes, both by land any by sea, AElfred met their fleet and held it at bay, while "Eadward and AEthelred caught their army near the Severn and overthrew it with a vast slaughter at Buttington." And AElfred was able so well to hold his own that in 897 the latest invaders withdrew, and the Danes, who had dwelt in the land,renewed the peace,which continued for thirteen years.

25. AElfred died in 901, and was succeeded by his son Eadward. In 910 there was a new outbreak of the Danes inhabiting England. AEthelred, the lord of Mercia, was also now dead, which left AEthelflaed the ruler of Mercia. She took the field and was so successful everywhere that she won back all that had composed the full kingdom of Mercia. Eadward, on his part, repulsed an inroad of another new band of Danes, and brought East Anglia under his power. AEthelflaed died in 918. Eadward immediately annexed Mercia to his dominion and carried his arms triumphantly to the Humber; and "in 924 the whole of the north suddenly laid itself at his feet. Not merely Northumbria, but the Scots and the Britons of Strathclyde `chose him to father and lord.'"

26. Eadward the Unconquered died in 925, and was succeeded by his son AEthelstan till 940, when he died and was succeeded by his son Eadmund till 946, when he was killed by a robber, and was succeeded by his brother Eadred. "Under AEthelstan Northumberland was incorporated, and the immediate realm of the one king of England reached to the Forth. Still both he and his two successors had to fight against endless

revolts and rival kings in Northumberland. The Danish land was won and lost, and won back, over and over again, till at last under Eadred Northumberland was finally incorporated, and ruled, sometimes by a single earl, sometimes by two, of the king's appointment.15 With its submission in 954 the work of conquest was done.

Dogged as his fight had been, the Northman at last owned himself beaten. From the moment of Eadred's final triumph all resistance came to an end."

27. "The kingdom of England was now formed. The first half of the tenth century thus gave the West Saxon kings a position in Britain such as no English kings of any kingdom had ever held before them. Dominant in their own island, claiming and, whenever they could, exercising, a supremacy over the other princes of the island, their position in the island-world of Britain was analogous to the position of the western emperors in continental Europe. It was, in fact, an imperial position. As such, it was marked by the assumption of the imperial title, monarcha, imperator, basileus, Augusius, and even Caesar. These titles were meant at once to assert the imperial supremacy of the English kings within their own world, and to deny any supremacy over Britain on the part of either of the lords of the continental world.16. . . . But one and strong and glorious as England stood in the central years of the tenth century, her unity and strength and glory were bought in no small degree by the loss of the ancient freedom of her people."17

28. In 955 Eadred died, and was succeeded by the two sons of his brother and predecessor, Eadmund. The elder son, Eadwig, received Wessex as king of England by right, while the younger, Eadgar, received Northumberland and Mercia as underking to Eadwig. But in 957 the kingdom was actually divided into these two parts by the Mercians and Northumbrians declaring Eadgar full king in his own right. However, in 959 Eadwig died and Eadgar succeeded to the whole dominion in his own right; and "under Eadgar's rule the land enjoyed sixteen years of unparalleled peace and of unparalleled prosperity. During his reign no word of foreign invasion was breathed, and the two or three disturbances within the island were of slight consequence.... At no time in our

early history did England hold a higher position in the world in general. And when Old-Saxon Otto wore the crown of Rome, and West Saxon Eadgar, in some sort his nephew, reigned over the island-empire of Britain, the Saxon name had reached the highest point of its glory."18

29. Eadgar was succeeded by his son Eadward in 975, but he was allowed to reign only four years, for at the instigation of his step-mother AElfthryth, he was murdered in 979, and AElfthryth's son AEthelred II was put upon the throne, and thus "entered on the saddest and most shameful reign" in English annals, which continued for thirty-seven years. In the second year of his reign, 980, another invasion of the Danes flooded the land, and the flood never really ceased until all England was held by the Danes, and a Dane sat upon the throne of all England. "The unready king -- that is, the king without rede or counsel -- seems to have been incapable of any settled or vigorous plan of action. He showed energy now and then in needless and fruitless enterprises; but under him the kingdom never showed a united front toward the common enemy. His only policy, only policy of his cowardly or traitorous advisers, was the self-destroying policy of buying off the invaders with money.

30. "The invaders are met at London, at Maldon, at Exeter, with the highest valor and conduct on the part of the leaders and people of particular cities and districts; but it is always isolated cities and districts which resist. Such local efforts were naturally fruitless; the local force is either defeated by superior numbers, or, if victorious, it has, through want of concert with other parts of the kingdom, no means of following up its victory. Through a warfare like this, carried on year after year, the nation at last lost heart as well as its king. Local jealousies, hushed under the vigorous rule of earlier kings, now rose again. It is emphatically said that `one shire would not help other.' Under such a reign the efforts of the best men in the land were thwarted, and the places of highest power fell to the worst men. The successive advisers of AEthelred appear as a succession of traitors, who sold him and his kingdom to the enemy." "It was for the Witan to pass decrees, but it was for the

king to put them in force: and under AEthelred nothing good was ever put in force."19

31. In 991 a new wave of the Danish flood swept upon the land. However, by this time, they were more than Danes who came. Even the Norwegian King, Olaf Tryggvesson, was amongst them. In 994 another wave swept upon the devoted land. In this the Northmen hosts were led by King Olaf of Norway and King Swegen of Denmark. The forces of London defeated those that invaded that part of the land; but AEthelred obtained peace from them by purchase with money. Yet the peace was not kept, except by a portion of them; and for eight years the war went on by new invasions on the part of the Danes, and new payments on the part of the king, until 1002 when an attempt was made to rid England of the Danes, by a general massacre on St. Brice's day, the thirteenth of November.

32. AEthelred had also quarreled with Duke Richard of Normandy; but in this same year, 1002, he sealed a peace with Richard, and also hoped to strengthen his kingdom by receiving in marriage Emma, the daughter of Duke Richard of Normandy. "Wedding and murder, however, proved feeble defenses against Swegen. His fleet reached the coast in 1003, and for four years he marched through the length and breadth of southern and eastern England, `lighting his war-beacons as he went' in blazing homestead and town. Then for a heavy bribe he withdrew, to prepare for a later and more terrible onset. But there was no rest for the realm. The fiercest of the Norwegian jarls took his place, and from Wessex the war extended over Mercia and East Anglia . . . . Swegen returned in 1013. The war was terrible but short. Everywhere the country was pitilessly harried, churches plundered, men slaughtered. With the one exception of London, there was no attempt at resistance. Oxford and Winchester flung open their gates. The thegns of Wessex submitted to the Northmen at Bath. Even London was forced at last to give way, and AEthelred fled over-sea to a refuge in Normandy." -- Green.20 "The Danish king was acknowledged as king -- though native writers choose rather to call him tyrant -- over all England." 21

33. Swegen died in 1014, and was succeeded by his son Cnut, or Knut, -- Canute, -- a young man of nineteen. The English Council, or Witan, however, called for the restoration of AEthelred. AEthelred returned, which caused a war between the two kings. In 1016 AEthelred died, and was succeeded by his son Eadmund, surnamed "Ironside," an able general, who was successful against Cnut until Ealdorman Eadric of Mercia's deserting him in the midst of a great battle at Assandun caused his complete overthrow. The kingdom was then divided between Eadmund and Cnut, Eadmund taking the south, and Cnut the north. But Eadmund died shortly afterward, and Cnut, both by his power and by formal election, became king of all England, was regularly crowned as such, and ruled even "as a native king." "England was neither oppressed nor degraded under his rule. His government, his laws, were framed after the pattern of those of the ancient kings. He sent home his Danish army, keeping only a body of chosen guards, the famous house-carls. These were the first standing army known in England, a body of picked men, Danes, Englishmen, or brave men from any quarter. Cnut gradually displaced the Danes whom he had at first placed in high offices, and gave them English successors. He raised an Englishman, the renowned Godwine, to a place second only to kingship, with the new title of Earl of the West Saxons.

34. "In her foreign relations, England, under her Danish king, was in no sense a dependency of Denmark. England was the center, Winchester was the imperial city, of a northern empire, which rivaled those of the East and the West. Canute, it must be remembered, was chosen to the crown of England first of all, while still very young. To that crown he added the crown of Denmark, on the death or deposition of his brother Harold. He won Norway, which had revolted against his father, from its king Olaf; and he seems to have established his power over part of Sweden and other parts of the Baltic lands. But all these were acquisitions made by one who was already `king of all England:' they were largely won by English valor, and the complaint in Denmark and elsewhere was that Canute made his northern kingdom subordinate to England, and preferred Englishmen rather than natives to high offices in them.

35. "At home, after the first years of his reign, his rule was one of

perfect peace."22 "In 1028 he wrote: `I have vowed to God to lead a right life in all things, to rule justly and piously my realms and subjects, and to administer just judgment to all. If heretofore I have done aught beyond what was just, through headiness or negligence of youth, I am ready, with God's help, to amend it utterly. No royal officer, either for fear of the king or for favor of any, is to consent to injustice, none is to do wrong to rich or poor as they would value my friendship and their own well-being. I have no need that money be heaped together for me by unjust demands. I have sent this letter before me that all the people of my realm may rejoice in my well-doing; for as you yourselves know, never have I spared, nor will I spare, to spend myself and my toil in what is needful and good for my people." In 1031 Canute's reign over all the north was made complete by the Scotch king's doing "full homage to the king of all England."

36. Canute died in 1035. He had named as his successor in England Harthacnut, or Hardicanute, his son by Emma, the widow of AEthelred, whom, early in his reign, he had married, though she must have been nearly twice as old as he. But there was another son named Harold, who was supported in his claims to the kingdom by Mercia and Northumberland. The West Saxons, with Godwine and Emma, in accordance with Canute's will, accepted Harthacnut. War was prevented by a decree of the national council, dividing the kingdom between the two. Harthacnut remained in Denmark, and the West Saxons deposed him and acknowledged Harold. There came also over from Normandy AElfred, the elder son of AEthelred, who, in 1016 had been obliged to flee the kingdom from the jealous hate of Canute. But his attempt was a complete failure. He and his companions fell into the hands of Harold. His companions were all put to death, he himself was blinded; and soon afterward he died.

37. In 1040 Harold himself died; and Harthacnut, by right and by national choice, became again king, this time, king of the whole realm. But his reign was now short, for he died in 1042. The English nation then chose Eadward, the second son of AEthelred, who had fled to Normandy. "His monastic virtues won him the reputation of a saint and the title of `the Confessor;' but no man could have been less fitted to wear

the crown of England in such an age." It was chiefly by the influence of Godwine that Eadward had been chosen to the kingship, and Eadward now married Godwine's daughter, and did him further honor by appointing his sons to earldoms.

38. Eadward greatly offended the English people by bringing with him from Normandy, and putting into every place that he could, a great number of Norman favorites. His chief favorite was a Norman monk whom he made, first, bishop of London, and, presently archbishop of Canterbury. These Norman favorites soon made themselves so insolent and unbearable that Godwine and his sons, in behalf of the nation, took up arms against them. But Godwine was induced to submit his cause to the National Council, which decided against him, and he and his sons were banished. But within a year, 1050, they returned, with an army. The English were now so utterly wearied with the arrogance of the king's Norman favorites that they gladly welcomed Godwine. The king mustered an army to meet him, but the army refused to fight. The national assembly again considered Godwine's cause, and banished the Norman archbishop of Canterbury, with a great company of other Normans.

39. In 1053 the great earl Godwine died, and was succeeded in his high place in the kingdom by his son Harold. In the beginning of 1066 King Eadward died while the national assembly was in session. Eadward had no children, and on his deathbed he had recommended Harold as his successor. The national assembly accepted the recommendation, and Harold was regularly chosen and crowned king of England, and reigned as Harold II.

THE NORMAN INVASION.

40. In 1035 the death of Duke Robert of Normandy had left his son William, his successor, a child of but seven or eight years old. He was the sixth duke of Normandy, and by relationship was the fifth in direct descent

from Rolf, or Rollo, the Danish chief who received from Charles the Simple the duchy of Normandy. By the time that he attained to the age of twenty, he had firmly fixed his authority in Normandy; and by the time he was thirty-six he had obtained possession of the counties of Maine and Brittany, and "stood first among the princes of France." In 1051 he had made a visit to King Eadward of England, and ever afterward claimed that at that time Eadward had promised to him the

crown of England at Eadward's death. He further claimed that while Eadward was a child in banishment in Normandy, he had said to William that if ever he became king of England, William should be his successor. Further, about 1065, when Harold was the foremost subject in England, he had made a journey to Normandy, but by a storm was driven out of his direct course, and was shipwrecked near the mouth of the Somme, in the territory of the count of Ponthieu, who would not let him go without a ransom, and William paid the ransom; and so Harold came safely to William's court. William told him of the promise that Eadward had made, and asked Harold whether he would support him in his claims under the promise. Harold assented; but William asked for an oath. This, too, Harold gave.

41. And now, in 1066, when William learned that Harold himself had received the crown of England, without any recognition or even mention of any of his claims, he determined that he would have the kingdom anyhow. He first sent an envoy to Rome, to obtain the sanction of the pope. When William had taken the oath of Harold to support him in his claims to the kingship of England under the promises of Eadward. by a trick he had secured Harold's oath upon the relics of the saints. And now, when he desired the pope's sanction of his enterprise, he urged the perjury and the awful blasphemy of Harold's course in disregarding an oath given upon the holy relics. He asked the pope even to put all England under an interdict because of her having chosen such a man as this for king, and also because the nation had expelled the archbishop of Canterbury, who had borne the consecration of Rome. Hildebrand was at that time archdeacon at the papal court. He approved William's claims, and, by his influence, the pope also was brought to William's support. William "was thus able to cloak his schemes under the guide of a crusade and to attack England alike with temporal and spiritual weapons." Feeling thus sure of his ground in the support of the papacy, William issued "a proclamation that, supported by the holy father of Christendom, who had sent to him a consecrated banner, William, duke of Normandy, was about to demand, by force of arms, his rightful inheritance of England; and that all who would serve him with spear, sword, or cross-bow, should be amply rewarded. At this call, gathered together all the adventurers of Western Europe. They came in crowds from

Maine and Anjou, from Poitou and Brittany, from Aquitaine and Burgundy, from France and Flanders. They should have land; they should have money; they should wed Saxon heiresses; the humblest foot soldier should be a gentleman. The summer of 1066 was almost past before the preparations were complete. A large fleet had assembled at the beginning of September at the mouth of the Dive." -- Knight.23

42. At this same time there was hanging over England another invasion from Norway. The king of Norway in this same month of September landed with a host in what is now Yorkshire, defeated the local forces, and September 24 received the submission of the territory immediately north of the Humber. Harold, marching to meet the invaders, found them September 25, and routed them at Stamford Bridge, near the city of York. In the afternoon of September 27, William, at the head of his fleet, started across the Channel, and, early in the day, September 28, landed at Pevensey,on the coast of Sussex. Harold, learning of this, brought his army as rapidly as possible again to the south; and, October 14, with his forces of Wessex, East Anglia, and Mercia, "met William and his host on the hill of Senlac," near the city of Hastings, and not a great distance from the place of his landing. "At nine o' clock the Normans moved across the little valley, with the papal banner carried in advance of the Duke." The camp of the English was fortified by a trench and a stockade, and at first the English were successful. They repulsed both the Norman horsemen and footmen, and at one times there was such danger of a panic amongst the Normans that William was obliged to tear off his helmet, so that he could be readily

recognized, and by voice rally his troops. "After a fight of six hours, William commanded his men to turn their backs. The English raised a cry of triumph, and, breaking their ranks, rushed from their commanding position into the plain. Then the Norman cavalry wheeled around and a terrible slaughter took place. Harold fell a little before sunset," pierced by an arrow, in his right eye. Under cover of the night the remnant of the English army fled, and William's victory was complete.

43. All of Harold's brothers had fallen with him in the battle; and of the regular royal line there was remaining but one male, a boy named Eadgar, about ten years old, the grandson of Eadmund Ironside. This

boy the national council chose to the kingship. But the boy had sufficient sense to keep him from offering resistance to the greatest warrior of the age, and he himself was at the head of the deputation sent by the national assembly to offer the crown to William. The widow of the late king Eadward yielded to William and surrendered Winchester. By the national assembly "he was now chosen king and crowned at Westminster on Christmas day. He was thus king by the submission of the chief men, by the right of coronation, and by the absence of any other claimant." Yet he had practically the whole of the territory of his kingdom still to conquer. This, however, he accomplished with ease, never, after Senlac, being required to fight a single pitched battle.

44. Yet, though so much of the realm was still unconquered, William felt so secure in his kingdom that in the month of March, the next year, 1067, he went back to Normandy to attend to the affairs of his dominions on the Continent. His lieutenants whom he left in charge in England, made themselves so obnoxious that before the end of the year, revolts recalled William to England; and within two years he secured the recognition of his power throughout the whole kingdom. "Early in 1070 William reviewed and dismissed his army at Salisbury. At the Easter feast of the same year, being now full king over all England, he was again solemnly crowned by legates from Rome." In 1072 he "entered Scotland and received the homage of Malcolm at Abernethy. He had thus succeeded to the empire, as well as to the immediate kingdom, of his West Saxon predecessors. In the next year he employed English troops on the Continent in winning back the revolted county of Maine. In 1074 he could afford to admit Eadgar, the rival king of a moment, to his favor."24

45. As before stated, William laid the basis of his claim to the kingdom of England in his asserted promise of Eadward that William should be his successor. And now that he had actually obtained possession of the kingdom, he held that the kingdom had been his, by full right, ever since the death of Eadward. By this assertion he made it to follow that all that had been done in the kingdom since the death of Eadward, had been illegal; that all who had fought against him were guilty of treason; that all who had sustained Harold, had fought against him; and that as the general assembly of the kingdom had sustained

Harold, and had even crowned a new king after the death of Harold, the whole nation was thus involved in the crime of treason. Whoever was guilty of treason, all his lands and goods were forfeit to the crown. And, since the whole kingdom was guilty of treason, all the lands and goods of all the people in the whole realm were forfeit to him, and he actually claimed all as his own. He did not remove the original owners from their land indiscriminately and everywhere. Much of the land he turned over to new owners, some he left in the possession of the original owners. But, whether given to new owners or left in the possession of the original owners, every one was obliged to receive it as the direct gift of the king, and to hold it continually subject to the king's pleasure, and as the king's "man." "The only proof of lawful ownership was either the king's written grant, or else evidence that the owner had been put in possession by the king's order."

46. In order to make this system thorough, William had a survey made of all the lands of the whole realm, and a census of all property and of the owners thereof. All this was recorded in a book -- the value of the lands at the time the survey was made, the value of it in the time of Eadward, and the value of it at the date when it was bestowed upon its latest owner by the grant of the king. In the book were recorded the numbers dwelling

upon the land, whether as tenants, or dependents; the amount of live stock, etc., etc. And, because the record in this book was the standard of decision upon every question or dispute as to property, and because its testimony was final in every case, that book was called Domesdeie Book -- Domesday Book -- Doomsday Book, from dom, doom, decree, law, judgment, or decision. This record was finished in 1086; and then "William gathered all the land-owners of his kingdom, great and small, whether his tenants in chief or the tenants of an intermediate lord, and made them all become his men." And thus the Norman king was not only the head of the State, but "also the personal lord of every man in his kingdom." This thoroughness with respect to persons and property caused the king's authority to be respected everywhere throughout the realm; and "the good peace that he made in the land" was such "that a man might fare over his realm with a bosom full of gold."

47. In January, 1087, William went again to Normandy especially for the purpose of setting a dispute concerning some Norman territory

which the king of France had seized. In the month of August his forces had taken the town of Mantes; and, as William rode amongst the smoldering ruins, his horse stumbled and fell, by which William received an injury from which he died September 9. He left three sons. The eldest, Robert, was at the court of France; the other two, William and Henry, were with him at the time of his death. To the eldest he left the inheritance of Normandy; to William he gave his ring, and advised him to go at once to England and assume the crown; to Henry,the youngest, he bequeathed five thousand pounds of silver. William arrived safely in England and was crowned at Westminster, Sept. 26, 1087. He is known in history as William Rufus -- "the Red." The Norman element of England was so opposed to him that they actually revolted; but it was in vain, for his English subjects stood so loyally by him as to render him successful against all opposition. In 1096 his brother of Normandy, desiring to go on the first crusade, and not having sufficient funds, borrowed the needed sum from William of England, and gave Normandy as the mortgage for the repayment of the money. A part of the duchy rebelled. William went over and put down the rebellion. In 1098-99 he also conquered Maine. Shortly afterward he returned to England, and Aug. 2, 1100, he was found dead in the New Forest, with an arrow in his breast; whether shot by an assassin, or in accident by a hunter, was never discovered.

48. The kingdom was instantly seized by his brother Henry, surnamed Beauclerc. The Norman element of the kingdom opposed him, as they had opposed William Rufus; but the national assembly unanimously elected him, and promptly crowned him. Further, to hold the affections of his English subjects, he married a lady of English blood -- Edith, the daughter of the king of Scotland, whose mother was the sister of the last king Eadgar, and granddaughter of King Eadmund Ironside. She changed her name to Maud, or Matilda; "and the shout of the English multitude when he set the crown on Matilda's brow drowned the murmur of churchman and of baron. The mockery of the Norman nobles who nicknamed the king and his spouse Godric and Godgifu, was lost in the joy of the people at large. For the first time since the conquest an English sovereign sat on the English throne. The blood of Cerdic and AElfred was to blend itself with that of Rolf and the Conqueror. Henceforth

it was impossible that the two peoples should remain parted from each other: so quick, indeed, was their union that the very name of Norman had passed away in half a century, and at the accession of Henry's grandson it was impossible to distinguish between the descendants of the conquerors and those of the conquered at Senlac." -- Green.25

49. Shortly after this, Robert returned from the Crusades, and the Norman nobles in England conspired to bring him over to contend in England for that kingdom. He did come with an army, landing at Portsmouth; but Henry was able to make with him such terms that without fighting, a peace was settled, by which Robert recognized Henry as king of England, and returned to his proper dominions on the Continent. There, however, he so misgoverned his territories that they called on Henry to come over and be their king. In 1106 he went to Normandy with an army. The dispute culminated in the battle of Tenchebrai, in which Robert was defeated and

captured, and was held in captivity until his death in 1134. Thus Normandy was conquered and possessed by the king of England, as, forty years before, England had been conquered and possessed by William of Normandy."During the rest of Henry's reign there was perfect peace in England; but nearly the whole time was filled with continental wars. The warfare between France and England, of which there had been only a glimpse in the days of Rufus, now began in earnest." And, from the entanglements, intrigues, and war in France, which was now begun by Henry, England never found herself free for three hundred and forty-seven years.

50. In 1120, as Henry was returning with his forces from Normandy to England, his only son, William, "full of merriment and wine," and "with rowers and steersman mad with drink," had barely left harbor when his ship struck a rock, and instantly sank. "One terrible cry, ringing through the silence of the night, was heard by the royal fleet, but it was not till the morning that the fatal news reached the king. Stern as he was, Henry fell senseless to the ground, and rose never to smile again." -- Green.26 This left the son of his captive brother Robert as the true heir to Henry's dominions, alike of England and Normandy. But Henry determined not to allow him to be his successor. Henry had a

daughter, Maud, or Matilda, who had been married to the emperor Henry V, but who, on his death, had returned to England and her father's house. And although, so far, in English history the reign of a woman had been unknown, yet Henry decided that Maud should succeed him upon the throne of England. Accordingly, while he lived, he "forced priests and nobles to swear allegiance to Maud as their future mistress;" and chose for her husband Geoffry, the son of the count of Anjou in France.

51. In 1135 Henry died. But the arrangement which he had made for the succession of Maud to the throne was disregarded by the national assembly, and Stephen was chosen king of England. Stephen was the grandson of William the Conqueror, and, with the rest of the chief men of England, had done homage, and sworn allegiance, to Maud as the successor of Henry. All this, however, was disregarded, and without opposition Stephen became king of England. One great reason why the agreement with Maud was not carried into effect, was that for her to be queen would cause that Geoffry of Anjou would practically be ruler -- and he an utter foreigner: and this neither English nor Normans would have. At the time all this occurred, Maud was not in England, but was with her husband in Anjou; and, when they heard of these proceedings in England, Geoffry seized Normandy. With this added prestige, and with an army, Maud invaded England in 1139. Stephen was defeated and captured, at Lincoln, in 1141, and Maud "was received throughout the land as its lady" -- they would not use the word queen. However, she was not crowned. She offended the city of London, which rose in arms against her. In an exchange of prisoners, Stephen had been released. For eleven years there was civil war, "a time of utter anarchy and havoc," a "chaos of pillage and bloodshed." Then, in 1153 an agreement was made between King Stephen and Maud's son Henry, who was now duke of Normandy. By this agreement Stephen was to reign as long as he lived, and then Henry should have the kingdom. Stephen died the next year, and the agreement was fully carried out, as to Henry; and so he came to his kingdom without any opposition or any further confusion.

52. Henry II was now, by right from his grandfather, Henry I, king of England, and duke of Normandy; in France, as the heir of his father, Geoffry, he was lord of the counties of Anjou, Maine, and Touraine,

and, through his brother, also of Brittany; and now, by marriage to Eleanor, the duchess of Poitou, Aquitaine, and Gascony, he received, with her, these three counties, the principal portion of southern Gaul. Besides all this, one of the first events of his reign was the granting of a bull by the pope, giving to him Ireland. Thus, in the reign of Henry II, the British empire embraced Ireland, all of England and Wales south of the Forth, and all of western and central France, from the English Channel to the border of Spain. "In ruling over a vast number of distinct states, widely differing in blood, language, and everything else, ruling over all without exclusively belonging to any, Henry II, king, duke; and count of all the lands from the Pyrenees to the Scottish border, was

the forerunner of the emperor Charles V." His father, Geoffry, count of Anjou, habitually wore in his helmet a sprig of broom-corn, called in the native tongue planta genista, from which he received the nickname of Plantagenet, which clung to his house. And so Henry -- II of England -- became the first of the Plantagenets, who ruled England for three hundred and thirty-one years -- 1154-1485.

53. Henry II died in 1189, and was succeeded by his son Richard, surnamed Coeur de Lion -- heart of lion. At his accession, Richard was absent from England, in his mother's possession in southern Gaul, and during his whole reign of ten years he was in England but twice, both times merely for the purpose of being crowned: first, immediately on his accession, in the autumn of 1189; second, in 1194, on his return from the Crusades. In 1190 Richard went on his crusade; and to obtain the money for his expenses he sold everything that he could sell, short of the very kingdom itself. "He put up the crown demesnes; he sold the public offices; he sold earldoms; he sold the claim which [his father] Henry had asserted to the right of homage for the crown of Scotland. `I would sell London, if I could find a chapman,' he exclaimed. `Richard's presence chamber was a market overt, in which all that the king could bestow -- all that could be derived from the bounty of the crown, or imparted by the royal prerogative -- was disposed of to the best chapman.'"-- Knight.27

54. Though on his crusade Richard was four years absent from his dominions, he was in Palestine only about sixteen months -- June 8,

1191, to Oct. 9, 1192. While there he had dealt a kick to the duke of
Austria for his refusing to work on the walls of Ascalon. And now on his return, as he was trying to make his way in disguise through Austria, he was detected when near Vienna, and was made prisoner by the duke of Austria, Dec. 21, 1192, who sold him to the emperor, who was also ready to sell him, but there was no buyer. In hope of release Richard agreed to pay an annual tribute to the emperor, resigned his crown to the emperor, and received it back as vassal to the "overlord of Christendom." Yet he was kept prisoner till March 8, 1194, when he was released on a ransom of what would be now about a million dollars. He went at once to England, landing March 12: and notwithstanding the heavy drain upon the people to pay his ransom, without any recompense whatever he "forcibly resumed the lands which he had sold, and turned out the officers who had purchased their places," to enable him to make his crusade. His stay in England was brief. He sailed away May 11, 1194, and never saw England again. He was mortally wounded by an arrow while besieging Chaluz, in a war with King Philip II of France, and died twelve days afterward, April 6, 1199. He was immediately succeeded by his brother John.

55. John, surnamed Lackland because his father, with all his vast possessions, left him no land, was crowned king of England on Ascension Day, May 27, 1199. There was a nearer heir in the person of Arthur, the grandson of Henry II, through his third son Geoffry, while John was so far removed as to be the fifth son of Henry. But Arthur, being a boy of only twelve years, while John was a man of thirty-two years, John was chosen as the one better able to discharge the responsibilities of kingship at that time. All the continental possessions of England likewise recognized John, except the three counties of Maine, Touraine, and Anjou. These openly espoused the claims of Arthur. King Philip of France stood with these in supporting Arthur: this, however, to promote his own designs in excluding, if possible, England from any possessions within the limits of what should be France. This brought on a war. John went at once to Normandy to defend his interests on the Continent: Philip invaded Normandy, besides putting garrisons in the three counties of Maine, Touraine, and Anjou.

56. When the war had continued eight months, a truce was arranged,

about the first of March, 1200. John spent the months of March and April in England; and the first of May he returned to Normandy. The war was taken up again; but on May 23 a peace was concluded. Philip abandoned the

interests of Arthur with respect to Maine, Touraine, and Anjou; but in the peace it was arranged that Arthur should receive Brittany as a fief from John; and that Philip's son Louis should marry john's niece, Blanche of Castile. While passing through his province of Aquitaine, John saw a beautiful woman, already betrothed to a noble, and he secured a divorce from his own wife, and persuaded this lady to marry him. This stirred up to vengeance against John, the noble -- Hugh, count of La Marche. He incited an insurrection in John's possessions on the Continent: he was secretly supported by Philip, and in two years and a half, Normandy, Anjou, Maine, and Touraine were lost to England. Arthur had joined in the insurrection, had been captured, and was assassinated at the direction of John, if not by the very hand of John himself.

57. In 1203 the estates of Brittany sent a deputation to Philip to demand justice against John. John, as duke of Normandy, was summoned to appear before a court of his peers in France, and as a vassal of the king of France. John's envoy asked for a safe conduct. Philip answered that he should come unmolested. Then John's envoy wanted to know whether he could be assured of a safe return. Philip replied that he should have safe return "if the judgment of his peers acquitted him." John's envoy then remarked that, since John was king of England as well as duke of Normandy, the duke of Normandy could not come without the king of England's coming, and declared that "the barons of England would not permit their king to run the risk of death or imprisonment." Philip, however, insisted that the duke of Normandy should come, because, as such, he was truly the vassal of the king of France.

58. John did not go; and, for his "contumacy," the court decreed that "whereas, John, duke of Normandy, in violation of his oath to Philip, his lord, has murdered the son of his elder brother, a homager of the crown of France, and near kinsman to the king, and has perpetrated the crime within the seigniory of France, he is found guilty of felony and treason, and is therefore adjudged to forfeit all the lands

he has held by homage." This allowed Philip to assert legal claim to all the English possessions in France; and he at once entered Normandy and occupied the strongholds with his troops. But this the Normans did not like, and they appealed to John to come to their rescue. But, against this England protested, because she "thought the time was come when her wealth should no longer be dissipated in Normandy; when her language should be spoken by those who ruled over her; when her laws should be administered by those who abided among her people; and when her Church should be upheld by those who had no foreign bishoprics and abbeys." As a consequence, all the continental possessions of England, except Aquitaine, were now lost, "and from the lordship of a vast empire that stretched from the Tyne to the Pyrenees John saw himself reduced at a blow to the realm of England."

59. Next, in 1207 John fell into a quarrel with Rome. March 24, 1208, England was placed under an interdict, which John resisted for five years, when in 1213 to the interdict, the excommunication of John was added; and England was given by the pope to Philip of France. Philip gathered a fleet and an army with which to go and take possession of England. John surrendered to the pope, and took an oath of fealty as the vassal of Rome. Then the pope forbade Philip any further designs upon England. Philip determined to take England anyhow; but his vassal, the count of Flanders, refused to support him. This caused war; John supported Flanders, and Philip's fleet was destroyed. Next, supported by the pope and the emperor, the count of Flanders and the Earl of Boulogne, John went with an army to punish Philip further. A great battle was fought at Bouvines. John and his allies were completely overthrown, and "concluded an ignominious truce with Philip," and returned to England, October, 1214.

60. The people of England had long borne with the numberless wickednesses of John; but, when he made the realm of England a fief, and the king of England a vassal, of the pope, they could bear with him no longer. John himself wrote to the pope that "whereas, before we were disposed to subject ourselves and our realm to your dominion, the earls and barons of England never failed in their devotion to us; since then, however, and as they publicly avow for that reason, they have been in continual and violent rebellion against us." Because of this attitude

of his nobles, when John returned now from France, he came with an army of mercenaries, with the avowed intent that by this power he would be "for the first time king and lord of England."

61. But "there were now two eminent persons among many other bold and earnest churchmen and laity who saw that the time was come when no man should be `king and lord in England' with a total disregard of the rights of other men; a time when a king should rule in England by law instead of by force, or rule not at all. Stephen Langton, the archbishop, and William, earl of Pembroke, were the leaders and at the same time moderators, in the greatest enterprise that the nation had yet undertaken. It was an enterprise of enormous difficulty. The pope was now in friendship with the king, and this might influence the great body of ecclesiastics. The royal castles were in possession of the mercenary soldiers. The craft of John was as much to be dreaded as his violence. But there was no shrinking from the duty that was before these patriots. They moved on steadily in the formation of a league that would be strong enough to enforce their just demands, even if the issue were war between the crown and the people. The bishops and barons were the great council of the nation. Parliament, including the Commons, was not, as yet, though not far distant. The doctrine of divine right was the invention of an age that sought to overthrow the ancient principle of an elective monarchy, in which hereditary claims had indeed a preference, but in which the sovereign `is appointed to protect his subjects in their lives, properties, and laws, and for this very end and purpose has the delegation of power from the people.'" -- Knight.28

62. The nobles met at Saint Edmundsbury; and after duly considering the situation, Nov. 20, 1214, they "solemnly swore to withdraw their allegiance from John, if he should resist their claims to just government. They had not only public wrongs to redress, but the private outrages of the king's licentiousness were not to be endured by the class of high-born knights whom he insulted through their wives and daughters. From Saint Edmundsbury they marched to London, where the king had shut himself up in the temple. When their deputies came into his presence, he first despised their claims and then asked for delay.

The archbishop of Canterbury, the earl of Pembroke, and the bishop of Ely guaranteed that a satisfactory answer should be given before Easter. The king employed the time in the endeavor to propitiate the church by promising a free election of bishops. He took the cross, and engaged to wage war with the infidels. He sent to Rome, to implore the aid of the pope in his quarrel. And the pope came to his aid; and commanded Langton to exercise his authority to bring back the king's vassals to their allegiance.

63. "At Easter, the barons, with a large force, assembled at Stamford. John was at Oxford, and Langton and Pembroke were with him. They were sent by the king to ascertain the demands of their peers; and these messengers, or mediators, brought back" Magna Charta. This "was a code of laws, expressed in simple language, embodying two principles -- the first, such limitations of the feudal claims of the king as would prevent their abuse; the second, such specifications of the general rights of all freemen as were derived from the ancient laws of the realm, however these rights had been neglected or perverted. . . . It demanded no limitation of the regal power which had not been acknowledged, in theory, by every king who had taken a coronation oath. It made that oath, which had been regarded as a mere form of words, a binding reality. It defined, in broad terms of practical application, the essential difference between a limited and a despotic monarchy. It preserved all the proper attributes of the kingly power, while it guarded against the king being a tyrant." In it the king was required to declare the great principle of the supremacy of the law of the realm in the words: "No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseized, or outlawed, or banished, or any otherwise destroyed; nor will we pass upon him, nor send upon him, unless by the legal judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land. To no man will we sell, to no man will we deny or delay, right or justice." -- Knight.29

64. The Charter was a long document. The archbishop read it to the king slowly and solemnly, item by item. "John went into a furious passion," exclaiming, "Why do they not ask for my kingdom? I will never grant

such liberties as will make me a slave." Langton and Pembroke took back to the nobles this the king's answer. The barons proclaimed themselves "the army of God and holy Church," and marched

88

upon London, which they entered May 22, 1215, the citizens of London having already agreed to make common cause with them. There were further negotiations: the barons were immovable, and John yielded and agreed to a meeting. The meeting was appointed to be held June 15 "on an island in the Thames, between Windsor and Staines, near a marshy meadow by the riverside, the meadow of Runnymede" -- Runemed, the mead or meadow of council. "The king encamped on one bank of the river, the barons covered the flat of Runnymede on the other. Their delegates met on the island between them, but the negotiations were a mere cloak to cover John's purpose of unconditional submission. The Great Charter was discussed and agreed to in a single day." -- Green.30

65. However, this was not all. The barons had not yet finished with John. They next required that he should agree to articles by which there should be assured the means of carrying into effect the provisions of the charter. "Twenty-five barons were to be chosen by the barons assembled, to maintain the observance of the peace and liberties granted and confirmed; so that if the king or his officers violated any of the conditions, four out of the twenty-five barons so chosen might petition for redress of the grievance; and if not redressed within forty days, the cause being laid before the rest of the twenty-five, they, `together with the community of the whole kingdom shall distrain and distress us all the ways possible; namely, by seizing our castles, lands, possessions, and in any other manner they can, till the grievance is redressed according to their pleasure, saving harmless our own person, and those of our queen and children; and when it is redressed, they shall obey us as before.'" It was further required "that the Charter should not only be published throughout the whole country, but sworn to at every hundred-mote and town-mote by order from the king."

66. When these new demands were made, John was more angry than ever. He cried out: "They have given me four-and-twenty overkings:" and flung himself on the floor "gnawing sticks and straw in his impotent rage." But it was all in vain; the nobles were inflexible, and john was obliged to sign all that they required. No sooner was it all over, however, and the respective parties had separated and the forces dispersed, than John let himself loose to take vengeance on the whole kingdom, in

89

all of which he was still zealously supported by the pope, who issued a bull excommunicating the barons and annulling the Charter. England rejected the excommunication and maintained the Charter. But, by the bull, John counted himself free from his oaths to the nobles, with full right to punish the whole people. "Wherever he marches, his force is to be tracked by fire and blood. The country was overrun by his fierce mercenaries. He marched to the north with the determination to recover his authority by the terrors of a widespread desolation, without one passing thought of justice or mercy. As he entered Scotland, in revenge for the alliance which its king, Alexander II, had formed with the barons, he burned the abbeys without distinction, and having rested at a village, set fire with his own hand, when he departed in the morning, to the house in which he had slept the previous night. In the South the same work of terror went forward, under the command of John's illegitimate brother, the earl of Salisbury. The barons despaired of their cause, for the people fled before these hell-hounds, abandoning home and property rather than perish under the hands of relentless torturers. Their leaders came at last to a desperate resolution. They offered the crown to Louis, the eldest son of the king of France." -- Knight.31

67. This desperate step, of course, was fraught with more war; yet it was certain that no war could be worse than were the miseries which John was inflicting upon the kingdom without war. Louis of France landed in England, May 30, 1216. Many of John's mercenaries were Frenchmen, and when their own prince came into England, they not only refused to fight against him, but actually went over to him in such numbers that John dared not meet him. Louis soon reached London, where he was welcomed: the barons and citizens paid him homage, "he swearing to govern justly, to defend them against their enemies, and to restore them to their rights and possessions." Everything was in his favor; but he destroyed all his good prospects by bestowing upon

Frenchmen, English honors and possessions. But the whole situation was presently relieved by the death of John. He was attacked with a fever, in addition to which he gorged himself with a "surfeit of peaches and new cider," and as a consequence died Oct. 18, 1216.

68. Though the nobles had invited Louis of France to be king of England, he had so offended that they now rejected him, and chose, to be king, John's son Henry, a boy of ten years, who was crowned King Henry III, at Gloucester, Oct. 28, 1216. Louis, however, defended his claims to the crown. There was war for two years, in which he was defeated, on both land and sea. He then willingly agreed to resign his claims and withdraw to France, upon the payment to him of "five thousand pounds to meet his necessities." While Henry III was so young, the kingdom was governed by a regency till 1227, when he declared himself of age, and began immediately to imitate his father John. He rejected the Charter and its appendices, which John had signed, and, instead of all that, declared: "Whensoever, and wheresoever, and as often as it may be our pleasure, we may declare, interpret, enlarge, or diminish, the aforesaid statutes, and their several parts, by our own free will, and as to us shall seem expedient for the security of us and our land." But he, as John, was firmly met by the kingdom's insistence upon the right of the people and the supremacy of the law.

69. In answer to Henry's pronunciamento, an English judge, Bracton, set the voice of English law, in words worthy of everlasting remembrance: "The king must not be subject to any man, but to God and the law, for the law makes him king. Let the king, therefore, give to the law what the law gives to him, dominion and power for there is no king where will, and not law, bears rule." Again: "The king can do nothing on earth, being the minister of God, but what he can do by law." And yet again, he "reckons as superior to the king, `not only God and the law by which he is made king, but his court of earls and barons; for the former (comites) are so styled as associates of the king, and whoever has an associate has a master: so that, if the king were without a bridle that is, the law they ought to put a bridle upon him.'"32 Upon this it has been well observed: "Let no Englishman, who lives under the rule of law, and not of will, forget that this privilege has been derived from a long line of forefathers; and that, although the eternal principles of justice depend not upon the precedence of ages, but may be asserted some day by any community with whom a continued

despotism has made them `native, and to the manner born,' we have the security that the old tree of liberty stands in the old earth, and that a short-lived trunk has not been thrust into a new soil, to bear a green leaf or two and then to die." -- Knight.33

70. Henry III reigned fifty-three years, and the whole reign is remarkable for the constitutional contest between the king and the people, upon the great question as to whether just government is by law, or by arbitrary and despotic will. His reign is also remarkable for the fact that "history presents him in scarcely any other light than that of an extortioner or a beggar. There were no contrivances for obtaining money so mean or unjust that he disdained to practice them;" and the pope sustained him in it all, and "had more than an equal share of the spoil." Thus, both he and the pope incurred not only the antagonism of the nobles, but the disrespect of the common people everywhere. Says a writer of the time, in 1252: "During all this time angry feelings were aroused, and hatred increased against the pope and the king, who favored and abetted each other in their mutual tyranny; and all, being in ill-humor, called them the disturbers of mankind." Matters reached such a pass in 1257 that the nobles took another step in constitutional government. The Parliament met at Westminster, May 2, the barons clad "each in complete armor. As the king entered, there was a clatter of swords; and Henry, looking around in alarm, said, `Am I a prisoner?' `No, sir,' said Roger Bigod, `but your foreign favorites and your prodigality have brought misery upon the realm; wherefore we demand that the powers of government be delegated to a committee of bishops and barons, who may correct abuses, and enact good laws."

71. To this demand the king was obliged to submit; and, on June 11, Parliament met at Oxford, to formulate what had been demanded. "It was enacted that four knights should be chosen by the votes of the

freeholders in each county, who should submit all breaches of law and justice to a parliament, to be called together regularly thrice in each year; that the sheriffs of the counties should be chosen by the freeholders; and that the great officers of State should be reappointed." This was but carrying into effect the provisions of Magna Charta, and its securities, which John had signed at Runnymede. And Henry, like John, after

having sworn to it all, obtained a dispensation from the pope to violate it, and "told the committee of council, in 1261, that he should rule without them." However, in 1262, after making a blustering show of war, he yielded, and again agreed to observe the law. In 1264, however, he broke loose again, and the difference this time did bring on a war. Henry was defeated; a parliament was assembled "on a more democratic basis than any which had been ever summoned since the foundation of the monarchy," to whose laws Henry was again required to submit.

72. Henry III died Nov. 16, 1272, and was succeeded by his son Edward, who, at the time, was absent in the Crusades. And it was not till 1274 that he arrived in England, August 3; and on August 19 he and his queen were crowned at Westminster. In 1282 Wales revolted, and Edward was obliged to make war there for two years before it was subdued. There, April 25, 1284, his first son was born, who was named Edward, and was given the title Prince of Wales, which is the origin of the title in the royal family of England. Edward I also resisted constitutional government, especially in the matter of raising taxes. But under the leadership of the two great earls, Roger Bigod of Norfolk and Humphrey Bohun of Hereford and Essex, the nobles of the kingdom "called upon the sheriffs to levy no more taxes till the charters were confirmed without any insidious reservation of the rights of the crown." Edward yielded and the statute of the confirmation of the charter was accepted by the king. "From that day, the tenth of October, 1297, the sole right of raising supplies has been invested in the people -- this most salutary power, which is the greatest of the many distinctions between a limited and a despotic monarchy."

73. Next Edward set up a claim to be "sovereign lord of the land of Scotland." This brought on a war in 1296, which continued for twenty-three years -- far beyond his death which occurred July 7, 1307. He was immediately succeeded by his son Edward, who was twenty-three years old. Edward II carried on the war with Scotland until 1323, when on May 10 a truce of thirteen years was concluded. In the first year of his reign Edward had married Isabella, the daughter of the king of France. In 1323 Isabella entered into an intrigue with Lord Roger Mortimer, which ended only in their murdering of the king. The murder, however, was preceded by his imprisonment. the declaring

of his son Edward king at the age of fifteen, Jan. 7, 1327; the deposition of Edward II, January 13; the proclamation of the accession of Edward III, January 24; and his crowning, January 29.

74. Only four years of the truce between England and Scotland had passed when the king of Scotland -- Robert Bruce -- broke the truce, and invaded England. But, in 1328 a peace was concluded, in which England recognized the independence of Scotland under Bruce, and the peace was sealed by the marriage of the sister of Edward to the son of Bruce. In 1328 had died Charles IV, king of France, leaving no direct heir. The throne was taken by a cousin -- Philip of Artois. Edward's mother was the sister of Charles; and therefore as Charles's nephew and nearer of kin than was Philip, Edward of England claimed the throne of France. The French law was that a woman could not inherit the throne; but Edward asserted the claim that though women were excluded, the law did not exclude the son of a woman who, if she had been a man, would have inherited. When Charles IV had died, Edward had presented his claim.

75. In 1332 Robert Bruce died, and John Balliol, who had done homage to Edward II for the kingdom, now attempted to take it from Bruce's young heir. Edward III favored Balliol, and the king of France aided young David, the son of Bruce. And this aiding of Scotland by the rival king of France against the king of

England and his ally was by Edward III made the ground "for commencing a great war for the purpose of asserting his pretensions to the crown of France." The king of France was just then at war with the people of Flanders. Edward III helped the Flemings, and they proclaimed him king of France. In 1337 "Edward boldly assumed the title of king of France, and prepared to enforce his claim at the sword's point." And thus began the Hundred Years' War between England and France, which continued about a hundred and twenty years, through the rest of the reign of Edward III, to 1337; through the reign of Richard II, to 1399; that of Henry IV, to 1413; that of Henry V, to 1422; and into the reign of Henry VI, till 1458.

76. The Hundred Years' War was barely ended when a civil war -- the Wars of the Roses -- began between the house of York and the house of Lancaster, which continued for thirty-five years, through the reigns

of Edward IV, Edward V, Richard III, till the death of Richard III, the last of the Plantagenets, and the crowning of Henry VII, the first of the Tudors, on Bosworth Field, Aug. 22, 1485. Though the Wars of the Roses were thus ended, peace did not come to the kingdom; for there were insurrections and pretenders to the throne which kept the kingdom in a constant turmoil for fifteen years. In the last eight years of the reign of Henry VII, 1501 to April 21, 1509, there was "neither revolts nor wars" in the kingdom. Henry VII had two sons, Arthur, born 1486, and Henry in 1491. When Arthur was four years old, a marriage was arranged for him with a girl of five years, Catherine of Aragon, the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. In the year 1499, when the children were aged twelve and thirteen, respectively, the marriage ceremony was performed; first by proxy while Catherine was in Spain, and again in their own proper persons, Nov. 6, 1501, when Catherine arrived in England.

77. In January, 1502, a treaty of perpetual peace was made between England and Scotland. This treaty was sealed by the marriage of Margaret, the daughter of Henry VII, of England, to James IV, the king of Scotland. In April of the same year occurred the death of Arthur, the husband of Catherine, and heir apparent to the throne. The two kings, however, Henry and Ferdinand, immediately arranged that Henry's remaining son -- Henry -- should be married to Arthur's young widow, Catherine. It took a year satisfactorily to settle the terms and to get a dispensation from the pope making the marriage legal; so that it was not till 1503 that the contract was actually completed by a ceremonial, "in which a person was appointed to object that the marriage was unlawful, and another to defend it as `good and effectual in the law of Christ's Church.'" To this contract young Henry was opposed; and, before he reached the age of fifteen, "he protested, in legal form, against the contract which had been made during his nonage." Henry VII died April 21, 1509, and the next day began the reign of his young son Henry, eighth of the name. June 7, following, Henry and Catherine were publicly married by the archbishop of Canterbury, and were crowned at Westminster the 24th of the same month.

1[Page 60] "Larger History of the English People." chap. i. per 30; chap. ii, pars. 1-7.

2[Page 60] Encyclopedia Britannica art. "England." history, "Final Predominance of Wessex."

3[Page 60] "Larger History of the English People," chap. ii, par. 4.

4[Page 60] Compare "Empires of the Bible," chap. vi, pars. 3-5; chap. vii, pars. 6, 9, 10; chap. vii, pars. 38-44.

5[Page 61] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. "England," history, "The Kingdom,"

6[Page 61] Id., "Earls and Churls."

7[Page 62] "Larger History," etc., chap. ii, pars 16, 17.

8[Page 64] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. "England," history, "Offa and Charles."

9[Page 64] "Larger History of the English People," chap. ii, last par.

10[Page 65] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. "English," history, "Supremacy of Wessex."

11[Page 65] "Larger History of the English People," chap. iii, pars. 2, 3.

12[Page 66] Id., par. 4.

13[Page 67] Id., par. 4.

14[Page 68] Id.

15[Page 69] Encyclopedia Britannica, Id., "The Imperial Claima."

16[Page 69] The Eastern or Greek Empire, and the Holy Roman Empire.

17[Page 69] Encyclopedia Britannica, Id.

18[Page 70] Encyclopedia Britannica, Id., "Reign of Eadgar."

19[Page 71] Encyclopedia Britannica, Id., "Reign of AEthelred."

20[Page 71] "Larger History of the English People," chap. iv. par. 10.

21[Page 71] Encyclopedia Britannica, Id., "Swegen Acknowledged as King."

22[Page 73] Encyclopedia Britannica, Id., "Cnut's Divisions."

23[Page 76] "History of England," chap. xii, par. 15.

24[Page 77] Encyclopedia Britannica, id., "Progress of the Conquest."

25[Page 80] "Larger History of the English People," book ii, cheap, ii. par. 4.

26[Page 80] Id., par. 8.

27[Page 82] "History of England," chap. par. 8.

28[Page 86] "History of England," chap. xxiii, par. 12.

29[Page 87] Id.

30[Page 88] "Larger History of the English People," John. par. 6 from end.

31[Page 89] "History of England," chap. xxiv, par. 2.

32[Page 90] Quoted by Hallam, "Middle Ages," chap. viii, par. 81; students' edition, chap. viii, part ii, sec. xii. par. 1.

33[Page 91] "History of England," chap. xxiv, par. 7.

8. PAGAN PHILOSOPHY THE STRENGTH OF THE PAPACY.

AS, out of the political difficulties of the days of Constantine and the failing empire of Rome, the Catholic Church -- the apostasy -- rose to power in the State, in the formation of the papacy; so, out of the ruin of the Roman Empire, she, in her Ecclesiastical Empire, rose to supremacy over kings and nations. She had speedily wrought the ruin of one empire; and now for more than a thousand years she would prove a living curse to all the other states and empires that should succeed it. However, in order to a clear understanding and appreciation of the standing of the papacy at the moment when the Roman Empire vanished, and she found herself alone in the midst of that vast scene of destruction and anarchy, it is essential to know the source of her strength, by which she was able to survive. And, in order to know this, it is essential that we sketch a certain portion of her preceding history.

2. In that dismal mixture of downright heathenism, and the profession and forms of Christianity in the philosophical schools of Ammonius Saccas, Clement, and Origen, in Alexandria, there was given birth to the element which, above all other things, has ever been the mainstay of the papacy -- monkery, or monasticism: from the Greek word "movachos" signifying "living alone, solitary; a man who retired from the world for religious meditation and the practice of religious duties in solitude; a religious hermit."

3. It will be remembered1 that in the philosophy of Ammonius, Clement, and Origen, all Scripture contains at least two meanings, -- the literal and the hidden: that the literal is the baser sense of the Scripture, and is therefore a hindrance to the proper understanding of the hidden meaning with its train of further hidden meanings, and, accordingly, was to be despised and separated as far as possible from the hidden sense, and counted as of the least possible worth: that "the

source of many evils lies in adhering to the carnal or external part of Scripture;" that "those who do so will not attain to the kingdom of God;" and that, therefore, "the Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written."

4. Now, the basis of that whole scheme was their conception of man himself. It was because that, in their philosophy, the body is the baser part of man, that the literal was counted the baser sense of Scripture. It was because that the body often betrays good men into sin, that, in their philosophy, the literal sense of Scripture was held to often lead men into error. In their system of philosophy, the body of man was but a clog to the soul, and hindered it in its heavenly aspirations; and therefore was to be despised, and, by neglect, punishment, and starvation, was to be separated as far as possible from the soul. And from this it followed that the literal sense of Scripture -- which corresponded to man's body, -- was, likewise, a hindrance to the proper understanding of the hidden meanings of the Scripture, and was, therefore, to be despised, neglected, and separated as far as possible from the hidden sense or soul of the Scripture.

5. Whence, then, came to them this philosophy of the nature of man? It was the adoption entire of the heathen conception of the nature of man: it was the direct continuation, under the Christian profession, of the heathen philosophy of the immortality of the soul. For, about the close of the second century, "a new philosophic body suddenly started up, which in a short time prevailed over a large part of the Roman Empire, and not only nearly swallowed up the other sects, but likewise did immense injury to Christianity. Egypt was its birthplace, and particularly Alexandria, which for a long time had been the seat of literature and every science. Its followers chose to be called Platonics [or Platonists]. Yet they did not follow Plato implicitly, but collected from all

systems whatever seemed to coincide with their own views. And the ground of this preference for the name of Platonics [or Platonists] was, that they conceived Plato to have understood more correctly than any one besides, that most important branch of philosophy, which treats of God, and things remote from sensible apprehension. . . . Notwithstanding these philosophers were the partisans of no sect, yet it appears from a variety of testimonies that they much preferred Plato, and embraced

97

the most of his dogmas concerning God, the human soul, and the universe." This, because they regarded "Plato as wiser than all the rest, and as especially remarkable for treating the deity, the soul, and things remote from sense, so as to suit the Christian scheme." -- Mosheim.2

6. This new philosophy "permitted the common people to live according to the laws of their country, and the dictates of nature; but directed the wise, by means of contemplation, to raise their souls, which sprang from God himself, above all earthly things, at the same time weakening and emaciating the body, which is hostile to the spirit's liberty, by means of hunger, thirst, labor, and other austerities. Thus they might, even in the present life, attain to communion with the Supreme Being, and ascend, after death, active and unimcumbered, to the universal Parent, and be forever united with him . . . .

7. "This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by Origen and other Christians, did immense harm to Christianity. For it led the teachers of it to involve in philosophic obscurity many parts of our religion, which were in themselves plain and easy to be understood; and to add to the precepts of the Saviour no few things, of which not a word can be found in the Holy Scriptures. It also produced for us that gloomy set of men called mystics, whose system, if divested of its Platonic notions respecting the origin and nature of the soul, will be a lifeless and senseless corpse. It laid a foundation, too, for that indolent mode of life which was afterward adopted by many, and particularly by numerous tribes of monks; and it recommended to Christians various foolish and useless rites, suited only to nourish superstition, no small part of which we see religiously observed by many even to the present day. And finally it alienated the minds of many, in the following centuries, from Christianity itself, and produced a heterogeneous species of religion, consisting of Christian and Platonic principles combined." -- Mosheim.3

8. "Plato had taught that the souls of heroes, of illustrious men, and eminent philosophers, alone, ascended after death into the mansions of light and felicity, while those of the generality, weighed down

98

by their lusts and passions, sunk into the infernal regions, whence they were not permitted to emerge before they were purified from their turpitude and corruption. This doctrine was seized with avidity by the Platonic Christians, and applied as a commentary upon that of Jesus. Hence a notion prevailed that only the martyrs entered upon a state of happiness immediately after death; and that, for the rest, a certain obscure region was assigned, in which they were to be imprisoned until the second coming of Christ, or, at least, until they were purified from their various pollutions.4 . . .

9. "Jesus Christ prescribed to all His disciples one and the same rule of life and manners. But certain Christian doctors, either through a desire of imitating the nations among whom they lived, or in consequence of a natural propensity to a life of austerity (which is a disease not uncommon in Syria, Egypt, and other Eastern provinces), were induced to maintain that Christ had established a double rule of sanctity and virtue, for two different orders of Christians. Of these rules, one was ordinary, the other extraordinary; one of a lower dignity, the other more sublime; one for persons in the active scenes of life, the other for those who, in a sacred retreat, aspired to the glory of a celestial state. In consequence of this wild system,they divided into two parts all those moral doctrines and instructions which they had received, either by writing or tradition. One of these divisions they called precepts, and the other counsels. They gave the name of precepts to those laws which were obligatory

upon all orders of men; and that of counsels to such as related to Christians of a more sublime rank, who proposed to themselves great and glorious ends, and aspired to an intimate communion with the Supreme Being.

10. "This double doctrine suddenly produced a new set of men, who made profession of uncommon degrees of sanctity and virtue, and declared their resolution of obeying all the counsels of Christ, that they might enjoy communion with God here; and also, that, after the dissolution of their mortal bodies, they might ascend to Him with greater facility, and find nothing to retard their approach to the supreme center of happiness and perfection. They looked upon themselves as prohibited from the use of things which it was lawful for other Christians

99

to enjoy, such as wine, flesh, matrimony, and trade [or worldly business]. They thought it their indispensable duty to extenuate the body by watchings, abstinence, labor, and hunger. They looked for felicity in solitary retreats, in desert places, where, by severe and assiduous efforts of sublime meditation, they raised the soul above all external objects and all sensual pleasures. Both men and women imposed upon themselves the most severe tasks, the most austere discipline, all of which, however, the fruit of pious intention, was, in the issue, extremely detrimental to Christianity. These persons were called ascetics, "epovdioi", "echlektoi" philosophers and even she-philosophers; not were they only distinguished by their title from other Christians, but also by their garb." -- Mosheim.5

11. "Egypt, the fruitful parent of superstition, afforded the first example of the monastic life." -- Gibbon.6 "From Egypt, this sour and unsocial discipline passed into Syria, and the neighboring countries, which also abounded with persons of the same dismal constitution with that of the Egyptians; and thence, in process of time its infection reached the European nations. Hence arose that train of austere and superstitious vows and rites, that still, in many places, throw a veil over the beauty and simplicity of the Christian religion. Hence the celibacy of the priestly order, the rigor of unprofitable penances and mortifications, the innumerable swarms of monks, who, in the senseless pursuit of a visionary sort of perfection, refused their talents and labors to society. Hence also that distinction between the theoretical and mystical life, and many other fancies of a like nature.7

12. Soon there arose certain orders amongst the monks themselves: Coenobites, Eremites or Hermits, Anchorites, and Sarabaites or Vagrants. The Coenobites "lived and ate together in the same house, and were associated under a leader and head, whom they called Father, or in the Egyptian tongue, Abbot." "The nuns [or female monks] also had their presidents, who were called Mothers." "The Eremites led a cheerless, solitary life in certain parts of the country, dwelling in hovels among the wild beasts." The Anchorites were "still more austere than the Eremites:

100

these lived in desert places, with no kind of shelter; fed on roots and plants, and had no fixed residence, but lodged wherever night overtook them, so that visitors might not know where to find them." The Sarabaites, or Vagrants, "roamed about the provinces, and from city to city, and got their living without labor,by pretended miracles, by trafficking in relies, and by other impositions." -- Mosheim.8

13. The Eremites "sunk under the painful weight of crosses and chains; and their emaciated limbs were confined by collars, bracelets, gauntlets, and greaves of massy and rigid iron. All superfluous incumbrance of dress they contemptuously cast away; and some savage saints of both sexes have been admired, whose naked bodies were covered only by their long hair. They aspired to reduce themselves to the rude and miserable state in which the human brute is scarcely distinguished above his kindred animals: and a numerous sect of Anchorets derived their name ["Boskoi", or Grazing-monks] from their humble practice of grazing in the fields of Mesopotamia with the common herd. They often usurped the den of some wild beast whom they affected to resemble; they buried themselves in some gloomy cavern, which art or nature had scooped out of the rock; and the marble quarries of Thebais are still inscribed with the monuments of their penance. The most perfect hermits

are supposed to have passed many days without food, many nights without sleep, and many years without speaking; and glorious was the man (I abuse the name) who contrived any cell, or seat, of a peculiar construction, which might expose him, in the most inconvenient posture, to the inclemency of the seasons."

14. "In this comfortless state, superstition still pursued and tormented her wretched votaries. The repose which they had sought in the cloister was disturbed by a tardy repentance, profane doubts, and guilty desires; and, while they considered each natural impulse an unpardonable sin, they perpetually trembled on the edge of a flaming and bottomless abyss. From the painful struggles of disease and despair, these unhappy victims were sometimes relieved by madness or death, and, in the sixth century, a hospital was founded at Jerusalem for a small portion of the austere penitents, who were deprived of their senses. Their visions before they attained this extreme and acknowledged term

of frenzy, have afforded ample materials of supernatural history. It was their firm persuasion that the air which they breathed was peopled with invisible enemies; with innumerable demons, who watched every occasion, and assumed every form, to terrify, and above all, to tempt, their unguarded virtue. The imagination, and even the senses, were deceived by the illusions of distempered fanaticism; and the hermit whose midnight prayer was oppressed by involuntary slumber might easily confound the phantoms of horror or delight which had occupied his sleeping and his waking dreams."

15. "The actions of a monk, his words, and even his thoughts were determined by an inflexible rule, or a capricious superior: the slightest offenses were corrected by disgrace or confinement, extraordinary fasts or bloody flagellations; and disobedience, murmur, or delay was ranked in the catalogue of the most heinous sins. A blind submission to the commands of the abbot, however absurd, or even criminal, they might seem, was the ruling principle, the first virtue of the Egyptian monks; and their patience was frequently exercised by the most extravagant trials. They were directed to remove an enormous rock; assiduously to water a barren staff that was planted in the ground, till, at the end of three years, it should vegetate and blossom like a tree; to walk into a fiery furnace; or to cast their infant into a deep pond: and several saints, or madmen, have been immortalized in monastic story, by their thoughtless and fearless obedience. The freedom of the mind, the source of every generous and rational sentiment, was destroyed by the habits of credulity and submission; and the monk, contracting the vices of a slave, devoutly followed the faith and passions of his ecclesiastical tyrant. The peace of the Eastern Church was invaded by a swarm of fanatics, insensible of fear, of reason, or humanity; and the Imperial troops acknowledged without shame that they were much less apprehensive of an encounter with the fiercest barbarians." -- Gibbon.9

16. As we have seen, to be a monk, was, in itself, to be holier than any could be who were not monks. But there arose degrees of holiness even amongst the monks themselves: and the chief of these were the Mystics. These were a sect composed of extremes of the Eremites and Anchorites. They "argued from that known doctrine of the Platonic

school, which also was adopted by Origen and his disciples, that the divine nature was diffused through all human souls; or, in other words, that the faculty of reason, from which the health and vigor of the mind proceed, was an emanation from God himself, and comprehended in it the principles and elements of all truth, human and divine. They denied that men could, by labor or study, excite this celestial flame in their breasts; and, therefore, they highly disapproved the attempts of those who, by definitions, abstract theorems, and profound speculations, endeavored to form distinct notions of truth, and to discover its hidden nature. On the contrary, they maintained that silence, tranquillity, repose, and solitude accompanied with such acts of mortification as might tend to extenuate and exhaust the body, were the means by which the internal word ["lagos", or reason] was excited to produce its latent virtues, and to instruct men in the knowledge of divine things.

17. "For thus they reasoned: `They who behold with a noble contempt all human affairs, they who turn away their eyes from terrestial vanities, and shut all the avenues of the outward senses against the contagious influences of a material world, must necessarily return to God, when the spirit is thus disengaged from the impediments that prevented that happy union; and in this blessed frame, they not only enjoy inexpressible raptures from their communion with the Supreme Being, but are also invested with the inestimable privilege of contemplating truth, undisguised and uncorrupted, in its native purity, while others behold it in a vitiated and delusive form." "An incredible number of proselytes joined those chimerical sectaries, who maintained that communion with God was to be sought by mortifying the senses, by withdrawing the mind from all external objects, by macerating the body with hunger and labor, and by a holy sort of indolence, which confined all the activity of the soul to a lazy contemplation of things spiritual and eternal. The progress of this sect appears evidently from the prodigious number of solitary monks and sequestered virgins, which had overrun the whole Christian world with an amazing rapidity."10

18. No one would readily think to what an extent these persons really did go in their endeavors to make manifest their contempt of the body, and to separate it from the soul. It was not alone that they separated

themselves from all people except their own kind, and starved the body by fastings and insufficient quantities of food, but it was manifested in every possible way what a wild and fanciful imagination could invent. "Every sensation that is offensive to man, was thought acceptable to God." Neither the body nor the clothes were ever washed -- not even feet or hands, except by an indulgence; so that filthiness actually became the measure of the degree of holiness.

19. Antony, if not the first, was the chief, the great exemplar, and the master of the monks in Egypt. In A. D. 305 he began the work of organizing such of them as would admit of it, into a regular body. He "engaged them to live in society with each other, and prescribed rules for the direction of their conduct." In 341, Athanasius, archbishop of Alexandria, the great champion of Catholic orthodoxy, "introduced into Rome the knowledge and practice of the monastic life; and a school of this new philosophy was opened by the disciples of Antony, who accompanied their primate to the holy threshold of the Vatican. The strange and savage appearance of these Egyptians excited, at first, horror and contempt, and, at length, applause and zealous imitation. The senators, and more especially the matrons, transformed their palaces and villas into religious houses, and the narrow institution of six Vestals was eclipsed by the frequent monasteries, which were seated on the ruins of ancient temples and in the midst of the Roman forum.

20. "Inflamed by the example of Antony, a Syrian youth, whose name was Hilarion, fixed his dreary abode on a sandy beach, between the sea and a morass, about seven miles from Gaza. The austere penance in which he persisted forty-eight years, diffused a similar enthusiasm; and the holy man was followed by a train of two or three thousand anchorets, whenever he visited the innumerable monasteries of Palestine. The fame of Basil is immortal in the monastic history of the East. With a mind that had tasted the learning and eloquence of Athens, with an ambition scarcely to be satisfied by the archbishopric of Caesarea, Basil retired to a savage solitude in Pontus, and deigned for a while to give laws to the spiritual colonies which he profusely scattered along the coast of the Black Sea. In the West, Martin of Tours, a soldier, a hermit, a bishop, and a saint, established the monasteries of Gaul; two thousand of his disciples followed him to the grave; and

his eloquent historian challenges the deserts of Thebais to produce, in a more favorable climate, a champion of equal virtue.

21. "Every province, and at last every city, of the empire, was filled with their increasing multitudes; and the bleak and barren isles from Lerins to Lipari, that arise out of the Tuscan Sea, were chosen by the anchorets for the place of their voluntary exile . . . . The pilgrims who visited Jerusalem eagerly copied, in the most distant

parts of the earth, the faithful model of the monastic life. The disciples of Antony spread themselves beyond the tropic, over the Christian empire of Ethiopia. The monastery of Banchor, in Flintshire, which contained above two thousand brethren dispersed a numerous colony among the barbarians of Ireland; and Iona, one of the Hebrides, which was planted by the Irish monks, diffused over the northern regions a doubtful ray of science and superstition." -- Gibbon.11 Thus Christendom was "filled with a lazy set of mortals, who, abandoning all human connections, advantages, pleasures, and concerns, wore out a languishing and miserable life, amidst the hardships of want and various kinds of suffering, in order to arrive at a more close and rapturous communion with God and angels." -- Mosheim.12

22. "It is incredible what rigorous and severe laws they imposed on themselves, in order to appease God, and deliver the celestial spirit from the body's bondage. To live among wild beasts -- nay, in the manner of these beasts; to roam about like madmen, in desert places, and without garments; to feed their emaciated bodies with hay and grass; to shun the converse and even the sight of men; to stand motionless in certain places, for many years, exposed to the weather; to shut themselves up in confined cabins, till life ended; -- this was accounted piety: this the true method of eliciting the [spark of] Deity from the secret recesses of the soul!

23. "Among these examples of religious fatuity none acquired greater veneration and applause than those who were called Pillar-Saints (Sancti Columnares), or in Greek, Stylites: persons of a singular spirit and genius, who stood motionless on the top of lofty columns during many years, even to the end, in fact, of life, to the great astonishment

of the ignorant multitude. This scheme originated in the present [the fifth] century [395-451] with Simeon of Sysan, a Syrian; at first a shepherd, then a monk; who, in order to be nearer heaven, spent thirty-seven years in the most uncomfortable manner, on the tops of five different pillars, of six, twelve, twenty-two, thirty-six, and forty cubits' elevation; and in this way procured for himself immense fame and veneration. His example was afterward followed, though not equaled, by many persons in Syria and Palestine, either from ignorance of true religion, or from love of fame."

24. The top of Simeon's last pillar "was three feet in diameter, and surrounded with a balustrade. Here he stood, day and night, and in all weathers. Through the night, and till nine A. M. he was constantly in prayer, often spreading forth his hands, and bowing so low that his forehead touched his toes. A bystander once attempted to count the number of these successive prostrations," and, "after numbering twelve hundred and forty-four repetitions, at length desisted from the endless account." "At nine o'clock A. M., he began to address the admiring crowd below, to hear and answer their questions, to send messages and write letters, etc.; for he took concern in the welfare of all the churches, and corresponded with bishops, and even with emperors." "Successive crowds of pilgrims from Gaul and India saluted the divine pillar of Simeon: the tribes of Saracens disputed in arms the honor of his benediction; the queens of Arabia and Persia gratefully confessed his supernatural virtue; and the angelic hermit was consulted by the younger Theodosius, in the most important concerns of the Church and State." "Toward evening he suspended his intercourse with this world, and betook himself again to converse with God till the following day. He generally ate but once a week; never slept; wore a long sheepskin robe, and cap of the same. His beard was very long, and his frame extremely emaciated.

25. "In this manner he is reported to have spent thirty-seven years; and at last, in his sixty-ninth year, to have expired unobserved, in a praying attitude, in which no one ventured to disturb him till after three days, when Antony, his disciple and biographer, mounting the pillar, found that his spirit was departed, and his holy body was emitting a delightful odor." "His remains were transported from the mountain

of Telenissa, by a solemn procession of the patriarch, the master-general of the East, six bishops, twenty-one counts or tribunes, and six thousand soldiers; and Antioch revered his bones, as her glorious ornament and

impregnable defense." "His pillar also was so venerated that it was literally inclosed with chapels and monasteries for some ages. Simeon was so averse from women, that he never allowed one to come within the sacred precincts of his pillar. Even his own mother was debarred this privilege, till after her death, when her corpse was brought to him. Pagan India still supplies gloomy fanatics resembling Simeon, and admirers like his contemporaries; a plain proof that his austerities were a graft from gentilism, the great religious evil of his day, and still at work upon the Christian Church."13

26. "The Christian Church would never have been disgraced by this cruel and unsocial enthusiasm, nor would any have been subjected to those keen torments of mind and body to which it gave rise, had not many Christians been unwarily caught by the specious appearance and the pompous sound of that maxim of ancient philosophy, `That in order to the attainment of true felicity and communion with God, it was necessary that the soul should be separated from the body, even here below, and that the body was to be macerated and mortified for this purpose.'" And how exactly according to the ancient philosophy this new Platonic, or monkish, philosophy was, and how certainly all this was the logical fruit of the Platonic philosophy, is easily seen by reference to Plato himself. And, that this may fairly be seen, Plato shall be quite fully quoted. Thus he says: --

"True philosophers . . . will speak to one another in such words as these: We have found, they will say, a path of speculation which seems to bring us and the argument to the conclusion that while we are in the body, and while the soul is mingled with this mass of evil, our desire will not be satisfied, and our desire is of the truth. For the body is a source of endless trouble to us by reason of the mere requirement of food; and also is liable to diseases which overtake and impede us in the search after truth: and by filling us so full of loves, and lusts, and fears, and fancies, and idols, and every sort of folly, prevents our ever having, as people say, so much as a thought . . . .

"Moreover, if there is time and an inclination toward philosophy,

yet the body introduces a turmoil and confusion and fear into the course of speculation, and hinders us from seeing the truth; and all experience shows that if we would have pure knowledge of anything we must be quit of the body, and the soul in herself must behold all things in themselves: then I suppose that we shall attain that which we desire, and of which we say that we are lovers, and that is wisdom; not while we live, but after death, as the argument shows; for if while in company with the body the soul can not have pure knowledge, one of two things seems to follow -- either knowledge is not to be attained at all, or, if at all, after death. For then, and not till then, the soul will be in herself alone and without the body.

"In this present life, I reckon that we make the nearest approach to knowledge when we have the least possible concern or interest in the body, and are not saturated with the bodily nature, but remain pure until the hour when God himself is pleased to release us. And then the foolishness of the body will be cleared away and we shall be pure and hold converse with other pure souls, and know of ourselves the clear light everywhere; and this is surely the light of truth. For no impure thing is allowed to approach the pure . . . .

"And what is purification but the separation of the soul from the body, as I was saying before; the habit of the soul gathering and collecting herself into herself, out of all the courses of the body; the dwelling in her own place alone as in another life, so also in this, as far as she can; the release of the soul from the chains of the body?

"The lovers of knowledge are conscious that their souls, when philosophy receives them, are simply fastened and glued to their bodies: the soul is only able to view existence through the bars of a prison, and not in her own nature; she is wallowing in the mire of all ignorance; and philosophy, seeing the terrible nature of her confinement, and that the captive through desire is led to conspire in her own captivity . . . philosophy shows her that this is visible and tangible, but that what she sees in her own nature is intellectual and invisible. And the soul

of the true philosopher thinks that she ought not to resist this deliverance, and therefore abstains from pleasures and desires and pains and fears, as far as she is able . . . .

"Each pleasure and pain is a sort of nail which nails and rivets the soul to the body, and engrosses her and makes her believe that to be true which the body affirms to be true; and from agreeing with the body and having the same delights she is obliged to have the same habits and ways, and is not likely ever to be pure at her departure to the world below, but is always saturated with the body; so that she soon sinks into another body and there germinates and grows, and has therefore no part in the communion of the divine and pure and simple. . . .

"When the dead arrive at the place to which the genius of each severally conveys them, first of all they have sentence passed upon them, as they have lived well and piously or not. And those who appear to

have lived neither well nor ill, go to the river Acheron, and mount such conveyances as they can get, and are carried in them to the lake, and there they dwell and are purified of their evil deeds, and suffer the penalty of the wrongs which they have done to others, and are absolved, and receive the rewards of their good deeds according to their deserts. But those who appear to be incurable by reason of the greatness of their crimes, -- who have committed many and terrible deeds of sacrilege, murders foul and violent, or the like, -- such are hurled into Tartarus, which is their suitable destiny, and they never come out. Those again who have committed crimes, which, although great, are not unpardonable, -- who in a moment of anger, for example, have done violence to a father or a mother, and have repented for the remainder of their lives, or who have taken the life of another under the like extenuating circumstances, -- these are plunged into Tartarus, the pains of which they are compelled to undergo for a year, but at the end of the year the wave casts them forth, -- mere homicides by way of Cocytus, parricides and matricides by Pyriphlegethon, -- and they are borne to the Acherusian Lake, and there they lift up their voices and call upon the victims whom they have slain or wronged, to have pity on them, and to receive them, and to let them come out of the river into the lake. And if they prevail, then they come forth and cease from their troubles; but if not, they are carried back again into Tartarus and from thence into the rivers unceasingly, until they obtain mercy from those whom they have wronged; for that is the sentence inflicted upon them by their judges. Those also who are remarkable for having led holy lives are released from this earthly prison, and go to their pure home which is above, and dwell in the purer earth; and those who have duly purified themselves with philosophy live henceforth altogether without the body, in mansions fairer far than these, which may not be described, and of which the time would fail me to tell.

"I do not mean to affirm that the description which I have given of the soul and her mansions is exactly true -- a man of sense ought hardly to say that. But I do say that, inasmuch as the soul is shown to be immortal, he may venture to think, not improperly or unworthily, that something of the kind is true."14

27. From this it is evident that the whole monkish system, with all its extravagances and torments in life, and its torments in purgatory afterward, was and is but the logical extension, under the name of Christianity, of the Platonic philosophy as propounded by Plato himself. This monkery of the Catholic Church was not peculiar, even in its extravagances, unless perhaps, in those of the pillar-saints; for paganism, long before this, had the like, and even yet has it: and, wherever it is found,

it is all the strict logic of the philosophy of the immortality of the soul Of the inquiries of the ancient philosophers of Greece and Rome with regard to the immortality of the soul, it has been well observed that "their reason had been often guided by their imagination, and that their imagination had been prompted by their vanity. When they viewed with complacency the extent of their own mental powers, when they exercised the various faculties of memory, of fancy, and of judgment, in the most profound speculations, or the most important labors, and when they reflected on the desire of fame, which transported them into future ages, far beyond the bounds of

death and of the grave, they were unwilling to . . . suppose that a being, for whose dignity they entertained the most sincere admiration, could be limited to a spot of earth, and to a few years of duration." -- Gibbon.15

28. Thus it is plain that vanity, self-love, self-exaltation -- selfishness -- is the root of the philosophy of the immortality of the soul. It was this that led them to consider themselves, in their souls, "immortal and imperishable" (for so Plato definitely puts it),16 and so, essentially a part of the Deity. And this is confirmed by revelation. For, when God had said to the man whom He had formed and placed in

dominion over all the earth and over every moving thing upon it: "Of all the trees of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree which is in the midst of the garden thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," Satan came with the words: "Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that, on the day ye eat thereof, your eyes will be opened and ye will be as God."17 The woman believed this Satanic word. So believing, she saw what was not true -- that the tree was "to be desired to make one wise," a philosopher; and "she took of the fruit thereof and did eat and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat."

29. This is the origin of the philosophy of the immortality of the soul, in this world. And the only reason why that man did not die that day, even in the very hour when he sinned, is that there, at that moment, Jesus Christ offered himself in behalf of man, and took upon himself the death that would then have fallen upon the man; and thus gave to man another chance, a probation, a breathing-space, that he might choose life. This is why God could immediately say to the deceiver: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."18 And so it is written: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."19 He came that they might first have life; and, without His then offering himself, man never would have had life after he sinned. And, having come that the man might first have life, this life to the man was and is solely for the purpose

that he might use it in securing life more abundantly, even eternal life, the life of God. Thus it is only by the gift of Christ that any man in this world ever has opportunity to breathe at all. And, the sole object of man's having an opportunity to breathe, is that he may choose life, that he may live and escape the death that is due to sin, and that is certain to fall, when Christ shall step away from between, and shall resume His place upon the throne of the universe.

30. And so it is written: "What is your life? -- It is even a vapor that appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away."20 And, what is death -- the death which men die in this world? -- It is even a sleep,21 from which there is waking only in the resurrection of the dead. So the entering of Christ -- Christ's gift of himself when man had sinned -- gave to man this life which is but a vapor, and which ends in this death which is but a sleep, between that life which is life indeed, and that death which is death indeed. Therefore, to all mankind it is spoken forever: "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil. Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."22 "He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."23

31. Accordingly, "he that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life;" for "this is the record that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son."24 And this life which is life indeed, beyond this life which is a vapor and this death which is a sleep, is assured only in Christ, through the resurrection of the dead: as it is written, "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory."25 "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise

first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and

112

so shall we ever be with the Lord."26 And, without the resurrection of the dead, there is no hereafter; for "if the dead rise not . . . your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins; then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." And "if after the men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."27

32. This is the true course, and the only true course, to immortality: not merely immortality of the soul, but the immortality of both soul and body. For Christ has bought, and will redeem, the body equally with the soul; He cares, and would have men care, for the body equally as for the soul; as it is written, "I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth."28 God only hath immortality.29 Christ "hath brought life and immortality to the light through the gospel."30 Thus immortality is the gift of God, and is obtained only by believers of the gospel. And to these it is given only at the resurrection of the dead; as it is written: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."31

33. This is the truth as to immortality. This is the true way of mankind from mortality to immortality. But, it is directly antagonistic to the Platonic or pagan idea of immortality, and of that way to it. This is evident on its face; but it is aptly confirmed by an incident that occurred at the very seat of the original Platonic philosophy -- in Athens itself. Paul, in one of his journeys, came to Athens, where he remained several days, and talked "in the synagogue with the Jews,

113

and with the devout persons, and in the market daily with them that met with him." And, in all his speech, he preached the gospel -- Christ and Him crucified: Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God: Christ and the resurrection of the dead: and life and immortality only through Christ and the resurrection of the dead. "Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics encountered him. And some said, What will this babbler say? Other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods." And this "because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection." This was altogether a new doctrine, something which they never had heard. Therefore, "they took him, and brought him unto Areopagus, saying, May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears: we would know therefore what these things mean." And when, standing on Mars' Hill, he preached to them the gospel, and called upon all "to repent: because He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead -- when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked: and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter."

34. This account demonstrates even by inspiration that the Christian conception of immortality is not in any sense that of Plato and the other philosophers. If Paul had preached in Athens the immortality of the soul, no one in Athens would ever have counted him "a setter forth of strange gods." Such preaching would never there have been called "new doctrine." Nothing of that sort would ever have been "strange things to their ears." But Christianity knows no such thing as the immortality of the soul. Therefore Paul preached immortality as the gift of God through Jesus Christ and the resurrection from the dead: immortality to be sought for and obtained only through the faith of Christ, by believers in Jesus -- immortality only through Christ and the resurrection of the

dead. He preached that, without the gospel, all men are lost, and subject to death. For, to the Greeks he wrote: "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost,in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should

shine unto them."32 He preached the Word, -- not that the soul is "immortal and imperishable," but -- "the soul that sinneth, it shall die;"33 that "the wicked shall perish:"34 that "they shall be as nothing:" that "yet a little while and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be:"35 that "the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."36 "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die?"37

35. Selfishness, then, selfishness in pride and self-exaltation,being the root of the philosophy of the immortality of the soul, in the nature of things selfishness could be the only root of this sanctification and glorification of the soul by all these starvings, punishments, or exercises of whatever sort that were employed to depress the body and exalt the soul so as to accomplish the separation of the soul from the body and enable her to reach the high destiny prescribed in the philosophy. Consequently, the analysis of the monastic life is clearly only self-righteousness: "exorbitant selfishness made the rule of life." -- Draper.38 The goal of the soul was to be reached solely by their own efforts. The rules for their guidance to this goal were of their own making. They themselves prescribed for themselves rules by which they were to deliver themselves from themselves. And, a law without a penalty being of no force, it was perfectly logical that, for the violation of the rules which they themselves had prescribed to themselves, they should lay upon themselves penalties in penances and dreadful punishments to whatever degree would most likely prevent any further violation of the rules, or any recurrence of the proscribed action or thought. But, all their rules were prohibitions of what it was inherently in them to do; all their proscriptions were of things which were essentially of themselves; and, it is impossible for a man by any law, penalty, or proscription upon himself, to prevent himself from desiring to do that which is in him to do. In other words, it is impossible for any finite being to deliver himself from himself. And, when, in his own proud estimation, any such one concludes that he has delivered himself from himself, in the very pride

and self-glorification of that which he decides that he has accomplished, self is magnified more than ever before. And this is exactly the round which was traveled in the self-involved system of the philosophy of the immortality of the soul and of its logical manifestation in monkery.

36. There is a way of deliverance from self. It is the way of Christ, and of the faith of Christ who is "the Way." And so it is written: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery [a thing to be seized upon and held fast, as a robber his prey] to be equal with God: but emptied himself."39 He, being divine, and in all perfections complete, could empty Himself and still retain His divine humility. He could successfully empty Himself without any taint of self-exaltation. And, that having been accomplished in Himself, in order that the like might be accomplished in all mankind; having emptied Himself, in order that every man might be emptied of himself; -- now to every man comes the word: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who . . . emptied Himself." Do not think that you are equal with God: do not think that you are immortal: do not think that equality with God is a thing to be seized upon and held fast. But, "let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who . . . emptied Himself." And that mind which was in Christ will accomplish in you precisely what it accomplished in Him: it will empty yourself. Do you also become "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross," by which the world shall be crucified unto you, and you unto the world; and so shall you be delivered "from this present evil world, according to the will of God and Jesus Christ our Lord."40 And all this without any rules, penances, or punishments; but by the divine power of the righteousness of God, which, from faith to faith, is revealed in the gospel of Christ.41

37. The frenzy of the fanaticism to which the devotees of monkery attained, was only the measure of the popularity which the philosophy of monkery had acquired. And thus the profession of monkery became the standard of all virtue -- with the clerical order, with kings and emperors, and with the multitude. Those who were not of the monastic order, in order to have any recognized standing anywhere, were obliged to imitate, or at least, to make a show of imitating, the course of the

monks, so far as it was practicable without their actually becoming monks. And one thing in particular that was thus demanded, and with a force that would accept of no refusal, was the celibacy of the clergy.

38. "Marriage was allowed to all the clergy, from the highest rank to the lowest. Yet those were accounted more holy and excellent who lived in celibacy. For it was the general persuasion that those who lived in wedlock were much more exposed to the assaults of the evil spirits than others: and it was of immense importance that no impure or malignant spirit should assail the mind or the body of one who was to instruct and govern others. Such persons, therefore, wished, if possible, to have nothing to do with conjugal life. And this, many of the clergy, especially in Africa, endeavored to accomplish with the least violence to their inclinations; for they received into their houses, and even to their beds, some of those females who had vowed perpetual chastity, affirming, however, most religiously, that they had no disgraceful intercourse with them. Such connections they considered as a marriage of soul, without the marriage of the body. These concubines were by the Greeks called "suneisaktoi" [plural of "suneisaktos" introduced together; a priest's housekeeper -- Liddell and Scott], and by the Latins mulieres subintroductae [women secretly brought in]." -- Mosheim.42

39. At first, all orders of monks were composed of the laity. But, when they attained to such heights of popularity, and therefore, of saintliness, many of them, by the voice of the populace, or even by the command of the emperors, were chosen to the clerical office, and even to bishoprics. At first, also, when they were of the laity, they, as others of the laity, were subject to the episcopal jurisdiction of the diocese in which they were. But, by reason of their great popularity and their immense numbers, they became so powerful, and by their self-exaltation they became so arrogant, that, on occasion, they would defy the authority of the bishops; and not only of the bishops, but even of the emperors; and, by the violent and virulent tide of their passions would carry everything before them.

40. This disregard of their authority the bishops resented; which resentment, in turn, the monks resented. Thus, gradually, there developed

a condition of continual variance between the bishopric and the monastic orders. In their contentions with the bishops, the monks would invariably appeal to the bishop of Rome; and thus, by degrees, through one minor exemption after another, the point was at last reached at which, by the authority of the pope, the monks were wholly exempt from all episcopal jurisdiction, and were made directly responsible to the bishop of Rome himself. This greatly magnified the self-importance of the monks, and brought to the pope a vast army permeating all Christendom -- an army of fanatics, who, by their very philosophy, were inured to the most savage hardships; and who thus were prepared to go through fire or flood, and to face death in any shape without flinching, in the service of their head, and for the propagation of the form of religion which they themselves were largely instrumental in creating.

41. This also gave to the bishop of Rome an army of devotees who were of a disposition to employ any means whatever, even to the most savage, to secure the recognition of his authority, and conformity to his religion. For their own "voluntary martyrdom must have gradually destroyed the sensibility both of the mind and body; nor can it be presumed that the fanatics, who torment themselves, are susceptible of any lively affection for the rest of mankind. A cruel, unfeeling temper has distinguished the monks of every age and country: their

stern indifference, which is seldom mollified by personal friendship, is inflamed by religious hatred; and their merciless zeal has strenuously administered the holy office of the Inquisition." -- Gibbon.43

---

1 [Page 95] "Great Empires of Prophecy," chap. xxvi, pars. 33-44.

2 [Page 96] "Ecclesiastical History," cent. ii, part ii, chap i, pars. 4-6.

3 [Page 96] Id., pars. 10, 12.

4 [Page 98] This is the origin of the Catholic Purgatory.

5 [Page 99] Id., cent. ii, part ii, chap. iii, par. 12.

6 [Page 99] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap, xxxvii, par. 3.

7 [Page 99] Id., cent. ii, part ii, chap. iii, pars. 13. 14.

8 [Page 100] Id., cent. iv. part ii, chap. iii, par. 15 and notes.

9 [Page 101] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxvii, pars. 13, 12, 6.

10 [Page 102] Id., cent. iii, part ii, chap. iii, par. 2; cent. iv. part ii, chap. iii, par. 12.

11 [Page 104] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxvii, par. 4.

12 [Page 104] Cent. iv, part ii, chap. iii, par. 13.

13 [Page 106] Murdock's "Mosheim," cent. v. part ii, chap. iii par. 12, note; Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxvii, pars. 14, 15.

14 [Page 108] "Plato's Dialogues," Phaedo.

15 [Page 109] "Decline and Fall," chap. xv, par. 18.

16 [Page 109] That this may be seen exactly as it is; and also that it may be seen how self-conceited and altogether vain and inconclusive really is the "reasoning" upon which the immortality of the soul is founded; the argument is here set down from Plato himself: --
What is that the inherence of which will render the body alive?
The soul.
And is this always the case?
Yes, of course.
Then whatever the soul possesses, to that she comes bearing life?
Yes, certainly. [This can be so only on the assumption that the soul has life in itself, that it is self-existent, and therefore equal with God. -- A. T. J.
And is there any opposite to life?
There is.
And what is that?
Death.
And what do we call that principle which does not admit of death?
The immortal.
And does the soul admit of death?

No.
Then the soul is immortal?
Yes.
And may we say that this is proved?
Yes, abundantly proved.
* * * * * * * * * * * * * *
If the immortal is also imperishable, then the soul will be imperishable as well as immortal; but if not, some other proof of her imperishableness will have to be given.
No other proof is needed; for if the immortal, being eternal, is liable to perish, then nothing is imperishable.
Yes, all men will agree that God, and the essential forms of life, and the immortal in general, will never perish.
Yes, all men -- that is true; and what is more, gods, if I am not mistaken, as well as men.
Seeing then that the immortal is indestructible, must not the soul, if she is immortal, be also imperishable?
Most certainly.
Then when death attacks a man, the mortal portion of him may be supposed to die, but the immortal goes out of the way of death and is preserved safe and sound?
True.
Then, beyond question the soul is immortal and imperishable, and our souls will truly exist in another world?
I am convinced, and have nothing more to object.

17 [Page 110] Gen. 3:4, 5. R. V. The Jews' translation, and the Hebrew.

18 [Page 110] Gen. 3:15; Haggai 2:7; Rom. 16:20; Heb. 2:14.

19 [Page 110] John 10:10.

20 [Page 111] James 4:14.

21 [Page 111] John 11:11-14; 1 Thess 4:15, 16; Acts 24:15; John 5:28, 29.

22 [Page 111] Deut 30:15, 19.

23 [Page 111] John 5:24.

24 [Page 111] 1 John 15:11, 12.

25 [Page 111] Col. 3:4.

26 [Page 112] 1 Thess 4:15-17.

27 [Page 112] 1 Cor. 15:16-18, 32.

28 [Page 112] 3 John 2.

29 [Page 112] 1 Tim 6:16.

30 [Page 112] 2 Tim. 1:10.

31 [Page 112] 1 Cor. 15:31-57.

32 [Page 114] 2 Cor. 4:3, 4.

33 [Page 114] Eze. 18:4.

34 [Page 114] Ps. 37:20.

35 [Page 114] Ps. 37:10.

36 [Page 114] Rom. 6:23.

37 [Page 114] Eze 33:11.

38 [Page 114] "Intellectual Development of Europe," Vol. i. chap. xiv, par. 7 from end.

39 [Page 115] Phil. 2:5. 6, R. V.

40 [Page 115] Gal. 1:4.

41 [Page 115] Rom, 1:15, 16.

42 [Page 116] Cent. iii, part ii, par. 7.

43 [Page 117] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. xxxvii, par. 14.

9. THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY -- COUNCIL OF EPHESUS.

ONE element in the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Empire that is impossible to be ignored is Theological Controversy; and another is Episcopal Rivalry and Ambition of Supremacy. These two elements were easily made to combine: each to promote the other, and both to contribute to the exaltation of the bishop of Rome.

2. This, because in every controversy in theology, each party strained every point to get the bishop of Rome to its side, and commit himself to the phase of doctrine held by that party; and when the controversy had been decided by a general council, there was, by the defeated party, invariably appeal to the bishop of Rome: and in every contest of rival bishops, and especially of rival patriarchs, it was the same way. In these rivalries, whether manifested through theological controversy or in episcopal ambition, the appellants, even though they were emperors, were ever ready to employ whatever flattering title, and to concede whatever honor, was most likely to win to their side the bishop of Rome. And such things were always highly pleasing to the bishop of Rome: they were always accepted by him; not one of them was ever forgotten by him. And whatever course the bishop of Rome might take with reference to the cause in behalf of which the flattering title or conceded dignity was bestowed, all these things were tenaciously held, were perpetually treasured, and were forever employed, as indisputable proofs of his supremacy, of his being the only true source of appeal, and of his absolute worthiness in all respects to wear them.

3. By the pious zeal of Theodosius, "the unity of the faith" had been supposedly secured, since by imperial decree and inquisitorial repression, the empire had been made Catholic. All possible efforts of the emperor had been exerted to secure and also to assure the peace of the Church. But peace was just as far from the Church now as it ever had been, and a good deal farther from the State than it had ever yet been.

4. By this time, among the chief bishoprics of the empire, the desire for supremacy had become so all-absorbing that each one was exerting every possible influence to bring the others into subjection to himself. The rivalry, however, was most bitter between the bishopric of Alexandria and that of Constantinople. Of the great sees of the empire, Alexandria had always held the second place. Now, however, Constantinople was the chief imperial city; and the Council of Constantinople had ordained that the bishop of Constantinople should hold the first rank after the bishop of Rome. The Alexandrian party argued that this dignity was merely honorary, and carried with it no jurisdiction. Rome, seeing to what the canon might lead, sided with Alexandria. Constantinople, however, steadily insisted that the canon bestowed jurisdiction to the full extent of the honor. The bishop of Constantinople therefore aspired to the complete occupancy of the second place, and Alexandria was supremely jealous of that aspiration.

5. Theodosius died A. D. 395, and was succeeded by his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius, by whom the empire was permanently divided. Arcadius became emperor of the East and Honorius of the West. Although Arcadius occupied the throne and bore the name of "emperor," "the East was now governed by women and eunuchs." -- Milman.1 Eutropius, a eunuch, was prime minister to Arcadius. At the death of Nectarius, Eutropius had brought from Antioch and made bishop of Constantinople, a presbyter, John surnamed Chrysostom -- the golden-mouthed. By the exercise of discipline, Chrysostom undertook to purify the bishopric. He "exposed with unsparing indignation the vices and venality of the clergy, and involved them all in one indiscriminate charge of simony and licentiousness." -- Milman.2 In an episcopal progress through Lydia and Phrygia, he deposed thirteen bishops. He declared his free opinion "that the number of bishops who might be saved, bore a very small proportion to those who would be damned." -- Gibbon.3 In addition to this, and with much more danger to himself, he incurred the enmity of the monks, by declaring with evident truth that they were "the disgrace of their holy profession."

6. These measures set the whole ecclesiastical order against him, and

they began to intrigue for his overthrow. This opened the way for the bishop of Alexandria again to assert his authority. Theophilus, a violent and unscrupulous prelate, was now bishop of Alexandria, and he immediately espoused the cause of the malcontents, who proudly accepted him as their leader.

7. Another new element was now added: Chrysostom had not confined his denunciations to the clergy and the monks, but had uttered them against the women of the court, and especially the empress Eudoxia, a young and beautiful woman of violent disposition, "who indulged her passions, and despised her husband." -- Gibbon.4 Her, Chrysostom reviled as another Jezebel. She was not the kind of woman who would take this without making reply. She called Theophilus to Constantinople to preside over a council to depose Chrysostom. He came with a "stout body of Egyptian mariners" to protect him, and a train of bishops to sit in the council.

8. Theophilus and his followers joined with the enemies of Chrysostom, numbering thirty-six bishops in all, and held their council at a place or estate Ad Quercem -- at the Oak. Four times the council summoned Chrysostom to appear, and sent the following letter: --

"The holy synod at the Oak to John: Letters complaining of countless offenses committed by you have been delivered to us. Appear, therefore, and bring with you the priests Serapion and Tigrius, for they are wanted."5

9. Chrysostom on his part assembled a council of forty bishops, and sent three of the bishops and two priests with a letter to Theophilus, telling him that he should not disturb the Church, and that if in spite of the Nicene Canon, he wanted to settle a dispute beyond his diocese, he should come to Constantinople itself, and "not like Cain entice Abel into the field." In the letter he also declared that as there was an indictment against Theophilus containing seventy charges, he was the one who ought really to be called to account rather than to be presiding in a council to try another; and besides this that there were more bishops in the council at

Constantinople than there were with Theophilus at the Oak. At the same time he wrote privately to other bishops at the Oak telling them that if they would exclude from the council his avowed enemies,

121

he would appear whenever they desired; but if not, he would not appear, even if they sent ten thousand times for him. In answer to this letter, a notary was sent to Chrysostom with an imperial decree that he "must appear at the synod," and at the same time a priest and a monk brought a fresh summons from the synod at the Oak. Chrysostom then sent authorized representatives to the Oak. "They were roughly treated, and the process against him was put into full swing." -- Hefele.6

10. The council sat for two weeks, during which time they framed twenty-nine different charges, amongst which those considered the very gravest were that he had "administered baptism after he had eaten," and another, that he had "administered the sacrament to those who had in like manner broken their fast." -- Milman.7 He was unanimously condemned, and as there had been accessions to their number, there were forty-five bishops who subscribed to the decree.

11. Having deposed him, it was necessary to execute the sentence, but on account of the watchfulness of the populace, this had to be done at night. To prevent a riot, he secretly surrendered himself to the imperial officers, who conducted him across the Bosphorus, and landed him at a place near the entrance of the Black Sea. Theophilus and his followers had come into the city, and the next day when the populace learned that Chrysostom had been carried off, "they suddenly rose with unanimous and irresistible fury. Theophilus escaped; but the promiscuous crowd of monks and Egyptian mariners were slaughtered without pity in the streets of Constantinople." -- Gibbon.8

12. The next night there was a harmless earthquake, but it was readily seized upon and made to do service as evidence of the wrath of Heaven against the deposition of Chrysostom. Eudoxia herself, as superstitious as the rest, was frightened by it, and when the mob crowded about the palace asserting the vengeance of Heaven and demanding the return of Chrysostom, she went herself to Arcadius, asked for his recall, and, to appease the populace, published a letter "disclaiming all hostility to the banished prelate, and protesting that she was `innocent of his blood.'" -- Milman.9

122

13. Chrysostom returned in triumph. The whole city, men, women, and children, turned out to meet him. The shores were crowded; the Bosphorus was covered with vessels, and both shores were grandly illuminated. When he landed, with hymns of thanksgiving and chants of praise they escorted him to the cathedral. Chrysostom mounted the pulpit, and made the following speech: --

"What shall I say? Blessed be God! These were last words on my departure, these the first on my return. Blessed be God! because He permitted the storm to rage. Blessed be God! because He has allayed it. Let my enemies behold how their conspiracy has advanced my peace, and redounded to my glory. Before, the church alone was crowded, now the whole forum is become a church. The games are celebrating in the circus, but the whole people pour like a torrent to the church. Your prayers in my behalf are more glorious than a diadem, -- the prayers both of men and women; for in Christ there is neither male nor female."10

14. Thus exultant in his victory over his opponents, he broke out more violently than ever in denunciation of the empress. The statue of Eudoxia was about to be set up in front of the cathedral. It seems that this was to be performed on a festival day, and on such occasions, dances, pantomimes, and all sorts of theatricals were indulged in. Chrysostom uttered a loud protest against this celebration, as his zeal "was always especially directed against these idolatrous amusements which often, he confesses, drained the church of his hearers." -- Milman.11 His denunciations were reported to the empress as personal insults to her. She threatened

to call another council, and have him deposed again. He replied with a sermon yet bolder than all before, in which he likened her to Herodias, exclaiming: --

"Again Herodias raves; again she is troubled; she dances again; and again desires to receive John's head in a charger."12

15. The emperor immediately suspended him, and a council was appointed, which, under the guidance of Theophilus, again condemned him, but upon the charges that he had resisted the decrees of the former synod, and that he had violated the canons of the Church in resuming and exercising the office of bishop, while yet under condemnation of a council. The sentence of exile was again pronounced, and a detachment of bar-

barian troops was brought into the city to assist the imperial officers in executing the sentence. "In the midst of the solemn celebration of Good Friday, in the great church of Santa Sophia, the military forced their way, not merely into the nave, but up to the altar, on which were placed the consecrated elements. Many worshipers were trodden underfoot; many wounded by the swords of the soldiers: the clergy were dragged to prison; some females, who were about to be baptized, were obliged to fly with their disordered apparel: the waters of the font were stained with blood; the soldiers pressed up to the altar; seized the sacred vessels as their plunder; the sacred elements were scattered about! . . . Constantinople for several days had the appearance of a city which had been stormed. Wherever the partisans of Chrysostom were assembled, they were assaulted and dispersed by the soldiery; females were exposed to insult, and one frantic attempt was made to assassinate the prelate." -- Milman.13

16. Chrysostom was concealed by his friends, but after a while he escaped from them, and gave himself up again. Again he was taken from the city by night; and now he was banished -- A. D. 404 -- to a town called Caucasus in the mountains of Armenia. And "on the very day of his departure, some of John's friends set fire to the church, which by means of a strong easterly wind, communicated with the Senate-House." -- Socrates.14

17. As soon as Chrysostom had been permanently sent away, Theophilus sent to the bishop of Rome, Innocent I, the information that he had deposed the bishop of Constantinople. Chrysostom also from his place of exile addressed the bishop of Rome, giving an account of the proceedings against him, and asking Innocent "to declare such wicked proceedings void and null, to pronounce all who had any share in them, punishable according to the ecclesiastical laws, and to continue to him the marks of his charity and communion." -- Bower."15

18. As was to be expected, Chrysostom also asked the bishop of Rome to use his influence to have a general council called to settle the matter. Letters were also sent from the clergy of Constantinople and the bishops

who sided with Chrysostom, asking Innocent to take an interest in the case. Innocent answered both with the statement that he admitted the bishops of both parties to his communion, and thus left no room for complaints on either side; and the council which was contemplated might not be biased beforehand. Innocent applied to the emperor Honorius, asking him to persuade Arcadius to agree to the calling of a general council, to settle the dispute and contention between Chrysostom and Theophilus. Honorius wrote three letters to Arcadius, the last of which was as follows: --

"This is the third time I write to your Meekness entreating you to correct and rectify the iniquitous proceedings that have been carried on against John, bishop of Constantinople. But nothing, I find, has been hitherto done in his behalf. Having therefore much at heart the peace of the Church, which will be attended with that of our empire, I write to you anew by these holy bishops and presbyters, earnestly desiring you to command

the Eastern bishops to assemble at Thessalonica. The Western bishops have sent five of their body, two presbyters of the Roman Church, and one deacon, all men of strictest equity, and quite free from the bias of favor and hatred. These I beg you would receive with that regard which is due to their rank and merit. If they find John to have been justly deposed, they may separate me from his communion; and you from the communion of the Orientals, if it appears that he has been unjustly deposed. The Western bishops have very plainly expressed their sentiments, in the many letters they have written to me on the subject of the present dispute. Of these I send you two, the one from the bishop of Rome, the other from the bishop of Aquileia; and with them the rest agree. One thing I must above all beg of your Meekness; that you oblige Theophilus of Alexandria to assist at the council how averse soever he may be to it; for he is said to be the first and chief author of the present calamities. Thus the synod, meeting with no delays or obstructions, will restore peace and tranquillity in our days."16

19. Not only were the letters of Honorius disregarded, but his ambassadors were insulted and abused; which when he learned, he was about to declare war, but was prevented by an invasion of the barbarians. Thus the efforts to obtain a general council upon this question came to naught. When Innocent learned this, he determined to take the side of Chrysostom. He therefore published a letter announcing the fact, and separating from his communion Theophilus and all who were of his party. Chrysostom died in 407; but the quarrel was continued by the bishop of Rome,

who refused to communicate with the new bishop of Constantinople, unless he would acknowledge that Chrysostom was lawful bishop of that city until the day of his death. As this would be to acknowledge that his own election to the bishopric of Constantinople was unlawful, Atticus refused; and the contention was kept up seven years longer, but was finally compromised in 414.

20. The empress Eudoxia died about A. D. 405. The emperor Arcadius died May 1, A. D. 408, leaving a son -- Theodosius II -- seven years of age, heir to the throne; and a daughter, Pulcheria, ten years of age, who after A. D. 414, held the most important place in the affairs of the empire for forty years. At the age of twenty and by the arts of Pulcheria, Theodosius II was married to Eudocia, who was nearly eight years older than himself, and the incapable youth was kept in a "perpetual infancy, encompassed only with a servile train of women and eunuchs," and ruled by women, eunuchs, and monks.

21. The war with Chrysostom was ended, yet the roots of bitterness and seeds of strife still remained between Alexandria and Constantinople. And though the two men who were bishops of these two cities were in harmony so far as the confusion about Chrysostom was concerned, the same jealousy as to the dignity of their respective sees still existed, and soon broke out more violently than ever before. The subject of the next dispute was a question of doctrine, and, like that over the Homoousion, was so illusive, and the disputants believed so nearly alike and yet were so determined not to believe alike, and the men who led in it were so arrogant and cruel, that from the beginning the contention was more violent than any that had yet been.

22. In. A. D. 412, Cyril, the nephew of Theophilus, became bishop of Alexandria. He was one of the very worst men of his time. He began his episcopacy by shutting up the churches of the Novatians, "the most innocent and harmless of the sectaries," and taking possession of all their ecclesiastical ornaments and consecrated vessels, and stripping their bishop, Theopemptus, of all his possessions. Nor was Cyril content with the exercise of such strictly episcopal functions as these: he aspired to absolute authority, civil as well as ecclesiastical.

23. He drove out the Jews, forty thousand in number, destroyed their synagogues, and allowed his followers to strip them of all their possessions.

Orestes, the prefect of Egypt, displeased at the loss of such a large number of wealthy and industrious people, entered a protest, and sent up a report to the emperor. Cyril likewise wrote to the emperor. No answer came from the court, and the people urged Cyril to come to a reconciliation with the prefect, but his advances were made in such a way that the prefect would not receive them. The monks poured in from the desert to the number of about five hundred, to champion the cause of Cyril.

24. Orestes was passing through the streets in his chariot. The monks flocked around him, insulted him, and denounced him as a heathen and an idolater. Orestes, thinking that perhaps they thought this was so, and knowing his life to be in danger, called out that he was a Christian, and had been baptized by Atticus, bishop of Constantinople. His defense was in vain. In answer, one of the monks threw a big stone which struck him on the head, and wounded him so that his face was covered with blood. At this all his guards fled for their lives; but the populace came to the rescue, and drove off the monks, and captured the one who threw the stone. His name was Ammonius, and the prefect punished him so severely that shortly afterward he died. "Cyril commanded his body to be taken up; the honors of a Christian martyr were prostituted on this insolent ruffian, his panegyric was pronounced in the church, and he was named Thaumasius -- the wonderful." Milman.17

25. But the party of Cyril proceeded to yet greater violence than this. At that time there was in Alexandria a teacher of philosophy, a woman, Hypatia by name. she gave public lectures which were so largely attended by the chief people of the city, that Cyril grew jealous that more people went to hear her lecture than came to hear him preach. She was a friend of Orestes, and it was also charged that she, more than any other, was the cause why Orestes would not be reconciled to Cyril. One day as Hypatia was passing through the street in a chariot, she was attacked by a crowd of Cyril's partisans, whose ring-leader was Peter the Reader. She was torn from her chariot, stripped naked in the street, dragged into a church, and there beaten to death with a club, by Peter the Reader. Then they tore her limb, and with shells scraped the

flesh from her bones, and threw the remnants into the fire, March, A. D. 414.

26. This was Cyril, -- now Saint Cyril, -- bishop of Alexandria. And in addition to his naturally tyrannical and murderous disposition, "jealousy and animosity toward the bishop of Constantinople were a sacred legacy bequeathed by Theophilus to his nephew, and Cyril faithfully administered the fatal trust." -- Milman.18

27. In 428, there was appointed to the bishopric of Constantinople a monk of Antioch, Nestorius by name, who in wickedness of disposition was only second to Cyril of Alexandria. In his ordination sermon before the great crowd of people, he personally addressed to the emperor these words: --

"Give me, my prince, the earth purged of heretics, and I will give you heaven as a recompense. Assist me in destroying heretics, and I will assist you in vanquishing the Persians."19

28. The fifth day afterward, in accordance with this proposition, Nestorius began his part in purging the earth of heretics. There was a little company of Arians who met in a private house for worship; these were surprised and attacked, and as they saw the house being torn to pieces and sacked, they set fire to it, which burned that building and many others adjoining. On account of this, Nestorius received from both parties the appropriate nickname of the "Incendiary." This attack upon the Arians was followed furiously upon the Quarto-Decimans, who celebrated Easter on a day other than the Catholic Sunday; and also upon the Novatians. The authority of the emperor somewhat checked his fury against the Novatians, but it raged unmolested against the Quarto-Decimans throughout Asia, Lydia, and Caria, and multitudes perished in the tumults which he stirred up, especially at Miletus and Sardis.

29. And now these two desperate men, Nestorius and Cyril, became the respective champions of the two sides of a controversy touching the faith of the Catholic Church, as to whether Mary was the mother of God or

not. In the long contention and the fine-spun distinctions as to whether the Son of God is of the same substance, or only of like substance with the Father, Christ had been removed entirely beyond the comprehension of the people. And owing to the desperate character and cruel

128

disposition of the men who carried on the controversy as the representatives of Christ, the members of the Church were made afraid of Him. And now, instead of Jesus standing forth as the mediator between men and God, He was removed so far away and was clothed with such a forbidding aspect, that it became necessary to have a mediator between men and Christ. And into this place the Virgin Mary was put.

30. This gave rise to the question as to what was the exact relationship of Mary to Christ. Was she actually the mother of the divinity of Christ, and therefore the mother of God? or was she only the mother of the humanity of Christ? For a considerable time already the question had been agitated, and among a people whose ancestors for ages had been devout worshipers of the mother goddesses -- Diana and Cybele -- the title "Mother of God" was gladly welcomed and strenuously maintained. This party spoke of Mary as "God-bearer;" the opposite party called her only "man-bearer;" while a third party coming between tried to have all speak of her as "Christ-bearer."

31. As before stated, this question had already been agitated considerably, but when two such characters as Cyril and Nestorius took it up, it speedily became the one all-important question, and the all-absorbing topic. Nestorius started it in his very first sermon after becoming bishop of Constantinople. He denied that Mary could properly be called the mother of God. Some of his priests immediately withdrew from his communion, and began to preach against his heresy, and the monks rushed in also. Nestorius denounced them all as miserable men, called in the police, and had some of them flogged and imprisoned, especially several monks who had accused him to the emperor. From this the controversy spread rapidly, and Cyril, urged on by both natural and inherited jealousy, came to the rescue in defense of the title, "Mother of God." "Cyril of Alexandria, to those who esteem the stern and uncompromising assertion of certain Christian tenets the one paramount Christian virtue, may be the hero, even the saint: but while ambition, intrigue, arrogance, rapacity, and violence are proscribed as unchristian means -- barbarity, persecution, bloodshed as unholy and unevangelical wickedness -- posterity will condemn the orthodox Cyril as one of the worst of heretics against the spirit of the gospel." -- Milman.20

129

32. It is not necessary to put into this book the blasphemous arguments of either side. It is enough to say that in this controversy, as in that regarding the Homoousion, the whole dispute was one about words and terms only. Each determined that the other should express the disputed doctrine in his own words and ideas, while he himself could not clearly express his ideas in words different from the others. "Never was there a case in which the contending parties approximated so closely. Both subscribed, both appealed, to the Nicene Creed; both admitted the pre-existence, the impassibility, of the Eternal Word; but the fatal duty . . . of considering the detection of heresy the first of religious obligations, mingled, as it now was, with human passions and interests, made the breach irreparable." -- Milman.21

33. Cyril demanded of Nestorius that he should confess Mary to be the mother of God, without any distinction, explanation, or qualification. And because Nestorius would not comply, Cyril denounced him everywhere as a heretic, stirred up the people of Constantinople against him, and sent letters to the emperor, the empress, and to Pulcheria, to prove to them that the Virgin Mary "ought to be called" the mother of God. He declared that to dispute such a title was rank heresy, and by adulation, and by declaring that whoever disputed this title was unworthy of the protection of the imperial family, he sought to have the court take his side at once against Nestorius. But Nestorius had the advantage with respect to the court, because he was present in Constantinople.

34. Fierce letters also passed between Cyril and Nestorius, and both sent off letters to Celestine, bishop of Rome. Nestorius sent his first, but he wrote in Greek, and Celestine had to send it to Gaul to be translated into Latin, so that he could read it. Before the letter of Nestorius was returned from Gaul, Cyril's letter had arrived, which was written in Latin; with which also he had sent some of the sermons of Nestorius which he had translated into Latin for the benefit of Celestine. Yet further he gave citations to Athanasius and Peter of Alexandria, where they had given to Mary the title of Mother of God. Celestine called a council in Rome, A. D. 430. The letters and papers of both Cyril and Nestorius were read, after which Celestine made a long speech to prove that "the Virgin Mary was truly the mother of God." He supported his

views by quotations from the Eastern bishops, whom Cyril had cited, and also from his predecessors Damasus and Hilary, and from Ambrose of Milan, who had caused the people on Christmas day every year to sing a hymn in honor of Mary, in which she was called the Mother of God.

35. The council declared that Nestorius was "the author of a new and very dangerous heresy," praised Cyril for opposing it, declared the doctrine of Cyril strictly orthodox, and condemned to deposition all ecclesiastics who should refuse to adopt it. Celestine conveyed to Nestorius the decision of the council, and in the name of the council and in his own name, commanded him publicly and in a written apology, to renounce his heretical opinions within ten days after the receipt of this letter, or else incur the penalty of excommunication. On the same day Celestine also wrote a letter to Cyril, appointing him as his agent to execute the decision of the council, and empowering him in the name, and with the authority, of the apostolic see, to excommunicate and depose Nestorius, if by the expiration of ten days he had not recanted. Other letters were also sent at the same time to the clergy and laity of Constantinople and to the principal bishops of the East, exhorting them to steadfastness in the faith, and declaring that whomsoever Nestorius had excommunicated or deposed on account of this question, should be counted as in communion with the bishop of Rome.

36. All these letters were sent to Cyril, who upon receiving them, called a council of the Egyptian bishops, and drew up twelve propositions with their respective curses, which Nestorius was to sign if he would obey the sentence of the council at Rome, and recant his opinions. It was also required that Nestorius should not only acknowledge the creed of Nice, but that he must add a written and sworn declaration that he did so, and that he would condemn all his previous "pernicious and unholy assertions," and agree in future to "believe and teach the same as Cyril, and as the synod, and the bishops of the East and West." -- Hefele.22

37. All this with the decree of the Council of Rome was sent by four bishops to Nestorius at Constantinople. These bishops to make as great a display of their authority as possible, went to the cathedral on Sunday, at the time of public service, and delivered the documents to Nestorius, while he was performing the principal service of the day. In answer to

these decrees Nestorius, in a sermon preached on the following Sabbath, declared that to maintain the peace and tranquillity of the Church, "he was ready to grant the title of `Mother of God' to the Virgin Mary, providing nothing else was thereby meant but that the man born of her was united to the Divinity." But Cyril insisted that he should adopt the twelve propositions and their curses which the Alexandrian Synod had sent. As a final reply Nestorius then drew up twelve counter-propositions with their respective curses, to which he demanded that Cyril should subscribe.

38. It was now the middle of December, 430. All the time that these contentions had been going on, both parties had been calling for a general council; and as early as November 19, the emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III had issued letters ordering a general council to meet at Ephesus in the spring of 431.

39. Of all places in the world, Ephesus was the very one where it would be the nearest to an impossibility to obtain anything like a fair examination of the question. Like Diana of Old, the Virgin Mary was now the patroness of Ephesus; and the worse than heathen Catholics were more fanatically devoted to her than even the heathen Ephesians had been to Diana. But a fair examination of the question, or in fact any real examination, was not intended by Celestine and Cyril. Their only intention was either the unconditional surrender or the condemnation of Nestorius. Cyril was appointed by Celestine to preside at the council. He addressed Celestine, asking whether Nestorius should be allowed to sit as a member of the council. Celestine told him that he should do everything to restore peace to the Church and to win Nestorius to the truth: but that if Nestorius was quite determined against this, "then he must reap what, with the help of the devil, he had sown." -- Hefele.23

40. Celestine also sent a letter to the emperor Theodosius II, saying that he could not personally attend the council, but that he would take part by commissioners. He desired that the emperor "should allow no innovations, and no disturbance of the peace of the Church. He should even regard the interests of the faith as higher than those of the State; and the peace of the Church as much more important than the peace of the nations." Celestine's instructions to his commissioners were to the

same intent. He commanded them to "hold strictly by Cyril," but at the same time to be sure "to preserve the dignity of the apostolic see." They were directed to attend all the meetings of the council, yet to take no part in any of the discussions, but to "give judgments" on the views of others. And finally, the letter which Celestine sent by these legates to the bishops in council exhorted them "to preserve the true faith," and closed with these words: --

"The legates are to be present at the transactions of the synod, and will give effect to that which the pope has long ago decided with respect to Nestorius; for he does not doubt that the assembled bishops will agree with this."24

41. Neither of the emperors was present at the council, but they jointly appointed Count Candidian, captain of the imperial bodyguard, as the "Protector of the Council." Nestorius came with sixteen bishops, accompanied by an armed guard composed of bathmen of Constantinople and a horde of peasants. In addition to this, by the special favor of the emperor, an officer, Irenaeus, with a body of soldiers, was appointed to protect him. Cyril came with fifty Egyptian bishops, and a number of bathmen, and "a multitude of women" from Alexandria, and such sailors in his fleet as he could depend upon. Arrived at Ephesus, he was joined by Memnon, bishop of that city, with fifty-two bishops, and a crowd of peasants whom he had drawn into the city. Juvenalis, bishop of Jerusalem, came with his subordinate bishops, we know not the number; these also were hostile to Nestorius, and joined Cyril and Memnon. Others came from Thessalonica, Apamea, and Hieropolis, and when the council opened, there were one hundred and ninety-eight bishops present, including the pope's legates, and not including Nestorius. John of Antioch, with the bishops of his diocese, was on the way, but did not reach Ephesus until Cyril's part of the council was over.

42. The council was to have met June 7, 431, but owing to delays on the part of the bishops of Jerusalem, Thessalonica, and Antioch, it did not open until June 22, and even then the bishops of Antioch had not arrived. But all the time was spent in preliminary disputes, winning partisans, and working up the populace. As Cyril had the great majority of the bishops on his side, and as the city was already devoted to the

"Mother of God," Nestorius was at great disadvantage, and his enemies
did not hesitate to let him know it, and to make him feel it. Cyril preached a sermon in which he paid the following idolatrous tribute to Mary: --

"Blessed be thou, O Mother of God! Thou rich treasure of the world, inextinguishable lamp, crown of virginity, scepter of true doctrine, imperishable temple, habitation of Him whom no space can contain, mother and virgin, through whom He is, who comes in the name of the Lord. Blessed be thou, O Mary, who didst hold in thy womb the Infinite One; thou through whom the blessed Trinity is glorified and worshiped, through whom the precious cross is adored throughout the world, through whom heaven rejoices and angels and archangels are glad, through whom the devil is disarmed and banished, through whom the fallen creature is restored to heaven, through whom every believing soul is saved."25

43. Cyril and his party urged that the council should be opened without any more delay. As the emperor had particularly required the presence of John of Antioch, Nestorius insisted on waiting till he came; and Candidian sustained Nestorius. Cyril refused, and he and his partisans assembled in the church of the Virgin Mary to proceed with the council. As soon as Count Candidian learned of this, he hastened to the church to forbid it, and there he fell into an ecclesiastical trap. He declared that they were acting in defiance of the imperial rescript which was to guide the council. They answered that as they had not seen the rescript, they did not know what it required of them. The count read it to them. This was just what they wanted. They declared that the reading of the rescript legalized their meeting! They greeted it with "loud and loyal clamors," pronounced the council begun, and commanded the count to withdraw from an assembly in which he had no longer any legal place.

44. Candidian protested against the unfairness of the proceedings; and then, he himself says, they "injuriously and ignominiously ejected" him. They next expelled all the bishops, sixty-eight in number, who were known to favor Nestorius, "and then commenced their proceedings as the legitimate Senate of Christendom." -- Milman.26

45. One of Cyril's presbyters was secretary, and he formally opened the business of the council by reading a statement of the dispute that had

brought them together. Then the emperor's letter calling the council was read. They sent four bishops to notify Nestorius to appear. He courteously refused to acknowledge the legality of their assembly. A second deputation of four bishops was sent, and they returned with the word that they were not allowed by the guard to go near him, but received from his attendants the same answer as before. A third deputation of four was sent, and they returned with the report that they were subjected to the indignity of being kept standing in the heat of the sun, and receiving no answer at all. Having made such an earnest effort to have Nestorius present, but in vain, they "sorrowfully" commenced the proceedings without him.

46. The Nicene Creed was first read, and then Cyril's letter to Nestorius, with the twelve propositions and their accompanying curses, all of which were solemnly confirmed by all the bishops in succession.

47. Then was read the letter of Nestorius to Cyril, with the twelve counter-propositions and their curses. One after another the bishops arose and declared the propositions blasphemous, and vehemently uttered the appended curses: Then when the list was completed, they all arose, and with one mighty roar that made the arches of the great church echo and re-echo, they bawled, "Anathema to him who does not anathematize Nestorius! Anathema! Anathema! The whole world unites in the excommunication! Anathema on him who holds communion with Nestorius!"27

48. Next were read the letters of Celestine, condemning him, which were made a part of the acts of the council. Then followed the reading of statements from the writings of Athanasius, Peter of Alexandria, Julius I. Felix I of Rome, Theophilus of Alexandria. Cyprian. Ambrose. Gregory Nazianzen, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Atticus of Constantinople and Amphilochius of Iconium, all to the effect that Mary was the mother of God. Then the tender-hearted, pious souls, according to their own words, proceeded "with many tears, to this sorrowful sentence:" --

"As, in addition to other things, impious Nestorius has not obeyed and citation, and did not receive the holy bishops who were sent by us to him, we were compelled to examine his ungodly doctrines.

135

We discovered that he had held and published impious doctrines in his letters and treatises, as well as in discourses which he delivered in this city, and which have been testified to. Urged by the canons, and in accordance with the letter of our most holy father and fellow-servant Celestine, the Roman bishop, we have come, with many tears, to this sorrowful sentence against him, namely, that our Lord Jesus Christ, whom He has blasphemed, decrees by the holy synod that Nestorius be excluded from the episcopal dignity, and from all priestly communion."28

49. This sentence the bishops all signed, and then it was sent to Nestorius, addressed, "To Nestorius, a second Judas." All these proceedings, from the visit and protest of Candidian to the notice to Nestorius, were carried through in a single day and one prolonged sitting. It was now night. Criers were sent all through the city to post up the decrees of the council, and to announce the joyful news that Mary was indeed the mother of God. Everywhere they were met with loudest shouts of joy. The multitude rushed into the streets and poured toward the church. With lighted torches they escorted the bishops to their abodes, the women marching before and burning incense. The whole city was illuminated, and the songs and exultations continued far into the night. The demonstrations far outdid that of their lineal ancestors, who, when they tried to kill the apostle Paul, "all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out, Great is Diana of the Ephesians."

50. Five days afterward John of Antioch with his bishops, arrived, and was greatly surprised to learn that the council was over. He got together about fifty bishops, who unanimously condemned the doctrines of Cyril and the proceedings of the council, and declared accursed all the bishops who had taken part in it. Cyril and Memnon answered with counter-curses. Letters came from Celestine, and Cyril's council reassembled, formally to receive them. When they were read, the whole company arose, and again cried with one voice: The council renders thanks to the second Paul, Celestine; to the second Paul,Cyril; to Celestine, protector of the faith; to Celestine, unanimous with the council. One Celestine one Cyril, one faith in the whole council, one faith throughout the world."29

51. Cyril's council next sent messengers with overtures to John, who refused to see them. Then the council declared annulled all the acts of

136

John's council, and deposed and excommunicated him and all the bishops of his party. John threatened to elect a new bishop of Ephesus in the place of Memnon, whom his council had deposed. A party tried to force their way into the cathedral; but finding it defended by Memnon with a strong garrison, they retreated. Memnon's forces made a strong sally, and drove them through the streets with clubs and stones, dangerously wounding many.

52. On learning that the council had been held, and Nestorius deposed before the arrival of John of Antioch, a letter had been sent down from the court, but was not received till this point in the contest. This letter annulled all the proceedings of the council, and commanded a reconsideration of the question by the whole assembly of the bishops now present. The letter also announced the appointment of another imperial officer, one of the highest officials of the State, to assist Count Candidian.

53. The court had not made known in Constantinople the proceedings of the council, and the deposition of Nestorius. Cyril sent away a secret message to the monks of Constantinople, announcing that Nestorius had been deposed and excommunicated. The object of this was by stirring up those fanatics to influence the court. The weak-minded Theodosius II stood in great awe of the holiness of the monks. "His palace was so regulated that it differed little from a monastery." In 422 there died one of these who was noted for that kind of holiness

that attaches to a monk, and Theodosius secured "his cassock of sackcloth of hair, which, although it was excessively filthy, he wore as a cloak, hoping that thus he should become a partaker, in some degree, of the sanctity of the deceased." -- Socrates.30 And now, on receipt of Cyril's message, a certain Dalmatius, who was famous for his filthy sanctity, left his cell, and put himself at the head of the whole herd of monks and archimandrites in and about Constantinople. They marched solemnly through the streets, and about everywhere as they passed, the populace burst into curses against Nestorius. They marched to the palace and lounged about the gates; but the chief influence at court was yet favorable to Nestorius, and their demonstrations had no immediate effect.

54. By this time the reports of both parties had reached the court. Theodosius, after examining both accounts, approved both, and pronounced

Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon, all three deposed. As for their faith, he pronounced them "all three alike orthodox," but deposed them as a punishment which he said they all three alike deserved as being the chief authors of continual disturbances.

55. The new imperial commissioner was sent down to Ephesus with the letter announcing the emperor's decision. As soon as he arrived, he summoned the bishops before him. Memnon refused to appear. Those who did come, however, had no sooner arrived than each party began to denounce the other. Cyril and his party pronounced the presence of Nestorius unendurable, and demanded that he be driven out. The party of Nestorius and John of Antioch, just as sternly demanded that Cyril should be expelled. As neither party could have its way, they began to fight. The imperial commissioner had to command his soldiers to separate the pugilistic bishops, and stop the fight. When order had thus been enforced, the imperial letters were read. As soon as the sentence of deposition against Cyril and Memnon was read, the uproar began again, and another fight was prevented only by the arrest of the three chiefs. Nestorius and John of Antioch submitted without remonstrance; but Cyril made a speech "in which he represented himself as the victim of persecution, incurred by apostolic innocence, and borne with apostolic resignation," and then yielded to the "inevitable necessity." Memnon was hunted up, and also taken into custody. Cyril escaped, and with his bodyguard of bathmen, women, and sailors, sailed away to Alexandria.

56. The emperor next commanded that eight bishops of each party should appear in his presence at Constantinople. They were sent, but, on account of the desperate temper of the monks of Constantinople, it was counted unsafe for them to enter the city, and therefore they were stopped at Chalcedon, on the opposite side of the Bosphorus. There the emperor met them. The whole summer had been spent in these contentions of the council, and it was now September 4, when the emperor granted them the first audience. Four times the emperor had them appear before him, and heard them fully. He appeared so decidedly to favor the party of Nestorius, that they thought the victory was already won. So certain were they of this that they even sent off letters to their party at Ephesus, instructing them to send up a message of thanks to him for his kindness.

57. But at the fifth meeting all their brilliant prospects were blasted. Cyril, from his post in Alexandria, had sent up thousands of pounds of gold, with instructions to Maximian, bishop of Constantinople, to add to it, not only the wealth of that Church, but his utmost personal effort to arouse "the languid zeal of the princess Pulcheria in the cause of Cyril, to propitiate all the courtiers, and, if possible, to satisfy their rapacity." -- Milman.31 As avarice was one of the ruling passions of the eunuchs and women who ruled Theodosius II, "Every avenue of the throne was assaulted with gold. Under the decent names of eulogies and benedictions, the courtiers of both sexes were bribed according to the measure of their rapaciousness. But their incessant demands despoiled the sanctuaries of Constantinople and Alexandria; and the authority of the patriarch was unable to silence the just murmur of his clergy, that a debt of sixty thousand pounds had already been contracted to support the expense of this scandalous corruption." -- Gibbon32

58. The efforts of Cyril were at last effective. The eunuch Scholasticus, one of the chief ministers of the emperor and the supporter of the cause of Nestorius at court, was bought; and it was this that caused the sudden revolution in the emperor's conduct toward the party of Nestorius. In the fifth and last audience that he gave the deputies, the emperor told them at once that they had better abandon Nestorius, and admit both Cyril and Memnon to their communion. They remonstrated, but he would listen to nothing. He put an end to the hearings, and returned the next day to Constantinople, taking with him the bishops of Cyril's party, regularly to ordain the successor of Nestorius in the bishopric of Constantinople. shortly afterward an imperial edict was issued declaring Nestorius justly deposed, reinstating Cyril and Memnon in their respective sees, pronouncing all the other bishops alike orthodox, and giving them all leave to return to their homes. This dissolved the council.

59. Even before the dissolution of the council the emperor had sent an order to Nestorius, commanding him to leave Ephesus and return to the monastery whence he had been called to the archbishopric of Constantinople. By the persistent efforts of Celestine, bishop of Rome, and

others, the emperor was induced -- A. D. 436 -- to banish him and two of his friends -- a count of the empire and a presbyter of Constantinople -- to Petra in Arabia. July 30, in the same year, an imperial edict was issued, commanding all who believed with Nestorius, to be called Simonians; that all the books by Nestorius should be sought for and publicly burnt; forbidding the Nestorius to hold any meetings anywhere, in city, in village, or in field; and if any such meeting was held, then the place where it was held should be confiscated, as also the estates of all who should attend the meeting. Nestorius was not allowed to remain long at Petra. He was taken from there to a place away in the desert between Egypt and Libya, and from there dragged about from place to place till he died of the hardships inflicted, at what date is not certainly known, but about A. D. 440.

60. Such was the cause and such the conduct of the first Council of Ephesus, the third general council of the Catholic Church. And thus was established the Catholic doctrine that the Virgin Mary was the mother of God.

61. The controversy went on, however, nor did it ever logically stop until Dec. 8, A. D. 1854, when Pope Pius IX established the actual divinity of the Virgin Mary, by announcing the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, which reads as follows: --

"By the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, as well as by our own, we declare, promulgate, and define that the doctrine which teaches that the most blessed Virgin Mary, at the very instant of her conception, was kept free from every stain of original sin solely by the grace and prerogative of the omnipotent God, in consideration of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was revealed by God, and must on that account be believed firmly and continually by all the faithful ones."33

---

1 [Page 119] History of Christianity, "book iii, chap. ix, par. 36.

2 [Page 119] Id., par. 45.

3 [Page 119] "Decline and Fall." chap. xxvii, par. 9, note.

4 [Page 120] Id., par. 13.

5 [Page 120] Befele, "History of the Church Councils," sec. cxv, par. 4,

6 [Page 121] Id., par. 6.

7 [Page 121] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. ix, par. 46, note.

8 [Page 121] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxii, par. 11.

9 [Page 121] "History of Christianity," book iii, chap. ix, par. 50.

10 [Page 122] Id., par. 51.

11 [Page 122] Id., par. 54.

12 [Page 122] Socrates'3 "Ecclesiastical History," book vi, chap. xviii,

13 [Page 123] "History of Christianity." book iii, chap. ix, par. 56.

14 [Page 124]"Ecclesiastical History," book vi, chap. xviii

15 [Page 124]"History of the Popes," Innocent I, par. 8.

16 [Page 125] Bower, Id., par. 14.

17 [Page 126] "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iii, par. 23.

18 [Page 127] Id., par. 21.

19 [Page 127] Socrates's "Ecclesiastical History," book vii, chap. xxix.

20 [Page 128] "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iii, par. 20.

21 [Page 129] Id., par. 15.

22 [Page 130] "History of the Church councils," sec. cxxxi, par. 1.

23 [Page 131] Id., sec. cxxxiii.

24 [Page 132] Id., par. 3.

25 [Page 133] Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. clxxi, par. 10.

26 [Page 133] "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iii, par. 49.

27 [Page 133] Id., par. 22.

28 [Page 135] Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," sac. cxxxiv, par. 6.

29 [Page 135] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iii, par. 56.

30 [Page 136] "Ecclesiastical History," book vii, chap. xxii.

31 [Page 138] "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iii, par. 64.

32 [Page 138] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlvii, par. 15.

33 [Page 139] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Immaculate Conception. The following is the original as there given: "Auctoritate Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, ac Nostra, declaramus, pronuntiamus et definimus, doctrinam, quae tenet Beatissimam Verginem Mariam in primo instanti suae Conceptionis fuisse singulari Omnipotentis Dei gratia et privilegio, intuitu meritorum Christi Jesu, Salvatoris humani generis ab omni originalis culpae labe praeservatam immunem. esse a Deo revelatam, atque idcirco ab omnibus fidelibus firmiter constanterque credendam."

10. THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY -- SECOND COUNCIL OF EPHESUS.

IT having been decided that the Virgin Mary was the mother of God, out of that decision there now arose another question involving the nature of Christ. That question was: How was the divine nature related to the human so that Mary could truly be called the mother of God? That is, Did the divine nature become human? or was the divine nature only joined to the human? In other words: Were there two natures in Christ? or was there but one?

2. It was now A. D. 448, and the Eutychian controversy began. For a clear understanding of the case, it will be best formally to introduce the leading characters.

3. Theodosius II was still emperor of the East; Valentinian III was emperor of the West.

4. Eutyches was the abbot, or superior, of a monastery close to Constantinople. He had been the chief leader of the monks in the contest against Nestorius. "At his bidding the swarms of monks had thronged into the streets, defied the civil power, terrified the emperor, and contributed, more than any other cause, to the final overthrow of Nestorius. He had grown old in the war against heresy." -- Milman.1

5. Flavianus was now the occupant of the episcopal seat of Constantinople.

6. Chrysaphius was another eunuch, who had risen to the place of chief minister of Theodosius II, and was also the godson of Eutyches. He was carrying on a court intrigue to break the power of Pulcheria, by exalting the influence of Eudocia. He hoped also to place Eutyches on the episcopal throne of Constantinople. The accession of Flavianus to that dignity had prevented this design for the time being, but he still held it

in mind. When Flavianus was installed in the bishopric, Chrysaphius demanded that he should make to the emperor the offering of gold that was customary on such occasions. Instead of bringing gold, Flavianus brought only three loaves of consecrated bread. This, Chrysaphius so employed as to prejudice the emperor against the archbishop.

7. Dioscorus was now archbishop of Alexandria. In this place it will be sufficient description of him simply to remark that he was a second Cyril, and leave it to the progress of the narrative to reveal him exactly as he was.

8. Leo I, "the Great," was bishop of Rome and regarded Dioscorus as "a prelate adorned with many virtues, and enriched with the gifts of the Holy Ghost."2

9. Eusebius was bishop of Dorylaeum, to which office he had been appointed from a civil office in the household of Pulcheria. He also had been an early, ardent, and persistent adversary of Nestorius. This Eusebius now stood forth as the accuser of Eutyches.

10. At a small synod which had been called for another purpose at Constantinople, Nov. 8, A. D. 448, Eusebius presented a written complaint against Eutyches, and asked that it be read. The complaint was to the effect that Eutyches had accused of Nestorianism orthodox teachers -- even Eusebius himself. To the complaint was appended a demand that Eutyches should be summoned before the present synod to answer.

11. As for Eusebius himself, he announced that he was ready to prove that Eutyches had "no right to the name of Catholic," and that he was "far from the true faith." Flavianus expressed surprise, and told Eusebius that he ought to go to Eutyches, and, by a private interview, try to convince him of the true faith; and if then he really showed himself to be a heretic, he would cite him before the synod. Eusebius said he had been to him several times. Flavianus asked him to go again; but he refused, and then the synod sent a priest and a deacon, as deputies to convey to Eutyches the accusations, and summon him to the synod which would meet again in four days.

12. The synod met again, November 12, and Eusebius renewed his complaint, with the addition that by conversations and discussions, Eutyches had misled many others. He then suggested that the synod

should give expression to the faith on the question that had been raised. Flavianus produced a letter which Cyril had written to Nestorius at the beginning of the controversy between them; the act of the Council of Ephesus which approved this letter; and another letter, which Cyril had written, about the close of that controversy. He required the bishops present to assent to the statements therein contained, as the expression of the true faith according to the Nicene Creed, which they had always believed and still believed, namely: --

"Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is true God and true man, of a reasonable soul and a body subsisting, begotten of the Father before all time, without beginning, according to the Godhead, but in the last times, for us men and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, according to the manhood; of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and of one substance with his mother, according to the manhood. We confess that Christ after the Incarnation consists of two natures in one hypostasis [personality] and in one person; one Christ, one Son, one Lord Whoever asserts otherwise. we exclude from the clergy and the Church."3

13. This they all signed, and then at the suggestion of suggestion of Eusebius it was sent to those who were absent for them to sign.

14. The next session of the synod was held November 15, and the deputies who had been sent to Eutyches reported that he had refused to come, for the reason that when he became a monk, he resolved never to leave the monastery to go to any place whatever. Besides, he told them that the synod ought to know that Eusebius had long been his enemy, and that it was only out of malice that he now accused him. He said he was ready to affirm and subscribe the declarations of the Councils of Nice and Ephesus. The synod summoned him again, and again he refused to come. Then Eusebius declared, "The guilty have ever ways of escaping; Eutyches must now be brought here, even against his will." The synod then summoned him a third time.

15. At the next meeting a messenger came from Eutyches, saying that he was sick. Flavianus told him the synod would wait until Eutyches got well, but that then he must come. At the next meeting, the deputies who had been sent with the third summons, reported that Eutyches had told them he had sent his messenger to the archbishop and the synod that he might in his name give his assent to the declarations

of the Councils of Nice and Ephesus, "and to all that Cyril had uttered." At this Eusebius broke in with the declaration, "Even if Eutyches will now assent, because some have told him that he must yield to necessity and subscribe, yet I am not therefore in the wrong, for it is with reference, not to the future, but to the past, that I have accused him."4 The deputies then closed with the information that he would come to the synod on the next Monday.

16. At the appointed time, Eutyches came; but he did not come alone. He came accompanied by a messenger of the emperor's privy council, and escorted by a great crowd composed of soldiers, and servants if the praetorian prefect, and "a rout of turbulent monks." The emperor's representative bore a letter to the synod, in which the emperor said: --

"I wish the peace of the Church and the maintenance of the orthodox faith, which was asserted by the Fathers at Nicaea and Ephesus; and because I know that the patrician Florentius is orthodox, and proved in the faith, therefore it is my will that he be present at the sessions of the synod, as the faith is in question."5

17. At this the bishops cried out, "Many years to the emperor, his faith is great! Many years to the pious, orthodox, high-priestly emperor." Then the emperor's commissioner took his place, and Eusebius and Eutyches, the accuser and the accused, placed themselves in the midst. The first thing was to read the proceedings from the beginning up to this point, the vital part of which was the declarations to which they had demanded that Eutyches should give his assent. The reader read the Nicene Creed, and there was no dissent. He read the first of Cyril's letters, yet there was no dissent. He read the decision of the Council of Ephesus, and still there was no dissent. Then he began the second of Cyril's letters, and read: --

"We confess our Lord Jesus Christ as perfect God and perfect man, and as of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and of one substance with us according to the manhood; for a union of the two natures has taken place, therefore we confess one Christ, one Lord, and, in accordance with this union without confusion, we call the holy Virgin God-bearer, because God the Logos was made flesh and man, and in the conception united the temple which He assumed from her with himself --"6

18. At this point Eusebius broke in. Seeing the reading was nearly finished with no sign of dissent, he was afraid that Eutyches would actually approve all the declarations, which doubtless he would have done. He therefore interrupted the reading, with the exclamation, "Certainly such is not confessed by this man here; he has never believed this, but the contrary, and so he has taught every one who has come to him!" Florentius asked that Eutyches might be given a chance to say for himself "Whether he agreed with what had been read." To this Eusebius vehemently objected, for the reason, said he, "If Eutyches agrees to it, then I must appear as having been lightly a slanderer, and shall LOSE MY OFFICE" !!

19. Florentius renewed his request that Eutyches might be allowed to answer; but Eusebius strenuously objected. And he only consented at the last, on the express condition that no prejudice should lodge against him, even though Eutyches should confess all that was required. Flavianus confirmed this condition, with the assurance that not the slightest disadvantage should come to Eusebius. But even then Eutyches was not allowed to answer in his own way, because the predicament in which Eusebius had found himself, involved in a measure the whole synod also, as they had given full credit to the charges of Eusebius, and had refused all the assurances of Eutyches that he agreed to all the documents which they had cited. Flavianus and Eusebius, therefore, in order to save themselves from defeat and perhaps deposition, if the matter should come to a general council, determined if possible to entrap Eutyches in some statement which they could condemn. The proceedings then were as follows: --

Flavianus. -- "Say, now, dost thou acknowledge the union of two natures?"

Eutyches. -- "I believe that Christ is perfect God and perfect man, but here I stop, and advise you to do so, too."

Eusebius. -- "Dost thou confess the existence of two natures even after the incarnation, and that Christ is of one nature with us after the flesh, or not?"

Eutyches. -- "I have not come to dispute, but to testify to your Holiness what I think. My view, however, is set down in this writing; command, therefore, that it be read."

Flavianus. -- "If it is thine own confession of faith, why shouldst thou need the paper?"

Eutyches. -- "That is my belief: I pray to the Father with the Son, and to the Son with the Father, and to the Holy Ghost with the Father and Son. I confess that his bodily presence is from the body of the holy Virgin, and that he became perfect man for our salvation. This I confess before the Father, before the Son, and before the Holy Ghost, and before your Holiness."

Flavianus. -- "Dost thou confess also that the one and same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, is of one substance with the Father as to His Godhead, and of one substance with His mother as to His manhood?"

Eutyches. -- "I have already declared my opinion; leave me now in peace."

Flavianus. -- "Dost thou confess that Christ consists of two natures?"

Eutyches. -- "I have not hitherto presumed to dispute concerning the nature of my God; but that he is of one substance with us, have I hitherto, as I affirm, never said. Up to this present day have I never said that the body of our Lord and God is of one substance with us. I do confess, however, that the holy Virgin is of one substance with us, and that our God is made of our flesh."

Flavianus, Florentius, and Basil of Seleucia. -- "If thou dost acknowledge that Mary is of one substance with us, and that Christ has taken His manhood from her, then it follows of itself that He, according to His manhood, is also of one substance with us."

Eutyches. -- "Consider well, I say not that the body of man has become the body of God, but I speak of a human body of God, and say that the Lord was made flesh of the Virgin. If you wish me to add further that His body is of one substance with ours, then I do this; but I do not understand this as though I denied that He is the Son of God. Formerly I did not generally speak of a unity of substance, but now I will do so, because your Holiness thus requires it."

Flavianus. -- "Thou doest it then only of compulsion, and not because it is thy faith?"

Eutyches. -- "I have not hitherto so spoken, but will do so now in accordance with the will of the synod."

"Florentius. -- Dost thou believe that our Lord, who was born of the Virgin, is of one substance with us, and that after the incarnation He is of two natures or not?"

Eutyches. -- "I confess that before the union he was of two natures, but after the union I confess only one nature."

20. At this "the whole council was in an uproar, and nothing was heard but anathemas and curses, each bishop there present striving to distinguish himself above the rest by being the foremost in uttering the most bitter and severe his zeal could suggest." -- Bower.7 When the

noise had ceased, Flavianus, in the name of the synod, demanded of Eutyches a public declaration of his faith in, and curse upon every view that did not accept, the doctrines which had been set forth by the synod. The proceedings then were as follows: --

Eutyches. -- "I will now indeed, since the synod so requires, accept the manner of speech in question; but I find it neither in Holy Scripture nor in the Father collectively, and therefore can not pronounce a curse upon the non-acceptance of the question, because that would be cursing the Fathers."

All together (springing to their feet). -- "Let him be accursed!"

Flavianus. -- "What does this man deserve who does not confess the right faith, but persists in his perverseness?"

Eutyches. -- "I will now indeed accept the required manner of speaking in accordance with the will of the synod, but can not pronounce the curse."

Florentius. -- "Dost thou confess two natures in Christ, and His unity of substance with us?"

Eutyches. -- "I read in the writings of St. Cyril and St. Athanasius: before the union they speak of two natures. but after the union only of one."

Florentius. -- "Dost thou confess two natures even after the union? If not, then wilt thou be condemned."

Eutyches. -- "Let the writings of Cyril and Athanasius be read."

Basil of Seleucia. -- "If thou dost not acknowledge two natures after the union also, then thou acceptest a mingling and confusion."

Florentius. -- "He who does not say `of two natures,' and who does not acknowledge two natures, has not the right faith."

All together. -- "And he who accepts anything only by compulsion does not believe in it. Long live the emperors!"

Flavianus, announcing the sentence. -- "Eutyches, a priest and archimandrite, has, by previous statements, and even now by his own confessions, shown himself to be entangled in the perversity of Valentinus and Apollinaris, without allowing himself to be won back to the genuine dogmas by our exhortation and instruction; therefore we, bewailing his complete perversity, have decreed, for the sake of Christ whom He has reviled, that he be deposed from every priestly office, expelled from our communion, and deprived of his headship over the convent. And all who henceforth hold communion with him, and have recourse to him, must know that they too are liable to the penalty of excommunication."8

21. The sentence was subscribed by all the synod, about thirty in number, and the synod was dissolved, Nov. 22, A. D. 448.

22. It is not necessary to follow the particulars any farther; as in

every other controversy, the dispute speedily spread far and wide. The decree of the synod was sent by Flavianus to all the other bishops for their indorsement. As soon as the action of the synod had been announced, Dioscorus, with all his powers, espoused the cause of Eutyches. Through Chrysaphius the Eunuch, Eutyches was already powerful at court, and added to this the disfavor in which Flavianus was already held by the emperor, the war assumed powerful proportions at the start.

23. The next step was, of course, for both parties to appeal to Leo, bishop of Rome. Eutyches felt perfectly safe in appealing to the because he had the words of Julius, bishop of Rome, saying, "It must not be said that there are two natures in Christ after their union; for as the body and soul from but one nature in man, so the divinity and humanity form but one nature in Christ."9 This being precisely the view of Eutyches, he felt perfectly confident in his appeal to Leo, for he could not suppose that Leo would contradict Julius. He shortly found that such a hope was altogether vain.

24. The emperor also wrote to the bishop of Rome. It seems that Leo did not make any answer to Eutyches direct. To Flavianus he sent a request for a fuller account of the whole matter, and that it should be sent by an envoy. To the emperor he wrote rejoicing that Theodosius "has not only the heart of an emperor, but also that of a priest, and is rightly anxious that no discord should arise; for then is the empire best established when the holy Trinity is served in unity."10

25. Dioscorus seeing now a chance of humbling the archbishop of Constantinople, joined Eutyches in a request to the emperor to call a general council. Chrysaphius, seeing again a prospect of accomplishing his favorite project to make Eutyches archbishop of Constantinople, strongly supported this request. But Theodosius, after his experience with the Council at Ephesus, dreaded to have anything to do with another one, and sought to ward off another calamity of the kind. But there was no remedy; the thing had to come.

26. Accordingly, March 30, A. D. 449, a message in the name of the two emperors, Theodosius II and Valentinian III, was issued, announcing that as doubts and controversies have arisen respecting the right

faith, the holding of an ecumenical synod has become necessary." Therefore the archbishops, metropolitans, and "other holy bishops distinguished for knowledge and character," should assemble at Ephesus August 1. A. special edict was sent to Dioscorus, saying: --

"The emperor has already forbidden Theodoret of Cyrus, on account of his writings against Cyril, to take part in the synod unless he is expressly summoned by the synod itself. Because, however, it is to be feared that some Nestorianizing bishops will use every means in order to bring him with them, the emperor, following the rule of the holy Fathers, will nominate Dioscorus to be president of the synod. Archbishop Juvenal of Jerusalem and Thalassius of Caesarea, and all zealous friends of the orthodox faith, will support Dioscorus. In conclusion, the emperor expresses the wish that all who shall desire to add anything to the Nicene confession of faith, or take anything from it, shall not be regarded in the synod; but on this point Dioscorus shall give judgment, since it is for this very purpose that the synod is convoked."

27. Leo was specially invited; and a certain Barsumas, a priest and superior of a monastery in Syria, was called as the representative of the monks, and Dioscorus was directed to receive him as such, and give him a seat in the council.

28. Not willing to wait for the decision of the question by the coming general council, Leo took occasion to assert his authority over all; and June 13 sent a letter to Flavianus, in which he indorsed the action of the Synod of Constantinople as far as it went, but reproved the synod for treating the matter so mildly as it had done, and himself took the strongest ground against Eutyches. In answer to the request of the emperor that he should attend the general council, Leo declined to attend in person, but promised to be present by Legates a Latere.

29. The council, composed of one hundred and forty-nine members, met in the church of the Virgin Mary at Ephesus, and was formally opened Aug. 8, A. D. 449. Dioscorus, the president, was seated upon a high throne. Two imperial commissioners, Elpidius and Eulogius, were in attendance, with a strong body of troops to keep order in the council, and preserve peace in the city. The council was opened with the announcement by the secretary, that "the God-fearing emperors have from zeal for religion, convoked this assembly." Then the imperial message calling the council was read, and next the two legates of the bishop of Rome announced that though invited by the emperor, Leo

did not appear in person, but had sent a letter. Next Elpidius, the imperial commissioner, made a short speech, in which he said: --

"The Logos has on this day permitted the assembled bishops to give judgment upon him. If you confess Him rightly, then He also will confess you before His Heavenly Father. But those who shall prevent the true doctrine will have to undergo a severe twofold judgment, that of God and that of the emperor."11

30. Next was read the emperor's instructions to the two imperial commissioners, which ran as follows: --

"But lately the holy Synod of Ephesus has been engaged with the affairs of the impious Nestorius, and has pronounced a righteous sentence on him. Because, however, new controversies of faith have arisen, we have summoned a second synod to Ephesus, in order to destroy the evil to the roots. We have therefore selected Elpidius and Eulogius for the service of the faith in order to fulfill our commands in reference to the Synod of Ephesus. In particular, they must allow no disturbances, and they must arrest every one who arouses such, and inform the emperor of him; they must take care that everything is done in order, must be present at the decisions, and take care that the synod examine the matter quickly and carefully, and give information of the same to the emperor. Those bishops who previously sat in judgment on Eutyches (at Constantinople) are to be present at the proceedings at Ephesus, but are not to vote, since their own previous sentence must be examined anew. Further, no other question is to be brought forward at the synod, and especially no question of money, before the settlement of the question of faith. By a letter to the proconsul, we have required support for the commissioners from the civil and military authorities, so that they may be able to fulfill our commissions, which are as far above other business as divine above human things."12

31. Following this was read a letter from the emperor to the council itself, in which he said: --

"The emperor has adjudged it necessary to call this assembly of bishops, that they might cut off this controversy and all its diabolical roots, exclude the adherents of Nestorius from the Church, and preserve the orthodox faith firm and unshaken; since the whole hope of the emperor and the power of the empire, depend on the right faith in God and the holy prayers of the synod."13

32. The council was now formally opened, and according to the instructions of the emperor they proceeded first to consider the faith. But upon this a dispute at once arose as to what was meant by the faith. Some insisted that this meant that the council should first declare its

faith; but Dioscorus interpreted it to mean not that the faith should first be declared, for this the former council had already done, but rather that they were to consider which of the parties agreed with what the true faith explains. And then he cried out: "Or will you alter the faith of the holy Fathers?" In answer to this there were cries, "Accursed be he who makes alterations in it; accursed be he who ventures to discuss the faith."

33. Next Dioscorus took a turn by which he covertly announced what was expected of the council. He said: "At Nicaea and at Ephesus the true faith has already been proclaimed; but although there have been two

synods, the faith is but one." In response to this there were loud shouts from the assembly, "No one dare add anything or take anything away. A great guardian of the faith is Dioscorus. Accursed be he who still discusses the faith; the Holy Ghost speaks by Dioscorus."14

34. Eutyches was now introduced to the council, that he might explain his faith. He first commended himself to the holy Trinity, and censured the Synod of Constantinople. He then handed to the secretary a written confession, in which he repeated the Nicene Creed, indorsed the acts of the Council of Ephesus and the doctrine of the holy father Cyril, and cursed all heretics from Nestorius clear back to Simon Magus, who had been rebuked by the apostle Peter. He then gave an account of the proceedings against himself. When this had been read, Flavianus demanded that Eusebius should be heard; but the imperial commissioners stopped him with the statement that they were not called together to judge Eutyches anew, but to judge those who had judged him, and that therefore the only legitimate business of the council was to examine the acts of the Synod of Constantinople.

35. Accordingly the proceedings of that synod were taken up. All went smoothly enough until the reader came to the point where the synod had demanded of Eutyches that he should acknowledge two natures in Christ after the incarnation. When this was read, there was an uproar against it in the council, as there had been against the statement of Eutyches in the synod; only the uproar here was as much greater than there, as the council was greater than the synod. The council cried with one voice, "Away with Eusebius! banish Eusebius! let him be burned

alive! As he cuts asunder the two natures in Christ, so be he cut asunder!"15

36. Dioscorus asked: "Is the doctrine that there are two natures after the incarnation to be tolerated?" Aloud the council replied: "Accursed be he who says so." Again Dioscorus cried: "I have your voices, I must have your hands. He that can not cry loud enough to be heard, let him lift up his hands." Then with uplifted hands the council unanimously bellowed: Whoever admits the two natures, let him be accursed; let him be driven out, torn in pieces, massacred."16

37. Eutyches was then unanimously pronounced orthodox and declared restored to the communion of the Church, to the government of his monastery, and to all his former privileges; and he was exalted as a hero for "his courage in daring to teach, and his firmness in daring to defend, the true and genuine doctrine of the Fathers. And on this occasion, those distinguished themselves the most by their panegyrics, who had most distinguished themselves by their invectives before" -- Bower.17

38. Dioscorus having everything in his own power, now determined to visit vengeance upon the archbishop of Constantinople. Under pretense that it was for the instruction of his colleagues, he directed that the acts of the previous Council of Ephesus concerning the Nicene Creed, etc., should be read. As soon as the reading was finished, he said: "You have now heard that the first Synod of Ephesus threatens every one who teaches otherwise than the Nicene Creed, or makes alterations in it, and raises new or further questions. Every one must now give his opinion in writing as to whether those who, in their theological inquiries, go beyond the Nicene Creed, are to be punished or not."18

39. This was aimed directly at Flavianus and Eusebius of Dorylaeum, as they had expressed the wish that the expression "two natures" might be inserted in the Nicene Creed. To the statement of Dioscorus, several bishops responded at once: "Whoever goes beyond the Nicene Creed is not to be received as a Catholic." Then Dioscorus continued: "As then the first Synod of Ephesus threatens every one who alters

anything in the Nicene faith, it follows that Flavianus of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylaeum must be deposed from their ecclesiastical dignity. I pronounce, therefore, their deposition, and every one of those present

shall communicate his view of this matter. Moreover everything will be brought to the knowledge of the emperor."

40. Flavianus replied: "I except against you," and, to take time by the forelock, placed a written appeal in the hands of the legates of Leo. Several of the friends of Flavianus left their seats, and prostrating themselves before the throne of Dioscorus, begged him not to inflict such a sentence, and above all that he would not ask them to sign it. He replied, "Though my tongue were to be cut out, I would not alter a single syllable of it." Trembling for their own fate if they should refuse to subscribe, the pleading bishops now embraced his knees, and entreated him to spare them; but he angrily exclaimed: "What! do you think to raise a tumult? Where are the counts?"

41. At this the counts ordered the doors to be thrown open and the proconsul of Asia entered with a strong body of armed troops, followed by a confused multitude of furious monks, armed with chains, and clubs, and stones. Then there was a general scramble of the "holy bishops" to find a refuge. Some took shelter behind the throne of Dioscorus, others crawled under the benches -- all concealed themselves as best they could. Dioscorus declared: "The sentence must be signed. If any one objects to it, let him take care; for it is with me he has to deal." The bishops, when they found that they were not to be massacred at once, crept out from under the benches and from other places of concealment, and returned trembling to their seats.

42. Then Dioscorus took a blank paper, and accompanied by the bishop of Jerusalem, and attended by an armed guard, passed through the assembly and had each bishop in succession to sign it. All signed but the legates of the bishop of Rome. Then the blank was filled up by Dioscorus with a charge of heresy against Flavianus, and with the sentence which he had just pronounced upon Flavianus and Eusebius. When the sentence was written, Flavianus again said: "I except against you;" upon which Dioscorus with some other bishops rushed upon him, and with Barsumas crying out, "Strike him! strike him dead!" they beat him and banged him about, and then threw him down and

kicked him and tramped upon him until he was nearly dead; then sent him off immediately to prison, and the next morning ordered him into exile. At the end of the second day's journey he died of the ill usage he had received in the council.19

43. All these proceedings, up to the murder of Flavianus, were carried out on the first day. The council continued three days longer, during which Dioscorus secured the condemnation and deposition of Domnus of Antioch, and several other principal bishops, although they had signed his blank paper, for having formerly opposed Cyril and Eutyches. He then put an end to the council, and returned to Alexandria.

44. The emperor Theodosius, whom Leo had praised as having the heart of a priest, issued an edict in which he approved and confirmed the decrees of the council, and commanded that all the bishops of the empire should immediately subscribe to the Nicene Creed. He involved in the heresy of Nestorius, all who were opposed to Eutyches, and commanded that no adherent of Nestorius or Flavianus should ever be raised to a bishopric. "By the same edict, persons of all ranks and conditions were forbidden, on pain of perpetual banishment, to harbor or conceal any who taught, held, or favored, the tenets of Nestorius, Flavianus, and the deposed bishops; and the books, comments, homilies, and other works, written by them or passing under their names, were ordered to be publicly burnt."20 He then wrote to Valentinian III, that by the deposition of the turbulent prelate Flavianus, "peace had in the end been happily restored to all the churches in his dominions."

45. As the doctrine which the council had established was contrary to that which Leo had published in his letter, he denounced the council as a "synod of robbers," refused to recognize it at all, and called for another general council. But in every respect this council was just as legitimate and as orthodox as any other one that had been held from the Council of Nice to that day. It was regularly called; it was regularly opened; the proceedings were all perfectly regular; and when it was over, the proceedings were regularly approved and confirmed by the

imperial authority. In short, there is no element lacking to make the second Council of Ephesus as thoroughly regular and orthodox as was the first Council of Ephesus, which is held by the Church of Rome to be entirely orthodox; or even as orthodox as was the Council of Nice itself.

---

1 [Page 140] "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iv, par. 22.

2 [Page 141] Bower's "History of the Popes." Leo, par. 22.

3 [Page 142] Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," sec. clxxii, par. 3.

4 [Page 143] Id., par. 13.

5 [Page 143] Id., par. 11.

6 [Page 143] Id., par. 22.

7 [Page 145] "History of the Popes," Leo, par. 24.

8 [Page 146] Hefele's of the Church Councils," sec. chap. xii, pars. 22-24; and Bower's "History of the Popes," Lec. par. 46.

9 [Page 147] Bower, Id., par. 25.

10 [Page 147] Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," sec. clxxiii, par. 10.

11 [Page 149] Id., sec. cixxviii, par. 5.

12 [Page 149] Id., clxxv, par. 3.

13 [Page 149] Id., par. 6.

14 [Page 150] Id., sec. cixxviii, pars. 6,7.

15 [Page 151] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iv, par. 30.

16 [Page 151] Bower's "History of the Popes," Leo. par. 31.

17 [Page 151] Id.

18 [Page 151] Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," sec. cixxviii, par. 15.

20 [Page 153] Bower's "History of the Popes," Leo, par. 82, Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iv. par. 30; and Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," sec. cixxviii, par. 16, and sec. clxxix.

21 [Page 153] Bower, Id., par. 34.

11. THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY -- COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.

LEO persisted in his refusal to recognize the validity of the acts of the second Council of Ephesus, and insisted that another general council should be called. As it was the will of Leo alone that made, or could now make, the late council anything else than strictly regular and orthodox according to the Catholic system of discipline and doctrine, it is evident that if another general council were called, it would have to be subject to the will of Leo; and its decision upon questions of the faith would be but the expression of the will of Leo. This is precisely what Leo aimed at, and nothing less than this would satisfy him.

2. Leo had now been bishop of Rome eleven years. He was a fullblooded Roman in all that that term implies. "All that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance,her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and in her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentrated in him alone." -- Milman.1

3. Yet Leo was not the first one in whom this spirit was manifested. His aspirations were but the culmination of the arrogance of the bishopric of Rome which had been constantly growing. To trace the subtle, silent, often violent, yet always constant, growth of this spirit of supremacy and encroachment of absolute authority, is one of the most curious studies in all history. Not only was there never an opportunity lost, but opportunities were created, for the bishop of Rome to assert authority and to magnify his power. Supremacy in discipline and in jurisdiction was asserted by Victor and Stephen; but it was not until the union of Church and State that the field was fully opened

to the arrogance of the bishopric of Rome. A glance at the successive bishops from the union of Church and State to the accession of Leo, will give a better understanding of the position and pretensions of Leo than could be obtained in any other way.

4. MELCHIADES.

was bishop of Rome from July 2, A. D. 311, to December, 314, and therefore, as already related, was in the papal chair when the union of Church and State was formed, and took a leading part in that evil intrigue. And soon the bishopric of Rome began to receive its reward in imperial favors. "The bishop of Rome sits by the imperial authority at the head of a synod of Italian bishops, to judge the disputes of the African Donatists." -- Milman.2 Melchiades was succeeded by --

SYLVESTER, A. D. 314-336.

5. In the very year of his accession, the Council of Arles bestowed upon the bishopric of Rome the distinction and the office of notifying all the churches of the proper time to celebrate Easter. And in 325 the general Council of Nice recognized the bishop of Rome the first bishop of the empire. Under him the organization of the Church was formed upon the model of the organization of the State. He was succeeded by --

MARK, A. D. 336,

whose term continued only from January till October, and was therefore so short that nothing occurred worthy of record in this connection. He was succeeded by --

JULIUS, OCTOBER, 336-352,

under whom the Council of Sardica -- 347 -- made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal, upon which "single precedent" the bishopric of Rome built "a universal right." -- Schaff.3 Julius was succeeded by --

LIBERIUS, 352-366,

who excommunicated Athanasius and then approved his doctrine, and carried on the contest with Constantius, in which he incurred banishment for the Catholic faith; and then became Arian, then Semi-Arian, and then Catholic again. He was succeeded by --

DAMASUS, 366-384.

6. In his episcopate, Valentinian I enacted a law making the bishop of Rome the judge of other bishops. A council in Rome, A. D. 378, enlarged his powers of judging, and petitioned the emperor Gratian to exempt the bishop of Rome from all civil jurisdiction except that of the emperor alone; to order that he be judged by none except a council, or the emperor direct; and that the imperial power should be exerted to compel obedience to the judgment of the bishop of Rome concerning other bishops. Gratian granted part of their request. and it was made to count for all.

7. Damasus was succeeded by --

SIRICIUS, 384-389,

who issued the first decretal. A decretal is " an answer sent by the pope to applications to him as head of the Church, for guidance in cases involving points of doctrine or discipline." The directions of Siricius in this decretal were to be strictly observed under penalty of excommunication. It was dated Feb. 11, A. D. 385. He convened a council in Rome, which decreed that "no one should presume to ordain a bishop without the knowledge of the apostolic see." -- Bower.4 He was succeeded by --

ANASTASIUS I, 389-402,

who, though very zealous to maintain all that his predecessors had asserted or claimed, added nothing in particular himself. He condemned as a heretic, Origen, who had been dead one hundred and fifty years, and who is now a Catholic saint. He was succeeded by --

INNOCENT I, 402-417.

8. Innocent was an indefatigable disciplinarian, and kept up a constant correspondence with all the West, as well as with the principal bishoprics of the East, establishing rules, dictating to councils, and issuing decretals upon all the affairs of the Church. Hitherto the dignity of the bishopric of Rome had been derived from the dignity of the city of Rome. Innocent now asserted that the superior dignity of the bishopric of Rome was derived from Peter, whom he designated the Prince of the Apostles; and that in this respect it took precedence

of that of Antioch because that in Rome Peter had accomplished what he had only begun in Antioch. He demanded the absolute obedience of all churches in the West, because, as he declared, Peter was the only apostle that ever preached in the West; and that all the churches in the West had been founded by Peter, or by some successor of his. This was utterly untrue, and he knew it, but that made no difference to him; he unblushingly asserted it, and then, upon that, asserted that "all ecclesiastical matters throughout the world are, by divine right, to be referred to the apostolic see, before they are finally decided in the provinces." -- Bower.5 At the invasion of Alaric and his siege of Rome, Innocent headed an embassy to the emperor Honorius to mediate for a treaty of peace between Alaric and the emperor. "Upon the mind of Innocent appears first distinctly to have dawned the vast conception of Rome's universal ecclesiastical supremacy, dim as yet, and shadowy, yet full and comprehensive in its outline." -- Milman.6

9. Innocent I was succeeded by --

ZOSIMUS, MARCH 18, A. D. 417, TO DEC. 26, 418,

who asserted with all the arrogance of Innocent, all that Innocent had claimed. He not only boasted with Innocent that to him belonged the power to judge all causes, but that the judgment "is irrevocable;" and accordingly established the use of the dictatorial expression, "For so it has pleased the apostolic see," as sufficient authority for all things that he might choose to command. And upon this assumption, those canons of the Council of Sardica which made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal, he passed off upon the bishops of Africa as the canons of the Council of Nice, in which he was actually followed by Leo, and put tradition upon a level with the Scriptures.

10. Zosimus was succeeded by --

BONIFACE I, 419-422,

who added nothing to the power or authority of the bishopric of Rome, but diligently and "conscientiously" maintained all that his predecessors had asserted, in behalf of what he called "the just rights of the see," in which he had been placed. He was succeeded by --

CELESTINE I, 422-432,

who in a letter written A. D. 438, plainly declared: "As I am appointed by God to watch over His Church, it is incumbent upon me everywhere to root out evil practices, and introduce good ones in their room, for my pastoral vigilance is restrained by no bounds, but extends to all places where Christ is known and adored." -- Bower.7 It was he who appointed the terrible Cyril his vicegerent to condemn Nestorius, and to establish the doctrine that Mary was the mother of God. He was succeeded by --

SIXTUS III, 432-440,

who, as others before, added nothing specially to the papal claims, yet yielded not an iota of the claims already made. He was succeeded by --

LEO I, "THE GREAT," A. D. 440-461.

11. Such was the heritage bequeathed to Leo by his predecessors, and the arrogance of his own native disposition, with the grand opportunities which offered during his long rule, added to it a thousandfold. At the very moment of his election he was absent in Gaul on a mission as mediator to reconcile a dispute between two of the principal men of the empire. He succeeded in his mission, and was hailed as "the Angel of Peace," and the "Deliverer of the Empire." In a sermon, he showed what his ambition embraced. He portrayed the powers and

glories of the former Rome as they were reproduced in Catholic Rome. The conquests and universal sway of heathen Rome were but the promise of the conquests and universal sway of Catholic Rome. Romulus and Remus were but the precursors of Peter and Paul. Rome of former days had by her armies conquered the earth and sea: now again, by the see of the holy blessed Peter as head of the world, Rome through her divine religion would dominate the earth.8

12. In A. D. 445, "at the avowed instance of Leo" and at the dictation, if not in the actual writing of Leo, Valentinian III issued a "perpetual edict" "commanding all bishops to pay an entire obedience and submission to the orders of the apostolic see;" "to observe, as law, whatever it should please the bishop of Rome to command;" "that the bishop of Rome had a right to command what he pleased;" and

"whoever refused to obey the citation of the Roman pontiff should be
compelled to do so by the moderator of the province" in which the recalcitrant bishop might dwell.9

13. This made his authority absolute over all the West, and now he determined to extend it over the East, and so make it universal. As soon as he learned of the decision of the Council of Ephesus, he called a council in Rome, and by it rejected all that had been done by the council at Ephesus, and wrote to the emperor, Theodosius II, "entreating him in the name of the holy Trinity to declare null what had been done there," and set everything back as it was before that council was called, and so let the matter remain until a general council could be held in Italy.

14. Leo addressed not the emperor Theodosius alone, to have another council called. He wrote to Pulcheria, appointing her a legate of St. Peter, and entreated her "to employ all her interest with the emperor to obtain the assembling of an ecumenical council, and all her authority to prevent the evils that would be otherwise occasioned by the war which had been lately declared against the faith of the Church." -- Bower. 10

15. In February 450, the emperor Valentinian III, with his mother Placidia and his wife Eudocia, who was the daughter of Theodosius II, made a visit to Rome. The next day after their arrival, they went to the church of St. Peter, where they were received by Leo, who, as soon as he met them, put on all the agony he could, and with sobs, and tears, and sighs, he addressed them; but on account of his great excess of grief, his words were so mumbled that nothing could be made of them.

16. Presently the two women began to cry. This somewhat relieved the stress upon Leo, so that with much eloquence, he represented the great danger that threatened the Church. Then he mustered up his tears again, and mixed them with more sighs and sobs, and begged the emperor and empress, by the apostle Peter to whom they were about to pay their respects, by their own salvation and by the salvation of Theodosius, to write to the emperor, and spare no pains to persuade

him to nullify the proceedings of the second Council of Ephesus, and call another general council, this time in Italy.

17. As soon as it was learned in the East what strenuous efforts Leo was making to have another general council called, many of the bishops who had condemned Flavianus began to make overtures to the party of Leo, so that if another council should be called, they might escape condemnation. Dioscorus learning this, called a synod of ten bishops in Alexandria, and solemnly excommunicated Leo, bishop of Rome, for presuming to judge anew, and annul what had already been judged and finally determined by a general council.

18. Leo finally sent four legates to the court of Theodosius, to urge upon him the necessity of another general council, but before they reached Constantinople, Theodosius was dead; and having left no heir to his

throne, Pulcheria, Leo's legate, became empress. As there was no precedent in Roman history to sanction the rule of a woman alone, she married a senator by the name of Marcian, and invested him with the imperial robes, while she retained and exercised the imperial authority. The first thing they did was to burn Chrysaphius. The new authority received Leo's legates with great respect, and returned answer that they had nothing so much at heart as the unity of the Church and the extirpation of heresies, and that therefore they would call a general council. Not long afterward they wrote to Leo, inviting him to assist in person at the proposed council.

19. No sooner was it known that Theodosius was dead, and Pulcheria and Marcian in power, than the bishops who had indorsed and praised Eutyches, changed their opinions and condemned him and all who held with him. Anatolius, an ardent defender of Eutyches, who had succeeded Flavianus as archbishop of Constantinople, and had been ordained by Dioscorus himself, "assembled in great haste all the bishops, abbots, presbyters, and deacons, who were then in Constantinople, and in their presence not only received and signed the famous letter of Leo to Flavianus, concerning the incarnation, but at the same time anathematized Nestorius and Eutyches, their doctrine, and all their followers, declaring that he professed no other faith but what was held and professed by the Roman Church and by Leo." -- Bower.11 The

example of Anatolius was followed by other bishops who had favored Eutyches, and by most of those who had acted in the late council, "and nothing was heard but anathemas against Eutyches, whom most of those who uttered them, had but a few months before, honored as new apostle, and as the true interpreter of the doctrine of the Church and the Fathers." -- Bower.12

20. By an imperial message dated May 17, A. D. 451, a general council was summoned to meet at Nice in Bithynia, the first of September. The council met there accordingly, but an invasion of the Huns from Illyricum made it necessary for Marcian to remain in the capital; and therefore the council was removed from Nice to Chalcedon. Accordingly at Chalcedon there assembled the largest council ever yet held, the number of bishops being six hundred and thirty.

21. Marcian, not being able to be present at the opening, appointed six of the chief officers of the empire, and fourteen men of the Senate as commissioners to represent him at the council. Leo's legates presided, their names were Paschasinus, Lucentius, and Boniface.

FIRST SESSION, OCTOBER 8.

22. When all the bishops were seated, Leo's legates arose, and advanced to the middle of the assembly, and Paschasinus, holding a paper in his hand, said: --

"We have here an order from the most blessed and apostolic pope, of the city of Rome, which is the head of all churches, by which his apostleship has been pleased to command that Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, should not be allowed to sit in the council. Let him therefore be ordered to withdraw, else we must withdraw."

The commissioners. -- " What have you to object against Dioscorus in particular?"

No answer. The question was repeated.

Lucentius. -- "He must be called to account for the judgment he gave at Ephesus, where he presumed to assemble a council without the consent of the apostolic see, which has never been thought lawful, which has never been done; as he is therefore to be judged, he ought not to sit as a judge."

The commissioners. -- "Neither ought you to sit as a judge, since you take it upon you to act as a party. However, let us know what crime you lay to the charge of Dioscorus, for it is not agreeable to

justice or reason, that he alone should be charged with a crime of which many others are no less guilty than he."

The legates. --" Leo will by no means suffer Dioscorus to sit or act in this assembly as a judge, and if he does, then we must withdraw, agreeably to our instructions."13

23. The commissioners finding the legates immovable, yielded at last, and ordered Dioscorus to leave his seat, and put himself in the midst of the assembly, in the place of one accused.

24. Then Eusebius of Dorylaeum, the original accuser of Eutyches, stepped forward as the accuser of Dioscorus, and declared: " I have been wronged by Dioscorus; the faith has been wronged; the bishop Flavian was murdered, and, together with myself, unjustly deposed by him. Give directions that my petition be read." This petition was a memorial to the emperors, and was to the effect that at the late council at Ephesus, Dioscorus "having gathered a disorderly rabble, and procured an overbearing influence by bribes, made havoc, as far as lay in his power, of the pious religion of the orthodox, and established the erroneous doctrine of Eutyches the monk, which had from the first been repudiated by the holy Fathers;" that the emperors should therefore command Dioscorus to answer the accusation which he now made; and that the acts of the late Council of Ephesus should be read in the present council, because from these he could show that Dioscorus was "estranged from the orthodox faith, that he strengthened a heresy utterly impious,"and that he had "wrongfully deposed" and "cruelly outraged" him.14

25. The late council at Ephesus had excommunicated Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus. Theodoret had appealed to Leo. Leo had reinstated him, and the emperor Marcian had specially summoned him to this council. Theodoret had arrived, and at this point in the proceedings, the imperial commissioners directed that he should be admitted to the council. "The actual introduction of Theodoret caused a frightful storm." -- Hefele.15 A faint estimate of this frightful storm may be formed from the following account of it, which is copied bodily from the report of the council: --

"And when the most reverend bishop Theodoret entered, the most reverend the bishops of Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine [the party of Dioscorus] shouted out, `Mercy upon us! the faith is destroyed. The canons of the Church excommunicate him. Turn him out! turn out the teacher of Nestorius.'

"On the other hand, the most reverend the bishops of the East, of Thrace, of Pontus, and of Asia, shouted out, `We were compelled [at the former council] to subscribe our names to blank papers; we were scourged into submission. Turn out the Manichaeans! Turn out the enemies of Flavian; turn out the adversaries of the faith!'

"Dioscorus, the most reverend bishop of Alexandria, said, `Why is Cyril to be turned out? It is he whom Theodoret has condemned.'

"The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, `Turn out the murderer Dioscorus. Who knows not the deeds of Dioscorus?'

"The most reverend the bishops of Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine shouted out, `Long life to the empress!'

"The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, `Turn out the murderers!'

"The most reverend the bishops of Egypt shouted out, `The empress turned out Nestorius; long life to the Catholic empress! The orthodox synod refuses to admit Theodoret.'"

26. Here there was a "momentary" lull in the storm, of which Theodoret instantly took advantage, and stepped forward to the commissioners with "a petition to the emperors," which was really a complaint against Dioscorus, and asked that it be read. The commissioners said that the regular business should be proceeded with, but that Theodoret should be admitted to a seat in the council, because the bishop of Antioch had vouched for his orthodoxy. Then the storm again raged: --

"The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, `He is worthy -- worthy!'

0 "The most reverend the bishops of Egypt shouted out, `Don't call him bishop, he is no bishop. Turn out the fighter against God; turn out the Jew!'

1 "The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, `The orthodox for the synod! Turn out the rebels; turn out the murderers!'

2 "The most reverend the bishops of Egypt, `Turn out the enemy of God. Turn out the defamer of Christ. Long life to the empress! Long life to the emperor! Long life to the Catholic emperor! Theodoret condemned Cyril. If we receive Theodoret, we excommunicate Cyril.'"16

3 27. At this stage the commissioners were enabled by a special exertion of their authority to allay the storm. They plainly told the loudmouthed

bishops, "Such vulgar shouts are not becoming in bishops, and can do no good to either party."17 When the tumult had been subdued, the council proceeded to business. First there were read all the proceedings from the beginning of the Synod of Constantinople against Eutyches clear down to the end of the late Council of Ephesus; during which there was much shouting and counter-shouting after the manner of that over the introduction of Theodoret, but which need not be repeated.

28. The first act of the council after the reading of the foregoing minutes was to annul the sentence which Dioscorus had pronounced against Flavianus and Eusebius. "Many of the bishops expressed their penitence at their concurrence in these acts; some saying that they were compelled by force to subscribe -- others to subscribe a blank paper." -- Milman.18 Then a resolution was framed charging Dioscorus with having approved the doctrine of one nature in Christ; with having condemned the doctrine of two natures, and having opposed Flavianus in maintaining it; and with having forced all the bishops at Ephesus to sign the sentence which he had pronounced.

29. Dioscorus was not afraid of anything, not even the terrors of an orthodox Church council, and without the least sign of intimidation or fear, he boldly confronted the whole host of his adversaries. In answer to their charges --

Dioscorus said. -- " I have condemned, still do, and always will, condemn the doctrine of two natures in Christ, and all who maintain it. I hold no other doctrine but what I have learned of the Fathers, especially Athanasius, Nazianzen, and Cyril. I have chosen rather to condemn Flavianus than them. Those who do not like my doctrine may use me as they please, now they are uppermost and have the power in their hands; but in what manner soever they think fit to use me, I am unalterably determined, my soul being at stake, to live and die in the faith which I have hitherto professed. As to my having forced the bishops to sign the condemnation of Flavianus, I answer that the constancy of every Christian, and much more of a bishop, ought to be proof against all kinds of violence and death itself. The charge brought by Eusebius lays heavier against them than it does against me, and therefore it is incumbent upon them to answer that, as they are the more guilty." -- Bower.19

30. Night had now come. Dioscorus demanded an adjournment. It was refused. Torches were brought in. The night was made hideous by the wild cries of acclamation to the emperor and the Senate, of appeals to God and curses upon Dioscorus. When the resolution was finally put upon its passage, it was announced as follows by --

The imperial commissioners. -- "As it has now been shown by the reading of the acts and by the avowal of many bishops who confess that they fell into error at Ephesus, that Flavianus and others were unjustly deposed, it seems right that, if it so pleases the emperor, the same punishment should be inflicted upon the heads of the previous synod. Dioscorus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia, and that their deposition from the episcopal dignity should be pronounced by the council."

The Orientals. -- "That is quite right."

31. Many of the party of Dioscorus now abandoned him and his cause, and went over to the other side, exclaiming; "We have all erred, we all ask for pardon." Upon this there was an almost unanimous demand that only Dioscorus should be deposed.

Dioscorus. -- "They are condemning not me alone, but Athanasius and Cyril. They forbid us to assert the two natures after the incarnation."

The Orientals, and other opponents of Dioscorus, all together. -- "Many years to the Senate! holy God, holy Almighty, holy Immortal, have mercy upon us! Many years to the emperors! The impious must ever be subdued! Dioscorus the murderer, Christ had deposed! This is a righteous judgment, a righteous Senate, a righteous council."

32. Amid such cries as these, and, "Christ has deposed Dioscorus, Christ has deposed the murderer, God has avenged his martyrs," the resolution was adopted. Then the council adjourned.20

THE SECOND SESSION, OCTOBER 10.

33. As soon as the council had been opened, the direction was given by --

The imperial commissioners. -- "Let the synod now declare what the true faith is, so that the erring may be brought back to the right way."

The bishops protesting. -- No one can venture to draw up a new formula of the faith, but that which has already been laid down by the Fathers [at Nice, Constantinople, and the first of Ephesus] is to be held fast. This must not be departed from."

Cecropius, bishop of Sebastopol. -- "On the Eutychian question a test has already been given by the Roman archbishop, which we [that is, he and his nearest colleagues] have all signed."

All the bishops, with acclamation. -- "That we also say, the explanation already given by Leo suffices; another declaration of faith must not be put forth."

The imperial commissioners. -- "Let all the patriarchs [the chief bishops] come together, along with one or two bishops of their province, and take common counsel respecting the faith, and communicate the result, so that, by its universal acceptance, every doubt in regard to the faith may be removed, or if any believe otherwise, which we do not expect, these may immediately be made manifest."

The bishops. -- "A written declaration of faith we do not bring forward. This is contrary to the rule" [referring to the command of the first Council of Ephesus].

Florentius, bishop of Sardes. -- "As those who have been taught to follow the Nicene Synod, and also the regularly and piously assembled synod at Ephesus, in accordance with the faith of the holy fathers Cyril and Celestine, and also with the letter of the most holy Leo, can not possibly draw up at once a formula of the faith, we therefore ask for a longer delay; but I, for my part, believe that the letter of Leo is sufficient."

Cecropius. -- "Let the formulas be read in which the true faith has already been set forth."

34. This suggestion was adopted. First the Nicene Creed, with its curse against the Arian heresy, was read, at the close of which, --

0 The bishops, unanimously. -- "That is the orthodox faith, that we all believe, into that we were baptized, into that we also baptize; thus Cyril taught, thus believes Pope Leo."

1 35. Next was read the Creed of Constantinople, and with similar acclamations it was unanimously indorsed. Then were read the two letters which Cyril had written, and which were a part of the record of the Inquisition upon Eutyches. Lastly there was read the letter of Leo. When Leo's letter was read, it was cheered to the echo, and again roared --

2 The bishops. -- "It is the belief of the Fathers -- of the apostles -- so believe we all! Accursed be he that admits not that Peter has spoken by

the mouth of Leo! Leo has taught what is righteous and true, and so taught Cyril. Eternal be the memory of Cyril! Why was not this read at Ephesus! It was suppressed by Dioscorus!"

36. The bishops of Illyricum and Palestine, however, said that there were some passages -- three, it proved -- in the letter of Leo of which they had some doubts. The truth of those passages was confirmed by statements which Cyril had made to the same effect.

The imperial commissioners. -- "Has any one still a doubt?"

The bishops, by acclamation. -- "No one doubts."

37. Still there was one bishop who hesitated, and requested that there might be a few days' delay that the question might be quietly considered and settled; and as the letter of Leo had been read, that they might have a copy of the letter of Cyril to Nestorius, that they might examine them together.

The council -- If we are to have delay, we must request that all the bishops in common shall take part in the desired consultation."

The commissioners. -- "The assembly is put off for five days, and the bishops shall, during that time, meet with Anatolius of Constantinople, and take counsel together concerning the faith, so that the doubting may be instructed."

38. As the council was about to be dismissed, some bishops entered a request that the bishops who had taken a leading part in the late Council of Ephesus, should be forgiven!

The petitioning bishops. -- "We petition for the Fathers that they may be allowed again to enter the synod. The emperor and the empress should hear of this petition. We have all erred; let all be forgiven!"

39. Upon this "a great commotion again arose, similar to that at the beginning of the council over the introduction of Theodoret:" --

0 The clergy of Constantinople shouted. -- "Only a few cry for this, the synod itself says not a syllable."

1 The Orientals cried out. -- "Exile to the Egyptian!"

2 The illyrians. -- "We beseech you, pardon all!"

3 The Orientals. -- "Exile to the Egyptian!"

4 The Illyrians. -- "We have all erred; have mercy on us all! These words to the orthodox emperor! The churches are rent in pieces."

5 The clergy of Constantinople. -- "To exile with Dioscorus; God has rejected him. Whoever has communion with him is a Jew."

40. In the midst of this uproar, the imperial commissioners put an end to the session. The recess continued only two days instead of five, for --

THE THIRD SESSION WAS HELD OCTOBER 13.

41. The first step taken at this session was by Eusebius of Dorylaeum, who proudly stepped forward to secure by the council his vindication as the champion of orthodoxy. He presented a petition to the council in which, after repeating his accusation against Dioscorus, he said: --

"I therefore pray that you will have pity upon me, and decree that all which was done against me be declared null, and do me no harm, but that I be again restored to my spiritual dignity. At the same time anathematize his evil doctrine, and punish him for his insolence according to his deserts."

42. Following this, Dioscorus was charged with enormous crimes, with lewdness and debauchery to the great scandal of his flock; with styling himself the king of Egypt, and attempting to usurp the sovereignty. Dioscorus was not present, and after being summoned three times without appearing, Leo's legates gave a recapitulation of the crimes charged against him, and then pronounced the following sentence: --

"Leo, archbishop of the great and ancient Rome, by us and the present synod, with the authority of St. Peter, on whom the Catholic Church and orthodox faith are founded, divests Dioscorus of the episcopal dignity, and declares him henceforth incapable of exercising any sacerdotal or episcopal functions."21

THE FOURTH SESSION, OCTOBER 17.

43. At this session, the discussion of the faith was resumed. First, there was read the act of the second session, ordering a recess of five days for the consideration of the faith.

The commissioners. -- "What has the reverend synod now decreed concerning the faith?"

The papal legate, Paschasinus -- "The holy synod holds fast the rule of faith which was ratified by the Fathers at Nicaea and by those at Constantinople. Moreover, in the second place, it acknowledges that exposition of this creed which was given by Cyril at Ephesus. In the third place, the letter of the most holy man Leo, archbishop of all churches, who condemned the heresy of Nestorius and Eutyches, shows

quite clearly what is the true faith, and this faith the synod also holds, and allows nothing to be added to it or taken from it."

The bishops altogether. -- "We also all believe thus, into that we were baptize, into that we baptize thus we believe."

44. In the midst of the assembly was the throne upon which lay the Gospels. The imperial commissioners now required that all the bishops should swear by the Gospels whether or not they agreed with the faith expressed in the creeds of Nice and Constantinople, and in Leo's letter. The first to swear was Anatolius, archbishop of Constantinople, next, the three legates of Leo, and after them, one by one, others came, until one hundred and sixty-one votes had been thus taken; whereupon the imperial commissioners asked the remaining bishops to give their votes all at once.

The bishops, unanimously and vociferously. -- "We are all agreed, we all believe thus; he who agrees, belongs to the synod! Many years to the emperors, many years to the empress! Even the five bishops [who had been deposed with Dioscorus] have subscribed, and believed as Leo does! They also belong to the synod!"

The imperial commissioners and others. -- "We have written on their [the five bishops'] account to the emperor, and await his commands. You, however, are responsible to God for these five for whom you intercede, and for all the proceedings of this synod."

The bishops. -- "God has deposed Dioscorus; Dioscorus is rightly condemned; Christ has deposed him."

45. After this the council waited to receive word from the emperor respecting the five bishops. After several hours the message came, saying that the council itself should decide as to their admission. As the council was already agreed upon it, and had called for it, the five bishops were called in at once. As they came in and took their places, again cried loudly --

The bishops. -- "God has done this! Many years to the emperors, to the Senate, to the commissioners! The union is complete, and peace given to the churches!"

46. The commissioners next announced that the day before, a number of Egyptian bishops had handed in a confession of faith to the emperor, who wished that it should be read to the council. The bishops were called in and took their places, and their confession was read. The confession was signed by thirteen bishops, but it was presented in the name of "all

the bishops of Egypt." It declared that they agreed with the orthodox faith and cursed all heresy, particularly that of Arius, and a number of others, but did not name Eutyches among the heretics. As soon as this was noticed, the council accused the Egyptians of dishonesty. Leo's legates demanded whether or not they would agree with the letter of Leo, and pronounce a curse on Eutyches.

The Egyptians. -- "If any one teaches differently from what we have indicated, whether it be Eutyches, or whoever it be, let him be anathema. As to the letter of Leo, however, we can not express ourselves, for you all

know that in accordance with the prescription of the Nicene Council, we are united with the archbishop of Alexandria, and therefore must await his judgment in this matter."

47. This caused such an outcry in the council against them, that the thirteen yielded so far as to pronounce openly and positively a curse upon Eutyches. Again the legates called upon them to subscribe to the letter of Leo.

The Egyptians. -- "Without the consent of our archbishop we can not subscribe."

Acacius, bishop of Ariarathia. -- "It is inadmissible to allow more weight to one single person who is to hold the bishopric of Alexandria, than to the whole synod. The Egyptians only wish to throw everything into confusion here as at Ephesus. They must subscribe Leo's letter or be excommunicated."

The Egyptians. -- "In comparison with the great number of the bishops of Egypt, there are only a few of us present, and we have no right to act in their name, to do what is here required. We therefore pray for mercy, and that we may be allowed to follow our archbishop. Otherwise all the provinces of Egypt will rise up against us."

Cecropius of Sebastopol. -- [Again reproaching them with heresy] "It is from yourselves alone that assent is demanded to the letter of Leo, and not in the name of the rest of the Egyptian bishops."

The Egyptians. -- "We can no longer live at home if we do this."

Leo's legate, Lucentius. -- "Ten individual men can occasion no prejudice to a synod of six hundred bishops and to the Catholic faith."

The Egyptians. -- "We shall be killed, we shall be killed, if we do it. We will rather be made away with here by you than there. Let an archbishop for Egypt be here appointed, and then we will subscribe and assent. Have mercy on our gray hairs! Anatolius of Constantinople knows that in Egypt all the bishops must obey the archbishop of Alexandria. Have pity upon us; we would rather die by the hands of the emperor, and by yours than at home. Take our bishoprics, if you will, elect an archbishop of Alexandria, we do not object."

Many bishops. -- "The Egyptians are heretics; they must subscribe the condemnation of Dioscorus."

The imperial commissioners. -- "Let them remain at Constantinople until an archbishop is elected for Alexandria."

The legate, Paschasinus. -- [Agreeing] "They must give security not to leave Constantinople in the meantime."

48. During the rest of the session matters were discussed which had no direct bearing upon the establishment of the faith.

THE FIFTH SESSION, OCTOBER 22.

49. The object of this session was the establishment of the faith; and the object was accomplished. The first thing was the reading of a form of doctrine which, according to arrangement made in the second session, had been framed, and also the day before had been "unanimously approved." As soon as it was read, however, there was an objection made against it: --

John bishop of Germanicia -- "This formula is not good; it must be improved."

Anatolius. -- "Did it not yesterday give universal satisfaction?"

The bishops in acclamation. -- "It is excellent, and contains the Catholic faith. Away with the Nestorians! The expression `Theotokos' [Mother of God] must be received into the creed."

Leo's legates. -- "If the letter of Leo is not agreed to, we demand our papers, so that we may return home, and that a synod may be held in the West."

0 50. The imperial commissioners then suggested that a commission composed of six bishops from the East, three from Asia, three from Illyria, three from Pontus, and three from Thrace, with the archbishop of Constantinople and the Roman legates, should meet in the presence of the commissioners, and decide upon a formula of the faith, and bring it before the council. The majority of the bishops, however, loudly demanded that the one just presented should be accepted and subscribed by all, and charged John of Germanicia with being a Nestorian: --

1 The commissioners. -- "Dioscorus asserts that he condemned Flavianus for having maintained that there are two natures in Christ; in the new doctrinal formula, however, it stands, `Christ is of two natures.'"

2 Anatolius. -- "Dioscorus has been deposed not on account of false doctrine, but because he excommunicated the pope, and did not obey the synod."

The commissioners. -- "The synod has already approved of Leo's letter. As that has been done, then that which is contained in the letter must be confessed."

51. The majority of the council, however, insisted upon adopting the formula already before them. The commissioners informed the emperor of the situation. Immediately the answer came: --

The emperor's message. -- "Either the proposed commission of bishops must be accepted, or the bishops must individually declare their faith through their metropolitans, so that all doubt may be dispelled, and all discord removed. If they will do neither of these things, a synod must be held in the West, since they refuse here to give a definite and stable declaration respecting the faith."

The majority. -- "We abide by the formula, or we go!"

Cecropius of Sebastopol. -- "Whoever will not subscribe it can go [to a Western council]."

The Illyrians. -- "Whoever opposes it is a Nestorian, these can go to Rome!"

The commissioners. -- "Dioscorus has rejected the expression, `There are two natures in Christ, and on the contrary has accepted `of two natures;' Leo on the other hand says, `In Christ there are two natures united:' which will you follow, the most holy Leo, or Dioscorus?"

The whole council. -- "We believe with Leo, not with Dioscorus; whoever opposes this is a Eutychian."

The commissioners. -- "Then you must also receive into the creed, the doctrine of Leo, which has been stated."

0 52. The council now asked for the appointment of the commission which the commissioners had suggested. Among those who were made members of the commission were a number of bishops who had not

only "vehemently supported" the doctrine of Eutyches, but had also actually taken a leading part with Dioscorus in the second Council of Ephesus. The commission met at once in the oratory of the church in which the council was held, and after consulting together not a great while, they returned to the council and presented the following preamble: --

1 "The holy and great Ecumenical Synod, . . . at Chalcedon in Bithynia. . . . has defined as follows: Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, when confirming the faith in his disciples, declared: `Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you,' so that no one might be separated from his neighbor in the doctrines of religion, but that the preaching of the truth should be made known to all alike. As, however, the evil one does not cease by his cares to hinder the seed of religion, and is ever inventing something new in opposition to the truth, therefore has God, in His care

for the human race, stirred up zeal in this pious and orthodox emperor, so that he has convoked the heads of the priesthood in order to remove all the plague of falsehood from the sheep of Christ, and to nourish them with the tender plants of truth. This we have also done in truth, since we have expelled, by our common judgment, the doctrines of error, and have renewed the right faith of the Fathers, have proclaimed the creed of the three hundred and eighteen to all, and have acknowledged the one hundred and fifty of Constantinople who accepted it, as our own. While we now receive the regulations of the earlier Ephesine Synod, under Celestine and Cyril, and its prescriptions concerning the faith, we decree that the confession of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers at Nicaea is a light to the right and unblemished faith, and that that is also valid which was decreed by the one hundred and fifty Fathers at Constantinople for the confirmation of the Catholic and apostolic faith."

53. Here they inserted bodily the creed of the Council of Nice and that of Constantinople; and then the preamble continued as follows: --

"This wise and wholesome symbol of divine grace would indeed suffice for a complete knowledge and confirmation of religion, for it teaches everything with reference to the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, and declares the incarnation of the Lord to those who receive it in faith; as, however, those who would do away with the preaching of the truth devised vain expressions through their own heresies, and, on the one side, dared to destroy the mystery of the incarnation of our Lord and rejected the designation of God-bearer, and, on the other side, introduced a mixture and confusion [of the natures], and, contrary to reason, imagined only one nature of the flesh and of the Godhead, and rashly maintained that the divine nature of the Only-begotten was, by the mixture, become possible, therefore the holy, great, and Ecumenical Synod decrees that the faith of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers shall remain inviolate, and that the doctrine afterward promulgated by the one hundred and fifty Fathers at Constantinople, on account of the Pneumatomachi shall have equal validity, being put forth by them, not in order to add to the creed of Nicaea anything that was lacking, but in order to make known in writing their consciousness concerning the Holy Ghost against the deniers of His glory.

"On account of those, however, who endeavored to destroy the mystery of the incarnation, and who boldly insulted him who was born of the holy Mary, affirmed that he was a mere man, the holy synod has accepted as valid the synodal letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius and to the Orientals in opposition to Nestorianism, and has added to them the letter of the holy archbishop Leo of Rome, written to Flavian for the overthrow of the Eutychian errors, as agreeing with the doctrine of St. Peter and as a pillar against all heretics, for the confirmation of the orthodox dogmas. The synod opposes those who seek to rend the mystery of the incarnation into a duality of sons, and excludes from holy communion those who

venture to declare the Godhead of the Only-begotten as capable of suffering, and opposes those who imagine a mingling and a confusion of the two natures of Christ, and drives away those who foolishly maintain that the servant-form of the Son, assumed from us, is from a heavenly substance, or any other [than ours], and

anathematizes those who fable that before the union there were two natures of our Lord, but after the union only one."

54. Having thus paved the way, they presented for the present occasion, for all people, and for all time, the following creed: --

"Following, accordingly, the holy Fathers, we confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and we all with one voice declare Him to be at the same time perfect in Godhead, and perfect in manhood, very God, and at the same time very man, consisting of a reasonable soul and a body, being consubstantial with the Father as respects His Godhead, and at the same time consubstantial with ourselves as respects his manhood; resembling us in all things, independently of sin; begotten before the ages, of the Father, according to his Godhead, but born, in the last of the days, of Mary, the virgin and mother of God, for our sakes and for our salvation; being one and the same Jesus Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, made known in two natures without confusion, without conversion, without severance, without separation inasmuch as the difference of the natures is in no way annulled by their union, but the peculiar essence of each nature is rather preserved, and conspires in one person and in one subsistence, not as though he were parted or severed into two persons, but is one and the same Son, Only-begotten, Divine Word, Lord Jesus Christ, as the prophets declared concerning him, and Christ himself has fully instructed us, and the symbol of the Fathers has conveyed to us. Since then, these matters have been defined by us with all accuracy and diligence, the holy and universal synod has determined that no one shall be at liberty to put forth another faith, whether in writing, or by framing, or devising, or teaching it to others. And that those who shall presume to frame, or publish, or teach another faith, or to communicate another symbol to those who are disposed to turn to the knowledge of the truth from heathenism, or Judaism, or any other sect -- that they, if they be bishops or clerks, shall suffer deprivation, the bishops of their episcopal, the clerks of their clerical office; and if monks or laics, shall be anathematized."22

55. When the reading of this report of the commission was finished, the council adjourned.

THE SIXTH SESSION, OCTOBER 25.

56. At this session the emperor Marcian and the empress Pulcheria, came with their whole court to ratify the decision which the council in

the previous session had reached concerning the faith. Marcian opened the session in a speech, spoken first in Latin and repeated in Greek, which was as follows:-

"From the beginning of our reign we have had the purity of the faith peculiarly at heart. As now, through the avarice or perversity of some, many have been seduced to error, we summoned the present synod so that all error and all obscurity might be dispelled, that religion might shine forth from the power of its light, and that no one should in future venture further to maintain concerning the incarnation of our Lord and Saviour, anything else than that which the apostolic preaching and the decree, in accordance therewith, of the three hundred and eighteen holy Fathers have handed down to posterity, and which is also testified by the letter of the holy pope Leo of Rome to Flavian. In order to strengthen the faith, but not at all to exercise violence, we have wished, after the example of Constantine, to be personally present at the synod, so that the nations may not be still more widely separated by false opinions. Our efforts were directed to this, that all, becoming one in the true doctrine, may return to the same religion, and honor the true Catholic faith. May God grant this."

57. As soon as he had finished the speech in Latin, --

The bishops unanimously exclaimed. -- "Many years to the emperor many years to the empress; he is the only son of Constantine. Prosperity to Marcian, the new Constantine!"

58. After he had repeated the speech in Greek, the bishops repeated their shouts of adulation. Then the whole declaration, preamble and all, concerning the faith, was read, at the close of which --

The emperor Marcian. -- "Does this formula of the faith express the view of all?"

The six hundred bishops all shouting at once. -- "We all believe thus; there is one faith, one will; we are all unanimous, and have unanimously subscribed; we are all orthodox! This is the faith of the Fathers, the faith of the apostles, the faith of the orthodox; this faith has saved the world. Prosperity to Marcian, the new Constantine, the new Paul, the new David! long years to our sovereign lord David! You are the peace of the world, long life! Your faith will defend you. Thou honorest Christ. He will defend thee. Thou hast established orthodoxy. . . . To the august empress, many years! You are the lights of orthodoxy. . . . .Orthodox from her birth, God will defend her. Defender of the faith, may God defend her. Thou hast persecuted all the heretics. May the evil eye be averted from your empire! Worthy of the faith, worthy of Christ! So are the faithful sovereigns honored. . . . Marcian is the new Constantine, Pulcheria is the new Helena!. . . Your life is the

177

safety of all; your faith is the glory of the churches. By thee the world is at peace; by thee the orthodox faith is established; by thee heresy ceases to be. Long life to the emperor and empress!"23

59. The emperor then "gave thanks to Christ that unity in religion had again been restored, and threatened all, as well private men and soldiers as the clergy, with heavy punishment if they should again stir up controversies respecting the faith," and proposed certain ordinances which were made a part of the canons established in future sessions. As soon as he had ceased speaking, the bishops again shouted, "Thou art priest and emperor together, conqueror in war and teacher of the faith."

60. The council was sitting in the church of St. Euphemia, and Marcian now announced that in honor of St. Euphemia and the council, he bestowed upon the city of Chalcedon the title and dignity of "metropolis;" and in return the bishops all unanimously exclaimed, "This is just; an Easter be over the whole world; the holy Trinity will protect thee. We pray dismiss us."

61. Instead of dismissing them, however, the emperor commanded them to remain "three or four days longer," and to continue the proceedings. The council continued until November 1, during which time ten sessions were held, in which there was much splitting of theological hairs, pronouncing curses, and giving the lie; and an immense amount of hooting and yelling in approval or condemnation. None of it, however, is worthy of any further notice except to say that twenty-eight canons were established, the last of which confirmed to the archbishopric of Constantinople the dignity which had been bestowed by the Council of Constantinople seventy years before, and set at rest all dispute on the matter of jurisdiction by decreeing that in its privileges and ecclesiastical relations it should be exalted to, and hold, the first place after that of Old Rome. Against this, however, Leo's legates protested at the time; and Leo himself, in three letters -- one to Marcian, one to Pulcheria, and one to Anatolius -- denounced it in his own imperious way.

62. Having closed its labors, the council drew up and sent to Leo a

178

memorial beginning with the words of Psalms 126:2, which read in substance as follows: --

"Our mouth was filled with laughter, and our tongue with joy.'

"The reason of this joy is the confirmation of the faith which has been preserved by your Holiness and the blissful contents of which have been translated by you as interpreter of the voice of Peter. You the bishops of

Chalcedon have taken as their guide, in order to show to the sons of the Church the inheritance of the truth. Your letter has been for us a spiritual, imperial banquet, and we believe we have had the heavenly Bridegroom present at it in our midst. As the head over the members, so have you, by your representatives, had the predominance among us. In order that everything might proceed in the most orderly manner, however, the faithful emperors have had the presidency. The wild beast Dioscorus, having in his madness attacked even him who is by the Saviour a keeper of the divine vineyard, and having dared to excommunicate him whose vocation it is to unite the body of the Church, the synod has inflicted meet punishment upon him because he has not repented and appeared in answer to our exhortation. All our other business has been prosperously conducted by God's grace and through St. Euphemia, who has crowned the assembly held in her bridal chamber, and has transmitted its doctrinal decree as her own to her bridegroom Christ by the hand of the emperor and the empress. . . . We have also confirmed the canon of the synod of the one hundred and fifty Fathers, by which the second rank is assigned to the see of Constantinople, immediately after thy holy and apostolic see. We have done it with confidence, because you have so often allowed the apostolic ray which shines by you to appear to the church at Constantinople, and because you are accustomed ungrudgingly to enrich those who belong to you by allowing them participation in your own possessions. Be pleased, therefore, to embrace this decree as though it were thine own, most holy and most blessed father. Thy legates have strongly opposed it, probably because they thought that this good regulation, like the declaration of the faith, should proceed from thyself. But we were of an opinion that it belonged to the Ecumenical Synod to confirm its prerogatives to the imperial city in accordance with the wish of the emperor, assuming that when thou hadst heard it, thou wouldst regard it as thine own act. For all that the sons have done, which is good, conduces to the honor of the Fathers. We pray thee, honor our decree also by thine assent; and as we have assented to thy good decree, so may thy loftiness accomplish that which is meet toward the sons. This will also please the emperors, who have sanctioned thy judgment in the faith as law; and the see of Constantinople may well receive a reward for the zeal with which it united itself with thee in the matter of religion. In order to show that we have done nothing from favor or dislike toward any one, we have brought the whole contents of what we have done to thy knowledge, and have communicated it to thee for confirmation and assent."

63. This was followed up December 18, by two letters to Leo from the emperor and the archbishop of Constantinople, Anatolius, saying that he had constantly done all for the honor of Leo and his legates, and from reverence for the pope, the council and himself had transmitted all to Leo for his approval and confirmation; Marcian expressing his gladness that the true faith had received its expression in accordance with the letter of Leo, and both praying him to approve and confirm the decrees of the council, and especially the canon in reference to the see of Constantinople. Leo steadily denounced that canon, however. But as Anatolius, in a letter, April, 454, acknowledged to Leo: "The whole force and confirmation of the decrees have been reserved for your Holiness:" this was to yield absolutely all to Leo, as far as it was possible for the council and its members to go.

64. February 7, A. D. 452, the emperor Marcian, in the name of himself and Valentinian III, issued the following edict confirming the creed of the council: --

"That which has been so greatly and universally desired is at last accomplished. The controversy respecting orthodoxy is over, and unity of opinion is restored among the nations. The bishops assembled in Chalcedon at my command from various exarchies, have taught with exactness in a doctrinal decree what is to be maintained in respect to religion. All unholy controversy must now cease, as he is certainly impious and sacrilegious who, after the declaration made by so many bishops, thinks that there still remains something for his own judgment to examine. For it is evidently a sign of extreme folly when a man seeks for a deceptive light in broad day. He who, after discovery has been made of the truth, still inquires after something else, seeks for falsehood. No cleric, no soldier, and generally no one, in whatever position he may be, must venture publicly to dispute concerning the faith, seeking to produce confusion, and to find pretexts for false doctrines. For it is an insult to the holy synod to subject that which it has decreed and fundamentally established, to new examinations and public disputes, since that which was recently defined concerning the Christian faith is in accordance with the doctrine of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers and the regulation of the one hundred and fifty Fathers.

The punishment of the transgressors of this law shall not be delayed, since they are not only opponents of the lawfully established faith but also by their contentions betray the holy mysteries to the Jews and heathen. If a cleric ventures openly to dispute respecting religion, he shall be struck out of the catalogue of the clergy, the soldier shall be deprived of his belt, other persons shall be removed from the residence

180

city, and shall have suitable punishments inflicted upon them, according to the pleasure of the courts of justice."

65. The following July 28, he issued a decree in which he forbade the Eutychians to have any clergy; and if anybody should attempt to appoint any, both they who should appoint and he who was appointed, should be punished with confiscation of goods and banishment for life. They were forbidden to hold any assemblies of any kind, or to build or to live in monasteries. If they should presume to hold any kind of meeting, then the place where it was held would be confiscated, if it was with the knowledge of the owner. But if, without the knowledge of the owner it was rented by some one for them, he who rented it should be punished with a beating, with confiscation of goods, and with banishment. They were declared incapable of inheriting anything by will, or of appointing any Eutychian an heir. If any were found in the army, they were to be expelled from it. Those of them who had formerly been in the orthodox faith, and also the monks of the monastery -- he called it the "stable" -- of Eutyches, were to be driven entirely beyond the boundaries of the Roman Empire. All their writings were to be burnt, whoever circulated them was to be banished, and all instruction in the Eutychian doctrine was to be "rigorously punished." And finally, all governors of provinces with their officials, and all judges in the cities who should be negligent in enforcing the law, were to be fined ten pounds of gold, as despisers of religion and the laws. At the same time that this last decree was issued, Eutyches and Dioscorus were sentenced to banishment. Eutyches died before the sentence was enforced, and Dioscorus died in exile at Gangra in Paphlagonia two years afterward.

66. As Leo had published his letters rejecting the canon concerning the see of Constantinople, and had not yet formally published any approval of the doctrinal decree of the council, the report went abroad throughout the East that he had repudiated all the decisions of the council. The report, therefore, was a new incentive to all who disagreed with the creed of the council, and "heresy" became again so prevalent that Feb. 15, A. D. 453, Marcian addressed a letter to Leo, earnestly beseeching him as soon as possible to issue a decree in confirmation of the decision of the Council of Chalcedon, "so that no one might have any further doubt as to the judgment of his Holiness." March 21, Leo responded in the following words: --

181

"I doubt not, brethren, that you all know how willingly I have confirmed the doctrinal decree of the Synod of Chalcedon. You would have been able to learn this not only from the assent of my legates, but also from my letters to Anatolius of Constantinople, if he had brought the answer of the apostolic see to your knowledge. But that no one may doubt my approving of that which was decreed at the Synod of Chalcedon by universal consent in regard to the faith, I have directed this letter to all my brethren and fellow-bishops who were present at the synod named, and the emperor will, at my request, send it to you, so that you may all know that, not merely by my legates, but also by my own confirmation of it, I have agreed with you in what was done at the synod; but only, as must always be repeated, in regard to the subject of the faith, on account of which the general council was assembled at the command of the emperors, in agreement with the apostolic see. But in regard to the regulations of the Fathers of Nicaea, I admonish you that the rights of the individual churches must remain unaltered, as they were there established by the inspired Fathers. No unlawful ambition must covet that which is not its own, and no one must increase by the diminution of others. And that which pride has obtained by enforced assent, and thinks to have confirmed by the name of a council, is invalid, if it is in opposition to the canons of the aforesaid Fathers[of Nicaea]. How reverentially the apostolic see maintains the rules of these Fathers, and that I by God's help shall be a guardian of the Catholic faith and of the ecclesiastical canons, you may see from the letter by which I have resisted the attempts of the bishop of Constantinople."

67. As the necessity for the Council of Chalcedon was created by the will of Leo alone; as the council when assembled was ruled from beginning to end by his legates in his name; as the documents presented in the council were addressed to "Leo, the most holy, blessed, and universal patriarch of the great city of Rome, and to the holy and Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon;" as the council distinctly acknowledged Leo as its head, and the members of the council as members of him; as the judgments were pronounced as his own; as his letter was made the test, and the expression of the faith, and with that all were required to agree; as the decisions of the council were submitted to him for approval, and were practically of little or no force until he had formally published his approval, and then only such portion as he did approve; as, in short, everything in connection with the council sprung from his will and returned in subjection to his will, -- Leo, and in him the bishopric of Rome, thus became essentially the fountain of the Catholic faith.

182

68. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that Leo should officially declare that the doctrinal decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were inspired. This is precisely what he did. In a letter to Bishop Julian of Cos (Epistle 144), he said: "The decrees of Chalcedon are inspired by the Holy Spirit, and are to be received as the definition of the faith for the welfare of the whole world." And in a letter (Epistle 145) to the emperor Leo, who succeeded Marcian in A. D. 457, he said: "The Synod of Chalcedon was held by divine inspiration." As therefore, the doctrinal decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were the expression of the will of Leo; and as these decrees were published and held as of divine inspiration; by this turn, it was a very short cut to the infallibility of the bishop of Rome.

69. Now let the reader turn to pages 145, 183, and 185, and compare the Italicized words in the statement of Eutyches, in the statement of the commissioners in the council, and in the creed of Chalcedon. It will be seen that Leo and the council came so near to saying what Eutyches had said, that no difference can be perceived. Eutyches had been condemned as a heretic for saying that in Christ, after the incarnation, the two natures are one. Now Leo and the council express the orthodox faith by saying that in Christ there are two natures united in one. In other words, Eutyches was a condemned heretic for saying that Christ is "of two natures;" while Leo and the council were declared everlastingly orthodox for saying that Christ is "in two natures." In Greek, the difference was expressed in the two small words, ek and en; which like the two large words, Homoousion and Homoiousion, in the beginning of the controversy between Alexander and Arius, differed only in a single letter. And like that also, the meaning of the two words is so "essentially the same," that he who believes either, believes the other. "Such was the device of the envious and God-hating demon in the change of a single letter, that, while in reality the one expression was completely inductive of the notion of the other, still with the generality the discrepancy between them was held to be considerable, and the ideas conveyed by them to be clearly in diametric opposition, and exclusive of each other; whereas he who confesses Christ in two natures, clearly affirms him to be from two, . . . and on the other hand, the position of one who affirms his origin from two natures, is completely inclusive of his

183

existence in two. . . So that in this case by the expression, `from two natures,' is aptly suggested the thought of the expression, in two,' and conversely; nor can there be a severance of the terms." -- Evagrius.24

70. And that is all that there was in this dispute,or in any of those before it, in itself. Yet out there came constant and universal violence, hypocrisy, bloodshed, and murder, which speedily wrought the utter ruin of the empire, and established a despotism over thought which remained supreme for ages, and which is yet asserted and far too largely assented to.

71. The whole world having been thus once more brought to the "unity of the faith," the controversy, the confusion, and the violence, went on worse than before. But as the faith of Leo which was established by the Council of Chalcedon, "substantially completes the orthodox Christology of the ancient Church," and has "passed into all the confessions of the Protestant churches"(Schaff25; and as the work of these four general

councils -- Nice, Constantinople, first of Ephesus, and Chalcedon -- was to put dead human formulas in the place of the living oracles of God; a woman in the place of Christ; and MAN IN THE PLACE OF GOD; it is not necessary to follow any farther that particular course of ambitious strife and theological contention.

---

1 [Page 155] "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iv, par. 2.

2 [Page 156] Id., book i, chap. ii, par. 1.

3 [Page 156] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. xii, par. 6.

4 [Page 157] "History of the Popes," Siricius, par. 21.

5 [Page 158] Id., "Innocent," par. 8 from end.

6 [Page 158] "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. 1, par. 8.

7 [Page 159] "History of the Popes," Celestine, par. 15.

8 [Page 159] Milman, "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iv, par. 2.

9 [Page 160] Id., par. 16; and Bower, "History of the Popes," Leo. par. 8.

10 [Page 160] "History of the Popes," Leo, par. 35.

11 [Page 161] "History of the Popes," Leo, par. 40.

12 [Page 162] Id.

13 [Page 163] Bower's "History of the Popes," Leo, par, 43.

14 [Page 163] Evagrius's "Ecclesiastical History," book ii, chap. iv.

15 [Page 163] "History of the Church Councils," sec, clxxxix, par. 4. This is the Theodoret who wrote an ecclesiastical history.

16 [Page 164] Quoted by Stanley," History of the Eastern Church," lecture ii, par. 8 from end.

17 [Page 165] Hefele, "History of the Church Councils," sec. clxxxix, par. 4.

18 [Page 165] "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iv. par. 38.

19 [Page 165] History of the Popes," Leo, par. 45.

20 [Page 166] Hefele's History of the Church Councils," sec. clxxxiii, last three paragraphs. Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap. iv. par. 38. In the rest of this chapter. Hefele's "History of the Church Councils" is followed so closely and so fully that particular references are not cited. The only references directly credited are to passages not derived from Hefele's account. In following Hefele, however, the uniformity of the narrative is maintained by turning indirect quotations into direct, so as to preserve as far as possible the personality of the speakers.

21 [Page 169] Bower, "History of the Popes,"Leo, par. 40.

22 [Page 175] Evagrius's "Ecclesiastical History," book ii, chap. iv, par. 4.

23 [Page 177] Quoted by Stanley, "History of the Eastern Church," lecture ii, par. 4.

24 [Page 183] "Ecclesiastical History," book ii, chap. v; Hefele's "History of the Church Councils," sec. cxciii par. 5, note; Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," vol. iii, sec. cxl, par. 9, note 2; sec. cxli, par. 12, note 4.

25 [Page 183] "History of the Christian Church," Vol. iii, sec. cxlii, pars, 1, 2.

12. THE PAPAL TEMPORAL POWER ESTABLISHED.

We have seen how that, by the arrogant ministry of Leo, the bishop of Rome was made the fountain of faith, and was elevated to a position of dignity and authority that the aspiring prelacy had never before attained. For Leo, as the typical pope, was one whose "ambition knew no bounds; and to gratify it, he stuck at nothing; made no distinction between right and wrong, between truth and falsehood; as if he had adopted the famous maxim of Julius Caesar, --

"Be just, unless a kingdom tempts to break the laws,
For sovereign power alone can justify the cause,'

or thought the most criminal actions ceased to be criminal and became meritorious, when any ways subservient to the increase of his power or the exhaltation of his see." -- Bower.1

2. Nor was the force of any single point of his example ever lost upon his successors. His immediate successor, --

HILARY, 461-467,

was so glad to occupy the place which had been made so large by Leo, that shortly after his election he wrote a letter to the other bishops asking them to exult with him, taking particular care in the letter to tell them that he did not doubt that they all knew what respect and deference was paid "in the Spirit of God to St. Peter and his see." The bishops of Spain addressed him as "the successor of St. Peter, whose primacy ought to be loved and feared by all."

3. Hilary was succeeded by --

SIMPLICIUS. 467-483.

in whose pontificate the empire perished when the Heruli, under Odoacer, overran all Italy, deposed the last emperor of the West, appropriated to themselves one third of all the lands, and established the Herulian

kingdom, with Odoacer as king of Italy. In fact, the more the imperial power faded, and the nearer the empire approached its fall, the more rapidly and the stronger grew the papal assumptions. Thus the very calamities which rapidly wrought the ruin of the empire, and which were hastened by the union of Church and State, were turned to the advantage of the bishopric of Rome. During the whole period of barbarian invasions from 400 to

476, the Catholic hierarchy everywhere adapted itself to the situation, and reaped power and influence from the calamities that were visited everywhere.

4. We have seen that Innocent I, upon whose mind there appears first to have dawned the vast conception of Rome's universal ecclesiastical supremacy, during the invasion of Italy and the siege of Rome by Alaric, headed an embassy to the emperor to mediate for a treaty of peace between the empire and the invading Goths. We have seen that at the moment of Leo's election to the papal see, he was absent on a like mission to reconcile the enmity of the two principal Roman officers, which was threatening the safety of the empire. Yet other and far more important occasions of the same kind fell to the lot of Leo during the term of his bishopric. In 453 Leo was made the head of an embassy to meet Attila as he was on his way to Rome, if possible to turn him back. The embassy was successful; a treaty was formed; Attila retired beyond the Danube, where he immediately died; and Italy was delivered. This redounded no less to the glory of Leo than any of the other remarkable things which he had accomplished. He was not so successful with Genseric two years afterward, yet even then he succeeded in mitigating the ravages of the Vandals, which were usually so dreadful.

5. Moreover, it was not against religion, as such, that the barbarians made war: as they themselves were religious. It was against that mighty empire of which they had seen much, and suffered much, and heard more, that they warred. It was as nations taking vengeance upon a nation which had been so great, and which had so proudly asserted lordship over all other nations, that they invaded the Roman Empire. And when they could plant themselves and remain, as absolute lords, in the dominions of those who had boasted of absolute and eternal dominion, and thus humble the pride of the mighty Rome, this was their supreme gratification.

6. As these invasions were not inflicted everywhere at once, but at intervals through a period of seventy-five years, the Church had ample time to adapt herself to the ways of such of the barbarians as were heathen, which, as ever, she readily did. The heathen barbarians were accustomed to pay the greatest respect to their own priesthood, and were willing to admit the Catholic priesthood to an equal or even a larger place in their estimation. Such of them as were already professedly Christian, were Arians, and not so savage as the Catholics; therefore, they, with the exception of the Vandals, were not so ready to persecute, and were willing to settle and make themselves homes in the territories of the vanished empire.

7. At the fall of the empire, the bishopric of Rome was the head and center of a strong and compactly organized power. And by deftly insinuating itself into the place of mediator between the barbarian invaders and the perishing imperial authority, it had attained a position where it was recognized by the invaders as the power which, though it claimed to be not temporal but spiritual was none the less real, had succeeded to the place of the vanished imperial authority of Rome. And in view of the history of the time, it is impossible to escape the conviction that in the bishopric of Rome there was at this time formed the determination to plant itself in the temporal dominion of Rome and Italy. So long had the emperors been absent from Rome, that the bishop of Rome had assumed their place there; and we have seen how the Church had usurped the place of the civil authority. The bishop of Rome was the head of the Church; and now, as the empire was perishing, he would exalt his throne upon its ruins, and out of the anarchy of the times would secure a place and a name among the powers and dominions of the earth.

8. The barbarians who took possession of Italy were Arians, which in the sight of the bishop of Rome was worse than all other crimes put together. In addition to this, the Herulian monarch, Odoacer, an Arian, presumed to assert civil authority over the papacy, which, on account of the riotous proceedings in the election of the pope, was necessary, but would not meekly be borne by the proud pontiffs. At the election of the first pope after the fall of the empire, the representative of Odoacer appeared and notified the assembly that without

his direction nothing ought to be done; that all they had done was null and void; that the election must begin anew; and "that it belonged to the civil magistrate to prevent the disturbances that might arise on such occasions, lest from the Church they should pass to the State." And as these elections were carried not only by violence, but by bribery, in which the property of the Church played an important part, Odoacer, by his lieutenant at this same assembly, A. D. 483, "caused a law to be read, forbidding the bishop who should now be chosen, as well as his successors, to alienate any inheritance, possessions, or sacred utensils that now belonged, or should for the future, belong, to the Church; declaring all such bargains void, anathematizing both the seller and the buyer, and obliging the latter and his heirs to restore to the Church all lands and tenements thus purchased, how long soever they might have possessed them." -- Bower.2

9. By the law of Constantine which bestowed upon the Church the privilege of receiving donations, legacies, etc., by will, lands were included; and through nearly two hundred years of the working of this law, the Church of Rome had become enormously enriched in landed estates. And more especially "since the extinction of the Western Empire had emancipated the ecclesiastical potentate from secular control, the first and most abiding object of his schemes and prayers had been the acquisition of territorial wealth in the neighborhood of his capital." -- Bryce.3

10. The Church of Rome had also other lands, scattered in different parts of Italy, and even in Asia, for Celestine I addressed to Theodosius II a request that he extend his imperial protection over certain estates in Asia, which a woman named Proba had bequeathed to the Church of Rome. As the imperial power faded away in the West, the bishop of Rome, in his growing power, came more and more to assert his own power of protection over his lands in Italy. And when the imperial power was entirely gone, it was naturally held that this power fell absolutely to him. When, therefore, Odoacer, both a barbarian invader and a heretic, issued a decree forbidding the alienation of Church lands and possessions, this was represented as a presumptuous invasion of the

rights of the bishop of Rome, not only to do what he would with his own, but above all as protector of the property and estates of the Church.

11. For this offense of Odoacer, there was no forgiveness by the bishop of Rome. Nothing short of the utter uprooting of the Herulian power could atone for it. The Catholic ecclesiastics of Italy began to plot for his overthrow, and it was soon accomplished. There were at that time in the dominions of the Eastern Empire, unsettled and wandering about with no certain dwelling place, the people of the Ostrogoths under King Theodoric. Although in the service of the empire, they were dissatisfied with their lot; and they were so savage and so powerful that the emperor was in constant dread of them. Why might not this force be employed to destroy the dominion of the Heruli, and deliver Rome from the interferences and oppression of Odoacer? The suggestion was made to Theodoric by the court, but as he was in the service of the empire, it was necessary that he should have permission to undertake the expedition. He accordingly addressed the emperor as follows: --

"Although your servant is maintained in affluence by your liberality, graciously listen to the wishes of my heart. Italy, the inheritance of your predecessors, and Rome itself, the head and mistress of the world, now fluctuates under the violence and oppression of Odoacer the mercenary. Direct me, with my national troops, to march against the tyrant. If I fall, you will be relieved from an expensive and troublesome friend: if, with the divine permission, I succeed, I shall govern in your name, and to your glory, the Roman Senate, and the part of the republic delivered from slavery by my victorious army."4

12. Zeno, who was at this time emperor, had already "stirred up against Odoacer the nation of the Rugians;" and thus "it is important to note that already in the year 486 the friendly relations between Odoacer and Zeno had been replaced by scarcely veiled enmity; and thus the mind of the emperor was already tuned to harmony with that fierce harangue against the `usurped authority of a king of Rugians and Turcilingians' which,

according to Jordanes, Theodoric delivered before him some time in the year 488." -- Hodgkin.5 The proposition which had been suggested was gladly accepted by the emperor Zeno; Theodoric

189

"received a commission to invade Italy," and in the winter of 489,
the whole nation of the Ostrogoths took up its march of seven hundred miles to Italy. "The march of Theodoric must be considered as the emigration of an entire people: the wives and children of the Goths, their aged parents, and most precious effects, were carefully transported; . . . and at length surmounting every obstacle by skillful conduct and persevering courage, he descended from the Julian Alps, and displayed his invincible banners on the confines of Italy." -- Gibbon.6

13. Theodoric defeated Odoacer in three engagements, A. D. 489-490, and "from the Alps to the extremity of Calabria, Theodoric reigned by right of conquest." Odoacer shut himself up in Ravenna, where he sustained himself against a close siege for three years. By the offices of the archbishop of Ravenna, and the clamors of the hungry people, Odoacer was brought a to sign a treaty of peace: the archbishop himself "acting as mediator." Before Theodoric entered the surrendered city, by a "prearranged" plan "the archbishop went forth to meet him, `with crosses and thuribles and the holy Gospels' and with a long train of priests and monks. Falling prostrate on the ground, while his followers sang a penitential psalm, he prayed that `the new king from the East' would receive him in peace. The request was granted, not only for himself and the citizens of Ravenna, but for all the Roman inhabitants of Italy . . . . A ceremony like this, prearranged in all probability between the king and the archbishop, was judged proper, in order to impress vividly on the minds both of Italians and Ostrogoths that Theodoric came as the friend of the Catholic Church and of the vast population which, even in accepting a new master, still clung to the great name of Roman." Soon afterward at a solemn banquet, Odoacer was slain by the hand of Theodoric himself; and "at the same moment, and without resistance," his people "were universally massacred," March 5, 493: "a kind of `Sicilian Vespers of the followers of Odoacer all over Italy; and, from the sanctimonious manner in which the bishop [Ennodius, Theodoric's panegyrist] claims Heaven as an accomplice in the bloody deed, we may perhaps infer that the Roman clergy generally were privy to the plot." -- Hodgkin.7

190

14. Thus was destroyed, "plucked up by the roots," the kingdom of Odoacer and the Heruli. And that it was in no small degree the work of the Catholic Church is certain from the further fact that "throughout the conquest and establishment of the Gothic kingdom, the increasing power and importance of the Catholic ecclesiastics, forces itself upon the attention. They are ambassadors, mediators in treaties; [they] decide the wavering loyalty or instigate the revolt of cities." -- Milman.8 The bishop of Pavia bore to Theodoric at Milan the surrender and offer of allegiance of that great city.

15. Another thing which makes this view most certainly true, is the fact that no sooner was order restored in Italy and in Rome, and the Church once more felt itself secure, than a council of eighty bishops, thirty-seven presbyters, and four deacons, was called in Rome by the pope, A. D. 499, the very first act of which was to repeal the law enacted by Odoacer on the subject of the Church possessions. Nor was the law repealed in order to get rid of it; for it was immediately re-enacted by the same council. This was plainly to declare that the estates of the Church were no longer subject in any way to the authority of the civil power, but were to be held under the jurisdiction of the Church alone. In fact, it was tantamount to a declaration of the independence of the papacy and her possessions.

16. This transaction also conclusively proves that the resentment of the bishopric of Rome, which had been aroused by the law of Odoacer, was never allayed until Odoacer and the law, so far as it represented the authority of the civil power, were both out of the way. And this is the secret of the destruction of the Herulian kingdom of Italy.

17. It is no argument against this to say that the Ostrogoths were Arians too. Because (1) as we shall presently see, Theodoric, though an Arian, did not interfere with Church affairs; and (2) the Church of Rome, in destroying one opponent never hesitates at the prospect that it is to be done by another; nor that another will arise in the place of the one destroyed. Upon the principle that it is better to have one enemy than two, she will use one to destroy another, and will never miss an opportunity to destroy one for fear that another will arise in its place.

18. Theodoric ruled Italy thirty-eight years, A. D. 493-526, during

which time Italy enjoyed such peace and quietness and absolute security as had never been known there before, and has never been known since until 1870: an "emphatic contrast to the century of creeping paralysis which preceded, and to the ghastly cycle of wars and barbarous revenges which followed that peaceful time." -- Hodgkin.9 The people of his own nation numbered two hundred thousand men, which with the proportionate number of women and children, formed a population of nearly one million. His troops, formerly so wild and given to plunder, were restored to such discipline that in a battle in Dacia, in which they were completely victorious, "the rich spoils of the enemy lay untouched at their feet," because their leader had given no signal of pillage. When such discipline prevailed in the excitement of a victory and in an enemy's country, it is easy to understand the peaceful order that prevailed in their own new-gotten lands which the Herulians had held before them.

19. During the ages of violence and revolution which had passed, large tracts of land in Italy had become utterly desolate and uncultivated; almost the whole of the rest was under imperfect culture; but now "agriculture revived under the shadow of peace, and the number of husbandmen multiplied by the redemption of captives;" and Italy, which had so long been fed from other countries, now actually began to export grain. Civil order was so thoroughly maintained that "the city gates were never shut either by day or by night, and the common saying that a purse of gold might be safely left in the fields, was expressive of the conscious security of the inhabitants." -- Gibbon.10 Merchants and other lovers of the blessings of peace thronged from all parts. This they could easily do, because his protective power reached even the Burgundians, the Visigoths, and the Alemanni; for "the Gothic sovereignty was established from Sicily to the Danube, from Sirmium or Belgrade to the Atlantic Ocean; and the Greeks themselves have acknowledged that Theodoric reigned over the fairest portion of the Western Empire."11

20. But not alone did civil peace reign. Above all, there was perfect freedom in the exercise of religion. In fact, the measure of civil liberty

and peace always depends upon that of religious liberty. Theodoric and his people were Arians, yet at the close of a fifty-years' rule of Italy, the Ostrogoths could safely challenge their enemies to present a single authentic case in which they had ever persecuted the Catholics. Even the mother of Theodoric and some of his favorite Goths had embraced the Catholic faith with perfect freedom from any molestation whatever. The separation between Church and State, between civil and religious powers, was clear and distinct. Church property was protected in common with other property, while at the same time it was taxed in common with all other property. The clergy were protected in common with all other people, and they were likewise, in common with all other people, cited before the civil courts to answer for all civil offenses. In all ecclesiastical matters they were left entirely to themselves. Even the papal elections Theodoric left entirely to themselves, and though often solicited by both parties to interfere, he refused to have anything at all to do with them, except to keep the peace, which in fact was of itself no small task. He declined even to confirm the papal elections, an office which had been exercised by Odoacer.

21. Nor was this merely a matter of toleration; it was in genuine recognition of the rights of conscience. In a letter to the emperor Justin, A. D. 524, Theodoric announced the genuine principle of the rights of conscience, and the relationship that should exist between religion and the State, in the following words, worthy to be graven in letters of gold: --

"To pretend to a dominion over the conscience, is to usurp the prerogative of God. By the nature of things, the power of sovereigns is confined to political government. They have no right of punishment but over those who disturb the public peace. The most dangerous heresy is that of a sovereign who separates himself from part of his subjects, because they believe not according to his belief."12

22. Similar pleas had before been made by the parties oppressed, but never before had the principle been announced by the party in power. The enunciation and defense of a principle by the party who holds the power to violate it, is the surest pledge that the principle is held in genuine sincerity.

23. The description of the state of peace and quietness in Italy above

193

given, applies to Italy, but not to Rome; to the dominions of Theodoric and the Ostrogoths, but not to the city of the pope and the Catholics. In A. D. 499, there was a papal election. As there were as usual rival candidates -- Symmachus and Laurentius -- there was a civil war. "The two factions encountered with the fiercest hostility; the clergy, the Senate, and the populace were divided;" the streets of the city "ran with blood, as in the days of republican strife." -- Milman.13

24. The contestants were so evenly matched, and the violent strife continued so long, that the leading men of both parties persuaded the candidates to go to Theodoric at Ravenna, and submit to his judgment their claims. Theodoric's love of justice and of the rights of the people, readily and simply enough decided that the candidate who had the most votes should be counted elected; and if the votes were evenly divided, then the candidate who had been first ordained. Symmachus secured the office. A council was held by Symmachus, which met the first of March, 499, and passed a decree "almost in the terms of the old Roman law, severely condemning all ecclesiastical ambition, all canvassing either to obtain subscriptions, or administration of oaths, or promises, for the papacy" during the lifetime of a pope. But such election methods as these were now so prevalent that this law was of as little value in controlling the methods of the aspiring candidates for the bishopric, as in the days of the republic the same kind of laws were for the candidates to the consulship.

25. Laurentius, though defeated at this time, did not discontinue his efforts to obtain the office. For four years he watched for opportunities, and carried on an intrigue to displace Symmachus, and in 503 brought a series of heavy charges against him. "The accusation was brought before the judgment-seat of Theodoric, supported by certain Roman females of rank, who had been suborned, it was said, by the enemies of Symmachus. Symmachus was summoned to Ravenna and confined at Rimini," but escaped and returned to Rome. Meantime, Laurentius had entered the city, and when Symmachus returned, "the sanguinary tumults between the two parties broke out with greater fury;" priests were slain, monasteries set on fire, and nuns treated with the utmost indignity.

194

26. The Senate petitioned Theodoric to send a visitor to judge the cause of Symmachus in the crimes laid against him. The king finding that the matter was only a Church quarrel, appointed one of their own number, the bishop of Altimo, who so clearly favored Laurentius that his partisanship only made the contention worse. Again Theodoric was petitioned to interfere, but he declined to assume any jurisdiction, and told them to settle it among themselves; but as there was so much disturbance of the peace, and it was so long continued, Theodoric commanded them to reach some sort of settlement that would stop their fighting, and restore public order. A council was therefore called. As Symmachus was on his way to the council, "he was attacked by the adverse

party; showers of stones fell around him; many presbyters and others of his followers were severely wounded; the pontiff himself only escaped under the protection of the Gothic guard" (Milman14), and took refuge in the church of St. Peter. The danger to which he was then exposed he made an excuse for not appearing at the council.

27. The most of the council were favorable to Symmachus and to the pretensions of the bishop of Rome at this time, and therefore were glad of any excuse that would relieve them from judging him. However, they went through the form of summoning him three times; all of which he declined. Then the council sent deputies to state to Theodoric the condition of affairs, "saying to him that the authority of the king might compel Symmachus to appear, but that the council had not such authority." Theodoric replied: "That is your affair, not mine. Had it been my business, I and my good chiefs would have settled it long ago."15 Further "with respect to the cause of Symmachus, he had assembled them to judge him, but yet left them at full liberty to judge him or not, providing they could by any other means put a stop to the present calamities, and restore the wished-for tranquillity to the city of Rome."

28. The majority of the council declared Symmachus "absolved in the sight of men, whether guilty or innocent in the sight of God," for the reason that "no assembly of bishops has power to judge the pope; he is accountable for his actions to God alone." -- Bower.16 They then

commanded all, under penalty of excommunication, to accept this judgment, and submit to the authority of Symmachus, and acknowledge him "for lawful bishop of the holy city of Rome." Symmachus was not slow to assert all the merit that the council had thus recognized in the bishop of Rome. He wrote to the emperor of the East that "a bishop is as much above an emperor as heavenly things, which the bishop administers and dispenses, are above all the trash of the earth, which alone the greatest among the emperors have the power to dispose of." -- Bower.17 He declared that the higher powers referred to in Rom. 13:1, mean the spiritual powers, and that to these it is that every soul must be subject.

29. At another council held in Rome in 504, at the direction of Symmachus, a decree was enacted "anathematizing and excluding from the communion of the faithful, all who had seized or in the future should seize, hold, or appropriate to themselves, the goods or estates of the Church; and this decree was declared to extend even to those who held such estates by grants from the crown." -- Bower.18 This was explicitly to put the authority of the Church of Rome above that of any State.

30. Justin was emperor of the East A. D. 518-527. He was violently orthodox, and was supported by his nephew, the more violently orthodox Justinian. It was the ambition of both, together and in succession, to make the Catholic religion alone prevalent everywhere. They therefore entered with genuine Catholic zeal upon the pious work of clearing their dominions of heretics. The first edict, issued in 523, commanded all Manichaeans to leave the empire under penalty of death; and all other heretics were to be ranked with pagans and Jews, and excluded from all public offices. This edict was no sooner learned of in the West, than mutterings were heard in Rome, of hopes of liberty from the "Gothic yoke." The next step was violence.

31. Under the just administration of Theodoric, and the safety assured by the Gothic power, many Jews had established themselves in Rome, Genoa, Milan, and other cities, for the purposes of trade. They were permitted by express laws to dwell there. As soon as the imperial edict was known, which commanded all remaining heretics to be ranked as pagans and Jews, as the Catholics did not dare to attack

the Gothic heretics, they, at Rome and Ravenna especially, riotously attacked the Jews, abused them, robbed them, and burnt their synagogues. A legal investigation was attempted, but the leaders in the riots could not be discovered. Then Theodoric levied a tax upon the whole community of the guilty cities, with which to settle the

damages. Some of the Catholics refused to pay the tax. They were punished. This at once brought a cry from the Catholics everywhere, that they were persecuted. Those who had been punished were glorified as confessors of the faith, and "three hundred pulpits deplored the persecution of the Church." -- Gibbon.19

32. The edict of 523 was followed in 524 by another, this time commanding the Arians of the East to deliver up to the Catholic bishops all their churches, which the Catholic bishops were commanded to consecrate anew. Theodoric addressed an earnest letter to Justin, in which he pleaded for toleration for the Arians from the Eastern Empire. This was the letter in which was stated the principle of the rights of conscience, which we have already quoted on page 192. To this noble plea, however, "Justin coolly answered: --

"I pretend to no authority over men's consciences, but it is my prerogative to intrust the public offices to those in whom I have confidence; and public order demanding uniformity of worship, I have full right to command the churches to be open to those alone who shall conform to the religion of the State."20

33. Accordingly, while pretending to no authority over men's consciences, the Arians of his dominions were by Justin "stripped of all offices of honor or emolument, were not only expelled from the Catholic churches, but their own were closed against them; and they were exposed to all insults, vexations, and persecutions of their adversaries, who were not likely to enjoy their triumph with moderation, or to repress their conscientiously intolerant zeal." -- Milman.21 Many of them conformed to the State religion; but those of firm faith sent to Theodoric earnest appeals for protection.

34. Theodoric did all that he could, but without avail. He was

urged to retaliate by persecuting the Catholics in Italy, but he steadfastly refused. He determined to send an embassy to Justin, and most singularly sent the pope as his ambassador! "No two pieces on the political chessboard ought, for the safety of his kingdom, to have been kept farther apart from one another than the pope and the emperor: and now, by his own act, he brings these pieces close together." -- Hodgkin.22 "The pope, attended by five other bishops and four senators, set forth on a mission of which it was the ostensible object to obtain indulgence for heretics -- heretics under the ban of his Church -- heretics looked upon with the most profound detestation." -- Milman.23 This arrangement gave to the bishop of Rome the most perfect opportunity he could have asked, to form a compact with the imperial authority of the East, for the further destruction of the Ostrogothic kingdom.

35. The pope, John I, "was received in Constantinople with the most flattering honors, as though he had been St. Peter himself. The whole city, with the emperor at its head, came forth to meet him with tapers and torches, as far as ten miles beyond the gates. The emperor knelt at his feet, and implored his benediction. On Easter day, March 30, 525, he performed the service in the great church, Epiphanius, the bishop, ceding the first place to the holy stranger."24 Such an embassy could have no other result than more than ever to endanger the kingdom of Theodoric. Before John's return, the conspiracy became more manifest; some senators and leading men were arrested. One of them, Boethius, though denying his guilt, boldly confessed, "Had there been any hopes of liberty, I should have freely indulged them; had I known of a conspiracy against the king, I should have answered in the words of a noble Roman to the frantic Caligula, You would not have known it from me."25 Such a confession as that was almost a confession of the guilt which he denied. He and his father-in-law were executed. When the pope returned, he was received as a traitor, and put in prison, where he died, May 18, 526.

36. He was no sooner dead than violent commotion and disturbances again arose amongst rival candidates for the vacant chair. "Many candidates appeared for the vacant see, and the whole city, the Senate

as well as the people and clergy, were divided into parties and factions, the papal dignity being now as eagerly sought for, and often obtained by the same methods and arts as the consular was in the times of the heathen." -- Bower.26 Theodoric, now seventy-four years old, fearing that these contentions would end in murder and bloodshed again, as they had at the election of Symmachus, suffered his authority to transcend his principles, and presumed, himself, to name a bishop of Rome. The whole people of the city, Senate, clergy, and all, united in opposition. But a compromise was effected, by which it was agreed that in future the election of the pope should be by the clergy and people, but must be confirmed by the sovereign. Upon this understanding, the people accepted Theodoric's nominee; and July 12, 526, Felix III was installed in the papal office.

37. The noble Theodoric died Aug. 30, 526, and was succeeded by his grandson Athalaric, about ten years old, under the regency of his mother Amalasontha. Justin died, and was succeeded by --

JUSTINIAN, AUG. 1, 527, TO NOV. 14, 565.

38. In the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Empire, Justinian holds the like place that Constantine and Theodosius occupy in the establishment of the Catholic Church. "Among the titles of greatness, the name `Pious' was most pleasing to his ears; to promote the temporal and spiritual interests of the Church was the serious business of his life; and the duty of father of his country was often sacrificed to that of defender of the faith." -- Gibbon.27 "The emperor Justinian unites in himself the most opposite vices, -- insatiable rapacity and lavish prodigality, intense pride and contemptible weakness, unmeasured ambition and dastardly cowardice. . . . In the Christian emperor, seem to meet the crimes of those who won or secured their empire by assassination of all whom they feared, the passion for public diversions, without the accomplishments of Nero or the brute strength of Commodus, the dotage of Claudius." -- Milman.28

39. Pope Felix was succeeded by Boniface II, A. D. 530-532, who was chosen amidst the now customary scenes of disturbance and strife,

which in this case were brought to an end, and the election of Boniface secured, by the death of his rival, who after his death was excommunicated by Boniface. On account of the shameful briberies and other methods of competition employed in the election of the popes, the Roman Senate now enacted a law "declaring null and execrable all promises, bargains, and contracts, by whomsoever or for whomsoever made, with a view to engage suffrages in the election of the pope; and excluding forever from having any share in the election, such as should be found to have been directly or indirectly concerned either for themselves or others, in contracts or bargains of that nature." -- Bower.29

40. Laws of the same import had already been enacted more than once, but they amounted to nothing; because, as in the days of Caesar, everybody was ready to bribe or be bribed. Accordingly, at the very next election, in 532, "Votes were publicly bought and sold; and notwithstanding the decree lately issued by the Senate, money was offered to the senators themselves, nay, the lands of the Church were mortgaged by some, and the sacred utensils pawned by others or publicly sold for ready money."30 As the result of seventy-five days of this kind of work, a certain John Mercurius was made pope, and took the title of John II, Dec. 31, 532.

41. In the year 532, Justinian issued an edict declaring his intention "to unite all men in one faith." Whether they were Jews, Gentiles, or Christians, all who did not within three months profess and embrace the Catholic faith, were by the edict "declared infamous, and as such excluded from all employments both civil and military; rendered incapable of leaving anything by will; and all their estates confiscated, whether real or personal." As a result of this cruel edict, "Great numbers were driven from their habitations with their wives and children, stripped and naked. Others betook themselves to flight, carrying with them what they could conceal, for their support and maintenance; but they were plundered of what little they had, and many of them inhumanly massacred." -- Bower.31

42. There now occurred a transaction which meant much in the supremacy of the papacy. It was brought about in this way: Ever since

the Council of Chalcedon had "settled" the question of the two natures in Christ, there had been more, and more violent, contentions over it than ever before; "for everywhere monks were at the head of the religious revolution which threw off the yoke of the Council of Chalcedon." In Jerusalem a certain Theodosius was at the head of the army of monks, who made him bishop, and in acts of violence, pillage, and murder, he fairly outdid the perfectly lawless bandits of the country. "The very scenes of the Saviour's mercies ran with blood shed in His name by his ferocious self-called disciples." -- Milman.32

43. In Alexandria, "the bishop was not only murdered in the baptistery, but his body was treated with shameless indignities, and other enormities were perpetrated which might have appalled a cannibal." And the monkish horde then elected as bishop one of their own number, Timothy the Weasel, a disciple of Dioscorus. -- Milman.33

44. Soon there was added to all this another point which increased the fearful warfare. In the Catholic churches it was customary to sing what was called the Trisagion, or Thrice-Holy. It was, originally, the "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts" of Isa. 6:3; but at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, it had been changed, and was used by the council thus: "Holy God, Holy Almighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us." At Antioch, in 477, a third monk, Peter the Fuller, "led a procession, chiefly of monastics, through the streets," loudly singing the Thrice-Holy, with the addition, "Who wast crucified for us." It was orthodox to sing it as the Council of Chalcedon had used it, with the understanding that the three "Holies" referred respectively to the three persons of the Trinity. It was heresy to sing it with the later addition.

45. In A. D. 511, two hordes of monks on the two sides of the question met in Constantinople. "The two black-cowled armies watched each other for several months, working in secret on their respective partisans. At length they came to a rupture. . . . The Monophysite monks in the church of the Archangel within the palace, broke out after the `Thrice-Holy' with the burden added at Antioch by Peter the

Fuller, `who wast crucified for us.' The orthodox monks, backed by the rabble of Constantinople, endeavored to expel them from the church; they were not content with hurling curses against each other, sticks and stones began their work. There was a wild, fierce fray; the divine presence of the emperor lost its awe; he could not maintain the peace. The bishop Macedonius either took the lead, or was compelled to lead the tumult. Men, women, and children poured out from all quarters; the monks with their archimandrites at the head of the raging multitude, echoed back their religious war cry." -- Milman.34

46. These are but samples of the repeated -- it might almost be said the continuous -- occurrences in the cities of the East. "Throughout Asiatic Christendom it was the same wild struggle. Bishops deposed quietly; or where resistance was made, the two factions fighting in the streets, in the churches: cities, even the holiest places, ran with blood. . . . The hymn of the angels in heaven was the battle cry on earth, the signal of human bloodshed."35

47. In A. D. 512 one of these Trisagion riots broke out in Constantinople, because the emperor proposed to use the added clause. "Many palaces of the nobles were set on fire, the officers of the crown insulted, pillage, conflagration, violence, raged through the city." In the house of the favorite minister of the emperor there was found a monk from the country. He was accused of having suggested the use of the addition. His head was cut off and raised high on a pole, and the whole orthodox populace marched through the streets singing the orthodox Trisagion, and shouting, "Behold the enemy of the Trinity!"36

48. In A. D. 519, another dispute was raised, growing out of the addition to the Trisagion. That was, "Did one of the Trinity suffer in the flesh? or did one person of the Trinity suffer in the flesh?" The monks of Scythia affirmed that "one of the Trinity" suffered in the flesh, and declared that to say that "one person of the Trinity suffered in the flesh," was absolute heresy. The question was brought before Pope Hormisdas, who decided that to say that "one person of the Trinity suffered in the flesh" was the orthodox view; and denounced the monks as proud, arrogant, obstinate, enemies to the Church, disturbers of the public peace,

slanderers, liars, and instruments employed by the enemy of truth to banish all truth, to establish error in its room, and to sow among the wheat the poisonous seeds of diabolical tares.

49. Now, in 533, this question was raised again, and Justinian became involved in the dispute: this time one set of monks argued that "if one of the Trinity did not suffer on the cross, then one of the Trinity was not born of the Virgin Mary, and therefore she ought no longer to be called the mother of God." Others argued: "If one of the Trinity did not suffer on the cross, then Christ who suffered was not one of the Trinity." Justinian entered the lists against both, and declared that Mary was "truly the mother of God;" that Christ was "in the strictest sense one of the Trinity;" and that whosoever denied either the one or the other, was a heretic. This frightened the monks, because they knew Justinian's opinions on the subject of heretics were exceedingly forcible. They therefore sent off two of their number to lay the question before the pope. As soon as Justinian learned this, he, too, decided to apply to the pope. He therefore drew up a confession of faith that "one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh," and sent it by two bishops to the bishop of Rome.

50. To make his side of the question appear as favorable as possible to the pope, Justinian sent a rich present of chalices and other vessels of gold, enriched with precious stones; and the following flattering letter: --

"Justinian, pious, fortunate, renowned, triumphant; emperor, consul, etc., to John, the most holy archbishop of our city of Rome, and patriarch: --

"Rendering honor to the apostolic chair, and to your Holiness, as has been always and is our wish, and honoring your Blessedness as a father, we have hastened to bring to the knowledge of your Holiness all matters relating to the state of the churches. It having been at all times our great desire to preserve the unity of your apostolic chair, and the constitution of the holy churches of God which has obtained hitherto, and still obtains.

"Therefore we have made no delay in subjecting and uniting to your Holiness all the priests of the whole East.

"For this reason we have thought fit to bring to your notice the present matters of disturbance; though they are manifest and unquestionable, and always firmly held and declared by the whole priesthood according to the doctrine of your apostolic chair. For we can not suffer

that anything which relates to the state of the Church, however manifest and unquestionable, should be moved, without the knowledge of your Holiness, who are THE HEAD OF ALL THE HOLY CHURCHES; for in all things, we have already declared, we are anxious to increase the honor and authority of your apostolic chair."37

51. All things were now ready for the complete deliverance of the Catholic Church from Arian dominion. Since the death of Theodoric, divided councils had crept in amongst the Ostrogoths, and the Catholic Church had been more and more cementing to its interests the powers of the Eastern throne. "Constant amicable intercourse was still taking place between the Catholic clergy of the East and the West; between Constantinople and Rome; between Justinian and the rapid succession of pontiffs who occupied the throne during the ten years between the death of Theodoric and the invasion of Italy." -- Milman.38

52. The crusade began with the invasion of the Arian kingdom of the Vandals in Africa, of whom Gelimer was the king, and was openly and avowedly in the interests of the Catholic religion and Church. For in a council of his ministers, nobles, and bishops, Justinian was dissuaded from undertaking the African War. He hesitated, and was about to relinquish his design, when he was rallied by a fanatical bishop, who exclaimed: "I have seen a vision! It is the will of heaven, O emperor, that you should not abandon your holy enterprise for the deliverance of the African Church. The God of battle will march before your standard and disperse your enemies, who are the enemies of His Son."39

53. This persuasion was sufficient for the "pious" emperor, and in June, 533, "the whole fleet of six hundred ships was ranged in martial pomp before the gardens of the palace," laden and equipped with thirty-five thousand troops and sailors, and five thousand horses, all under the command of Belisarius. He landed on the coast of Africa in September; Carthage was captured on the 18th of the same month; Gelimer was disastrously defeated in November; and the conquest of Africa, and the destruction of the Vandal kingdom, were completed by the capture of Gelimer in the spring of 534.40 During the rest of the year, Belisarius

"reduced the islands of Corsica, Sardinia, Majorica, Minorica, and
whatever else belonged to the Vandals, either on the continent or in the islands." -- Bower.41

54. Belisarius dispatched to Justinian the news of his victory. "He received the messengers of victory at the time when he was preparing to publish the Pandects of the Roman law; and the devout or jealous emperor celebrated the divine goodness and confessed, in silence, the merit of his successful general. Impatient to abolish the temporal and spiritual tyranny of the Vandals, he proceeded, without delay, to the full establishment of the Catholic Church. Her jurisdiction, wealth, and immunities, perhaps the most essential part of episcopal religion, were restored and amplified with a liberal hand; the Arian worship was suppressed, the Donatist meetings were proscribed; and the Synod of Carthage, by the voice of two hundred and seventeen bishops, applauded the just measure of pious retaliation." -- Gibbon.42

55. In the summer of 534 Belisarius returned to Constantinople, taking with him the captive Gelimer and the small remnant of Vandals who remained yet alive. He was awarded a triumph, "which for near six hundred years had never been enjoyed by any but an emperor." As Gelimer followed in the train of his captor, and "came into the Hippodrome and saw Justinian sitting on his throne and the ranks and orders of the Roman people standing on either side of him," he "repeated again and again the words of the kingly Hebrew preacher: `Vanity of vanities: all is vanity.'" He was suffered to live, and was given "large estates in the Galatian province, and lived there in peace with his exiled kinsfolk."

56. Also among the spoils of Vandal conquest carried that day in grand triumphal procession, were the golden candlestick and other sacred vessels of the temple of God, which had been carried to Rome by Titus and had graced his triumph after the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. They had been taken by Genseric in his sack of Rome in 455, and were carried by him to Carthage, where they remained till the capture of that city by Belisarius and his return in triumph to Constantinople. There that day a Jew seeing them, said to a friend of the emperor's:

"If those vessels are brought into the palace, they will cause
the ruin of this empire. They have already brought the Vandal to Rome, and Belisarius to Carthage: nor will Constantinople long wait for her conqueror, if they remain here." This word coming to Justinian, he took warning and sent the sacred vessels to Jerusalem, whence they had been carried more than six hundred years before, and where they were now "stored up in one of the Christian churches."43

57. As soon as this pious work of uprooting the Vandal kingdom had been fully accomplished, the arms of Justinian were turned against Italy and the Arian Ostrogoths. In 534 Amalasontha had been supplanted in her rule over the Ostrogoths by her cousin Theodotus. And "during the short and troubled reign of Theodotus -- 534-536 -- Justinian received petitions from all parts of Italy, and from all persons, lay as well as clerical, with the air and tone of its sovereign." -- Milman.44

58. Belisarius subdued Sicily in 535, and invaded Italy and captured Naples in 536. As it was now about the first of December, the Gothic warriors decided to postpone, until the following spring, their resistance to the invaders. A garrison of four thousand soldiers was left in Rome, a feeble number to defend such a city at such a time in any case, but these troops proved to be even more feeble in faith than they were in numbers. They threw over all care of the city, and "furiously exclaimed that the apostolic throne should no longer be profaned by the triumph or toleration of Arianism; that the tombs of the Caesars should no longer be trampled by the savages of the North; and, without reflecting that Italy must sink into a province of Constantinople, they fondly hailed the restoration of a Roman emperor as a new era of freedom and prosperity. The deputies of the pope and clergy, of the Senate and people, invited the lieutenant of Justinian to accept their voluntary allegiance, and to enter into the city, whose gates would be thrown open to his reception." -- Gibbon.45

59. Belisarius at once marched to Rome. "Vitiges, the king of the Goths, not thinking himself in a condition to defend the city against

his victorious army, left four thousand chosen troops in it, and withdrew with the rest to Ravenna; having first exhorted pope Silverius and the Senate, says Procopius, to continue steady in their allegiance to the Goths, who had deserved so well of them and their city. But he was no sooner gone than the Senate, at the persuasion of the pope, invited Belisarius to come and take possession of the city; which he did accordingly: the Goths, who could not make head at the same time against the enemy without, and the citizens within, the walls, retiring by the Flaminian, while the Romans entered by the Asinarian, gate. Thus was the city of Rome reunited to the empire, on the 10th of December of the present year, 536, after it had been separated from it threescore years." -- Bower.46

60. But the taking of Rome was not the destruction of the nation of the Ostrogoths: it was not the uprooting of the Ostrogothic kingdom. "From their rustic habitations, from their different garrisons, the Goths assembled at Ravenna for the defense of their country: and such were their numbers that, after an army had been detached for the relief of Dalmatia, one hundred and fifty thousand fighting men marched under the royal standard" in the spring, A. D. 537; and the Gothic nation returned to the siege of Rome and the defense of Italy against the invaders. "The whole nation of the Ostrogoths had been assembled for the attack, and was almost entirely consumed in the siege of Rome," which continued above a year, 537-538. "One year and nine days after the commencement of the siege, an army so lately strong and triumphant, burnt their tents, and tumultuously repassed the Milvian bridge," and Rome was delivered, March 12, 538. "With heavy hearts the barbarians must have thought, as they turned them northward, upon the many graves of gallant men which they were leaving on that fatal plain. Some of them must have suspected the melancholy truth that they had dug one grave, deeper and wider than all: the grave of the Gothic monarchy in Italy." -- Hodgkin. 47 The remains of the kingdom were soon afterward destroyed. "They had lost their king (an inconsiderable loss), their capital, their treasures, the provinces from Sicily to the Alps, and the military force of two hundred thousand barbarians,

magnificently equipped with horses and arms." -- Gibbon.48 And thus was the kingdom of the Ostrogoths destroyed before the vengeful arrogance of the papacy.

61. This completely opened the way for the bishop of Rome to assert his sole authority over the estates of the Church. The district immediately surrounding Rome was called the Roman duchy, and it was so largely

occupied by the estates of the Church that the bishop of Rome claimed exclusive authority over it. "The emperor, indeed, continued to control the elections and to enforce the payment of tribute for the territory protected by the imperial arms; but, on the other hand, the pontiff exercised a definite authority within the Roman duchy, and claimed to have a voice in the appointment of the civil officers who administered the local government."49

62. Under the protectorate of the armies of the East which soon merged in the exarch of Ravenna, the papacy enlarged its aspirations, confirmed its powers, and strengthened its situation both spiritually and temporally. Being by the decrees of the councils, and the homage of the emperor, made the head of all ecclesiastical and spiritual dominion on earth, and being now in possession of territory, and exerting a measure of civil authority therein, the opportunity that now fell to the ambition of the bishopric of Rome was to assert, to gain, and to exercise, supreme authority in all things temporal as well as spiritual. And the sanction of this aspiration was made to accrue from Justinian's letter, in which he rendered such distinctive honor to the apostolic see. It is true that Justinian wrote these words with no such far-reaching meaning, but that made no difference; the words were written, and like all other words of similar import, they could be, and were, made to bear whatever meaning the bishop of Rome should choose to find in them.

63. Therefore, the year A. D. 538, which marks the conquest of Italy, the deliverance of Rome, and the destruction of the kingdom of the

Ostrogoths, is the true date which marks the establishment of the temporal authority of the papacy, and the exercise of that authority as a world-power. All that was ever done later in this connection was but to enlarge by additional usurpations and donations, the territories which the bishop of Rome at this point possessed, and over which he asserted civil jurisdiction. This view is fully sustained by the following excellent statement of the case: --

"The conquest of Italy by the Greeks was, to a great extent at least, the work of the Catholic clergy. . . . The overthrow of the Gothic kingdom was to Italy an unmitigated evil. A monarch like Witiges or Totila would soon have repaired the mischiefs caused by the degenerate successors of Theodoric, Athalaric, and Theodotus. In their overthrow began the fatal policy of the Roman see, . . . which never would permit a powerful native kingdom to unite Italy, or a very large part of it, under one dominion. Whatever it may have been to Christendom, the papacy has been the eternal, implacable foe of Italian independence and Italian unity; and so (as far as independence and unity might have given dignity, political weight, and prosperity) to the welfare of Italy." -- Milman.50

64. Then "began that fatal policy of the Roman see," because she was then herself a world-power, possessing temporalities over which she both claimed and exercised dominion, and by virtue of which she could contend with other dominions, and upon the same level. And that which made the papacy so much the more domineering in this fatal policy, was the fact of Justinian's having so fully committed himself. When the mightiest emperor who had ever sat on the Eastern throne had not only under his own hand rendered such decided homage to the papacy, but had rooted out the last power that stood in her way, this to her was strongly justifiable ground for her assertion of dominion over all other dominions, and her disputing dominion with the powers of the earth.

---

1 [Page 184] "History of the Popes," Leo, last paragraph but one.

2 [Page 187] "History of the Popes," Felix II, par. 1.

3 [Page 187] "The Holy Roman Empire," chap. iv, par. 7

4 [Page 188] "Gibbon, "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxix, par. 5.

5 [Page 188] "Italy and Her Invaders" (The Ostrogothic Invasion), book iv, chap. 4, last paragraph.

6 [Page 189] Id., par. 6.

7 [Page 189] "Italy and Her Invaders," book vi, chap. vi pars. 4, 6, 16 from end; Gibbon, Id.

8 [Page 190] "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. iii, par. 3.

9 [Page 191] Id., chap 8, par. 2.

10 [Page 191] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxix, par. 14; and Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. iii, par. 5.

11 [Page 191] Id., par. 11.

12 [Page 192] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. iii, par. 8 from end.

13 [Page 193] Id., par. 11.

14 [Page 194] Id., par. 14.

15 [Page 194] Hodgkin's "Italy and Her Invaders," book iv, chap. xi, par. 22.

16 [Page 194] "History of the Popes," Symmachus pars. 9, 10.

17 [Page 195] Id., par. 16.

18 [Page 195] Id., par. 18.

19 [Page 196] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxix, par. 17; Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. iii, par. 23.

20 [Page 196] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. iii, par. 30.

21 [Page 196] Id.

22 [Page 197] "Italy and Her Invaders," book iv, chap. xi, par. 5 from end.

23 [Page 197] Id.

24 [Page 197] Id., par. 32.

25 [Page 197] Id., par. 20.

26 [Page 198] "History of the Popes," Felix III, par. 1

27 [Page 198] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlvii, par. 23.

28 [Page 198] "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. iv, par. 2.

29 [Page 199] "History of the Popes," Boniface II, par. 8.

30 [Page 199] Id., John II, par. 1.

31 [Page 199] Id., par. 2.

32 [Page 200] "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. 1, par. 5.

33 [Page 200] Id. Bower calls him Timothy the Cat; but whether "weasel" or "cat," the distinction is not material, as either fitly describes his disposition, though both would not exaggerate it.

34 [Page 201] Id. par. 31.

35 [Page 201] Id., pars. 21, 22.

36 [Page 201] Id.

37 [Page 203] Croly's "Apocalypse," chap. xi, "History," under verses 3-10.

38 [Page 203] "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. iv, par. 5.

39 [Page 203] Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. xii, par. 3.

40 [Page 203] Id., pars. 7-12.

41 [Page 204] "History of the Popes," Agapetus, par. 5, note a.

42 [Page 204] "Decline and Fall," chap. xii, par. 11.

43 [Page 205] Hodgkin, "Italy and Her Invaders," book iv, chap. xv, par. 3 from end; and book iii, chap. ii, par. 5 from end.

44 [Page 205] "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. iv, par. 7.

45 [Page 205] "Decline and Fall," chap. xii, par. 23.

46 [Page 206] "Lives of the Popes," Silverius, par. 2.

47 [Page 206] "Italy and Her Invaders," book v. chap. ix, last paragraph

48 [Page 207] Id., pars. 23, 28, and chap. xliii, par. 4. Afterward, from 541 till 553, there was carried on what had been called the "Gothic" War; but those who made the war were not Goths. They were "a new people," made up of Roman captives, slaves, deserters, and whoever else might choose to join them, with but a thousand Goths to begin with. See Gibbon, Id., chap. xliii, pars. 4, 6.

49 [Page 207] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Popedom, par. 25.

50 [Page 208] "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. iv, last paragraph but one.

13. RESTORATION OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE.

IT is evident that as the papacy had hitherto claimed, and had actually acquired, absolute dominion over all things spiritual, henceforth she would claim, and, if crafty policy and unscrupulous procedure were of any avail, would actually acquire, absolute dominion over all things temporal as well as spiritual. Indeed, as we have seen, this was already claimed, and the history of Europe for more than a thousand of the following years abundantly proves that the claim was finally and fully established.

2. "Rome, jealous of all temporal sovereignty but her own, for centuries yielded up, or rather made, Italy a battlefield to the Transalpine and the stranger, and at the same time so secularized her own spiritual supremacy as to confound altogether the priest and the politician, to degrade absolutely and almost irrevocably the kingdom of Christ into a kingdom of this world." -- Milman.1 Henceforth kings and emperors were but her tools, and often but her playthings; and kingdoms and empires her conquests, and often only her traffic. The history of how the papacy assumed the supremacy over kings and emperors and how she acquired the prerogative of dispensing kingdoms and empires, is no less interesting and no less important to know than is that of how her ecclesiastical supremacy was established.

3. The contest began even with Justinian, who had done so much to exalt the dignity and clear the way of the papacy. Justinian soon became proud of his theological abilities, and presumed to dictate the faith of the papacy, rather than to submit, as formerly, to her guidance. And from A. D. 542 to the end of his long reign in 565, there was almost constant war, with alternate advantage, between Justinian and the popes. But as emperors live and die, while the papacy only lives, the real victory remained with her.

4. VIGILIUS, NOV. 22, 537, TO 555,

was pope when the Ostrogothic kingdom was destroyed in 538; and when, after the annihilation of the mixed people who were in rebellion, the dominion of the Eastern Empire was formally restored in Italy by the establishment of the exarchate of Ravenna in 552. He "paid a fearful price for his advancement -- false accusation, cruel oppression, perhaps murder." -- Milman.2 He was the most vacillating of the popes who had yet reigned. The war between the papacy and Justinian was over what is known as the Three Chapters. In the writings of three men who lived and wrote nearly a hundred years before, Justinian found what he proclaimed and condemned as heresy. The three men had all lived and written before the Council of Chalcedon. The three men and their writings had all been noticed by the Council of Chalcedon; yet that council had passed them, all without condemnation or even censure. And now when Justinian condemned them all as heretical, this was held by all the orthodox as a covert attack on the Council of Chalcedon, and an undermining of the authority of general councils as such.

5. "The emperor threatened with deposition and exile," all bishops, without distinction, who would not accept his definitions as to the Three Chapters. Under such alternative the new "faith" was soon adopted "by almost all the bishops of the whole East. But in the West it met with no less vigorous than general opposition. Vigilius and the other bishops of Italy, as well as those of Gaul and Africa, all declared unanimously against it, as evidently striking at what they called the very foundation of the Catholic faith, the authority of councils." -- Bower.3 This position was so much the more essential to the bishop of Rome, because the Council of Chalcedon was especially the council of Lee the Great, and the faith of Chalcedon was pre-eminently the faith of Leo as pope.

6. In 543 Justinian peremptorily summoned Vigilius to Constantinople. In 544 "he set forth with the imprecations of the Roman people, and assailed with volleys of stones, as the murderer of Silverius, and a man

of notorious cruelty. . . . `May famine and pestilence pursue thee: evil hast thou done to us; may evil overtake thee wherever

211

thou art.'" Arrived at Constantinople, he was between two fires: if he resisted the emperor, he might be made a prisoner and an exile; if he yielded to the emperor, he would certainly be repudiated by all the West, and might lose the papal throne. Having no strength of character or purpose, he sought alternately to please both the emperor and the West.

7. Vigilius arrived at Constantinople Jan. 25, 547. He was "received with uncommon marks of respect" by the emperor and the empress, but on the first occasion, he condemned the emperor's condemnation of the Three Chapters; and excommunicated the patriarch of Constantinople and all the bishops who had accepted the condemnation of the Three Chapters. Then "a few months after, the desire he had of returning to Rome prevailed over the regard he pretended to have for the Council of Chalcedon and the Catholic faith:" he withdrew his excommunication, and assembled in Constantinople a council of seventy bishops, at the head of which he "issued his infallible anathema against the Three Chapters" themselves. This caused all the West to revolt, in which joined even the ecclesiastics who had accompanied the pope to Constantinople. He then revoked the declarations of his late council; and upon the plea that no Western bishops were present at the late council, prevailed on Justinian to count it as naught, and call a general council.

8. Great numbers of the Eastern bishops assembled for the council, in 551, but only a very few from the West -- "some from Italy, only two from Africa, and not one from Illyricum," nor any from Gaul. The pope refused to attend the council till a greater number of Western bishops came; and no more Western bishops would came. Justinian, seeing that by this dodge the pope was trifling with him, placarded a new edict against the Three Chapters. Vigilius gathered as many bishops as he could in a council, and denounced the emperor's "usurpation of ecclesiastical authority," and excommunicated all who should conform to the edict. Justinian made him a prisoner in Constantinople; but he escaped to Chalcedon, and took refuge there at the shrine of St. Euphemia. The emperor did not dare to try to take him from there, and made terms with him; he revoked his edict, and deferred the question to a council, at which the pope promised to be present

212

9. But when the council met, in 553, the pope refused to attend unless it was composed of an equal number of bishops of the East and of the West. To this the emperor agreed; but the Eastern bishops unanimously protested: besides, there was no possibility of having a proper general council composed equally of Eastern and Western bishops, because there were so few Western bishops present. Justinian sent an embassy to the pope, to persuade him of the unreasonableness of his demand; but Vigilius stiffly maintained his ground, insisting on his readiness to meet in council "on the terms agreed to by him and the emperor."

10. Justinian at last ordered the council to proceed. Accordingly, one hundred and sixty-five Eastern bishops met together; while sixteen Western bishops met with Vigilius. The emperor's council condemned the Three Chapters as heretical: the pope's council approved the Three Chapters, by solemn decree acquitting them of all heresy. This decree closes as follows: --

"These things being thus settled by us with all care, diligence, and circumspection, we ordain and decree, statuimus et decernimus, that henceforth it shall be lawful for no person in holy orders, however dignified or distinguished, to write, speak, or teach anything touching these Three Chapters, contrary to what we have, by our present constitution, taught and decreed; nor shall it be lawful for any one, after this our present definition, to move any question about them. But if anything relating to them be said, done, or written, contrary to what we have here taught and decreed, we declare it null, by the authority of the apostolic see, in which, by the grace of God, we now preside."

11. The emperor notified the pope that he must agree with the decree of the council of the Eastern bishops; and that if he would not do this, he should be deposed and exiled. The pope replied that since he "could not sign the acts and decrees of such an assembly without renouncing the holy faith of Chalcedon, he was ready to suffer, and suffer with joy, both exile and death in so good a cause. He was therefore immediately seized and sent into exile to "Proconnesus, an inhospitable island in the Propontis." The other Western bishops who had composed the pope's council, were also deposed and exiled in different places.

12. After about five months in the rocky island of his exile, Vigilius,

213

learning that steps were being taken by the emperor to depose him, and by the people of Rome to elect a new pope, he wrote a letter to the patriarch of Constantinople informing him that "upon examining the Three Chapters with more care and attention (he had already examined them with all care and attention -- omni undique cantela atque diligentia) he was fully convinced that they had been deservedly condemned, so he was not ashamed openly to acknowledge and own that he had done wrong to defend them, imitating therein St. Austin, who was not ashamed when he discovered the truth, to condemn and retract whatever he had written against it. He . . . concludes thus: --

"We make it known to the whole Catholic Church, that we condemn and anathematize all heresies and heretics, namely, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and his impious writings; the writings of Theodoret, against St. Cyril, and the Council of Ephesus; and the letter of Maris, the Persian, which is said to have been written by Ibas. We likewise anathematize all who shall presume to defend the said Three Chapters, or shall think them capable of being maintained or defended. We acknowledge for our colleagues and brethren, those who have condemned them; and by these presents annul whatever has been done, said, or written by us or by others to defend them."

13. This letter was presented by the patriarch to the emperor; but the emperor would not accept any recantation that did not make it clear that the pope condemned the Three Chapters "as repugnant to the doctrine of Chalcedon." Therefore the pope made another, Feb. 23, 554, in which he went into the subject in greater detail than at any time before, closing as follows: --

"We therefore anathematize and condemn the Three above-mentioned impious Chapters; . . . as for what we or others may, at any time, have said or written in defense of the said Three impious Chapters, we declare the whole, by the authority of this our present constitution, absolutely null."4

14. This document was entirely satisfactory to Justinian; and Vigilius was at once brought back to Constantinople, was received by the emperor with "extraordinary marks of honor," and was given liberty to return immediately to Rome. He set out; but on the voyage died, early in the year 555. He was succeeded by --

214

PELAGIUS, APRIL 11, 555, TO MARCH 1, 560,

who had been the close attendant and supporter of Vigilius in all his whole course as pope. Accordingly, he had changed "faith" exactly as had Vigilius in his many changes, even to the latest one. Therefore Justinian had promised to him the office of pope if he should survive Vigilius. He was with Vigilius when he died, and hastened to Rome to assume the pontificate. But when he arrived there, he found every body against him, on account of his latest condemnation of the Three Chapters. But having the emperor in his favor, all that was required for him to become pope was a sufficient number of bishops to ordain him. The canons required that there should be at least three; but in all Italy there could be found but two bishops who were willing to take part in the ordination of Pelagius. These two with a presbyter of Ostia, performed the ceremony; and so Pelagius became pope.

15. The condition of Justinian's favor to Pelagius was that he should cause the emperor's doctrine as to the Three Chapters to be accepted throughout the West, and now Pelagius must fulfill his part of the bargain. The emperor commanded Narses, his representative in the West, to support Pelagius "with all his interest and power. In compliance with the emperor's command, Narses spared no pains to reconcile the people of Rome with their bishop; and succeeded therein so far as to gain over, in a very short time, the greater part of the nobility and clergy." However, Narses used only persuasion to effect his purpose; and this was not swift enough in its results to satisfy Pelagius. He therefore urged Narses to use his imperial authority, and compel conformity. Narses demurred, not being willing to persecute. Then the pope wrote to him as follows: --

"Be not alarmed at the idle talk of some, crying out against persecution, and reproaching the Church, as if she delighted in cruelty, when she punishes with wholesome severities, or procures the salvation of souls. He alone persecutes who forces to evil; but to restrain men from doing evil, or to punish them because they have done it, is not persecution, or cruelty, but love of mankind. Now that schism, or a separation, from the apostolic see, is an evil, no man can deny: and that schismatics may and ought to be punished, even by the secular power, is manifest both from the canons of the Church, and the Scripture.

16. "He closes his letter with exhorting Narses to cause the heads of the schism to be apprehended, and sent under a strong guard to Constantinople; assuring him that he need not scruple to use violence, if it may be so called, in the present case, seeing the civil power is allowed, nay, and required by the canons, not only to apprehend, but to sent into exile, and confine to painful prisons, those who, dissenting from their brethren, disturb the tranquility of the Church." -- Bower.5

17. Justinian died Nov. 14, A. D. 565. "His death restored in some degree the peace of the Church, and the reigns of his four successors" -- Justin II, Tiberius, Maurice, and Phocas; and also the reigns of the three successors of Pelagius -- John III, July 18, 560, to 573; Benedict, June 3, 574, to July 30, 578; and Pelagius II, Nov. 28, 578, to Feb. 8, 590; "are distinguished by a rare, though fortunate, vacancy in the ecclesiastical history of the East." -- Gibbon.6 Yet the confusion over the Three Chapters continued between the pope and many bishops; and in 588 there began a war between the pope and the patriarch of Constantinople over the title of "universal bishop," which, though not of the same fierce and violent order as had been the war between Justinian and the pope, was of no less importance in the development of the papacy, and the restoration of the Western Empire.

18. In 588 there was held in Constantinople a council to try a certain Gregory, patriarch of Antioch. This council took advantage of the occasion to bestow upon the patriarch of Constantinople the title of universal bishop. "Pelagius, no less distributed and concerned than if the whole of the Catholic faith had been at stake, or the council had condemned some fundamental article of the Christian religion, immediately declared by the authority and in the name of St. Peter, all and every act of that assembly absolutely null, except the sentence in favor of Gregory." He sent letters to Constantinople, to his representative there, and to the patriarch of Constantinople, in which he charged the patriarch "with pride and ambition, styling his attempt `wicked,' `detestable,' and `diabolical,' and threatening to separate himself from his communion if he did not forthwith relinquish the antichristian title he had impiously assumed." -- Bower.7 Pelagius II died before

he could carry the contention any farther; but his place was more than only supplied by his successor --

GREGORY THE GREAT, SEPT. 3, 590, TO MARCH 12, 604.

19. Though Gregory "never attempted to extend his authority by any new usurpations or encroachments on the rights of his brethren, even of those who were immediately subject to his see; though he never exercised

or claimed any new jurisdiction or power; yet he was a most zealous asserter of that which his predecessors had exercised, or at any time claimed. He often declared that he had rather lose his life than suffer the see of St. Peter to forfeit any of the privileges it had ever enjoyed, or the prime apostle to be anyways injured, or robbed of his rights. . . . It has ever been, even from the earliest times, a maxim of the popes, never to part with any power or jurisdiction which their predecessors had acquired, by what means soever they had acquired it; nor to give up the least privilege which any of their predecessors, right or wrong, ever had claimed."8

20. "The bishop of Constantinople was now distinguished all over the East, with the pompous title of ecumenical or universal patriarch; and Gregory found that he had so styled himself over and over again, in a judgment which he had lately given against a presbyter arraigned of heresy, and which, at the request of the pope, he had transmitted to Rome. At this Gregory took the alarm, and, forgetting all other cares, as if the Church, the faith, the Christian religion, were in imminent danger, he dispatched in great haste a messenger with letters to Sabinianus, his nuncio at Constantinople, charging him as he tendered `the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free' to use his utmost endeavors with the emperor, with the express, and above all, with the bishop himself, his beloved brother, to divert him from evermore using the `proud,' the `profane,' the `antichristian' title of `universal bishop,' which he had assumed in the pride of his heart, to the great debasement of the whole episcopal order. The nuncio, in compliance with his orders, left nothing unattempted, which he thought could make any impression on the patriarch, assuring him that unless he relinquished the odious title which had given so great an offense to the pope, he would find in him a formidable antagonist, not to say an irreconcilable enemy."

21. The patriarch answered that though he was "sorry that his most holy brother of Rome should have taken any umbrage at so inoffensive a title;" yet since the title "had been bestowed, and bestowed by so great a council, not on him alone, but on him and his successors, it was not in his power to resign it; nor would his successors stand to his resignation if he should." The emperor's answer to Gregory was only an exhortation to him to live in peace with "the bishop of the imperial city." Gregory replied: --

"It is very hard that after we have parted with our silver, our gold, our slaves, and even our garments, for the public welfare, we should be obliged to part with our faith, too; for to agree to that impious title is parting with our faith."

22. Since the patriarch would not yield, Gregory, by his nuncio, excommunicated him; and then wrote to him "a long letter, loading the title of universal patriarch or bishop with all the names of reproach and ignominy he could think of: calling it `vain,' `ambitious,' `profane,' `impious,' `execrable,' `antichristian,' `blasphemous,' `infernal,' `diabolical;' and applying to him who assumed it, what was said by the prophet Isaiah of Lucifer: `Whom do you imitate in assuming that blasphemous title? -- Whom but him, who, swelled with pride, exalted himself above so many legions of angels, his equals, that he might be subject to none, and all might be subject to him. The apostle Peter was the first member of the universal Church. As for Paul, Andrew, and John, they were only the heads of particular congregations; but all were members of the Church under one head, and none would ever be called universal.'" And to the empress he wrote: --

"Though Gregory is guilty of many great sins, for which he well deserves thus to be punished, Peter is himself guilty of no sins, nor ought he to suffer for mine. I therefore, over and over again, beg, entreat, and conjure you, by the Almighty, not to forsake the steps of your ancestors; but treading in them, to court and secure to yourself the protection and favor of that apostle, who is not to be robbed of the honor that is due to his merit, for the sins of one who has no merit, and who so unworthily serves him."9

23. In the month of October, A. D. 602, the army of the Danube revolted, declared the emperor Maurice unworthy to reign, raised to the

command a centurion Phocas, and marched to Constantinople. The capital joined the revolt; and the emperor fled. He with his family hoped to find refuge in the church of St. Euphemia in Chalcedon; but by a tempest were driven ashore and took refuge in the church of St. Autonomous, near to Chalcedon. In the games that were celebrated in honor of the grand entry of Phocas into the capital, November 23, a dispute for precedence arose between the factions of the circus. When Phocas decided in favor of one faction, the other cried out, "Remember that Maurice is still alive." This aroused all the terrible jealously of Phocas. "The ministers of death were dispatched to Chalcedon: they dragged the emperor from his sanctuary: and the five sons of Maurice were successively murdered before the eyes of their agonizing parent. At each stroke which he felt in his heart, he found strength to rehearse a pious ejaculation: `Thou art just, O Lord! and thy judgments are righteous.' And such, in the last moments, was his rigid attachment to truth and justice that he revealed to the soldiers the pious falsehood of a nurse who presented her own child in the place of a royal infant. The tragic scene was finally closed by the execution of the emperor himself, in the twentieth year of his reign and the sixty-third of his age. The bodies of the father and his five sons were cast into the sea, their heads were exposed at Constantinople to the insults or pity of the multitude, and it was not till some signs of putrefaction had appeared that Phocas connived at the private burial of these venerable remains." -- Gibbon.10

24. The empress and three daughters had been spared at the time of the massacre of the emperor and his sons. However, not long afterward these were all sent by Phocas to the same place, and were "beheaded on the same ground which had been stained with the blood of her husband and five sons. After such an example it would be superfluous to enumerate the names and sufferings of meaner victims. Their condemnation was seldom pressed by the forms of trial, and their punishment was imbittered by the refinements of cruelty: . . . a simple and speedy death was a mercy which they could rarely obtain. The hippodrome, the sacred asylum of the pleasures and the liberty of the Romans, was polluted with heads and limbs and mangled bodies; and the companions of Phocas were the most sensible that neither his favor nor

their services could protect them from a tyrant, the worthy rival of the Caligulas and Domitians of the first age of the empire."11

25. Yet knowing of these things, Pope Gregory the Great lauded Phocas literally to the skies. As soon as Phocas had made himself sole emperor by the massacre of all possible legitimate claimants, he sent to Rome and the other principal cities of the East and West, the images of himself and wife. In Rome "the images of the emperor and his wife Leontia were exposed in the Lateran to the veneration of the clergy and Senate of Rome, and afterward deposited in the palace of the Caesars between those of Constantine and Theodosius."12 And on receiving these images Pope Gregory the Great wrote to Phocas thus: --

"Glory be to God in the highest, who, as it is written, changes times and removes kings; who has made known to all what He was pleased to speak by His prophet: The Most High rules in the kingdom of men, and gives it to whomsoever He will. Various are the changes, and many the vicissitudes of human life: the Almighty giving sometimes, in His justice, princes to afflict His people; and sending sometimes, in His mercy, princes to comfort and relieve them. We have been hitherto most grievously afflicted; but the Almighty has chosen you, and placed you on the imperial throne, to banish, by your merciful disposition, all our afflictions and sorrows. Let the heavens therefore rejoice; let the earth leap for joy; let the whole people return thanks for so happy a change. May the republic long enjoy these most happy times! May God with His grace direct your heart in every good thought, in every good deed! May the Holy Ghost that dwells in your breast ever guide and assist you, that you may, after a long course of years, pass from an earthly and temporal to an everlasting and heavenly kingdom!"13

26. Before Phocas received this letter from the pope, he had sent one to the pope, saying that at his accession he had found at Constantinople no nuncio of the pope, and asked that he send one. This gave Gregory another opportunity to laud Phocas, which he did thus: --

"What thanks are we not bound to return to the Almighty, who has at last been pleased to deliver us from the yoke of slavery, and make us again enjoy the blessings of liberty under your empire! That your Serenity has found no deacon of the apostolic see residing according to custom in the palace, was not owing to any neglect in me; but to the times, the late most unhappy and calamitous times, when the ministers of this Church all declined the office that obliged them to reside in the

palace, and were even afraid to approach it.14 But now that they know it has pleased the Almighty, in His goodness and mercy, to place you on the throne, they fear no more; but exult and rejoice, and, courting the office they declined before, fly to your feet with inexpressible joy. . . . We hope the Almighty, who has begun to relieve us, will complete what He has so happily begun, and that He who has given us such pious lords, will deliver us from our cruel enemies. May the holy Trinity, therefore, grant you long life, that the later we have received the blessings that flow from your piety, the longer we may enjoy them!"15

27. At the same time he wrote also to the new empress as follows: --

"What tongue can utter, what mind can conceive, the thanks we owe to God, who has placed you on the throne to ease us of the yoke with which we have been hitherto so cruelly galled? Let the angels give glory to God in heaven; let men return thanks to God upon earth; for the republic is relieved, and our sorrows are all banished. May the Almighty, who in His mercy has made you our emperors, make you likewise zealous defenders of the Catholic faith! May He endow your minds with zeal and mercy: with zeal to punish what is committed against God; with mercy to bear and forgive what may be committed against yourselves! May He grant to you, and to our most pious lord, a long reign, that the comforts and blessings we enjoy in it may be long! I should perhaps have entreated you to take under your particular protection the hitherto most grievously afflicted Church of the apostle St. Peter. But as I know you love God, I need not ask you to do what I am sure you are ready to do of your own accord. For the more you fear God, the more you must love His apostle, to whom it was said: `Thou art Peter,' etc., `To thee will I give,' etc. I do not therefore doubt but you take care to oblige and bind him to you, by whom you are to be loosened from your sins. May he, therefore, be the guardian of your empire; may he be your protector on earth; may he be your advocate in heaven; that after a long course of years you may enjoy, in the kingdom of heaven, the reward that is due to you there, for relieving your subjects from the burdens they groaned under, and rendering them happy upon earth."16

28. These praises brought swiftly to the papacy a corresponding reward. The nuncio whom Gregory sent to Constantinople in 603, at the request of Phocas, was a certain Boniface, a native of Rome and a

deacon of the Church in Rome. Gregory the Great died March 12, 604, and was succeeded by --

SABINIAN, SEPT. 13, 604, TO FEB. 22, 606,

who reigned but one year, five months, and nine days, and was succeeded by this very nuncio Boniface, who became Pope --

BONIFACE III, FEB. 19 TO NOV. 10, 607.

29. Having been sent to Phocas by Gregory under such letters as those which Gregory wrote to Phocas and Leontia, it can be easily understood what would be the attitude and course of Boniface toward the new emperor and empress. And now he was chosen to be pope, expressly because he was "one who was not only well known to Phocas, but greatly favored both by him and his wife. For, by flattering the usurper, as Gregory had done, and conniving at his cruelties, if not applauding him in them, while the rest of mankind exclaimed against

him as an outrageous tyrant, Boniface had so insinuated himself into his good graces as to become one of his chief favorites, or, as Sigebert writes, his only favorite, being the only person in the whole city of Constantinople who approved, or could so dissemble as to make the tyrant believe that he approved, of his conduct. For that merit alone he was chosen"17 to the papal throne. The diligent use which he made of the opportunity that fell to him in the office of nuncio at the court of Phocas, can in some measure be comprehended by the fact that, though he was at Constantinople only about a year, and was pope less than nine months, yet while he was pope he succeeded in securing from Phocas an edict settling upon him and his successors the grand and intensely coveted title of "universal bishop."

30. The patriarch of Constantinople at this time, Cyriacus, had incurred the disfavor of Phocas by protecting the empress -- widow of Maurice -- and her daughters. And now Boniface had "no sooner found himself vested with the papal dignity, than, taking advantage of the partiality and favor of Phocas to him, and of his aversion and hatred to the patriarch Cyriacus, he not only prevailed on the tyrant to revoke the decree settling the title of universal bishop on the bishop of the

imperial city; but obtained . . . a new decree, settling on himself and his successors that very title."

31. "No sooner was the imperial edict, vesting him with the title of universal bishop, and declaring him head of the Church, brought to Rome, than, assembling a council in the basilic of St. Peter, consisting of seventy-two bishops, thirty-four presbyters, and all the deacons and inferior clergy of the city, he acted there as if he had not been vested with the title alone (though Phocas probably meant to grant him no more), but with all the power of a universal bishop, with all the authority of a supreme head, or rather absolute monarch of the Church. For by a decree, which he issued in that council, it was `pronounced,' `declared,' and `defined' that no election of a bishop should thenceforth be deemed lawful and good, unless made by the people and clergy, approved by the prince or lord of the city, and confirmed by the pope interposing his authority in the following terms: `We will and command -- valumus et jubemus.'"18

32. Thus was the hitherto claimed title and power of universal bishop, or head of the whole Church, officially and legally settled upon the bishop of Rome. And thus, through Boniface III held the papal office so short a time, "yet it may truly be said that to him alone the Roman see owes more than to all his predecessors together." That title as officially and legally bestowed "owed its original to the worst of men; it was procured by the basest of means, by flattering a tyrant in his wickedness and tyranny; and was in itself, if we stand to the judgment of Gregory the Great, `antichristian,' `heretical,' `blasphemous,' `diabolical.'" And so in the palace of the Caesars the place of the image of Phocas between those of Constantine and Theodosius, was perfectly fitting, as symbolizing the equality of Phocas with those two in the making of the papacy. And how fitting the workmanship to the workers -- the papacy: Constantine, Theodosius, and Phocas!

33. The center of motion in the development of the papacy is next found in Italy; and in a train of circumstances through which the papacy secures independence of the Eastern Empire, and which ends only in the assertion of the supremacy of the papacy over kingdoms and empires in the restoration of the Western Empire.

34. In A. D. 568 the Lombards had invaded Italy, and for nearly twenty years wrought such devastation that even the pope thought the world was coming to an end. The imperial power of the East was so weak that the defense of Italy fell exclusively to the exarch of Ravenna and the pope. And as "the death of Narses had left his successor, the exarch of Ravenna, only the dignity of a sovereign which he was too weak to exercise for any useful purpose of government" (Milman19), the pope alone became the chief defender of Italy. In 594 Gregory the Great concluded a treaty of peace with the Lombards; and "the pope and the king of the Lombards became the real powers in the north and center of Italy."20 Even at that time the pope so far ignored the power of the

Eastern emperor, as to send "letters to King Childebert and Queen Brunehaut, under the apparent pretext of recommending a priest whom he sent to the bishops of Gaul; but in reality to solicit their aid." -- De Cormenin.21

35. The wife of the king of the Lombards was a Catholic, and by the influence of Gregory, she "solemnly placed the Lombard nation under the patronage of St. John the Baptist. At Monza she built in his honor the first Lombard church, and the royal palace near it." From this the Lombards soon became Catholic; but though this was so, they would not suffer the priesthood to have any part in the affairs of the kingdom. They "never admitted the bishops of Italy to a seat in their legislative councils." -- Gibbon.22 And although under the Lombard dominion "the Italians enjoyed a milder and more equitable government than any of the other kingdoms which had been founded on the ruins of the empire," this exclusion of the clergy from affairs of the state was as much against them now, though Catholic, as their Arianism had been against them before; and the popes ever anxiously hoped to have them driven entirely from Italy.

36. In 728 the edict of the Eastern emperor abolishing the worship of images, was published in Italy. The pope defended the images, of course, and "the Italians swore to live and die in defense of the pope and the holy images." And thus there was begun a war which in

its nature and consequences was in every sense characteristic of the papacy. It established the worship of images, as an article of Catholic faith; it developed the supremacy of the pope in temporal affairs.

37. "The first introduction of a symbolic worship was in the veneration of the cross and of relics." -- Gibbon.23 And the first introduction of the cross as a visible symbol was by Constantine. It is true that the sign of the cross was used as early as the days of Tertullian; but it was only a sign, made with a motion of the hand upon the forehead or breast. Constantine enlarged upon this by the introduction of the visible cross itself: in the Labarum. He erected in Rome his own statue, "bearing a cross in its right hand, with an inscription which referred the victory of his arms and the deliverance of Rome to that salutary sign, the true symbol of force and courage. The same symbol sanctified the arms of the soldiers of Constantine; the cross glittered on their helmets, was engraved on their shields, was interwoven into their banners; and the consecrated emblems which adorned the person of the emperor himself were distinguished only by richer materials and more exquisite workmanship.

38. "But the principal standard which displayed the triumph of the cross was styled the Labarum. . . . It is described as a long pike intersected by a transversal beam. The silken veil which hung down from the beam was curiously inwrought with the images of the reigning monarch and his children. The summit of the pike supported a crown of gold which inclosed the mysterious monogram, at once expressive of the figure of the cross and the initial letters of the name of Christ." The basis of all this was the fiction and the imposture of Constantine's "vision of the cross." And, from it "the Catholic Church, both of the East and of the West, has adopted a prodigy which favors, or seems to favor, the popular worship of the cross."24

39. Under Constantine's patronage also, "magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome adorned with images and pictures, where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple." -- Lawrence.25 "At first the experiment was made with

caution and scruple; and the venerable pictures were discreetly allowed to instruct the ignorant, to awaken the cold, and to gratify the prejudices of the heathen proselytes. By a slow, though inevitable, progression, the honors of the original were transferred to the copy: the devout Christian prayed before the image of a saint; and the pagan rites of genuflexion, luminaries, and incense again stole into the Catholic Church. The scruples of reason or piety were silenced by the strong evidence of visions and miracles; and the pictures which speak, and

move, and bleed, must be endowed with a divine energy, and may be considered as the proper objects of religious adoration.

40. "The use and even the worship of images was firmly established before the end of the sixth century; they were fondly cherished by the warm imagination of the Greeks and Asiatics; the Pantheon and Vatican were adorned with the emblems of a new superstition. . . . The style and sentiments of a Byzantine hymn will declare how far their worship was removed from the grossest idolatry: "How can we with mortal eyes contemplate this image, whose celestial splendor the host of heaven presumes not to behold? He who dwells in heaven condescends this day to visit us by his venerable image. He who is seated on the cherubim visits us this day by a picture which the Father has delineated with His immaculate hand; which He has formed in an ineffable manner; and which we sanctify by adoring it with fear and love.'" -- Gibbon.26

41. Thus stood Catholic idolatry when the Mohammedans, with equal contempt for the images and their worshipers, swarmed up from the deserts of Arabia. And under the influence of the charge of idolatry which the Mohammedans incessantly urged against the Catholics, some began to awake to the thought that perhaps the charge was true. "The triumphant Mussulmans, who reigned at Damascus and threatened Constantinople, cast into the scale of reproach the accumulated weight of truth and victory. The cities of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt had been fortified with the images of Christ, His mother, and His saints: and each city presumed on the hope or promise of miraculous defense. In the rapid conquest of ten years, the Arabs subdued those cities and these images; and, in their opinion, the Lord of hosts pronounced

a decisive judgment between the adoration and contempt of these mute and inanimate idols. In this season of distress and dismay the eloquence of the monks was exercised in the defense of images. But they were now opposed by the murmurs of many simple or rational Christians, who appealed to the evidence of texts, of facts, and of the primitive times; and secretly desired the reformation of the Church."27

42. Thus began the Iconoclastic Controversy, between the worshipers and the breakers of the images, which continued with bloody and unabated fury for one hundred and twenty years -- 726-846; and which finally resulted in the triumph of the worship of images, and the "religion of Constantine." In A. D. 726, Leo III, "the Isaurian," as emperor, ascended the throne of the East. "He began in 727-730 the famous iconoclastic reform. He ordered the images to be broken to pieces; the walls of the churches to be whitewashed; and prosecuted with honest but imprudent vigor his design of extirpating idolatry. But a fierce dissension at once raged throughout all Christendom: the monks and the people arose in defense of their images and pictures, and the emperor, even in his own capital was denounced as a heretic and a tyrant. There was an image of the Saviour renowned for its miraculous powers, over the gate of the imperial palace called the Brazen Gate from the rich tiles of gilt bronze that covered its magnificent vestibule. The emperor ordered the sacred figure to be taken down and broken to pieces. But the people from all parts of the city flew to the defense of their favorite idol, fell upon the officers, and put many of them to death.

43. "The women were even more violent than the men. Like furies they rushed to the spot, and, finding one of the soldiers engaged in the unhallowed labor at the top of the ladder, they pulled it down, and tore him to pieces as he lay bruised upon the ground. `Thus,' exclaims the pious annalist, `did the minister of the emperor's injustice fall at once from the top of the ladder to the bottom of hell.' The women next flew to the great church, and finding the iconoclastic patriarch officiating at the altar, overwhelmed him with a shower of stones and a thousand opprobious names. He escaped, bruised and fainting, from the building. The guards were now called out and the female insurrection

suppressed; but not until several of the women had perished in the fray." -- Lawrence.28 "The execution of the imperial edicts was resisted by frequent tumults in Constantinople and the provinces; the person of Leo was

endangered, his officers were massacred, and the popular enthusiasm was quelled by the strongest efforts of the civil and military power." -- Gibbon.29

44. When Leo's decree against the worship of images was published in the West, "the images of Christ and the Virgin, of the angels, martyrs, and saints, were abolished in all the churches in Italy;" and the emperor threatened the pope that if he did not comply with the decree, he should be degraded and sent into exile. But the pope --

GREGORY II, MAY 19, 715, TO FEB. 20, 732,

stood firmly for the worship of images, and sent pastoral letters throughout Italy, exhorting the faithful to do the same. "At this signal, Ravenna, Venice, and the cities of the exarchate and Pentapolis adhered to the cause of religious images; their military force by sea and land consisted, for the most part, of the natives; and the spirit of patriotism and zeal was transfused into the mercenary strangers. The Italians swore to live and die in the defense of the pope and the holy images. . . . The Greeks were overthrown and massacred, their leaders suffered an ignominious death, and the popes, however inclined to mercy, refused to intercede for these guilty victims."

45. At Ravenna, A. D. 729, the riot and bloody strife was so great that even the exarch, the personal representative of the emperor, was slain. "To punish this flagitious deed, and restore his dominion in Italy, the emperor sent a fleet and army into the Adriatic Gulf. After suffering from the winds and the waves much loss and delay, the Greeks made their descent in the neighborhood of Ravenna. . . . In a hard-fought day, as the two armies alternately yielded and advanced, a phantom was seen, a voice was heard, and Ravenna was victorious by the assurance of victory. The strangers retreated to their ships, but the populous seacoast poured forth a multitude of boats; the waters of the Po were so deeply infected with blood, that during six years the public prejudice abstained from the fish of the river; and the institution of an

annual feast perpetuated the worship of images, and the abhorrence of the Greek tyrant. Amidst the triumph of the Catholic arms, the Roman pontiff convened a synod of ninety-three bishops against the heresy of the Iconoclasts. With their consent he pronounced a general excommunication against all who by word or deed should attack the traditions of the Fathers and the images of the saints."30

46. As already stated, Gregory II was now pope. Some of his argument in support of the worship of images is worth setting down here, in order that it may be seen how certainly idolatrous is the use of images in the Catholic Church. In 730 Gregory II wrote to the emperor Leo III thus: --

"Ten years by God's grace you have walked aright, and not mentioned the sacred images; but now you assert that they take the place of idols, and that those who reverence them are idolaters, and want them to be entirely set aside and destroyed. You do not fear the judgment of God, and that offense will be given not merely to the faithful, but also to the unbelieving. Christ forbids our offending even the least. and you have offended the whole world, as if you had not also to die and to give an account. You wrote: `We may not, according to the command of God (Ex. 20:4), worship anything made by the hand of man, nor any likeness of that which is in the heaven or in the earth. Only prove to me, who has taught us to worship ( ) anything made by man's hands, and I will then agree that it is the will of God.' But why have not you, O emperor and head of the Christians, questioned wise men on this subject before disturbing and perplexing poor people? You could have learnt from them concerning what kind of images made with hands God said that. But you have rejected our Fathers and doctors, although you gave the assurance by your own subscription that you would follow them. The holy Fathers and doctors are our scripture, our light, and our salvation, and the six synods have taught us (that); but you do not receive their testimony. I am forced to write to you without delicacy or learning, as you also are not delicate or learned; but my letter yet contains the divine truth.

"God gave that command because of the idolaters who had the land of promise in possession and worshiped golden animals, etc., saying: `These are our gods, and there is no other God.' On account of these diabolical, God has forbidden us to worship them. . . . Moses wished to see the Lord, but He showed himself to him only from behind. To us, on the contrary, the Lord showed himself perfectly, since the Son of God has been made man. . . . From all parts

men now came to Jerusalem to see Him, and then depicted and represented him to others. In the same way they have depicted and represented James, Stephen, and the martyrs; and men leaving the worship of the devil, have venerated these images, but not absolutely (with latria), but relatively. . . . Why, then, do we make no representation of God the Father? The divine nature can not be represented. If we had seen Him, as we have the Son, we could also make an image of Him. . . . You say: `We worship stones and walls and boards.' But it is not so, O emperor; but they serve us for remembrance and encouragement, lifting our slow spirits upward by those (persons) whose names the pictures bear, and whose representation they are. And we worship them not as God, as you maintain; God forbid! For we set not our hope on them; and if a picture of the Lord is there, we say: Lord Jesus Christ, help and save us. At a picture of His holy mother, we say: Holy God-bearer, pray for us with thy Son; and so with a martyr. . . . It would have been better for you to have been a heretic than a destroyer of images."31

47. In this crisis the papacy formed an alliance with the Lombards, who were glad of the opportunity offered in a zeal for the worship of images to seize upon the Italian territories of the Eastern emperor. By means of this alliance "entire Italy, excited by the pontiff, resolved to free itself from the rule of the Greek emperors." -- De Cormenin.32 This alliance, however, did not last long: each power -- the Lombards and the papacy -- being determined to possess as much of Italy as possible, there was constant irritation which finally culminated in open hostilities, and the Lombards invaded the papal territory in A. D. 739. And now what could the pope do? He could not appeal to his image-breaking enemy, the emperor. The Lombards, though friends of the images, were also now enemies of the pope. What could be done?

48. Charles Martel, the mayor of the palace of the Frankish kingdom, had gained a world-wide glory by his late victory, 732, over the Mohammedans at Tours. Of all the barbarians, the Franks were the

first who had become Catholic, and they had ever since been dutiful sons of the Church. The pope, now --

determined to appeal to Charles for help against this assertion of Lombard dominion. He sent to Charles the keys of the "sepulcher of St. Peter;" some filings from the chains with which "Peter had been bound;" and, more important than all, as the legitimate inheritor of the authority of the ancient Roman republic, he presumed to bestow upon Charles Martel the title of Roman consul. "Throughout these transactions the pope appears actually, if not openly, an independent power, leaguing with the allies or the enemies of the empire, as might suit the exigencies of the time." And now, "the pope, as an independent potentate, is forming an alliance with a transalpine sovereign for the liberation of Italy." -- Milman.33

49. The Lombards, too, sent to Charles with counter-negotiations. This the pope knew, and wrote to Charles that in Italy the Lombards were treating him with contempt, and were saying, "Let him come, this Charles, with his army of Franks; if he can, let him rescue you out of our hands;" and then Gregory laments, and pleads with Charles thus: --

"O unspeakable grief, that such sons so insulted should make no effort to defend their holy mother, the Church! Not that St. Peter is unable to protect his successors, and to exact vengeance upon their oppressors, but

the apostle is putting the faith of his followers to trial. Believe not the Lombard kings, that their only object is to punish their refractory subjects, the dukes of Spoleto and Benevento, whose only crime is that they will not join in the invasion and plunder of the Roman see. Send, O my Christian son, some faithful officer, who may report to you truly the condition of affairs here; who may behold with his own eyes the persecutions we are enduring, the humiliation of the Church, the desolation of our property, the sorrow of the pilgrims who frequent our shrine. Close not your ears against our supplication, lest St. Peter close against you the gates of heaven. I conjure you by the living and the true God, and by the keys of St. Peter, not to prefer the alliance of the Lombards to the love of the great apostle, but hasten, hasten to our succor that we may say with the prophet, `The Lord has heard us in the day of tribulation, the God of Jacob has protected us.'"34

231

50. The ambassadors and the letters of the pope "were received by Charles with decent reverence; but the greatness of his occupations and the shortness of his life, prevented his interference in the affairs of Italy, except by friendly and ineffectual mediation." -- Gibbon.35 But affairs soon took such a turn in France that the long-cherished desire of the papacy was rewarded with abundant fruition. Charles Martel was simply duke or mayor of the palace, under the sluggard kings of France. He died Oct. 21, 741. Gregory III died November 27, of the same year, and was succeeded by --

ZACHARIAS, NOV. 30, 741, TO MARCH 14, 752.

No immediate help coming from France, Zacharias made overtures to the Lombards, and a treaty of peace for twenty years was concluded between the kingdom of Lombardy and "the dukedom of Rome."

51. Charles Martel left two sons, Carloman and Pepin. Carloman being the elder was his successor in office; but he had been in place but a little while, before he resigned it to his brother, and became a monk, A. D. 747. The late events in Italy, and the prestige which the pope had gained by them, exerted a powerful influence in France; and as the pope had already desired a league with Charles Martel, who, although not possessing the title, held all the authority, of a king, Pepin, his successor, conceived the idea that perhaps he could secure the papal sanction to his assuming the title of king with the authority which he already possessed. Pepin therefore sent two ecclesiastics to consult the pope as to whether he might not be king of France. Zacharias returned answer "that the nation might lawfully unite, in the same person, the title and authority of king; and that the unfortunate Childeric, a victim of the public safety, should be degraded, shaved, and confined in a monastery for the remainder of his days. An answer so agreeable to their wishes was accepted by the Franks as the opinion of a casuist, the sentence of a judge, or the oracle of a prophet; . . . and Pepin was exalted on a buckler by the suffrage of a free people, accustomed to obey his laws, and to march under his standard;" and March 7, 752, was proclaimed king of the Franks. -- Gibbon.36

52. Zacharias died March 14, the same year, and was succeeded by

232

STEPHEN II

who died the fourth day afterward, and before his consecration, and

STEPHEN III

became pope, March 26. Astolph was now king of the Lombards. He had openly declared himself the enemy of the pope; and was determined to make not only the territories of the exarchate, but those of the pope, his own. The pope sent ambassadors, and the treaty of peace was renewed for "forty years;" "but in four months, the Lombard was again in arms. In terms of contumely and menace he demanded the instant submission of Rome, and the payment of a heavy personal tribute, a poll-tax on each citizen." The pope again sent ambassadors; but

they were treated with contempt, and Astolph invaded the territory of the exarchate, and laid siege to the capital, Ravenna.

53. "Eutychius, at this time exarch, defended the place for some time with great resolution and intrepidity; but, finding his men quite tired out, as the garrison was but small, by the repeated attacks of the enemy, and despairing of relief, he abandoned it at last, and returned, carrying with him what men and effects he could, by sea to Constantinople. Aistulphus, become thus master of the metropolis of the exarchate, reduced, almost without opposition, the other cities, and all the Pentapolis, which he added to his kingdom; and raised, by that addition, the power of the Lombards to the highest pitch it had yet attained to since the time they first entered Italy. Thus ended the exarchate of Ravenna; and, with the exarchate, the splendor of that ancient city, which had been ever since the time of Valentinian the seat of the emperors of the West, as it was afterward of the Gothic kings, and, upon their expulsion, of the exarchs, who residing there, had, for the space of one hundred and eighty-seven years, maintained the power and authority of the emperors in the West." -- Bower.37

54. Astolph, having thus supplanted the exarch, claimed as his successor, the territories of the pope, even to Rome itself. The Eastern emperor sent an ambassador by way of Rome, with whom the pope sent his brother, to Astolph to ask him to send a representative to Constantinople to arrange terms between the Lombards and the Eastern Empire.

Astolph sent them away with fair words; but seeing the pope intriguing with the emperor, he sent a messenger to the pope and the Romans demanding that they recognize his authority. They positively refused. Astolph with his army approached Rome to enforce his demand. "The pope appealed to heaven, by tying a copy of the treaty, violated by Astolph, to the holy cross." -- Milman.38 Astolph pressed the siege. The pope's case was desperate again.

55. He wrote to Pepin, but got no answer. In his distress he wrote even to Constantinople, but much less from there was there an answer. Then he determined to go personally to Pepin, and ask his help. There was present at the court of the pope an ambassador from the court of France, under whose protection Stephen placed himself, and traveled openly through the dominions of Astolph. Nov. 15, 752, he entered the French dominions. He was met on the frontier by one of the clergy and a nobleman, with orders to conduct him to the court of the king. A hundred miles from the palace he was met by Prince Charles, afterward the mighty Charlemagne, with other nobles who escorted him on his way. Three miles from the palace, the king himself, with his wife and family, and an array of nobles, met Stephen. "As the pope approached, the king dismounted from his horse, and prostrated himself on the ground before him. He then walked by the side of the pope's palfrey. The pope and the ecclesiastics broke out at once into hymns of thanksgiving, and so chanting as they went, reached the royal residence.

56. "Stephen lost no time in adverting to the object of his visit. He implored the immediate interposition of Pepin to enforce the restoration of St. Peter. . . . Pepin swore at once to fulfill all the requests of the pope."39 "He even made in advance a donation to St. Peter of several cities and territories, which were still under the rule of the Lombards. The deed was solemnly delivered, and Pepin signed it, in his own name and that of his two sons, Charles and Carloman." -- De Cormenin.40 As the winter rendered all military operations impracticable, Pepin invited the pope "to Paris, where he took up his residence in the abbey of St. Denys."

57. Pepin had already been anointed by a bishop in France, but

this was not enough; the pope must anoint him too, and then upon this claim that the king of the Franks held his kingdom by the grace of the bishop of Rome. In the monastery of St. Denys, Stephen III placed the diadem on the head of Pepin, anointed him with the holy oil, confirmed the sovereignty in his house forever, and

pronounced an eternal curse upon all who should attempt to name a king of France from any other than the race of Pepin. The pope was attacked with a dangerous sickness which kept him at the capital of France until the middle of 753.

58. On this same occasion, the pope as the head of the restored republic of Rome, renewed to Pepin the Roman title and dignity of patrician, which, as well as that of consul, had been conferred upon Charles Martel. He also bestowed the same title upon the two sons of Pepin, "to pledge them to defend the holy city." The insignia of the new office were the keys of the shrine of St. Peter, "as a pledge and symbol of sovereignty;" and a "holy" banner which it was their "right and duty to unfurl" in defense of the Church and city of Rome.

59. The emperor Leo died in 741, and was succeeded by his son, Constantine V, June 18. While Constantine was absent on an expedition against the Saracens, a rival espoused the cause of the images, usurped the throne, and triumphantly restored the worship of the images. Constantine returned with his army and was victorious against the usurper and his cause. It had been the purpose of the emperor Leo "to pronounce the condemnation of images as an article of faith, and by the authority of the general council;" and now his son fulfilled that purpose. He convened a general council at Constantinople in 754, composed of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops. After six months' deliberations, in a long disquisition they rendered their "unanimous decree that all visible symbols of Christ, except in the eucharist, were either blasphemous or heretical; that image-worship was a corruption of Christianity and a renewal of paganism; that all such monuments of idolatry should be broken or erased; and that those who should refuse to deliver the objects of their private superstition were guilty of disobedience to the authority of the Church and to the emperor." -- Gibbon.41

60. "The patient East abjured, with reluctance, her sacred images; they were fondly cherished and vigorously defended by the independent zeal of the Italians."42 The decree of the council was enforced by all the power of the emperor in bitter persecution. He "demanded of all the bishops and of the most distinguished monks a written assent to the decree of his synod. We do not learn that one single man among the bishops and secular clergy of the whole [Byzantine] kingdom refused; but so much the more earnestly was opposition made by many monks." -- Hefele.43

61. Meantime Astolph had persuaded Carloman to leave his monastery, and go to the court of Pepin to counteract the influence of the pope, and if possible to win Pepin to the cause of the Lombards. But the unfortunate Carloman was at once imprisoned "for life," and his life was ended in a few days. In September and October, 753, Pepin and the pope marched to Italy against Astolph, who took refuge in Pavia. They advanced to the walls of that city: and Astolph was glad to purchase an ignominious peace, by pledging himself, on oath, to restore the territory of Rome.

62. Pepin returned to his capital; and Stephen retired to Rome. But Pepin was no sooner well out of reach, than Astolph was under arms again, and on his way to Rome. He marched to the very gates of the city, and demanded the surrender of the pope. "He demanded that the Romans should give up the pope into his hands, and on these terms only would he spare the city. Astolph declared he would not leave the pope a foot of land." -- Milman.44

63. Stephen hurried away messengers with a letter to Pepin in which the pope reminded him that St. Peter had promised him eternal life in return for a vow which he had made to make a donation to St. Peter. He told Pepin that he risked eternal damnation in not hastening to fulfill his vow; and that as Peter had Pepin's handwriting to the vow, if he did not fulfill it, the apostle would present it against him in the day of judgment. Pepin did not respond, and a second letter was dispatched in which the pope "conjured him, by God and His holy mother, by the angels in heaven, by the apostles St. Peter

and St. Paul, and by the last day," to hasten to the rescue of his holy mother, the Church, and promised him, if he would do so, "victory over all the barbarian nations, and eternal life."

64. But even yet Pepin did not respond; and as Astolph was pressing closer and harder, the pope determined to have St. Peter himself address the dilatory king. Accordingly, he sent now the following letter: --

"I, Peter the apostle, protest, admonish, and conjure you, the most Christian kings, Pepsin, Charles, and Carloman, with all the hierarchy, bishops, abbots, priests, and all monks; all judges, dukes, counts, and the whole people of the Franks. The mother of God likewise adjures you, and admonishes and commands you, she as well as the thrones and dominions, and all the hosts of heaven, to save the beloved city of Rome from the detested Lombards. If ye hasten, I, Peter, the apostle, promise you my protection in this life and in the next, I will prepare for you the most glorious mansions in heaven, will bestow on you the everlasting joys of paradise. Make common cause with my people of Rome, and I will grant whatever ye may pray for. I conjure you not to yield up this city to be lacerated and tormented by the Lombards, lest your own souls be lacerated and tormented in hell, with the devil and his pestilential angels. Of all nations under heaven, the Franks are highest in the esteem of St. Peter; to me you owe all your victories. Obey, and obey speedily, and, by my suffrage, our Lord Jesus Christ will give you in this life length of days, security, victory; in the life to come, will multiply his blessings upon you, among his saints and angels."45

65. This aroused Pepin to the most diligent activity. Astolph heard that he was coming, and hastened back to his capital; but scarcely heard he reached it before Pepin was besieging him there. Astolph yielded at once, and gave up to Pepin the whole disputed territory. Representatives of the emperor of the East were there to demand that it be restored to him; but "Pepin declared that his sole object in the war was to show his veneration for St. Peter;" and as the spoils of conquest, he bestowed the whole of it upon the pope -- A. D. 755. "The representatives of the pope, who, however, always speak of the republic of Rome, passed through the land, receiving the homage of the authorities, and the keys of the cities. The district comprehended Ravenna, Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Cesena, Sinigaglia, Iesi, Forlimpopoli, Forli with the Castle Sussibio, Montefeltro, Acerra, Monte di Lucano,

Serra, San Marino, Bobbio, Urbino, Cagli, Luciolo, Gubbio, Comachio, and Narni, which was severed from the dukedom of Spoleto."46

66. Astolph was soon afterward killed while hunting. The succession was disputed between Desiderius and Rachis. Desiderius secured the throne by courting the influence of the pope, and in return the pope compelled him to agree to surrender to the papacy five cities, and the whole duchy of Ferrara besides. The agreement was afterward fulfilled, and these territories were added to the kingdom of the pope.

67. Stephen III died April 26, 757, and was succeeded by his brother --

PAUL, MAY 29, 757, TO JUNE 28, 767,

who glorified Pepin as a new Moses, who had freed Israel from the bondage of Egypt. As Moses had confounded idolatry, so had Pepin confounded heresy; and he rapturously exclaimed, "Thou, after God, art our defender and aider. If all the hairs of our heads were tongues, we could not give you thanks equal to your deserts." When Constantine V learned that Pepin had bestowed upon the pope "the exarchate of Ravenna and Pentapolis," he sent two ambassadors to Pepin to persuade him to restore those lands to the authority of the Eastern emperor. But, to his request, Pepin answered that "the Franks had not shed their blood for the Greeks, but for St. Peter and the salvation of their souls; and he would not, for all the gold in the world, take back his promise made to the Roman Church." Paul I "took every pains to work in opposition to the Byzantines;" and "in one of the letters which Pope Paul now addressed to Pepin, he assured him that it was the affair of the images that was the principal cause of the great anger of the Greeks against Rome." -- Hefele.47

68. All the donations which Pepin had bestowed upon the papacy were received and held by the popes, under the pious fiction that they were for such holy uses as keeping up the lights in the churches, and maintaining the poor. But in fact they were held as the dominions of the new sovereign State descended from the Roman republic, the actual authority of which had now become merged in the pope, and by right of which the pope had already made Charles a Roman consul,

and Pepin a patrician. All these territories the pope ruled as sovereign. He "took possession as lord and master; he received the homage of the authorities and the keys of the cities. The local or municipal institutions remained; but the revenue, which had before been received by the Byzantine crown, became the revenue of the Church: of that revenue the pope was the guardian, distributor, possessor." -- Milman.48

69. In A. D. 768, Pepin died, and was succeeded by his two sons, Charles and Carloman. In 771 Carloman died, Charlemagne reigned. In 772 succeeded to the popedom --

HADRIAN OR ADRIAN, FEB. 9, 772, TO DEC. 25, 795.

70. Charlemagne was a no less devout Catholic than was Clovis before him. His wars against the pagan Saxons were almost wholly wars of religion; and his stern declaration that "these Saxons must be Christianized or wiped out," expresses the temper both of his religion and of his warfare. The enmity between the pope and the Lombards still continued; and the king of the Lombards invaded the territory and took possession of some of the cities, which Pepin had bestowed upon the papacy. The pope immediately applied to Charlemagne, reminding him of the obligation that was upon him ever since he with his father Pepin had received of the pope the title and dignity of patrician of Rome. Charlemagne marched immediately into Lombardy, A. D. 773, and laid siege to Pavia, the Lombard capital: at the same time with a part of his army attacking the city of Verona.

71. It was the month of October before Verona fell; and Pavia held out till the following summer. As Easter approached, Charlemagne decided to celebrate the festival in Rome. In the month of March, "attended by a great many bishops, abbots, and other ecclesiastics, who had accompanied him into Italy, as well as officers and persons of distinction," he made his journey to the renowned city. As soon as the pope knew the road upon which Charlemagne was coming "he sent all the magistrates and judges of the city, with their banners and the badges of their respective offices, to meet him at thirty miles' distance, and attend him the remaining part of his journey. At a

mile from the gate he was received by all the militia of Rome under arms, and a procession of children carrying branches of olive trees in their hands and singing his praises. After them appeared at some distance the crosses that were carried according to custom before the exarchs and the Roman patricians, in their public entries. As soon as he saw the crosses, Charlemagne alighted from his horse, with all his retinue, and, attended by his own nobility and the Roman, went on foot, amidst the loud acclamations of the people crowding from all parts to see him, the rest of the way to the Vatican.

72. "As for the pope, he, with the whole body of the clergy, had repaired to the church of the Vatican early in the morning to await there the arrival of the king, and conduct him in person to the tomb of St. Peter. Charlemagne being arrived at the foot of the steps leading up to the church, kneeled down and kissed the first step; and thus continued kneeling down and kissing each step as he ascended. At the entry of the church he was received by the pontiff in all the gorgeous attire of his pontifical ornaments. They embraced each other with great tenderness; and the king holding the pope's right hand with his left, they thus entered the church: the people and clergy singing aloud the words of the gospel, `Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' The pope conducted the king straight to the confession; that is, to the supposed tomb of St. Peter; and there prostrating

themselves both on the ground, they returned thanks to the prince of the apostles for the great advantage the king had, by his intercession, already obtained over his enemies and the enemies of the Church. . . .

73. "The third day after Easter the pope and the king had a conference in the Vatican, when Hadrian coming to the main point put the king in mind of the promise which King Pepin, his father, and he himself had made at Chiersi to his holy predecessor, Pope Stephen, extolled the generosity of his predecessors and his own to the apostolic see, the merit they had thereby acquired, and the reward that was on that account reserved for them in heaven; and earnestly entreated him as he tendered his happiness in this world and the other, to confirm his former promise or donation; to cause all the places mentioned therein to be delivered up without further delay to St. Peter;

240

and to secure forever the possession of them to that apostle and his Church. Charlemagne readily complied with the desire of the pope: and having caused the former instrument of donation to be read, he ordered Etherius, his chaplain and notary, to draw up another. This new instrument he signed himself: and, requiring all the bishops, abbots, and other great men who had attended him to Rome, to sign it, with his own hand he laid it thus signed, kissing it with great respect and devotion, on the body of St. Peter." -- Bower.49

74. This document has been so utterly lost, that it is impossible to know just what was included in the donation. It was more to the interest of the papacy that it should be lost, than that it should be preserved. If it were preserved, the claims of the papacy could be confined to its specified limits: while if it were utterly lost, they could under it claim at least everything within the bounds of all Italy. And this has actually been done: "It is said to have comprehended the whole of Italy, the exarchate of Ravenna from Istria to the frontiers of Naples, including the Island of Corsica." -- Milman. It is known that at least the dukedom of Spoleto was added to the territories already named in the donation of Pepin. "Charlemagne made this donation as lord by conquest over the Lombard kingdom, and the territory of the exarchate."50

75. Charlemagne returned to the siege of Pavia, which he pressed so hard that the city soon fell. Desiderius, the Lombard king, was obliged to surrender "and deliver up himself, with his wife and daughter, to Charlemagne upon condition, for the conqueror would hear to no other, that their lives were spared. Charlemagne took them with him into France, and confined them, according to some writers, first to Liege and afterward to the monastery of Corbie, where Desiderius is said to have spent the rest of his life in fasting, in praying, and in other good works. Thus ended the reign of the Lombard princes in Italy two hundred and six years after they had made themselves masters of that country. I say the reign of the Lombard princes; for, properly speaking, that kingdom did not end now, Charlemagne having assumed, upon the surrender of Pavia and the captivity of Desiderius,

241

the title of King of the Lombards, and left the people in the same condition he found them; so that the monarch was changed, but no alteration was made in the monarchy.

76. "As Charlemagne claimed the kingdom of the Lombards by right of conquest, he caused himself, soon after the reduction of Pavia, to be crowned king of Lombardy by the archbishop of Milan at a place called Modastia, about ten miles from that city. Of that ceremony we read the following account in the Ordo Romanus, a very ancient ritual: The new king was led out of his chamber by several bishops to the church; and being conducted to the high altar, the archbishop, after some solemn prayers, asked the people whether they were willing to subject themselves to Charles, and with constant fidelity obey his commands? The people answering that they were willing, the bishop anointed his head, breast, shoulders, and arms, praying that the new king might be successful in his wars, and happy in his issue. He then girt him with a sword, put bracelets on his arms, and gave him a robe, a ring, and a scepter; and having placed the crown on his head he led him through the choir to the throne, and having seated him there and given him the kiss of peace, he celebrated divine service."

77. Having thus completed the conquest of Lombardy and placed, upon his own head the iron crown of that kingdom, "Charlemagne's first care, after the reduction of Pavia, was to put the pope in possession of all the places that had been yielded to him by his father or himself; viz., the exarchate, the Pentapolis, and the dukedom of Spoleto, which, however, continued to be governed by its own dukes. Thus the popes had at last the satisfaction, the so-long-wished-for satisfaction, of seeing the Lombards humbled, and no longer able to control them in their ambitious views; the emperors driven almost out of Italy; and themselves enriched by the spoils of both. . . . Charlemagne, having thus settled the affairs of Italy to the entire satisfaction of the pope and his own, repassed the mountains in the month of August of the present year [774], and returned to France." -- Bower.51

78. In exactly the papal, the feudal, form of temporal government, "Hadrian took possession of the exarchate, seemingly with the power and privileges of a temporal prince. Throughout the exarchate of

Ravenna he had `his men,' who were judged by magistrates of his appointment, owed him fealty, and could not leave the land without his special permission. Nor are these only ecclesiastics, subordinate to his spiritual power (that spiritual supremacy Hadrian indeed asserted to the utmost extent: Rome had a right of judicature over all churches); but his language to Charlemagne is that of a feudal suzerain also: `As your men are not allowed to come to Rome without your permission and special letter, so my men must not be allowed to appear at the court of France without the same credentials from me. The same allegiance which the subjects of Charlemagne owed to him, was to be required from the subjects of the see of Rome to the pope. Let him be thus admonished: We are to remain in the service, and under the dominion, of the blessed apostle St. Peter to the end of the world.' The administration of justice was in the pope's name; and not only the ecclesiastical dues, and the rents of estates forming part of the patrimony of St. Peter, the civil revenue likewise came into his treasury. Hadrian bestows on Charlemagne as a gift, the marbles and mosaics of the imperial palace in Ravenna: that palace apparently his own undisputed property.

79. "Such was the allegiance claimed over the exarchate and the whole territory included in the donation of Pepin and Charlemagne: with all which the ever-watchful pope was continually adding (parts of the old Sabine territory, of Campania and of Capua) to the immediate jurisdiction of the papacy. Throughout these territories the old Roman institutions remained under the pope as patrician; the patrician seemed tantamount to imperial authority. The city of Rome alone maintained, with the form, somewhat of the independence of a republic. Hadrian, with the power, assumed the magnificence of a great potentate. His expenditure in Rome more especially, as became his character, on the religious buildings, was profuse. Rome with the increase of the papal revenues, began to resume more of her ancient splendor." -- Milman.52

80. In 776 Charlemagne was obliged by a Lombard revolt to go again to Italy. His motions were, however, so prompt and vigorous that it was not necessary for him to remain there long. In 780, again

because of a Lombard revolt, and also because the archbishop of Ravenna had laid claim to the exarchate in opposition to the pope, he was obliged to go again to Italy. This time he went even to Rome, where he again celebrated Easter, 781, with the pope; and had his son Carloman, who was five years old, baptized by the pope; and both his sons Carloman and Louis anointed kings -- Carloman of Lombardy, Louis of Aquitaine.

81. During all these years, the Iconoclastic War had gone on between the East and the West. Constantine V had died Sept. 14, 775, and had been succeeded by his son, Leo IV, who largely relieved the pressure which Constantine had continuously held, against the worship of images. He died Sept. 8, 780, and was succeeded by his son, Constantine VI, who was but ten years old. Because of the youth of the new Constantine, his mother Irene became his guardian, and began diligently to work for the restoration of the images. She opened correspondence with Pope Hadrian I, who "exhorted her continually to this."53 But since the image worship had

been abolished by a general council, it was only by a general council that image worship could be doctrinally restored. It took considerable time to bring this about, so that it was not till 787 that the council was convened.

82. This council, called also the seventh general council, was held at Nice, in Asia, especially for the prestige that would accrue to it by the name of the second Council of Nice. It was held Sept. 24 to Oct. 23, A. D. 787. "The iconoclasts appeared, not as judges, but as criminals or penitents; the scene was decorated by the legates of Pope Adrian, and the Eastern patriarchs; the decrees were framed by the president, Tarasius, and ratified by the acclamations and subscriptions of three hundred and fifty bishops. They unanimously pronounced that the worship of images is agreeable to Scripture and reason, to the Fathers and councils of the Church." -- Gibbon.54

83. The closing words of the decree of the council are as follows: --

"We are taught by the Lord, the apostles, and the prophets, that we ought to honor and praise before all, the holy God-bearer, who is exalted above all heavenly powers; further, the holy angels, the apostles, prophets, and martyrs, the holy doctors, and all saints, that we may avail ourselves of their intercession, which can make us acceptable to God if we walk virtuously. Moreover, we venerate also the image of the sacred and life-giving cross and the relics of the saints, and accept the sacred and venerable images, and greet and embrace them, according to the ancient tradition of the holy Catholic Church of God, namely, of our holy Fathers, who received these images, and ordered them to be set up in all churches everywhere. These are the representations of our Incarnate Saviour Jesus Christ, then of our inviolate Lady and quite holy God-bearer, and of the unembodied angels, who have appeared to the righteous in human form; also the pictures of the holy apostles, prophets, martyrs, etc., that we may be reminded by the representation of the original, and may be led to a certain participation in His holiness."

84. "This decree was subscribed by all present, even by the priors of monasteries and some monks. The two papal legates added to their subscription the remark, that they received all who had been converted from the impious heresy of the enemies of images." -- Hefele.55 "The council was not content with this formal and solemn subscription. With one voice they broke out into a long acclamation, `We all believe, we all assent, we all subscribe. This is the faith of the apostles, this is the faith of the Church, this is the faith of the orthodox, this is the faith of all the world. We, who adore the Trinity, worship images. Whoever does not the like, anathema upon him! Anathema on all who call images idols! Anathema on all who communicate with them who do not worship images! Anathema upon Theodorus, falsely called bishop of Ephesus; against Sisinnius, of Perga, against Basilius with the ill omened name! Anathema against the new Arius Nestorius and Dioscorus, Anastasius; against Constantine and Nicetas (the iconoclast patriarchs of Constantinople)! Everlasting glory to the orthodox Germanus, to John of Damascus! To Gregory of Rome everlasting glory! Everlasting glory to the preachers of truth!"56

85. "In the West, Pope Adrian I accepted and announced the decrees of the Nicene assembly, which is now revered by the Catholics as the seventh in rank of the general councils." "For the honor of

orthodoxy, at least the orthodoxy of the Roman Church, it is somewhat unfortunate that the two princes [Constantine and Irene] who convened the two councils of Nice, are both stained with the blood of their sons." -- Gibbon.57

86. In the year 787 Charlemagne went again to Italy, took six cities -- Sora, Arces, Aqrpino, Arpino, Theano, and Capua -- of the dukedom of Beneventum, and added them to his already immense territorial donations to the papacy. In the year 795 Pope Hadrian died, and was immediately succeeded by --

who in the year 799 made a journey to France, and was royally received and entertained by Charlemagne. At a royal banquet, the king and the pope quaffed together "their rich wines with convivial glee." -- Milman.58

87. And now Charlemagne's conquests were finished. He wore the crown of the Frankish kingdom, and the iron crown of the kingdom of Lombardy. In addition to these two kingdoms, he was the ruler of a vast region, in which dukedoms were almost as large as kingdoms: some of which had indeed been kingdoms. He was the one great sovereign in Europe; and the one great defender of the Church. Why then should he not be emperor? He and his father and his grandfather had all been made by the popes patricians of Rome. And now that Charlemagne was so much greater than when he was made patrician; and so much greater than was either his father or his grandfather when they were made patricians; why should he not have a yet higher dignity? If a mere king of France could deserve to be a patrician of Rome, did not that same king of France when also king of Lombardy and sovereign of vast territories besides, deserve a dignity as much greater than that of patrician as his power was now greater than when he was only king of France? There were only two dignities higher than that of patrician -- consul and emperor; and that of consul as well as that of patrician had been bestowed on Charles Martel when he was not even a king. Therefore for Charlemagne what appropriate dignity remained but that of emperor.

88. In the year 800 Charlemagne made a journey to Rome. He arrived in the city November 23, and remained there through the winter, and till after Easter. On Christmas day, A. D. 800, magnificent services were held. Charlemagne appeared not in the dress of his native country, but in that of a patrician of Rome, which honor he, as both his father and his grandfather, had received from the pope. Thus arrayed, the king with all his court, his nobles, and the people, and the whole clergy of Rome, attended the services. "The pope himself chanted the mass; the full assembly were wrapped in profound devotion. At the close the pope rose, advanced toward Charles with a splendid crown in his hands, placed it upon his brow, and proclaimed him Caesar Augustus." The dome of the great church "resounded with the acclamations of the people, `Long life and victory to Charles, the most pious Augustus, crowned by God the great and pacific emperor of the Romans.'" Then the head and body of Charlemagne were anointed with the "holy oil" by the hands of the pope himself, and the services were brought to a close.59 In return for all this, Charlemagne swore to maintain the faith, the powers, and the privileges of the Church; and to recognize the spiritual dominion of the pope, throughout the limits of his empire.

89. It would be a sheer ignoring of the native far-seeing craftiness of the papacy, to suppose that this deduction had not occurred to the popes who witnessed Charlemagne's wonderful career. This would be true even though there were nothing but that amazing career, upon which the papacy might be expected to build. But in addition to this there are in the course of the papacy unquestionable facts which practically demonstrate that it was a deeply laid scheme for the exaltation of the papacy, its secret working traceable far back in her ambitious course.

90. The conferring of the dignity of patrician, as well as that of consul, was a prerogative that pertained to the Roman emperor alone. For the pope then to confer such a dignity was in itself first to assert that the pope occupied the place of emperor, and possessed an authority that included that of emperor. This is exactly what was claimed. We have seen that even while the Roman Empire yet remained, Pope Leo

the Great, 440-461, declared that the former Rome was but the promise of the latter Rome; that the glories of the former were to be reproduced in Catholic Rome; that Romulus and Remus were but the precursors of Peter and Paul, and the successors of Romulus therefore the precursors of the successors of Peter; and that as the former Rome had ruled the world, so the latter by the see of the holy blessed Peter as head of the world would dominate

the earth. This conception was never lost by the papacy. And when the Roman Empire had in itself perished, and only the papacy survived the ruin and firmly held place and power in Rome, the capital, how much stronger and with the more certitude would that conception be held and asserted.

91. This conception was also intentionally and systematically developed. The Scriptures were industriously studied and ingeniously perverted to maintain it. By a perverse application of the Levitical system of the Old Testament, the authority and eternity of the Roman priesthood was established; and by perverse deductions "from the New Testament, the authority and eternity of Rome herself was established." First taking the ground that she was the only true continuation of original Rome, upon that the papacy took the ground that wherever the New Testament cited or referred to the authority of original Rome, she was meant, because she was the true, and the only true, continuation of original Rome. Accordingly, where the New Testament enjoins submission to the powers that be, or obedience to governors, it means the papacy; because the only power and the only governors that then were, were Roman. And since even Christ had recognized the authority of Pilate who was but the representative of Rome, who should dare to disregard the authority of the papacy, the true continuation of that authority to which even the Lord from heaven had submitted? "Every passage was seized on where submission to the powers that be is enjoined; every instance cited where obedience had actually been rendered to imperial officials: special emphasis being laid on the sanction which Christ himself had given to Roman dominion by pacifying the world through Augustus, by being born at the time of the taxing, by paying tribute to Caesar, by saying to Pilate, `Thou couldest have no power at all against me except it were given thee from above.'"60

248

92. The power that was usurped by the popes upon these perversions of Scripture, was finally confirmed by a specific and absolute forgery. This "most stupendous of all the medieval forgeries" consisted of "the Imperial Edict of Donation," or "the Donation of Constantine." "Itself a portentous falsehood, it is the most unimpeachable evidence of the thoughts and beliefs of the priesthood which framed it. . . . It tells how Constantine the Great, cured of his leprosy by the prayers of Sylvester, resolved, on the fourth day after his baptism, to forsake the ancient seat for a new capital on the Bosphorus, lest the continuance of the secular government should cramp the freedom of the spiritual; and how he bestowed therewith upon the pope and his successors the sovereignty over Italy and the countries of the West. But this was not all, although this is what historians, in admiration of its splendid audacity, have chiefly dwelt upon. The edict proceeds to grant to the Roman pontiff and his clergy a series of dignities and privileges, all of them enjoyed by the emperor and his Senate, all of them showing the same desire to make the pontifical a copy of the imperial office. The pope is to inhabit the Lateran palace, to wear the diadem, the collar, the purple cloak, to carry the scepter, and to be attended by a body of chamberlains. Similarly his clergy are to ride on white horses, and receive the honors and immunities of the Senate and patricians. The notion which prevails throughout, that the chief of the religious society must be in every point conformed to his prototype, the chief of the civil, is the key to all the thoughts and acts of the Roman clergy: not less plainly seen in the details of papal ceremonial, than in the gigantic scheme of papal legislation." -- Bryce.61

93. The document tells how that "Constantine found Sylvester in one of the monasteries on Mount Soracte, and having mounted him on a mule, he took hold of his bridle rein, and, walking all the way, the emperor conducted Sylvester to Rome, and placed him on the papal throne;" and then, as to the imperial gift, says: --

"We attribute to the see of Peter, all the dignity, all the glory, all the authority, of the imperial power. Furthermore we give to Sylvester and to his successors our palace of the Lateran, which is incontestably the finest palace on earth; we give him our crown, our miter,

249

our diadem, and all our imperial vestments; we transfer to him the imperial dignity. We bestow on the holy pontiff in free gift the city of Rome, and all the Western cities of Italy. To cede precedence to him, we divest ourselves of our authority over all these provinces; and we withdraw from Rome, transferring the seat of our empire to Byzantium: inasmuch as it is not proper that an earthly emperor should preserve the least authority where God hath established the head of His religion."62

94. This forgery was committed in these very times of the intrigues of the popes with Pepin and Charlemagne against the Lombards and the authority of the Eastern Empire as represented in the West in the exarchate of Ravenna. It was first produced as a standard of appeal in 776; and in the dense ignorance in which the papacy had whelmed Europe, it was easy to maintain it. And this is the great secret of the marvelous success of the popes in securing to the papacy the immense donations of the Italian and Lombard cities and territories by Pepin and Charlemagne. And with such inveterate views of her own possession of the imperial dignity and prerogatives, to do with as she would, to bestow upon whom she pleased, it is easy enough to understand that she would anxiously watch the conquering career of Charlemagne, or of any other who might appear, and would carefully cultivate his friendship ready to make use of him at the opportune moment, to flatter his ambition and exalt her own dignity and power by exercising the prerogative of creating emperors.

95. Just at this time also there occurred another circumstance which perfectly opened the way for the papacy to take this mighty step: the Eastern Empire had fallen absolutely to a woman. It was held to be utterly illegitimate for a woman to reign as empress. Before this, women had exercised the imperial authority; yet it was always concealed under the name of a husband or a minor son. But in 797 Irene, the mother of Constantine VI and widow of the emperor Leo IV, who from 780 to 790 had reigned as regent, deposed her son, and had his eyes put out with such barbarity that in a few days afterward he died. "Upon his death Irene was proclaimed empress. And thus, what had never before happened, did the empire fall to the distaff." -- Bower.63

And into the breach caused by the usurpation of Irene, 797-802, Pope Leo III pressed himself with the crowning of Charlemagne as emperor, and, thus, with the restoration of the Western Empire.

96. When Odoacer with the Senate in 476 abolished the Western Empire, "he did not abolish it as a separate power, but caused it to be reunited with or sunk into the Eastern." He sent the imperial insignia to the Eastern emperor, with the statement that one emperor was sufficient: "so that from that time there was, as there had been before Diocletian, a single undivided Roman Empire." And now when by the usurpation of Irene there was no Eastern emperor and Charlemagne is crowned emperor, it was held to be the transference of the empire once more to its original and rightful place in the West. And thus Charlemagne was always in the fiction "held to be the legitimate successor, not of Romulus Augustus, but of Leo IV, Heraclius, Justinian, Aracadius, and the whole Eastern line. And hence it is that in all the annals of the time, and of many succeeding centuries, the name of Constantine VI, the sixty-seventh in order from Augustus, is followed without a break by that of Charles, the sixty-eighth." Leo and Charlemagne professed that they were "but legitimately filling up the place of the deposed Constantine the Sixth: the people of the imperial city exercising their ancient right of choice, their bishop his right of consecration." -- Bryce.63

97. Thus the assumption of the papacy in the crowning of Charlemagne emperor, was not merely the assumption of power and prerogative to create an emperor in itself: it was nothing less than the enormous assumption of all the power and prerogative of the whole original Roman Empire, and the re-establishment of it in its own original capital Rome. And though for the immediate occasion, Charlemagne was the convenient means by which this enormous assumption was made to prevail; and though through later occasions, Charlemagne's successors were the means by which that enormous assumption was maintained; yet these were indeed only the occasional means of the papacy's attaining to that supreme height of arrogance at which she would hold as entirely of herself all the power and prerogative of that enormous assumption, and, "arrayed with sword and crown and scepter,"

would stout aloud to the assembled multitude, "I AM CAESAR -- I AM EMPEROR!"

98. The real nature of this new empire with office of emperor can be seen from the fact that "in a great assembly held at Aachen, A. D. 802, the lately crowned emperor revised the laws of all the races that obeyed him, endeavoring to harmonize and correct them, and issued a capitulary singular in subject and in tone. All persons within his dominions, as well ecclesiastical as civil, who have already sworn allegiance to him as king, are thereby commanded to swear to him afresh as Caesar; and all who have never yet sworn, down to the age of twelve, shall now take the same oath. `At the same time it shall be publicly explained to all what is the force and meaning of this oath, and how much more it includes than a mere promise of fidelity to the monarch's person. Firstly, it binds those who swear it, to live, each and every one of them, according to his strength and knowledge, in the holy service of God; since the lord emperor can not extend over all his care and discipline. Secondly, it binds them neither by force nor fraud to seize or molest any of the goods or servants of the crown. Thirdly, to do no violence nor treason toward the Holy Church, or to widows, or orphans, or strangers, seeing that the lord emperor has been appointed after the Lord and His saints, the protector and defender of all such. Then in similar fashion purity of life is prescribed to the monks; homicide, the neglect of hospitality, and other offenses are denounced, the notions of sin and crime being intermingled and almost identified in a way to which no parallel can be found, unless it be in the Mosaic Code. . . . The whole cycle of social and moral duty is deduced from the obligation of obedience to the visible autocratic head of the Christian State.

99. "In most of Charles's words and deeds, nor less distinctly in the writings of his adviser Alcuin, may be discerned the working of the same theocratic ideas. Among his intimate friends he chose to be called by the name of David, exercising in reality all the powers of the Jewish king; presiding over this kingdom of God upon earth rather as a second Constantine or Theodosius than in the spirit and traditions of the Julii or the Flavii. Among his measures there are two which in particular recall the first Christian emperor. As Constantine

founds, so Charles erects on a firmer basis, the connection of Church and State. Bishops and abbots are as essential a part of rising feudalism as counts and dukes. Their benefices are held under the same conditions of fealty and the service in war of their vassal tenants, not of the spiritual person himself: they have similar rights of jurisdiction, and are subject alike to the imperial missi. The monarch tries often to restrict the clergy, as persons, to spiritual duties; quells the insubordination of monasteries; endeavors to bring the seculars into a monastic life by instituting and regulating chapters. But after granting wealth and power, the attempt was vain: his strong hand withdrawn, they laughed at control. Again, it was by him first that the payment of tithes, for which the priesthood had long been pleading, was made compulsory in Western Europe, and the support of the ministers of religion intrusted to the laws of the State." -- Bryce.65

100. "Thus the holy Roman Church and the holy Roman Empire are one and the same thing, in two aspects; and Catholicism, the principle of the universal Christian society, is also Romanism: that is, rests upon Rome as the origin and type of its universality; manifesting itself in a mystic dualism which corresponds to the two natures of its Founder. As divine and eternal, its head is the pope, to whom souls have been intrusted; as human and temporal, the emperor, commissioned to rule men's bodies and acts. In nature and compass the government of these two potentates is the same, differing only in the sphere of its working; and it matters not whether we call the pope a spiritual emperor, or the emperor a secular pope.

101. "This is the one perfect and self-consistent scheme of the union of Church and State; for, taking the absolute coincidence of their limits to be self-evident, it assumes the infallibility of their joint government, and devices, as a corollary from that infallibility, the duty of the civil magistrate to root out heresy and schism no less than to punish treason and rebellion. It is also the scheme which, granting the possibility of their harmonious action, places the two powers in that relation which gives each of them its maximum strength. But by a law to

which it would be hard to find exceptions, in proportion as the State became more Christian, the Church, who to work out her purposes

had assumed worldly forms, became by the contact worldlier, meaner, spiritually weaker."66

102. As to the relationship of the emperor and the pope "no better illustrations can be desired than those to be found in the office for the imperial coronation at Rome, too long to be transcribed here, but well worthy of an attentive study. The rights prescribed in it are rights of consecration to a religious office: the emperor, besides the sword, globe, and scepter of temporal power, receives a ring as the symbol of his faith, is ordained a subdeacon, assists the pope in celebrating mass, partakes as a clerical person of the communion in both kinds, is admitted a canon of St. Peter and St. John Lateran. . . . The emperor swears to cherish and defend the holy Roman Church and her bishop. . . . Among the emperor's official titles there occur these: `Head of Christendom," `Defender and Advocate of the Christian Church,' `Temporal Head of the Faithful,' `Protector of Palestine and of the Catholic Faith.'"67

---

1 [Page 209] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. i, book iii, chap. iv, last paragraph.

2 [Page 210] Id., par. 10.

3 [Page 210] "Lives of the Popes," Vigilius, par. 19.

4 [Page 213] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Vigilius.

5 [Page 215] "Lives of the Popes," par. 6.

6 [Page 215] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlvii, par. 26.

7 [Page 215] "Lives of the Popes," Pelagius II.

8 [Page 216] Id.,Gregory, par. 18.

9 [Page 217] Id., pars. 31-34.

10 [Page 218] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlvi, par. 12.

11 [Page 219] Id.

12 [Page 219] Id.

13 [Page 219] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Gregory, under the year 602, or par. 59.

14 [Page 220] While Maurice was emperor, to him Gregory had written "that his tongue could not express the good he had received of the Almighty, and his lord the emperor; that he thought himself bound in gratitude to pray incessantly for the life of his most pious and most Christian lord: and that, in return for the goodness of his most religious lord to him, he could do no less than love the very ground which he walked on." -- Id., under the year 603, or par. 62.

15 [Page 220] Id., under 603, or par. 60.

16 [Page 220] Id., under 603, or par. 61.

17 [Page 221] Id., Boniface III, par. 1.

18 [Page 222] Id., par. 8.

19 [Page 223] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. i, book iii, chap. vii, par. 1.

20 [Page 223] Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Lombards, par. 6.

21 [Page 223] "History of the Popes," Gregory I, par. 82.

22 [Page 223]"Decline and Fall," chap. xiv. par. 18.

23 [Page 224] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlix, par. 2.

24 [Page 225] Id., chap. xx, pars. 11, 13.

25 [Page 225] "Historical Studies," art. Bishops of Rome, par. 13.

26 [Page 225] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlix, pars. 2, 3.

27 [Page 226] Id., chap. xlix, par. 4.

28 [Page 227] "Historical Studies," art. Bishops of Rome, par. 33.

29 [Page 227] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlix, par. 5.

30 [Page 228] Id., par. 9.

31 [Page 229] Hefele's "History of the Councils," sec. cccxxxii. As late as our own day the worship of images has been supported by a Catholic bishop with the following argument: --

"The Old Testament forbade images (Ex. 20:4), because through the weakness of the Jewish people, and their strong inclination to imitate the idolatrous worships of the neighboring peoples, they had brought the spiritual and Monotheistic worship of God into danger. This prohibition was, like all ritual ordinances, no longer binding in itself, in the New Testament. On the contrary, it was the business of Christianity to lay hold of and ennoble the whole man in all his higher powers; and thus not only all the other noble arts, e. g., music and poetry, but also to draw painting and sculpture into the service of the most holy." -- Hefele, Id., par. 1.

32 [Page 229] "History of the Popes," Gregory II, par. 29.

33 [Page 230] "History of Latin Christianity," book iv, chap. ix, pars. 14, 26.

34 [Page 231] Id., par. 24.

35 [Page 231] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlix, par. 12.

36 [Page 232] Id., par. 13.

37 [Page 232] "Lives of the Popes," Stephen II, par. 3.

38 [Page 233] "History of Latin Christianity," book iv, chap. xi, par. 24.

39 [Page 234] Id., par. 25.

40 [Page 235] "History of the Popes," Stephen III, par. 21.

41 [Page 234] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlix, par. 6.

42 [Page 235] Id., par. 47.

43 [Page 236] "History of the Councils," sec. cccxxxvii.

44 [Page 237] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. ii, book iv, chap. xi, par. 28.

45 [Page 236] Id., par. 31.

46 [Page 237] Id., par. 35.

47 [Page 238] Id., sec. cccxxxviii.

48 [Page 238] Id., par. 41.

49 [Page 240] "Lives of the Popes," Hadrian, pars. 13, 14.

50 [Page 240] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. ii, book iv, chap. xii, pars. 15, 16.

51 [Page 241] "Lives of the Popes," Hadrian, par. 26, note 17.

52 [Page 242] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. ii, book iv, chap. xii, pars. 19, 20.

53 [Page 243] In his argument promotive of image worship the pope used Heb. 11:21 -- Jacob blessed both sons of Joseph and "worshiped upon the top of his staff," making it support image worship by casting out the prepositions so as to read: "worshiped the top of his staff." -- Bower's" Lives of the Popes," Hadrian, par. 40. And so it reads in the Catholic Bible to-day.

54 [Page 243] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlix, par. 17.

55 [Page 244] "History of the Councils," sec. cocli.

56 [Page 244] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book iv, chap. vii, par. 27.

57 [Page 245] "Decline and Fall," chap. xlix, par. 18.

58 [Page 245] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol ii, book iv, chap. xii, par. 26.

59 [Page 246] Id., par. 31, and Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. xlix, par. 20.

60 [Page 247] Bryce, "The Holy Roman Empire," chap. vii, par. 17.

61 [Page 248] "The Holy Roman Empire," chap. vii, pars. 8, 9.

62 [Page 249] Wylie's "History of Protestantism," book i, chap. iii, par. 14.

63 [Page 249] "Lives of the Popes," Leo III, par. 26.

64 [Page 250] "The Holy Roman Empire," chap. v, par. 10.

65 [Page 252] "The Holy Roman Empire," chap. v, pars. 8, 9 from end.

66 [Page 253] Id., chap. vii, pars. 12, 13.

67 [Page 253] Id., chap. vii, par. 16.

14. THE PAPACY AND THE BARBARIANS.

ANOTHER important and suggestive specification concerning the Ecclesiastical Empire is that "a host was given him . . . by reason of transgression."1 Transgression is simply sin, because "sin is the transgression of the law." Therefore, this statement in Daniel is in itself the original suggestion from which Paul wrote his expression, "the man of sin." It was by sin, by reason of transgression by courting the elements of sin and playing into the hands of trangression by that the man of sin gathered to himself the "host" which gave to him the power that has ever characterized his sway.

2. By apostasy in doctrine, in discipline, in philosophy, in rites, the Catholic Church had gathered to herself such a host that she was able to crowd herself upon the Roman State, to its ruin. And, now, still by reason of transgression, she gathers to herself another host -- even the host of barbarians -- by means of which she will exalt herself to the headship of the world. This is usually spoken of as the conversion of the barbarians; but, by every evidence in the case, it is manifest that such a term is a misnomer. A host gained only by reason, by means, of transgression, could be only a host gathered from the elements of iniquity, by means of iniquity; and the working of the power thus gained could be only the working of iniquity; even as described "the mystery of iniquity."

3. Ever since the time of Constantine, the god and saviour of the Catholics had been the god of battle; and no surer way to the eternal rewards of martyrdom could be taken than by being killed in a riot in behalf of the orthodox faith, or to die by punishment inflected for such proceeding, as in the case of that riotous monk who attempted to murder Orestes. It was easy, therefore, for the heathen barbarians, whose

greatest god was the god of battle, and whose greatest victory and surest passport to the halls of the warrior god, was to die in the midst of the carnage of bloody battle, -- it was easy for such people as this to become converted to the god of battle of the Catholics. A single bloody victory would turn the scale, and issue in the conversion of a whole nation.

4. As early as A. D. 430, the Huns making inroads into Gaul, severely afflicted the Burgundians, who finding impotent the power of their own god, determined to try the Catholic god. They therefore sent representatives to a neighboring city in Gaul, requesting the Catholic bishop to receive them. The bishop required them to fast for a week, during which time he catechised them, and then baptized them. Seen afterward the Burgundians found the Huns without a leader, and, suddenly falling upon them at the disadvantage, confirmed their conversion by the slaughter of ten thousand of the enemy. Thereupon the whole nation embraced the Catholic religion "with fiery zeal." -- Milman.2 Afterward, however, when about the fall of the empire, the

Visigoths under Euric asserted their dominoin over all Spain, and the greater part of Gaul, and over the Burgundians too, they deserted the Catholic Church, and adopted the Arian faith.

5. Yet Clotilda, a niece of the Burgundian king, "was educated" in the profession of the Catholic faith. She married Clovis, the pagan king of the pagan Franks, and strongly persuaded him to become a Catholic. All her pleadings were in vain, however, till A. D. 496, when in their great battle with the Alemanni, the Franks were getting the worst of the conflict, in the midst of the battle Clovis vowed that if the victory could be theirs, he would become a Catholic. The tide of battle turned; the victory was won, and Clovis was a Catholic. Clotilda hurried away a messenger with the glad news to the bishop of Rheims, who came to baptize the new convert.

6. But after the battle was over, and the dangerous crisis was past, Clovis was not certain whether he wanted to be a Catholic. He said he must consult his warriors; he did so, and they signified their readiness to adopt the same religion as their king. He then declared that he was convinced of the truth of the Catholic faith, and preparations

were at once made for the baptism of the new Constantine, Christmas day, A. D. 496. "To impress the minds of the barbarians, the baptismal ceremony was performed with the utmost pomp. The church was hung with embroidered tapestry and white curtains; odors of incense like airs of paradise, were diffused around; the building blazed with countless lights. When the new Constantine knelt in the font to be cleansed from the leprosy of his heathenism, `Fierce Sicambrian,' said the bishop, `bow thy neck; burn what thou hast adored, adore what thou hast burned.' Three thousand Franks followed the example of Clovis." -- Milman.3

7. The pope sent Clovis a letter congratulating him on his conversion. As an example of the real value of his religious instruction, it may be well to state that some time after his baptism, the bishop delivered a sermon on the crucifixion of the Saviour; and while he dwelt upon the cruelty of the Jews that transaction, Clovis exclaimed, "If I had been there with my faithful Franks, they would not have dared to do it!" "If unscrupulous ambition, undaunted valor and enterprise, and desolating warfare, had been legitimate means for the propagation of pure Christianity, it could not have found a better champion than Clovis. For the first time the diffusion of belief in the nature of the Godhead became the avowed pretext for the invasion of a neighboring territory." -- Milman.4 "His ambitious reign was a perpetual violation of moral and Christian duties; his hands were stained with blood in peace as well as in war; and as soon as Clovis had dismissed a synod of the Gallican Church, he calmly assassinated all the princes of the Merovingian race." -- Gibbon.5

8. The bishop of Vienne also sent a letter to the new convert, in which he prophesied that the faith of Clovis would be a surety of the victory of the Catholic faith; and he, with every other Catholic in Christendom, was ready to do his utmost to see that the prophecy was fulfilled. The Catholics in all the neighboring countries longed and prayed and conspired that Clovis might deliver them from the rule of Arian monarchs; and in the nature of the case, war soon followed.

9. Burgundy was the first country invaded. Before the war actually began, however, by the advice of the bishop of Rheims, a synod of the

orthodox bishops met at Lyons; then with the bishop of Vienne at their head, they visited the king of the Burgundians, and proposed that he call the Arian bishops together, and allow a conference to be held, as they were prepared to prove that the Arians were in error. To their proposal the king replied, " If yours be the true doctrine, why do you not prevent the king of the Franks from waging an unjust war against me, and from caballing with my enemies against me? There is no true Christian faith where there is rapacious covetousness for the possessions of others, and thirst for blood. Let him show forth his faith by his good works." -- Milman.6

10. The bishop of Vienne dodged this pointed question, and replied, "We are ignorant of the motives and intentions of the king of the Franks; but we are taught by the Scripture that the kingdoms which abandon the divine law are frequently subverted: and that enemies will arise on every side against those who have made God their enemy. Return with thy people to the law of God, and He will give peace and security to thy dominions." -- Gibbon.7 War followed, and the Burgundian dominions were made subject to the rule of Clovis, A. D. 500.

11. At this time the Visigoths possessed all the southwestern portion of Gaul. They, too, were Arians; and the mutual conspiracy of the Catholics in the Gothic dominions, and the crusade of the Franks from the side of Clovis, soon brought on another holy war. At the assembly of princes and warriors at Paris, A. D. 508, Clovis complained, "It grieves me to see that the Arians still possess the fairest portion of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God; and, having vanquished the heretics, we will possess and divide their fertile province." Clotilda added her pious exhortation to the effect "that doubtless the Lord would more readily lend His aid if some gift were made;" and in response, Clovis seized his battle-ax and threw it as far as he could, and as it went whirling through the air, he exclaimed, "There, on that spot where my Francesca shall fall, will I erect a church in honor of the holy apostles."8

12. War was declared, and as Clovis marched on his way, he passed through Tours, and turned aside to consult the shrine of St. Martin of

Tours, for an omen. "His messengers were instructed to remark the words of the psalm which should happen to be chanted at the precise moment when they entered the church." And the oracular clergy took care that the words which he should "happen" to hear at that moment -- uttered not in Latin, but in language which Clovis understood -- should be the following from Psalm 18: "Thou hast girded me, O Lord, with strength unto the battle; thou hast subdued unto me those who rose up against me. Thou hast given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them that hate me." The oracle was satisfactory, and in the event was completely successful. "The Visigothic kingdom was wasted and subdued by the remorseless sword of the Franks."9

13. Nor was the religious zeal of Clovis confined to the overthrow of the Arians. There were two bodies of the Franks, the Salians and the Ripuarians. Clovis was king of the Salians, Sigebert of the Ripuarians. Clovis determined to be king of all; he therefore prompted the son of Sigebert to assassinate his father, with the promise that the son should peaceably succeed Sigebert on the throne; but as soon as the murder was committed, Clovis commanded the murderer to be murdered, and then in a full parliament of the whole people of the Franks, he solemnly vowed that he had had nothing to with the murder of either the father or the son; and upon this, as there was no heir, Clovis was raised upon a shield, and proclaimed king of the Ripuarian Franks; -- all of which, with a further "long list of assassinations and acts of the darkest treachery," Gregory, bishop of Tours, commended as the will of God, saying of Clovis that "God thus daily prostrated his enemies under his hands, and enlarged his kingdom, because he walked before him with an upright heart, and did that which was well pleasing in his sight." -- Milman.10 Thus was the bloody course of Clovis glorified by the Catholic writers, as the triumph of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity over Arianism.

14. In the Spanish peninsula "the Catholics enjoyed a free toleration" under the Arian Visigoths. "During the early reigns, both of the Suevian and Visigothic kings, the Catholic bishops had held their councils undisturbed." -- Milman,11 The Visigoths remained Arian until

the reign of Recared, A. D. 568. The last Arian king of Spain was Leovigild, 572-586 A. D., the father and predecessor of Recared. Leovigild's eldest son, Hermenegild, "was invested by his father with the royal diadem, and the fair principality of Boetica." He married a daughter of King Sigebert of Austrasia, who was a Catholic. Her mother-in-law fiercely abused her. This caused Hermenegild to cling the closer to her; and by her influence and that of the archbishop of Seville, Hermenegild became a Catholic. Some time after this he rebelled against

his father, hoping to raise his principality into an independent kingdom. In the long war that followed, Hermenegild was constantly defeated, and his country, his cities, and at last himself were taken. "The rebel, despoiled of the regal ornaments, was still permitted, in a decent exile, to profess the Catholic religion." But he still fomented treasons, so that it was necessary to imprison him; and he was finally put to death.

15. King Leovigild attributed to the Catholic Church the rebellious course of his son and the purpose to establish an independent kingdom. There can scarcely be any doubt that in this he was correct; because throughout the whole course of the war and all the dealings of the king, in bringing again into subjection his rebellious son, the Catholics counted it persecution; and Hermenegild, about a thousand years afterward, was made, and now is, a Catholic saint. But when Leovigild's troubles with his son had ended in Hermenegild's execution, there was nothing that could even be construed to be persecution of the Catholics. When, in 586, Recared ascended the Visigothic throne, he was a Catholic. And, in order to smooth the way to bring the nation over to Catholicism, he "piously supposed" that his father "had abjured the errors of Arianism, and recommended to his son the conversion of the Gothic nation. To accomplish that salutary end, Recared convened an assembly of the Arian clergy and nobles, declared himself a Catholic, and exhorted them to imitate the example of their prince. . .

16. "The Catholic king encountered some difficulties on this important change in the national religion. A conspiracy, secretly fomented by the queen dowager, was formed against his life; and two counts excited a dangerous revolt in the Narbonnese Gaul. But Recared disarmed

the conspirators, defeated the rebels, and executed severe justice; which the Arians, in their turn, might brand with the reproach of persecution. Eight bishops, whose names betray their barbaric origin, abjured their errors; and all the books of Arian theology were reduced to ashes, with the house in which they had been purposely collected. The whole body of the Visigoths and Suevi were allured or driven into the pale of the Catholic communion; the faith, at least of the rising generation, was fervent and sincere; and the devout liberality of the barbarians enriched the churches and monasteries of Spain.

17. "Seventy bishops, assembled in the council of Toledo, received the submission of their conquerors; and the zeal of the Spaniards improved the Nicene Creed, by declaring the procession of the Holy Ghost, from the Son, as well as from the Father; a weighty point of doctrine, which produced, long afterward, the schism of the Greek and Latin churches. The royal proselyte immediately saluted and consulted Pope Gregory, surnamed the Great a learned and holy prelate, whose reign was distinguished by the conversion of heretics and infidels. The ambassadors of Recared respectfully offered on the threshold of the Vatican his rich presents of gold and gems: they accepted as a lucrative exchange, the hairs of St. John the Baptist; a cross which inclosed a small piece of the true wood; and a key that contained some particles of iron which had been scraped from the chains of St. Peter." -- Gibbon.12

18. Next after the "conversion" of the Visigoths, Gregory the Great could add to the glory of the Church and himself the gaining to Catholicism of the Anglo-Saxons. Before Gregory had become pope, while he was yet only a monk, he was fired with the zeal for the conquest of Angle-land, by the sight of some Anglian youth being sold for slaves in the city of Rome. As he passed by, he saw-them, and asked who they were. The slave-dealers answered: "They are Angli" Gregory exclaimed: "They have an angelic mien, and it becomes such to be coheirs with the angels in heaven." "Whence are they brought?" asked Gregory. The slave-dealers answered: "They come from the province of Deira." Gregory exclaimed: "It is well: de ira eruti -- snatched from wrath, and called to Christ." "What is the name of their king?" inquired Gregory. He was told: "Aella." "Alleluiah!" shouted Gregory. "The praise of God the Creator must be sung in those parts."

19. But Gregory's personal conquest of Angle-land was prevented by his election to the office of pope, in 587 A. D. Yet this, though preventing his personal visit to the British Isles, only gave him the more power to accomplish it by means of others: he immediately called to the task a monk by the name of Augustine. Augustine, with a band of forty monks, set out on his long journey, recommended by the pope to the favor of the good Catholic sovereigns of France. From among the Franks he obtained interpreters, and "the good offices of Queen Brunehaut, who had at this time usurped the sovereign power in France. This princess, though stained with every vice of treachery and cruelty, either possessed or pretended great zeal for the cause; and Gregory acknowledged that to her friendly assistance was in a great measure owing the success of that undertaking." -- Hume.13 With these re-enforcements Augustine and his company went forward on their mission. They landed on the isle of Thanet, of the kingdom of Kent, where the first Anglo-Saxons had made their permanent landing 148 years before. Ethelbert was king of Kent: he had married Bertha, the daughter of Charibert, king of France, who was a Catholic; it being specified in the marriage contract that she should be allowed the free exercise of her religion.

20. From Thanet, Augustine sent word to the king that he had come "as a solemn embassage from Rome, to offer to the king of Kent the everlasting bliss of heaven: an eternal kingdom in the presence of the true and living God," and asked for a meeting. The king would not meet them in any house or building, but only in the open air, in the field; "for he had taken precaution that they should not come to him in any house, according to the ancient superstition, lest, if they had any magical arts, they might at their coming impose upon him, and get the better of him." "Augustine and his followers met the king with all the pomp which they could command, with a crucifix of silver in the van of their procession, a picture of the Redeemer borne aloft, and chanting their litanies for the salvation of the king and of his people. `Your words and offers,' replied the king, `are fair; but they are new to me, and as yet unproved, I can not abandon at once the faith of my Anglian ancestors.' But the missionaries were entertained with courteous hospitality. Their severely monastic lives, their constant prayers, fastings,

and vigils, with their confident demeanor, impressed more and more favorably the barbaric mind. Rumor attributed to them many miracles. Before long the king of Kent was an avowed convert, his example was followed by many of his noblest subjects." -- Milman.14 The king as yet used no compulsion to cause his subjects to become Catholics; yet it was made plain that those who did become Catholics were special objects of royal favor.

21. Augustine, of course, sent to Gregory the glad news of the conversion of the king. Gregory rewarded him with the archbishopric. He established his see at Canterbury, and thus originated the archbishopric of Canterbury, which has ever held the primacy of all England. The pope also wrote Ethelbert, "enjoining him, in the most solemn manner, to use every means of force as well as of persuasion to convert his subjects; utterly to destroy their temples, to show no toleration to those who adhere to their idolatrous rites." A bishopric of London was established, and to the new bishop Gregory wrote that the sacred places of the heathen were not to be destroyed, provided they were well built; but were to be cleared of their idols, to be purified by holy water; and the relics of the saints to be "enshrined in the precincts. Even the sacrifices were to be continued under another name. The oxen which the heathen used to immolate to their gods were to be brought in procession on holy days. The huts or tents of boughs, which used to be built for the assembling worshipers, were still to be set up, the oxen slain and eaten in honor of the Christian festival: and thus these outward rejoicings were to train an ignorant people to the perception of true Christian joys."

22. One of these pagan festivals that was then adopted by the Catholic Church, and which to-day holds a large place even in Protestant worship, is the festival of Eostre -- Easter. Eostre, or Ostara, was the Anglo-Saxon goddess of spring. Accordingly, to her was dedicated "the fourth month, answering to our April -- thence called Eostur-monath." This goddess Eostre, or Ostara, among the Anglo-Saxons, was identical with Ishtar of the Assyrians and Babylonians, and Astarte and Ashtaroth of the Phenicians. The worship of Eostre as of Ishtar, Astarte, and Ashtaroth, was a phase of sun worship. This is indeed suggested by the

German form of the word -- Ostern -- the root of which is Ost, and means the East. From Ost there was derived oster, and osten, which signify "rising," from the rising of the sun. This idea of rising was attached specially to the springtime, because then all nature "rises" anew. The source of this rising of nature, was attributed to the sun, which, through his rising at the winter solstice, December 25, in his victory over the powers of darkness and of night, had by the time of Eostur-monath grown so powerful as to cause all nature also to rise. This pagan festival of the sun, and of spring, as in the conception of Eostre, was by Augustine and Rome allowed to stand and still be celebrated: but as the festival of resurrection of Christ. And this pagan festival it is, this festival of Eostre, Ostara, Ishtar, Astarte, Ashtaroth, -- the female element in sun worship, -- that is still the spring festival of the professed Christian world.

23. In the early times of the Christian era Christianity had been planted in Britain, and had continued there ever since, though at this time not in its original purity. In the dreadful slaughters wrought by the Anglo-Saxons in their terrible invasions of the land, the Christians of Britain had had no opportunity to approach the invaders in a missionary way. The wrath of the invaders was upon all the natives alike. To be a Briton was sufficient to incur the full effects of that wrath, without any question as to whether the individual was a Christian or not. Thus, whatever Christianity there was amongst the Britons, was, with the Britons, pushed back into the farthest corners of the land, where the remains of the Britons might still be suffered to exist. The British Christians celebrated the Christian passover according to the original custom, on the fourteenth day of the first month, on whatsoever day of the week it might fall. There were also other matters of discipline in which the Church of Britain differed from the Church of Rome.

24. Augustine had not been long in the island before he made inquiries respecting the Christians among the Britons. The Britons likewise were interested to know what this new invasion might mean for them. Communication was opened between them. A conference was arranged, at which "the Romans demanded submission to their discipline, and the implicit adoption of the Western ceremonial on the contested points." The Britons were not satisfied, and asked for opportunity

to consult their own people, and that then there be another conference. This was agreed to.

25. In the interval, the British delegates consulted one of their wise men as to what they had better do. He told them: "If the man is of God, follow him." They asked: "How are we to know that he is of God?" He answered: "Our Lord saith, Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly of heart. If, therefore, Augustine is meek and lowly of heart, it is to be believed that he has taken upon himself the yoke of Christ, and offers it to you to take upon yourselves. But if he is haughty and proud, it is manifest that he is not of God, and that we need not regard his words." Again they asked: "How shall we discern this?" He replied: "Arrange it so that he first arrive with his company at the place of conference; and if, at your approach, he shall rise up to meet you, do you, being then assured that he is the servant of Christ, hear him obediently. But if he shall despise you, and not rise up to you, who are the greater in number, let him also be contemned of you."15

26. They did so, and so came to the conference. "Augustine sat, as they drew near, in unbending dignity. The Britons at once refused obedience to his commands, and disclaimed him as their metropolitan. The indignant Augustine (to prove his more genuine Christianity) burst out into stern denunciations of their guilt, in not having preached the gospel to their enemies. He prophesied (a prophecy which could hardly fail to hasten its own fulfillment) the divine vengeance by the arms of the Saxons." -- Milman.16 "The vengeance with which they were threatened finally came upon them in the massacre of Bangor. On that terrible day, when Ethelfrith, the Bernician, advanced against the Britons, the monks of Bangor, who had fled to the army headed by the chief of Powis, knelt upon the battlefield, and prayed for the safety of their countrymen. The pagan Saxon ordered the unarmed band to be massacred, `for if they are crying to God for my enemies, then they fight against me, though

without arms'. . . The memory of Augustine has been stained by the reproach that he excited this massacre in a spirit of revenge against those who, in the language of Bede, `had disdained

265

his counsels for their eternal salvation.' The fierce prophecy of Augustine, even without his direct intervention, might have had much to do with its cruel accomplishment . . . Be that as it may, the spirit of the prophecy was antichristian." -- Knight.17

27. Thus did the religion of Rome enter Britain; and in its own antichristian way it proceeded, until, in a hundred years, the Anglo-Saxons had become Catholic "from one end of the land to the other." And even then it continued in its own native way; for it is the truth that two hundred years later "the Saxons, though they had been so long settled in the island, seem not as yet to have been much improved beyond their German ancestors, either in arts, civility, knowledge, humanity, justice, or obedience to the laws. Even Christianity, though it opened the way to connections between them and the more polished states of Europe, had not hitherto been very effectual in banishing their ignorance or softening their barbarous manners. As they received that doctrine through the corrupted channels of Rome, it carried along with it a great mixture of credulity and superstition, equally destructive to the understanding and to morals. The reverence toward saints and relics seems to have almost supplanted the adoration of the Supreme Being Monastic observances were esteemed more meritorious than the active virtues; the knowledge of natural causes was neglected from the universal belief of miraculous interpositions and judgments; bounty to the Church atoned for every violence against society; and the remorses for cruelty, murder, treachery, assassination, and the most robust vices were appeased, not by amendment of life, but by penances, servility to the monks, and an abject and illiberal devotion." -- Hume.18

28. Before Augustine had set foot on British soil, the Christianity of the Britons and of the Irish had been carried by them into Germany to the wild tribes of the native forests. A hundred years after Augustine entered England, Boniface, a Saxon monk, went on a mission to Germany, to bring the pagan and heretic Germans into the Catholic fold. He was not at once so successful as he expected to be, and, after about two years, he returned to England. But shortly he decided to go to Rome, that he might have the sanction and blessing of the pope upon his mission to the Germans.

266

29. Gregory II was pope at the time. He readily sanctioned Boniface's enterprise, "bestowed upon him ample powers, but exacted an oath of allegiance to the Roman see. He recommended him to all the bishops and all orders of Christians, above all to Charles Martel, who, as mayor of the palace, exercised royal authority in that part of France. He urged Charles to assist the missionary by all means in his power in the pious work of reclaiming the heathen from the state of brute beasts. And Charles Martel faithfully fulfilled the wishes of the pope. `Without the protection of the prince of the Franks,' writes the grateful Boniface, `I could neither rule the people, nor defend the priests, the monks, and the handmaids of God, nor prevent pagan and idolatrous rites in Germany.' And the pope attributes to the aid of Charles the spiritual subjugation of a hundred thousand barbarians by the holy Boniface."

30. Boniface again went to Rome, where he was ordained bishop in 723 A. D. He went again to Germany and remained there till about 740 A. D., when he again went to Rome, and was made an archbishop by Gregory III, "with full powers as representative of the apostolic see." He established his throne at Mentz, -- Mainz, or Mayence. "Boniface ruled the minds of the clergy, the people, and the king. He held councils, and condemned heretics." In short, he aimed fairly to be a pope in his own dominion, for he "even resisted within his own diocese, the author of his greatness," the pope himself.19

31. The work of Boniface and Charles Martel was carried to completion by St. Lebuin and Charlemagne. "The Saxon wars of Charlemagne, which added almost the whole of Germany to his dominions, were avowedly religious wars. If Boniface was the Christian, Charlemagne was the Mohammedan, apostle of the gospel. The

declared object of his invasions, according to his biographer, was the extinction of heathenism: subjection to the Christian faith, or extermination. Baptism was the sign of subjugation and fealty; the Saxons accepted or threw it off according as they were in a state of submission or revolt."

32. The first expedition of Charlemagne against the Saxons, was in 772, and was brought about thus: Among the missionaries who had passed from England into Germany, to Catholicize the heathen, was St.

Lebuin. He arranged to attend the annual diet of all the Saxon tribes, which was held on the Weser. At the same time, Charlemagne held his diet, or Field of May, at Worms. "The Saxons were in the act of solemn worship and sacrifice, when Lebuin stood up in the midst, proclaimed himself the messenger of the one true God, the Creator of heaven and earth, and denounced the folly and impiety of their idolatries. He urged them to repentance, to belief, to baptism, and promised as their reward temporal and eternal peace. So far the Saxons seemed to have listened with decent or awe-struck reverence; but when Lebuin ceased to speak in this more peaceful tone, and declared that, if they refused to obey, God would send against them a mighty and unconquerable king, who would punish their contumacy, lay waste their land with fire and sword, and make slaves of their wives and children, the proud barbarians broke out into the utmost fury; they threatened the dauntless missionary with stakes and stones: his life was saved only by the intervention of an aged chieftain. The old man insisted on the sanctity which belonged to all ambassadors, above all the ambassadors of a great God." -- Milman.20

33. Charlemagne immediately assembled his army at Worms, crossed the Rhine, and invaded Saxony. And thus began a war of thirty-three years, in the execution of his terrible purpose that "these Saxons must be Christianized or wiped out." "The acts and language of Charles show that he warred at once against the religion and the freedom of Germany . . . Throughout the war Charlemagne endeavored to subdue the tribes as he went on, by the terror of his arms; and terrible indeed were those arms! On one occasion, at Verdun-on-the-Allier, he massacred in cold blood four thousand brave warriors who had surrendered."

34. Into the "converted" barbarians, the Catholic system instilled all of its superstition, and its bigoted hatred of heretics and unbelievers. It thus destroyed what of generosity still remained in their minds, while it only intensified their native ferocity; and the shameful licentiousness of the papal system likewise corrupted the purity, and the native respect for women and marriage which had always been a noble characteristic of the German nations.

35. When such horrible actions as those of Clovis were so lauded by the chiefest of the clergy as the pious acts of orthodox Catholics, it is certain that the clergy themselves were no better than were the bloody objects of their praise. Under the influence of such ecclesiastics, the condition of the barbarians after their so-called conversion, could not possibly be better, even if it were not worse than before. To be converted to the principles and precepts of such clergy was only the more deeply to be damned. In proof of this it is necessary only to touch upon the condition of Catholic France under Clovis and his successors. This is strictly proper, because from the day of the "conversion" of Clovis, France has always been counted by Rome as the eldest and most devoted "son of the Church." The Catholic system in France, therefore, is strictly representative.

36. "It is difficult to conceive a more dark and odious state of society than that of France under her Merovingian kings, the descendants of Clovis, as described by Gregory of Tours. In the conflict or coalition of barbarism with Roman Christianity, barbarism has introduced into Christianity all its ferocity, with none of its generosity or magnanimity; its energy shows itself in atrocity of cruelty and even of sensuality. [Roman] Christianity has given to barbarism hardly more than its superstition and its hatred of heretics and unbelievers. Throughout, assassinations, parricides, and fratricides intermingle with adulteries and rapes.

37. "The cruelty might seem the mere inevitable result of this violent and unnatural fusion; but the extent to which this cruelty spreads throughout the whole society almost surpasses belief. That King Chlotaire should burn alive his rebellious son with his wife and daughter, is fearful enough; but we are astounded, even in these times, that a bishop of Tours should burn a man alive to obtain the deeds of an estate which he coveted. Fredegonde sends two murderers to assassinate Childebert, and these assassins are clerks [clerics]. She causes the archbishop of Rouen to be murdered while he is chanting the service in the church; and in this crime a bishop and an archdeacon are her accomplices. She is not content with open violence; she administers poison with the subtlety of a Locusta or a modern Italian, apparently with no sensual design, but from sheer barbarity.

38. "As to the intercourse of the sexes, wars of conquest, where the females are at the mercy of the victors, especially if female virtue is not in much respect, would severely try the more rigid morals of the conqueror. The strength of the Teutonic character, when it had once burst the bonds of habitual or traditionary restraint, might seem to disdain easy and effeminate vice, and to seek a kind of wild zest in the indulgence of lust, by mingling it up with all other violent passions, rapacity and inhumanity. Marriage was a bond contracted and broken or the slightest occasion. Some of the Merovingian kings took as many wives, either together or in succession, as suited either their passions or their politics.

39. The papal religion "hardly interferes even to interdict incest. King Chlotaire demanded for the fisc the third part of the revenue of the churches; some bishops yielded; one, Injuriosus, disdainfully refused, and Chlotaire withdrew his demands. Yet Chlotaire, seemingly unrebuked, married two sisters at once. Charibert likewise married two sisters: he, however, found a churchman -- but that was Saint Germanus -- bold enough to rebuke him. This rebuke the king (the historian quietly writes), as he had already many wives, bore with patience. Dagobert, son of Chlotaire, king of Austrasia, repudiated his wife Gomatrude for barrenness, married a Saxon slave Mathildis, then another, Regnatrude; so that he had three wives at once, besides so many concubines that the chronicler is ashamed to recount them. Brunehaut and Fredegonde are not less famous for their licentiousness than for their cruelty. Fredegonde is either compelled, or scruples not of her own accord, to take a public oath, with three bishops and four hundred nobles as her vouchers, that her son was the son of her husband Chilperic.

40. "The Eastern rite of having a concubine seems to have been inveterate among the later Frankish kings: that which was permitted for the sake of perpetuating the race, was continued and carried to excess by the more dissolute sovereigns for their own pleasure. Even as late as Charlemagne, the polygamy of that great monarch, more like an Oriental sultan (except that his wives were not secluded in a harem), as well as the notorious licentiousness of the females of his court, was unchecked, and indeed unreproved, by the religion of which he was at least the

temporal head, of which the spiritual sovereign placed on his brow the crown of the Western Empire."

41. "The religious emperor, in one respect, troubled not himself with the restraints of religion. The humble or grateful Church beheld meekly, and almost without remonstrance, the irregularity of domestic life, which not merely indulged in free license, but treated the sacred rite of marriage as a covenant dissoluble at his pleasure. Once we have heard, and but once, the Church raise its authoritative, its comminatory voice, and that not to forbid the king of the Franks from wedding a second wife while his first was alive, but from marrying a Lombard princess. One pious ecclesiastic alone in his dominions, he a relative, ventured to protest aloud. Charles repudiated his first wife to marry the daughter of Desiderius; and after a year repudiated her to marry Hildegard, a Swabian lady. By Hildegard he had six children. On her death he married Fastrada, who bore him two; a nameless concubine, another. On Fastrada's death he married Liutgardis, a German, who died without issue. On her decease he was content with four concubines." -- Milman.21

42. "The tenure of land implying military service, as the land came more and more into the hands of the clergy, the ecclesiastic would be embarrassed more and more with the double function; till at length we arrive at the prince bishop, or the feudal abbot, alternately unite the helmet and the miter on his head, the crozier and the lance in his hand: now in the field and in front of his armed vassals, now on his throne in the church in the midst of his chanting choir." -- Milman.22

43. In the seventh century "the progress of vice among the subordinate rulers and ministers of the Church was truly deplorable: neither bishops, presbyters, deacons, nor even the cloistered monks,were exempt from the general contagion; as appears from the unanimous confession of all the writers of this century that are worthy of credit. In those very places that were consecrated to the advancement of piety and the service of God, there was little to be seen but spiritual ambition, insatiable avarice, pious frauds, intolerable pride, and supercilious contempt of the

natural rights of the people, with many other vices still more enormous." -- Mosheim.23

44. In the eighth century it was worse. "That corruption of manners which dishonored the clergy in the former century, increased, instead of diminishing, in this, and discovered itself under the most odious characters, both in the Eastern and Western provinces . . . . In the Western world Christianity was not less disgraced by the lives and actions of those who pretended to be the luminaries of the Church, and who ought to have been so in reality by exhibiting examples of piety and virtue to their flock. The clergy abandoned themselves to their passions without moderation or restraint: they were distinguished by their luxury, their gluttony, and their lust; they gave themselves up to dissipations of various kinds, to the pleasures of hunting, and, what seemed still more remote from their sacred character, to military studies and enterprises. They had also so far extinguished every principle of fear and shame, that they became incorrigible; nor could the various laws enacted against their vices by Carloman, Pepin, and Charlemagne, at all contribute to set bounds to their licentiousness, or to bring about their reformation."24

45. Carloman was obliged to enact severe laws against "the whoredom of the clergy, monks, and nuns." Charlemagne had to enact laws against "clergymen's loaning money for twelve per cent interest;" against their "haunting taverns;" against their "practicing magic;" against their "receiving bribes to ordain improper persons;" against "bishops, abbots, and abbesses keeping packs of hounds, or hawks, or falcons;" against "clerical drunkenness," "concubinage," "tavernhaunting," and "profane swearing."25 But all this was in vain; for abundant and indisputable evidence demonstrates that in the next century the deplorable condition was even worse. Thus did the papacy for the barbarians whom she "converted;" and such as she could not thus corrupt she destroyed.

---

1 [Page 254] Dan. 3:12.

2 [Page 255] "History of Latin Christianity," book ii, chap, ii, par. 21; Socrates's "Ecclesiastical History," book vii, chap. xxx.

3 [Page 256] "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. ii, par. 27.

4 [Page 256] Id., par. 28.

5 [Page 256] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxviii, par. 6.

6 [Page 257] "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. ii, par. 28.

7 [Page 257] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxviii, par. 8.

8 [Page 257] Id., par. 11.

9 [Page 258] Id., par. 12, and Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book iii, chap. ii, par. 29.

10 [Page 258] "History of Latin Christianity," Id., par. 29.

11 [Page 259] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. ii, book iii, chap. vii, par. 24.

12 [Page 260] "Decline and Fall," chap. xxxvii, par. 28.

13 [Page 261] "History of England," chap. i, par. 38.

14 [Page 262] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. ii, book iv, chap. iii, par. 7.

15 [Page 264] Knight's "History of England," chap. v, par. 12.

16 [Page 264] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. ii, book iv, chap. iii, par. 9.

17 [Page 265] Id.

18 [Page 265] "History of England," chap. i, par. 7 from end.

19 [Page 266] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book iv, chap. v, pars. 18-27.

20 [Page 267] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. ii, book v. chap. i, pars. 7, 9.

21 [Page 270] Id., Vol. ii, book v, chap. i, par. 5.

22 [Page 270] Id., book iii, chap. ii, pars. 33-37.

23 [Page 271] "Ecclesiastical History," cent. vii, part ii, chap. ii, par. 3.

24 [Page 271] Id., cent. viii, part ii, chap. ii, par. 1.

25 [Page 271] Id., Murdock's translation, in the notes.

15. THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE

WHEN thus it was with the branches, what else could be the tree at its root? Rome it was which, more than anything else, was the cause of the terrible condition of things amongst the nations. What, then, must have been Rome herself!

2. Leo III was pope at the crowning of Charlemagne and, in that, the re-establishment of the Western Empire. Thus "at the beginning of the ninth century, the holy see found itself freed from the yoke of the Greek emperors, the exarchs of Ravenna, and the Lombard kings. The popes, by crowning Charlemagne emperor of the West, had procured for themselves powerful and interested protectors in his successors, who, in order to maintain their tyranny over the people, compelled all the bishops to submit, without any examination of them, to the decisions of the court of Rome. But a strange change was soon seen at work in religion: holy traditions were despised, the morality of Christ was outraged; the orthodoxy of the Church no longer consisted in anything but

the sovereignty of the pope, the adoration of images, and the invocation of saints; in sacred singing, the solemnity of masses, and the pomps of ceremonies; in the consecration of temples, splendid churches, monastic vows and pilgrimages.

3. "Rome imposed its fanaticism and its superstitions on all the other churches; morality, faith, and true piety were replaced by cupidity, ambition, and luxury; the ignorance of the clergy was so profound that a knowledge of the singing of the Lord's prayer, the creed, and the service of the mass was all that was demanded from princes and ecclesiastical dignitaries. The protection which Charlemagne had granted to letters was powerless to change the shameful habits of the priests, and to draw them from the incredible degradation into which they had been plunged." -- De Cormenin.1

273

4. The first pope after the crowning of Charlemagne was --

STEPHEN V, JUNE 21, 816, TO JAN. 24, 817.

Charlemagne's son Louis was now emperor. To make certain his standing with the new emperor of the West, and to secure the support of Louis against any assertion of power in the West by the emperor of the East, the first thing that the new pope did was to send legates into France, to represent to Louis the papal situation. It seems, however, that his need was so urgent that Stephen, without waiting for the return of his legates, went himself to France, to meet the emperor. As soon as Louis learned that the pope was coming, he sent messengers to the king of Italy, directing him to accompany Stephen over the Alps; and also sent ambassadors and guards to escort the pope to the city of Rheims, where the meeting was to be.

5. As Stephen approached Rheims, "the emperor ordered the great dignitaries of his kingdom -- the archchaplain Hildebald; Theodulf, bishop of Orleans; John, metropolitan of Arles, and several other prelates to go to meet the pope with great ceremony. He himself advanced with his court as far as the monastery of St. Remi, and as soon as he perceived the pontiff, he dismounted from his horse, and prostrated himself before him, exclaiming: `Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord.' Stephen took him by the hand, replying, `Blessed be the Lord, who has caused us to see a second David.' They then embraced, and went to the metropolitan church, where they sung a Te Deum. Both prayed for a long time in silence; finally, the pope rose, and in a loud voice thundered forth canticles of gladness in honor of the king of France. The next day he sent to the queen and the great officers of the court the presents which he had brought from Rome; and the following Sunday, before celebrating divine service, he consecrated the emperor anew, placed on his head a crown of gold enriched with precious stones, and presented to him another destined for Irmengarde, whom he saluted with the name of empress. During his sojourn at Rheims, Stephen

274

passed all his days in conversing with Louis the Easy, on the affairs of the Church, and obtained from him all he desired: he even induced him to place at liberty the murderers who had attempted the life of Leo III." Before the end of the year Stephen "returned to Italy, laden with honors and presents." He died Jan. 22, 817, and was succeeded by --

PASCAL, JAN. 25, 817, TO FEB. 10, 824.

6. Pascal did not wait for the arrival of the envoys of the emperor to witness his consecration. This brought a rebuke from the emperor. The pope laid the fault to the urging of the people. "Louis then notified the citizens of Rome, that they should be careful for the future how they wounded his imperial majesty; and that they must preserve more religiously the customs of their ancestors. But this easy prince soon repented that he had written so severely; and in order to atone for his fault, he renewed the treaty of alliance which confirmed to the holy see the donations of Pepin and Charlemagne, his grandfather and father; he even augmented the domains of

the Church, and recognized the absolute sovereignty of the pontiff over several patrimonies of Campania, Calabria, and the countries of Naples and Salerno, as well as the jurisdiction of the popes over the city and duchy of Rome, the islands of Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily. . . . The court of Rome thus became a formidable power; nor were the popes possessed only of immense revenues, but the sovereigns of the West placed armies under their command, ruined empires, exterminated people in the name of St. Peter, and sent the spoils of the vanquished to increase the wealth of the Roman clergy, and to support the monks in idleness and debauchery. The pontiffs were no longer content to treat on equal terms with princes; they refused to receive their envoys, and to open their messages."

7. In the year 823, Lothaire, the eldest son of the emperor Louis, "having come to Rome to be consecrated by the pontiff, was scandalized by all the disorders which existed in the holy city, and particularly in the palace of the pope, which resembled a lupanar in those evil cities destroyed in former times by fire from heaven. He addressed severe remonstrances to Pascal, and threatened him in the name of the emperor, his father, to hand over an examination of his actions to a council. The pontiff promised to amend his morals; but as soon as the young prince

275

quitted Italy, he arrested Theodore, the primiciary of the Roman Church, and Leo, the nomenclator, two venerable priests whom he accused of having injured him to the young prince. He caused them to be conducted to the palace of the Lateran, and their eyes to be put out, and their tongues dragged out, in his own presence; he then handed them over to the executioner to be beheaded."

8. When word of this reached the emperor, he sent to Rome two envoys to make inquiry concerning it. This inquiry, however, Pascal would forestall by sending two legates to the court of the emperor in France, "to beseech the monarch, not to credit the calumnies which represented him as the author of a crime in which he had no participation." Nevertheless the emperor sent his two commissioners to Rome, with full powers to investigate the matter. As soon as they arrived in Rome, the pope, with a company of his clergy, called on them and claimed the right "to justify himself by oath" in their presence, and in the presence of a council. Accordingly, "the next day he assembled in the palace of the Lateran thirty-four bishops, sold to the holy see, as well as a large number of priests, deacons, and monks; and before this assembly swore that he was innocent of the deaths of the primiciary and the nomenclator.

9. "The envoys of France then demanded that the murderers should be delivered up to them; the pontiff refused to do so, under the pretext that the guilty were of the family of St. Peter, and that it was his duty to protect them against all the sovereigns of the world. Besides, added he, `Leo and Theodore were justly condemned for the crime of lesemajeste. The holy father then sent a new embassy composed of John, a bishop; Sergius, the librarian; and Leo, the leader of the militia, to convince the monarch of the sincerity of his protests. The emperor Louis did not judge it opportune for the dignity of the Church, to push his investigations and researches any further, fearing to find himself forced, in order to punish a crime, to deliver up to the executioner the head of an assassin pontiff."

10. At the death of Pascal, May 11, 824, there were two rival factions at Rome, each of which set up a pope. The nobles, the magistrates, and the clergy chose a priest named Zinzinus: the populace were more powerful than the other party, and compelled Zinzinus to yield the place to their candidate, and so --

276

EUGENIUS II -- FEB. 14, 824, TO AUG. 27, 827 --

became pope. He immediately sent legates to the emperor in France, asking him to punish the opposing party for sedition. The emperor sent his son Lothaire to deal with the matter. "The prince, on his arrival in the holy city, having caused it to be announced that he would hear all the complaints of citizens, entire families cast

themselves at his feet, demanding justice against the holy see; and Lothaire was enabled to judge for himself how many unjust condemnations the unworthy predecessor of Eugenius had made for the sole purpose of seizing upon the riches of the people. He ordered the holy father to restore to families the lands and territories which had been unjustly confiscated; and, in order to prevent new abuses, he published the following decree before the people, assembled in the cathedral of St. Peter: --

"It is prohibited, under penalty of death, to injure those who are placed under the special protection of the emperor.

"Pontiffs, dukes, and judges shall render to the people an equitable justice. No man, free or slave, shall impede the exercise of the right of election of the chiefs of the Church, which appertains to the Romans, by the old concessions made to them by our fathers.

"We will, that commissioners be appointed by the pope to advise us each year, in what manner justice has been rendered to the citizens, and how the present constitution should have been observed. We will also, that it should be asked of the Romans under what law they wish to live, in order that they may be judged according to the law which they shall have adopted, which shall be granted to them by our imperial authority.

"Finally, we order all the dignitaries of the State to come into our presence, and to take to us the oath of fidelity in these terms: `I swear to be faithful to the emperors Louis and Lothaire, notwithstanding the fidelity I have promised to the holy see; and I engage not to permit a pope to be uncanonically chosen, nor to be consecrated until he has renewed before the commissioners of the sovereigns, the oath which is now framed by the pontiff actually reigning, Eugenius the Second.'"

11. When Lothaire returned to France, he found there ambassadors from the emperor of the East, who had been sent to complain to him, as king of Italy, against the pope, for instigating priests and monks in the Eastern Empire, to take the crosses from the churches and replace them by images, to scratch the colors from the pictures, and to do a number of other things in the promotion of image worship, in the dominions of the Eastern Empire. The French bishops asked of Eugenius authority to

assemble a council in Gaul "to examine the question of the images," Eugenius granted the request, and the emperor directed the bishops of Gaul to assemble at Paris, Nov. 1, 826. After an examination and discussion of the question, they addressed to the emperor a letter, in which they said: --

"Illustrious Emperor: Your father, having read the proceedings of the synod of Nice, found in them several condemnable things: he addressed judicious observations on them to the pope Adrian, in order that the pontiff might censure, by his authority, the errors of his predecessors; but the latter, favoring those who sustained the superstition of the images, instead of obeying the orders of the prince, protected the image worshipers.

"Thus, notwithstanding the respect due to the holy see, we are forced to recognize, that in this grave question it is entirely in error, and that the explanations which it has given of the holy books, are opposed to the truth, and destructive of the purity of the faith.

"We know how much you will suffer at seeing that the Roman pontiffs, those powers of the earth, have wandered from divine truth, and have fallen into error; still we will not allow ourselves to be stopped by this consideration, since it concerns the salvation of our brethren."

12. "The disorders and debaucheries of the clergy in this age of darkness, had entirely destroyed ecclesiastical discipline; the corruption of morals was frightful, especially in the convents of the monks and nuns. Eugenius the Second undertook to reform the abuses, and convoked a synod of all the prelates of Italy. Sixty bishops, eighteen priests, and a great number of clerks and monks assembled, by the orders of the holy

father. This assembly brought together all the ablest prelates of Italy; their ignorance was, however, so profound, that they were obliged to copy the preface of the proceedings of a council held by Gregory the Second, to serve them as an initiatory discourse." The council framed come decrees to secure the education and the better behavior of the clergy; yet these "had not the power to reform the corrupt morals of the priests, nor to excite them to study. The clergy changed none of their vicious habits, and remained plunged, as before, in an ignorance so profound, that those were quoted as the best informed among the bishops, who knew how to baptize according to the rules, who could explain the pater and the credo in the vulgar tongue, and who possessed a key to the calendar of the Church."

278

13. Eugenius died Aug. 27, 827, and was succeeded by --

VALENTINE,

who is described as specially a model of piety. But his reign continued only five weeks. He died Oct. 10, 827, and was succeeded by --

GREGORY IV, OCTOBER, 827, TO JAN. 25, 844,

whose means of acquiring the pontificate were so scandalous and violent, that the emperor, some time afterward, "enlightened by the reports of his ministers as to the conduct of the pontiff, wrote him a severe letter, and threatened to depose him if he did not repair the scandal of his election by exemplary conduct. From that time Gregory vowed an implacable hatred to the prince." In 833 the sons of the emperor Louis all set themselves against their father; and Gregory took advantage of this occasion to be revenged upon the emperor, and intrigued with the sons. The better to accomplish his purposes, he went into France. The clergy of France who were faithful to the emperor, wrote to him demanding that he leave France, declaring "that if he should undertake to lay an interdict on them, they would return against him the excommunication and the anathemas, and would solemnly depose him from his sacred functions." Gregory replied that "the power of the holy see is above thrones," and that "those who have been baptized, no matter what their rank, owe to him entire obedience."

14. When Gregory had arrived at the camp of the emperor, under pretense of seeking to establish concord between the sons and their father, he obtained access to the emperor's court. "He remained several days with the emperor, and whilst making protestations to him of unutterable devotion, he was assuring himself of the defection of the troops by presents, promises, or threats; and on the very night of his departure, all the soldiers went over to the camp of Lothair. The next day, Louis, having been informed of this odious treason, perceived that he could no longer resist the criminal projects of his sons. He called together the faithful servants who remained about his person, went to the camp of the princes, and delivered himself into their hands. The plain on which these events occurred lies between Basel and Strasburg: since that time it has been called `the plain of falsehood' [German,

279

Lugenfeld: Latin, campos mentilis, campus mendacii], in remembrance of the infamy of the pontiff."

15. The emperor was obliged to resign his imperial office, and to make a public, enforced confession of a long list of sins and crimes, written out for him. "Having rehearsed this humiliating lesson, the emperor laid the parchment on the altar, was stripped of his military belt, which was likewise placed there; and, having put off his worldly dress, and assumed the garb of a penitent, was esteemed from that time incapacitated from all civil acts. The most memorable part of this memorable transaction is, that it was arranged, conducted, accomplished, in the presence and under the authority of the clergy. The permission of Lothair is slightly intimated; but the act was avowedly intended to display the strength of the ecclesiastical power, the punishment justly incurred by those

who are disobedient to sacerdotal admonition. Thus the hierarchy assumed cognizance not over the religious delinquencies alone, but over the civil misconduct, of the sovereign. They imposed an ecclesiastical penance, not solely for his asserted violated oaths before the altar, but for the ruin of the empire." -- Milman.2

16. The emperor Louis, after all this, repented of his repentance, and was restored in full measure to his imperial office, which he held till his death, June 20, 840. But neither by the clergy nor by the pope was there ever lost the memory of their humiliation of an emperor. And it was made the precedent and the basis of the assertion by the popes of later times, of absolute authority, civil and ecclesiastical, over all powers of earth. Gregory died Jan. 25, 844, and was succeeded by --

SERGIUS II, FEB. 10, 844, TO JAN. 27, 847,

who, amidst the usual rivalry and rioting, was placed on the papal throne. He likewise was consecrated without his election having first been confirmed by the emperor. Upon learning this the emperor Lothaire appointed his son Louis king of Italy, and sent him to Rome "to testify his discontent with the holy see, and to prevent the future consecration of popes without his authority."

17. When Louis had arrived at Rome, Sergius "sent to meet him the magistrates of Rome, the children of the schools, the companies of

the miltia with their leaders, all thundering forth songs in honor of the young sovereign, and bearing crosses and banners at the head of the procession, as was practiced in the reception of the emperors." Thus he was escorted through the city to the church of St. Peter. On the porch of the church "stood the pontiff Sergius, surrounded by his clergy, and clothed with ornaments glittering with gold and precious stones. When the king had mounted the steps of the church, the two sovereigns embraced, and both entered the court of honor, holding each other by the hand. At a signal of the holy father, the inner gates, which were of massive silver, closed as if of their own accord. Then Sergius, turning toward the prince, said to him: `My lord, if you come hither with a sincere desire to contribute with all your efforts to the safety of the capital State and Church, I will cause the sacred gates to open; but if not, you shall not enter the temple of the apostles.' The king assured him that he had come with no evil intent. Immediately the doors swung open again, and the pope conducted the king to the tomb of St. Peter, while the accompanying clergy sang, `Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord.'

18. "Still, notwithstanding the pacific assurances of the young monarch, the soldiers of his escort, encamped around the city, had orders to ravage the country, to punish the Romans for having ordained a pope without waiting for the arrival of the commissioners of the emperor. The French prelates and lords even assembled to examine if the election of Sergius was regular, and if they should drive from the pontifical throne the audacious archpriest. This assembly, composed of twenty-three bishops and a great number of abbots and lords, was so indignant at the intrigues and machinations of the holy father, that Angilbert, metropolitan of Milan, loudly accused Sergius of having excited, by his ambition, all the disorders which desolated the holy city, and declared that the separated himself from his communion.

19. "Viguier also affirms that during the reign of Sergius, the priests enjoyed every license. He adds, `The pope had a brother named Benedict, a man of a brutal character, who seized upon the ecclesiastical and political administration of the city of Rome. By his avarice he introduced disorder everywhere, and wore out the people by his exactions. He publicly sold the bishoprics, and he who gave the highest

price obtained the preference. He at last rendered the usage of simony so natural to the Italian clergy, that there did not exist in this corrupt province a single bishop or priest, animated by laudable motives, who did not address complaints to the emperor to put an end to this abominable traffic. The divine Providence, wearied of

these abominations, sent the scourge of the pagans to revenge the crimes of the court of Rome. The Saracens, urged on by the hand of God, came even into the territory of the Church, to put to death a great number of persons, and sacked villages and castles.'

20. "Such was the frightful position of Rome six months after the enthronement of Sergius. Nevertheless, the young prince, seduced by the presents and the flattery of the pontiff, confirmed his election, notwithstanding the advice of his counselors, and only exacted that the citizens of Rome should renew their oath of fidelity to him and his father. The ceremony took place in the church of St. Peter; the Italian and French lords, the clergy, the people, and the pontiff, swore before the body of the apostle, entire submission to the emperor Lothaire and his son, after which Louis received the crown at the hands of Sergius, who proclaimed him king of the Lombards." Sergius was succeeded by --

LEO IV, APRIL 11, 847, TO JULY 17, 855.

21. The invasion of the Saracens had become so threatening that the people thought they could not wait for the regular confirmation of the emperor, and again ordered a pope without it; however, with the declaration that they by no means intended to derogate from the just rights of the imperial crown. The time and efforts of Leo IV were mainly spent in restoring the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, which had been rifled and damaged by the Saracens; and, in fortifying the city against those invaders. The church of St. Peter he decorated "with a cross of gold, with chalices and chandeliers of silver, with curtains and tapestries of precious stuffs; he placed in front of the confessional of the pretended sepulcher, tables of gold, enriched with precious stones and adorned with paintings in enamel, representing his portrait and that of Lothaire. The sepulcher was surrounded by large frames of silver, richly worked, and all these ornaments were covered by an immense tabernacle of silver, weighing sixteen hundred pounds,

These embellishments and the revenues which he appropriated to the priests of this Church amounted to more than three thousand eight hundred and sixteen pounds' weight of silver, and two hundred and sixteen pounds of gold." Leo IV was succeeded by --

BENEDICT III, SEPT. 29, 855, TO APRIL 8, 858.

22. Benedict was regularly chosen and seated on the pontifical throne. Deputies were sent to the emperor to receive his confirmation of the election. But a certain Anastasius, who had been deposed from the bishopric by Leo IV and a council, gathered about him a number of clergy and secured the support of the representatives of the emperor and numerous troops, and entered the city to seize for himself the throne of the papacy. At the head of his company he "first entered the church of St. Peter to burn the tableau of the council, on which was inscribed his deposition. He then invaded the palace of the Lateran, and ordered his satellites to drag Benedict from the pontifical throne. He himself despoiled him of his pontifical ornaments, overwhelmed him with reproaches, struck him with his bishop's cross, and then gave him over to priests who had been deposed from the priesthood. These to obtain the favor of their new master, bound the unfortunate Benedict with cords, and drove him from the palace, striking him with sticks.

23. "Anastasius, left master of the palace, declared himself pope, and mounted upon the chair of St. Peter in the presence of the clergy and the soldiers. Rome was then plunged into consternation and affright." The great mass of the people called upon the commissioners of the emperor to restore to them Benedict. But the commissioners insisted that they should receive Anastasius: they even threatened to strike with their swords the representatives of the people. But all remained firm in their demands that Benedict should be pope. After several days of this universal confusion in the city, the commissioners were obliged to yield to the populace. But, since Anastasius was already in possession, he had now to be driven out, in order that Benedict might be seated. Amidst more riot and confusion, however, this was done, and Benedict thus finally became pope.

24. During the reign of Benedict, in 856, King AEthelwolf of England "made a pilgrimage to Rome, and placed his kingdom under

283

the protection of the pope. He offered to St. Peter a crown of gold weighing forty pounds and magnificent presents; he made great largesses to the clergy and the people, and constructed new buildings for the English school which had been burned down. On his return to Great Britain, he held a council at Winchester, in the church of St. Peter; and made a decree by which for the future the tenth part of the land in his kingdom appertained to the Church and was exempt from all charges; he re-established Peter's pence in all his kingdom, and finally left by will a rental of three hundred marks of gold payable yearly to the holy see." Benedict III was succeeded by --

NICHOLAS, APRIL 24, 858, TO NOV. 13, 867.

25. Nicholas was elected and consecrated in the presence of the emperor, who arrived in Rome one month after the death of Benedict III, and the emperor's presence prevented the usual factions, rioting and violence. The first thing of importance that engaged the attention of the new pope, were appeals that came up to him from the Eastern emperor and the patriarch of Constantinople. The emperor had removed from the patriarchate Ignatius, and had established Photius in his place. And, both the emperor and the new patriarch sent letters and ambassadors to the bishop of Rome, to have him confirm that which had been done. Not to enter into the details of the long, drawn-out controversy, it is sufficient only to say that the opportunity was used to the full by Nicholas to exalt the honors and prerogatives of the bishopric of Rome.

26. Photius was a layman. But, as in many other instances both in the East and the West, he was put through the several steps of the ecclesiastical order unto the archbishopric, to qualify him for the office. When the emperor sent word of this to the pope, for his approval, Pope Nicholas required that all the particulars of the whole affair, the case as it stood against Ignatius, and as it stood in favor of Photius, should be presented to him, before he would pronounce anything upon the matter. Therefore he sent legates to Constantinople to hold a council and investigate the whole subject. The legates allowed themselves to be bribed, and agreed with the council in approving the emperor's deposition of Ignatius and the promotion of Photius.

284

27. As soon as the news of the action of his legates reached Nicholas in Rome, he called a council of the Roman clergy, and repudiated all that the council and the legates had done in his name. Later, in a council called for another purpose, the principal one of the legates who had been sent to Constantinople "was convicted of simony and prevarication on his own avowal," and was therefore deposed and excommunicated. "After this the holy father thus spoke: --

"In the name of the holy Trinity, by the authority transmitted to us from the prince of the apostles, having taken cognizance of all the complaints brought against the patriarch Photius, we declare him deposed of his sacerdotal functions, for having sustained the schismatics of Byzantium; for having been ordained bishop by Gregory,bishop of Syracuse, during the life of Ignatius, the legitimate bishop, of Constantinople; for having corrupted our envoys, and finally, for having persecuted the orthodox priests who remained attached to our brother Ignatius.

"We have discovered Photius to be guilty of crimes so enormous, that we declare him to be forever deprived of all the honors of the priesthood, and divested of all clerical functions, by the authority which we hold from Jesus Christ, the apostles St. Peter and Paul, from all the saints, and the six general councils.

"The Holy Spirit pronounces by our mouth a terrible judgment against Photius, and condemns him forever, no matter what may happen, even at the moment of death, from receiving the body and blood of the Saviour."

28 When this anathema of the pope reached Constantinople the Eastern emperor sent to Italy a representative "bearing a letter to the pontiff from his master, in which that prince threatened to chastise the holy see, if it did not immediately revoke the anathema launched against Photius." To this letter Nicholas replied: --

"Know, prince, that the vicars of Christ are above the judgment of mortals; and that the most powerful sovereigns have no right to punish the crimes of popes, how enormous soever they may be. Your thoughts should be occupied by the efforts which they accomplish for the correction of the Church, without disquieting yourself about their actions; for no matter how scandalous or criminal may be the debaucheries of the pontiffs, you should obey them, for they are seated on the chair of St. Peter. And did not Jesus Christ himself, even when condemning the excesses of the scribes and Pharisees, command obedience to them, because they were the interpreters of the law of Moses?...

"We have regarded with pity that abominable cabal which you call

a council, and which, in you made pride, you place on an equality with the general Council of Nice. We declare, by virtue of the privileges of our Church, that this assembly was sacrilegious, impure, and abominable. Cease, then, to oppose our rights, and obey our orders, or else we will, in our turn, raise our power against yours, and will say to the nations, People, cease to bow your heads before your proud masters. Overthrow these impious sovereigns,these sacrilegious kings, who have arrogated to themselves the right of commanding men, and of taking away the liberty of their brethren.

"Fear, then, our wrath, and the thunders of our vengeance; for Jesus Christ has appointed us with his own mouth absolute judges of all men; and kings themselves are submitted to our authority. The power of the Church has been consecrated before your reign, and it will subsist after it. Do not hope to alarm us by your threats of ruining our cities and our fields. Your arms will be powerless, and your troops will fly before the forces of our allies.

"Many thousands come to Rome every year, and place themselves devoutly under the protection of St. Peter. We have the power of summoning monks, and even clergy, from every part of the world: you, O emperor, have no such power; you have nothing to do with monks, but humbly to entreat their prayers."3

29. In the exercise of his power over kings and their affairs, Nicholas had excommunicated Lothaire, the king of Lorraine. The archbishop of Cologne and his clergy had also incurred the displeasure of the pope by resisting his arrogance. King Lothaire sent a representative to Rome with overtures for peace. "To his letters was attached an act of submission from the bishops of Lorraine. Nicholas replied to them in these terms: --

"You affirm that you are submissive to your sovereign, in order to obey the words of the apostle Peter, who said, `Be subject to the prince, because he is above all mortals in this world.' But you appear to forget that we, as the vicar of Christ, have the right to judge all men; thus, before obeying kings, you owe obedience to us; and if we declare a monarch guilty, you should reject him from your communion until we pardon him.

"We alone have the power to bind and to loose, to absolve Nero, and to condemn him; and Christians can not, under penalty of excommunication, execute other judgment than ours, which alone is infallible. People are not the judges of their princes; they should obey, without murmuring, the most iniquitous orders; they should bow their foreheads under the chastisements which it pleases kings to inflict on them; for a sovereign can violate the fundamental laws of the State,

and seize upon the wealth of citizens, by imposts or by confiscations; he can even dispose of their lives, without any of his subjects having the right to address to him simple remonstrances. But if we declare a king heretical and sacrilegious, -- if we drive him from the Church, -- clergy and laity, whatever their rank, are freed from their oaths of fidelity, and may revolt against his power..."

30. "Nicholas at the same time wrote to Charles the Bald, to excite him against the king of Lorraine: --

"You say, my lord, that you have induced Lothaire to submit to our decision, and that he has replied to you that he would go to Rome to obtain our judgment upon his marriage. But are you not aware that he has himself already informed us of this design by his ambassadors, and that we have prohibited him from presenting himself before us in the state of sin in which he is? We have waited long enough for his conversion, deferring even unto this time from crushing him beneath our anathema, in order to avoid war and effusion of blood. A longer patience, however, will render us criminal in the eyes of Christ, and we order you, in the name of religion, to invade his States, burn his cities, and massacre his people, whom we render responsible for the resistance of their bad prince."

31. The Bulgarian king Bagoris had lately become a Catholic, and he sent an embassy to the pope in 866 with a list of one hundred and five questions, asking for instruction concerning the new faith. Bagoris had undertaken to compel his people to adopt his new religion. This caused revolt, and in putting down the revolt Bagoris had massacred a number of his nobles, and even their innocent children. One of his questions to the pope was whether in this he had sinned. In answer, Nicholas told him that he had undoubtedly sinned in putting the children to death, who had no share in the guilt of their fathers; but as for the rest of his conduct Nicholas wrote thus: --

"You advise us that you have caused your subjects to be baptized without their consent, and that you have exposed yourself to so violent a revolt as to have incurred the risk of your life. I glorify you for having maintained your authority by putting to death those wandering sheep who refused to enter the fold; and you not only have not sinned, by showing a holy rigor, but I even congratulate you on having opened the kingdom of heaven to the people submitted to your rule. A king need not fear to command massacres, when these will retain his subjects in obedience, or cause them to submit to the faith of Christ, and God will reward him in this world, and in eternal life, for these

murders.... You must feast on Sunday, and not on Saturday; you should abstain from labor on the days of the festivals of the holy Virgin, of the twelve apostles, the evangelists, Saint John the Baptist, Saint Stephen the first martyr, and of the saints, whose memory is held in veneration in your country.

"On these days, and during Lent, you should not administer judgment, and you should abstain from flesh during the fast of Lent, on Pentecost, on the Assumption of the Virgin, and on Christmas; you must also fast on Fridays, and the eve of great feasts. On Wednesdays you may eat meat, and it is not necessary to deprive yourselves of baths on that day and on Fridays, as the Greeks recommend. You are at liberty to receive the communion daily in Lent, but you should not hunt, nor gamble, nor enter into light conversation, nor be present at the shows of jugglers during this season of penitence. You must not give feasts, nor assist at marriages, and married people should live in continence. We leave to the disposal of the priests the duty of imposing a penance on those who shall have yielded to the desires of the flesh.

"You may carry on war in Lent, but only to repel an enemy. You are at liberty to eat all kinds of animals, without troubling yourself about the distinction of the old law; and laymen, as well as clergy, can bless the table before eating, by making the sign of the cross. It is the custom of the Church not to eat before nine o'clock in the morning, and a Christian should not touch game killed by a pagan....

"Before declaring war on your enemies, you should assist at the sacrifice of the mass, and make rich offerings to the churches; and we order you to take, as your military ensign, instead of the horse's tail, which serves you for a standard, the cross of Jesus Christ. We also prohibit you from forming any alliance with the infidels; and when you conclude a peace in future, you will swear upon the evangelists, and not upon the sword."

32. Nicholas is very worthily classed with Leo I and Gregory I, as deserving of the title of "the Great," for "never had the power of the clergy or the supremacy of Rome been asserted so distinctly, so inflexibly. The privileges of Rome were eternal, immutable, anterior to all synods or councils, derived from none, but granted directly by God himself; they might be assailed, but not transferred; torn off for a time, but not plucked up by the roots. An appeal was open to Rome from all the world, from her authority lay no appeal." -- Milman.4 He died Nov. 13, 867, and was immediately succeeded by --

HADRIAN II, DEC. 13, 867, TO NOV. 26, 872,

who also was consecrated and enthroned without the emperor's sanction. But when the emperor called him to an account for it, the excuse was again presented that it was not out of any disrespect to the emperor, but because he was overborne by the urgency of the multitude. The emperor accepted the plea and confirmed the election.

33. Hadrian immediately pardoned all those who had been deposed or anathematized by Nicholas, and did everything in his power to exalt the name and memory of Nicholas. He gave a grand banquet to a great number of Eastern monks who had been persecuted by Nicholas, at which he treated them with the greatest deference, even serving them with his own hands. When the banquet was finished and the monks had risen from the table "Hadrian prostrated himself before them with his face to the earth, and addressed them as follows: --

"My brethren, pray for the holy Catholic Church, for our son the most Christian emperor Louis, that he may subjugate the Saracens; pray for me and beseech God to give me strength to govern his numerous faithful. Let your prayers rise in remembrance of those who have lived holy lives, and let us all thank Christ together for having given to his Church my lord and father, the most holy and most orthodox pope Nicholas, who has defended it like another Joshua against its enemies."

34. The monks responded: "God be praised for having given to his people a pastor so respectful as you are toward your predecessor." And then they three times exclaimed: "Eternal memory to the sovereign pontiff Hadrian, whom Jesus Christ has established as universal bishop." Hadrian seeing that they avoided saying anything in praise of Nicholas, checked them, and said: --

"My brethren, I beseech you in the name of Christ, that your praises be addressed to the most holy orthodox Nicholas. Established by God sovereign pontiff and universal pope; glory to him the new Elias, the new Phineas, worthy of an eternal priesthood, and peace and grace to his followers."

35. This ascription the monks repeated three times after the pope, and the assembly dispersed. Next he wrote to the metropolitans of France as follows: --

"We beseech you, my brethren, to re-establish the name of pope Nicholas in the books and sacred writings of your churches, to name him in the mass, and to order the bishops to conform to our decision

on this subject. We exhort you to resist with firmness the Greek princes, who undertake to accuse his memory or reject his decrees; still, we do not wish to be inflexible toward those whom he has condemned, if they will

implore our mercy, and consent not to justify themselves by accusing that great pope, who is now before God, and whom no one dared to attack whilst living.

"Be then vigilant and courageous, and instruct the prelates beyond the Alps, that if they reject the decrees of a pontiff, they will destroy the supreme authority of the ministers of the Church; all should fear lest their ordinances be despised, when they have attained the power which rules kings."

36. In the year 869 King Lothaire died, leaving no children that could inherit his dominion. His brother, the emperor Louis, was therefore the rightful heir to the kingdom of Lorraine. But, for fear of Charles the Bald, Louis would not enter his claim until he had enlisted in his interests the pope. Hadrian wrote to the lords and prelates of the kingdom of Lorraine, commanding them to recognize the emperor Louis as the legitimate heir of the kingdom, "and to yield neither to promises nor threats" from any other claimant. He also sent letters to the metropolitans, dukes, and counts of the kingdom of Charles the Bald, containing "threats of excommunication against those who did not arrange themselves on the side of the emperor; and recalled to the recollection of the French the solemn oaths by which the grandchildren of Charlemagne had bound themselves to observe religiously the agreements which had governed the division between them and their nephews; and added: --

"Know, bishops, lords, and citizens, that whosoever among you shall oppose himself to the pretensions of Louis whom we declare sovereign of Lorraine, shall be struck by the arms which God has placed in our hands for the defense of this prince."

37. The pope's commands, however, arrived too late to be of any warning, because, at the first news of the death of Lothaire, Charles the Bald had entered the kingdom; and at Metz was already crowned king of Lorraine. When the pope learned of this, he immediately wrote to Charles the Bald, that what he had done was an insult to the authority of the pope; accused him of having treated with contempt the the pope's legates, instead of prostrating himself at their feet as other sovereigns had done; and closed thus: --

"Impious king, we order thee to retire from the kingdom of Lorraine, and to surrender it to the emperor Louis. If thou refusest submission to our will, ourselves go into France to excommunicate thee and drive thee from thy wicked throne."

38. At the same time he wrote to the archbishop of Rheims, reproving him "for not having turned aside the king from his projects of usurpation; and reproached him with having rendered himself guilty, through his weakness, of being a criminal accomplice in the rebellion of the monarch. He ordered him to repair his fault by anathematizing Charles, by not having any communication with him, and by prohibiting all the bishops of Gaul from receiving the usurper in their churches under penalty of deposition and excommunication." At the same time he gave secret instruction to his legates to incite the son of Charles to revolt against his father. This they did; but Charles, learning of it, caused his son's eyes to be put out with hot lead, because he considered death too light a penalty. The pope then sent an abusive letter condemning Charles for this ill-treatment of his son, and ordering the king to re-establish the son --

"in his property his honors, and his dignities, until the time in which our legate shall go into thy accursed kingdom, to take, in behalf of this unfortunate, the measures which we shall judge proper. In the meantime, whatever may be the enterprises of Carloman against thee, we prohibit thy lords from taking arms in thy defense, and we enjoin on the bishops not to obey thy orders, under penalty of excommunication and eternal damnation; for God wills that division shall reign between the father and the son to punish thee for the usurpation of the kingdoms of Lorraine and Burgundy."

39. In reply to the letter which the pope had sent to the clergy in the dominions involved in this quarrel, the archbishop of Rheims, in behalf of himself and them, wrote as follows: --

"When we exhort the people to dread the power of Rome, to submit to the pontiff, and to send their wealth to the sepulcher of the apostle in order to obtain the protection of God, they reply to us: Defend then, by your thunders, the State against the Normans who wish to invade it; let the holy see no more implore the succor of our arms to protect it.

"If the pope wishes to preserve the aid of our people, let him no more seek to dispose of thrones; and say to him that he can not be at once king and priest. That he can not impose on us a monarch, nor

pretend to subjugate us -- us who are Franks, for we will never support the yoke of the slavery of princes or popes, and will follow the precepts of Scripture, combating without ceasing for liberty, the only heritage which Christ left to the nations when dying on the cross.

"If the holy father excommunicates Christians who refuse to cringe blindly beneath his authority, he unworthily abuses the apostolic power, and his anathemas have no power in heaven; for God, who is just, has refused to him the power of disposing of temporal kingdoms.

"I have done my best to lead our prelates into sentiments more conformable to your wishes; but all my words have been useless; I ought not then to be separated from your communion for the sins of others. Your legates are my witnesses, that in the execution of your orders, I have resisted the lords and the king, until they have threatened me, that if I persisted in defending you, they would make me sing alone before the altar of my church, and would take from me all power over the property and persons of my diocese. Threats more terrible still have been made against you, which they will not fail to execute, if God permits. Thus I declare to you, after having had sad experience, that neither your anathemas nor your thunders will prevent our monarch and his lords from keeping Lorraine, on which they have seized."

40. As for king Charles, he replied to the pope as follows: --

"In your letter concerning Hincmar of Laon, you write to us thus: `We will and command, by our apostolic authority, Hincmar of Loan to be sent to us.' Did any of your predecessors ever write in the like style to any of ours? Do you not thereby banish Christian simplicity and humility from the Church, and introduce worldly pride and ambition in their room?. . . I wrote to you formerly, and now write to you again lest you forget it, that we kings of the Franks, come of royal race, are not the vicegerents of bishops, but lords and masters of the world. . . We therefore entreat you nevermore to write such letters to us, or to the bishops and lords of our kingdoms, that we may not be obliged to treat with contempt both the letters and the bearers. We are willing to embrace what is approved by the holy see, when what the holy see approves is agreeable to Scripture, to tradition, and to the laws of the church. If it interferes with them, know that we are not to be frightened into it with menaces of excommunication and anathemas."5

41. These bold words of both the bishops and the king had a wonderfully subduing effect upon the loftiness of the pope; for he immediately wrote to the king as follows: --

"Prince Charles, we have been apprised by virtuous persons that you are the most zealous protector of churches in the world; that

there exists not in your immense kingdom any bishopric or monastery on which you have not heaped wealth, and we know that you honor the see of St. Peter, and that you desire to spread your liberality on his vicar, and to defend him against all his enemies.

"We consequently retract our former decisions, recognizing that you have acted with justice in punishing a guilty son and a prelatical debauchee, and in causing yourself to be declared sovereign of Lorraine and Burgundy. We renew to you the assurance that we, the clergy, the people, and the nobility of Rome wait with impatience for the day, on which you shall be declared king, patrician, emperor, and defender of the Church. We, however, beseech you to keep this letter a secret from your nephew Louis."

42. These latter letters were written in 871, and Hadrian II died Nov. 26, 872, and was succeeded by --

JOHN VIII, DEC. 14, 872, TO DEC. 14, 882;

and the emperor, happening at that time to be in Italy, his deputies were present at the consecration of the new pope. Aug. 13 or 14, 875, the emperor Louis died at Milan; and immediately upon learning of it the pope "sent a pompous embassy to Charles the Bald, inviting him to come to Rome to receive the imperial crown, which he offered him as a property of which the popes had the entire disposal." Charles was only too glad to receive such an invitation, and instantly set out for Rome, where, upon his arrival, he was received by the clergy and the magistrates, and the schools, with banners and crosses and great display, as had the great ones before him; and on Christmas day 875, he was crowned emperor by the pope. "In placing the crown on the brow of the monarch, John said to him: `Do not forget, prince, that the popes have the right to create emperors.'"

43. Immediately after the coronation of the emperor, he and the pope went together to Pavia, where the pope assembled a council which went through the form of electing Charles the Bald as king of Lombardy. The assembled prelates addressed Charles as follows: --

"My lord, since divine goodness, through the intercession of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the ministry of Pope John, has elevated you to the dignity of emperor, we unanimously select you for our protector, submitting joyfully to your will, and promising to observe faithfully all that you shall order for the utility of the Church and our safety."

44. This form of an election to the kingship of Lombardy was essential to give to Charles the show of legality as ruler of Italy, because Charles had no legitimate claim to the imperial crown. True, the emperor Louis had left no male heirs; but he left two uncles, who, if there were to be any claim to the imperial office by right of descent, were legitimate heirs. But the pope, seeing in this failure of direct descent an opportunity of further confirming the papal prerogative of bestowing empire, seized the occasion offered in the ambition of Charles the Bald,to demonstrate to the world the supremacy of the papacy over all earthly power. "Maimbourg affirms that this council was convened by John VIII, only for the purpose of rendering it manifest to the world that Charles had not become emperor by right of succession, but that he had obtained his dignity by an election." Indeed this is shown in a letter written by the pope himself at the time. For he said: --

"We have elected and approved, with the consent of our brothers, the other bishops, of the ministers of the holy Roman Church, and of the Senate and people of Rome, the king Charles, emperor of the West."

45. But all this that the pope bestowed on Charles, much as in itself it redounded to the exaltation of the pope, was not without return from Charles to the pope. "The historians are almost unanimous as to the price which Charles was compelled to pay for his imperial crown. He bought the pope, he bought the senators of Rome; he bought, if we might venture to take the words to the letter, St. Peter himself [Beato Petro multa et pretiosa munera offerens in Imperatorem unctus et coronatus est. . . . Omnem senatum populi Romani, more Jugurthino corrupit, sibique sociavit.]" -- Milman.6 But it was not only in the Jugurthine extravagance of bribery that Charles rewarded the papacy for his crowning. "In order to obtain the principal scepter, against the hereditary rights of the legitimate successors of Charlemagne, he yielded to the pontiffs the sovereignty which the emperors exercised over Rome and the provinces of the Church; and he declared the holy see to be an independent state."

46. Nor was it alone honors to the papacy in Italy that Charles bestowed. Immediately upon his return to France he convened "a synod of bishops in the city of Ponthion, at which he caused them to

recognize the supreme authority of the popes over France. The Roman legates named the deacon John, metropolitan of Sens, and Ansegisus, primate of the Gauls and Germany, with the title of vicar of the holy see in the two provinces. They conferred on this last named the power of convening councils, of signifying the decrees of the court of Rome, of judging ecclesiastical causes, of executing the orders of the pope, and they only reserved appeals to Rome in the greater cases. The prelates of France protested with energy against such an institution which destroyed all the liberty of the Gallican Church; but the emperor maintained the sacrilegious compact which he had made with John: he declared that he had a commission to represent the pope in this assembly, and that he would execute his orders. He then commanded a seat to be placed on his right hand, and Ansegisus seated himself by him in his quality of primate."

47. In the year 876 the Saracens became so strong in Italy as seriously to threaten the very existence of the papal State. The pope wrote most appealingly to the emperor Charles, saying: --

"Do not believe that our evils only come from the pagans. Christians are still more cruel than the Arabs. I would speak of some lords, our neighbors, and chiefly of those whom you call marquises or governors of frontiers: they pillage the domains of the Church and cause it to die, not by the sword, but by famine. They do not lead people into captivity, but they reduce them into servitude; and their oppression is the cause why we find no one to combat the Saracens. Thus, my lord, you alone, after God, are our refuge and our consolation. We beseech you then, in the name of the bishops, priests, and nobles, but above all, in the name of our people, to put forth a hand of succor to the Church,your mother, from which you hold not only your crown, nut even the faith of Christ; and which has elevated you to the empire, notwithstanding the legitimate rights of your brother."

48. But,just about that time, died Louis the German, at Frankfort; and the emperor, Charles the Bald, immediately marched with an army to seize that kingdom. However, he was totally defeated by the son and successor of Louis the German, and was pursued even into his own kingdom. This made it impossible for him to furnish any help to the pope in Italy. Yet more, his nephew Carloman, king of Bavaria, taking advantage of Charles's defeat, invaded Italy, claimed the kingdom of Lombardy, and designed to secure the imperial

crown if possible. Pope John assembled a council in the Lateran, which he opened with the following speech: --

"According to ancient usage, my brethren, we solemnly elevated Charles to the imperial dignity, by the advice of the bishops, of the ministers of our Church, of the Senate, and of all the people of Rome, and, above all, to accomplish the thought which had been revealed to Pope Nicholas by a heavenly inspiration. The election of Charles is then legitimate and sacred. It emanates from the will of the people, and the will of God. We therefore declare anathematized him who would condemn it, and we devote him to the execration of men, as the enemy of Christ, and the minister of the devil."

49. When the emperor learned that Carloman had entered Italy, he himself marched to Italy. But nothing definite came of it, except his death, which occurred Oct. 6, 877, as he was about to return to France. Carloman now seeing that there was possibly some hope of his receiving the imperial crown, "wrote to the pontiff letters of submission and claimed from the master and dispenser of the imperial crown. Before, however, consecrating the new prince, he wished to profit by circumstances to insure material advantages to his see. He replied then to the king of Bavaria: --

"We consent to recognize you as emperor of Italy; but before giving you the crown, we demand that you should pour into the purse of St. Peter all the sums which are in your treasury, in order that you may be worthy to receive the recompense of him who promised to honor in another world those who honor him in this. We will send you shortly the articles which treat of that which you should grant to the Church; we will then address you a more solemn legation, in order to conduct you to Rome with the honors due to your rank. We will then treat together of the good of the State and the safety of Christian people. Until that time, I beseech you to give no access near to you of infidels, or of such as wish our life, whatever may have been your anterior relation with them; and I conjure you to remit the revenues of the patrimony of St. Peter, which are situated in Bavaria."

50. Carloman was not in a position to grant all this at once, and so the pope, not receiving either money or the aid of troops, was obliged to secure relief from the Saracens by an agreement "to pay them twenty thousand marks of gold annually" to redeem from them the States of the Church, which they had already taken. In 878 the pope was so harassed

and abused by Lombard princes that he "caused all the sacred treasures to be conveyed from St. Peter's to the Lateran, covered the altar of St. Peter with sackcloth, closed the doors, and refused to permit the pilgrims from distant lands to approach the shrine. He then fled to Ostia and embarked for France." -- Milman.7 Through all his journey and in France, he was received with greatest honors. In France he held councils and dealt out anathemas and excommunications on every hand, and against all whom he chose to decide had infringed in any way, whatever he might presume were the rights or the laws of the papacy. Before the end of the year he returned into Italy.

51. Carloman in 879 was supplanted in his claims upon Italy by his brother, Charles the Fat. Shortly afterward Carloman died; and, leaving no children, his kingdom fell to his second brother Louis. To make sure of his hold on the kingdom, against his brother Charles, Louis renounced, in Charles's favor, all claim to the kingdom of Lombardy, and also to the imperial title. Pope John, learning of this, wrote to Charles to come to Italy and receive the imperial crown. As Charles came, the pope met him at Ravenna, informing him that "we have called you by the authority of our letters, to the imperial sovereignty, for the advantage and exaltation of the Church." He also enjoined Charles to send before him to Rome his chief officers to ratify "all the privileges of the Roman see, saying that "the Church must suffer no diminution, but rather be augmented in her rights and possessions."8 They came together to Rome, where, on Christmas day, 880, in the church of St. Peter, Charles the Fat was crowned emperor by Pope John VIII.

52. The bishop of Naples was also duke of Naples. He had secured the safety of his dominions from the Saracens by entering into an alliance with them. The pope visited Naples in order to persuade the episcopal duke to break off his alliance with the Saracens and join in a general league against them; and, because Anastasius would not do so, John excommunicated him, April, 881. The following year Athanasius sent a deacon to the pope with the word that he had broken his alliance with the Saracens and would stand with the pope. The pope would not accept his word alone, but required of Athanasius, as a surety of good faith, "that

he should seize the chiefs of the Mohammedans, send them to Rome, and massacre the rest in the presence of the pope's legates." By this treacherous and barbarous act, "demanded by the head of Christendom, the duke-bishop of Naples was to obtain readmission to the Catholic Church, and the right to officiate there as a Catholic bishop!9

53. John VIII was succeeded by --

MARTIN II, DECEMBER, 882, TO MAY, 884,

who "proved to be as depraved in his morals, as treacherous in his policy, and as proud in his conduct, as his predecessor, John the Eighth." But, in his short reign, no special occasion was offered for the manifestation of the special characteristics of a pope. He was succeeded by --

HADRIAN III, JUNE, 884, TO JULY 2, 885,

who took another step in the supremacy of the papacy, by decreeing "that the new pope should be thenceforth consecrated without waiting for the imperial envoys to assist at his consecration." He was succeeded by --

STEPHEN VI, JULY, 885, TO SEPTEMBER, 891.

54. The emperor of the East had written to Pope Hadrian III, resenting the pope's interference with the government of the Eastern Church; but, Hadrian dying, it fell to Stephen to answer the letter. And in his answer he said: --

"God has given to princes the power of governing temporal things, as He has given to us, by the authority of St. Peter, the power of governing spiritual things. Sovereigns have the right to repress a rebellious people, to cover the land and sea with their soldiers, to massacre men who refuse to recognize their rule, or obey the laws which they make for the interests of their crown. To us, it appertains to teach the people, that they ought to endure the tyranny of kings, the horrors of famine, even death itself, in order to obtain eternal life. The ministry which Christ has confided to us is as high above yours, as heaven is above the earth, and you can not be the judge of the sacred mission which we have received from God."

55. In January, 888, died the emperor Charles the Fat, leaving no male heir. The Lombard dukes and people thought to have one of their own nation to be king of Italy. But there was no unanimity as to the

choice, and violent confusion reigned. The pope invited Arnulf, king of Germany, to Italy to receive the kingdom and the imperial crown; but Arnulf could not respond at once, and the pope and city of Rome declared for Guido, duke of Spoleto. This turned the balance in his favor: he defeated in battle his rival, in 890, and thus became king of Lombardy; and, Feb. 21, 891, he was crowned emperor by the pope.

56. Stephen VI was succeeded by --

FORMOSUS, SEPTEMBER, 891, TO APRIL 4, 896,

who, in 876, had been excommunicated by Pope John VIII, in a council held at Rome, "on the charge of conspiring against the emperor as well as against the pope," and "caballing to raise himself from a smaller to a greater Church, even to the apostolic see." Pope John had also required of Formosus an oath that he would never return to Rome, would never exercise any episcopal functions anywhere, but would content himself with lay communion as long as be lived. From both the excommunication and the oath, Pope Martin II had absolved him, reinstating him in the honors and dignities of his original bishopric of Porto.

57. The emperor Guido died in 894, and was succeeded by his son Lambert, whom Formosus crowned emperor. But the authority of Lambert was disputed by a Lombard duke, Berengar; and a destructive war followed. The pope sent word to Arnulf of Germany, promising to crown him emperor if he would come and restore peace in Italy. Arnulf reached Rome in 895. The city at first resisted him; but as soon as he had captured the outer city, "the Senate and the nobility, submitting to the conqueror, came out in a body with their standards and crosses to receive him, and to implore his protection against the insults of his victorious army. The pope received the king upon the steps of St. Peter's church,and attending him with the whole body of the clergy, to the tomb of the apostles, he anointed and crowned him emperor that very day." -- Bower.10 Shortly afterward Arnulf returned to Germany. As soon as he was gone, the claimants to the kingdom of Lombardy began their

war again, which, by the intercession of the pope, ended in the division of Lombardy into two parts to satisfy both claimants.

58. Formosus was succeeded by --

299

BONIFACE VI,

who, for the crimes of adultery and murder, and for a wicked and scandalous life in general, had been deposed, first from the office of sub-deacon, and afterward, even from the priesthood. But he died at the end of a reign of only fifteen days, and was succeeded by --

STEPHEN VII, JULY, 896, TO MAY 2, 897,

who, "intruded himself by force and violence into the see." The first thing that Stephen VII did after his installation, was to bring to trial Pope Formosus, who had been dead more than three months. He assembled a council, and had the dead body of Formosus taken out of the grave and brought before the council. And "there in the midst of the convention, the dead body of Formosus was placed on the pontifical seat, the tiara on its head, the pastoral baton in its hand, and clothed with the Sacerdotal ornaments." A deacon was appointed as counsel and advocate for the corpse. Then Pope Stephen VII addressed the corpse in the following words: --

"Bishop of Porto, why hast thou pushed thy ambition so far as to usurp the see of Rome, in defiance of the sacred canons which forbade this infamous action?"

59. The advocate who had been appointed, of course confessed him guilty; whereupon Pope Stephen "pronounced a sentence of deposition against the bishop of Porto; and, having approached the pontifical seat, he gave a blow to the dead body which made it roll at his feet. He himself then despoiled it of all the sacerdotal vestments, cut off three fingers from the right hand, and finally ordered the executioner to cut off the head, and cast the dead body into the Tiber." Some fishermen found the body, where it had floated ashore, and it was again given burial. Pope Stephen next called to him all the clergy whom Formosus had ordained, declared the ordination void, and himself ordained them all anew. He even declared the emperor Arnulf deposed, because Formosus had crowned him emperor; and crowned Lambert, duke of Speleto, emperor of the West.

60. In the short time that had elapsed since Hadrian III had decreed that the pope should be crowned without waiting for the approval of the emperor, the violence accompanying the election of the popes had grown

300

so great that Stephen VII was constrained to issue the following decree: --

"As the holy Roman Church, in which we preside by the appointment of God, suffers great violence from many at the death of the pontiff, owing to the custom which has been introduced of consecrating the elect without waiting for the approbation of the emperor, or the arrival of his envoys to assist at his ordination, and prevent, with their presence, all tumults and disorders, we command the bishops and the clergy to meet when a new pontiff is to be chosen, and the election to be made in the presence of the Senate and the people; but let the elect be consecrated in the presence of the imperial envoys."

61. Stephen VII, a master of violence, was soon overtaken by his own example; he was soon dethroned, was cast into prison, and was there strangled. The papal annalist Cardinal Baronius declares that Stephen VII richly deserved the fate that overtook him -- "since he entered the fold like a thief, it was just that he should die by the halter." He was succeeded by --

who "preserved his rank among those execrable popes, though he only occupied the holy see for four months." He was succeeded by --

THEODORE II, NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER, 897,

who restored the dead Formosus to the place from which Stephen VII had cast him down. He reversed all the acts of Stephen against Formosus, declared all the acts of Formosus legal and valid, and with great honor and papal solemnity, restored his body to its sepulcher in the Vatican.

62. Theodore was first succeeded by a certain Sergius; but, as there were rival parties, Sergius was driven out before he was consecrated, and --

JOHN IX, JANUARY, 898, TO JULY, 900,

was pope. John was not satisfied with Theodore's vindication of Formosus; but since Stephen VII had condemned Formosus by a council. John IX would have him vindicated by a council. Accordingly, John's council declared: --

"We entirely reject the council held by the pontiff Stephen; and we condemn as baneful to religion, the convention by which the dead body of Formosus was torn from its sepulcher, judged, and dragged through

the streets of Rome: a sacrilegious act, until that time unknown among Christians. . . The bishops who assisted at this judgment having implored our pardon, and protested that fear alone forced them into this horrible synod, we have used indulgence in their behalf; but we prohibit the pontiffs, our successors, from hindering in future liberty of deliberation, and from doing any violence to the clergy. . . . The unction of the holy oil that was given to our spiritual son, the emperor Lambert, is confirmed. . .

"The proceedings of the conventions which we have censured shall be burned; Sergius, Benedict, and Marin, can no longer be regarded as ecclesiastics, unless they live in penitence. We declare them separated from the communion of the faithful, as well as all those who violated the sepulcher of Formosus, and who dragged his dead body into the Tiber.

" The holy Roman Church suffers great violence on the death of a pope. Disorders attend the elections, which are made to the insult of the emperor, and without waiting, as the canons ordain, the presence of the imperial commissioners. We ordain that in future the pontiffs be elected in a convention of the bishops, at the request of the Senate and the people, and under the auspices of the prince; and we prohibit the exaction from him of oaths which usage shall not have consecrated.

"The times have introduced a detestable custom: on the death of a pontiff, the patriarchal palace is pillaged; and the pillage extends through the whole city; episcopal mansions even are treated in the same way on the death of bishops. It is our will that this custom shall cease. Ecclesiastical censures and the indignation of the emperor will punish those who shall brave our prohibition.

"We also condemn the usage of selling secular justice: if, for example, prostitutes are found in a house belonging to a priest, judges or their officers drag them from it with scandal, and maltreat them until they are ransomed by their masters, in order to acquire the right of prostitution."

63. When the emperor Arnulf died, in the year 909, the clergy of Germany thought it necessary to apologize to the pope for choosing his son -- seven years old -- to be king of Germany without waiting for his

"sacred orders;" and the bishops of Bavaria wrote to him acknowledging that he occupied "God's place on the earth."

64. The eulogy that Cardinal Baronius bestows on John IX is that he was "the best of the bad popes." And of the papacy in general in the ninth century, which closed with the reign of John IX, the same writer says: --

"Never had divisions, civil wars, the persecutions of pagans, heretics, and schismatics caused it [the holy see] to suffer so much as the monsters

who installed themselves on the throne of Christ by simony and murders. The Roman Church was transformed into a shameless courtezan, covered with silks and precious stones, which publicly prostituted itself for gold; the palace of the Lateran was become a disgraceful tavern, in which ecclesiastics of all nations disputed with harlots the price of infamy. Never [before] did priests, and especially popes, commit so many adulteries,rapes, incests, robberies, and murders; and never was the ignorance of the clergy so great, as during this deplorable period. . . . Thus the tempest of abomination fastened itself on the Church, and offered to the inspection of men the most horrid spectacle! The canons of councils, the creed of the apostles, the faith of Nice, the old traditions the sacred rites, were buried in the abyss of oblivion, and the most unbridled dissoluteness, ferocious despotism, and insatiable ambition usurped their place."11

65. But soon events demonstrated that the tenth century must witness a yet worse condition of the papacy. And, of this the cardinal is obliged to write that it was "an iron age, barren of all goodness; a leaden age, abounding with all wickedness; and a dark age, remarkable, above all the rest, for the scarcity of writers and men of learning. In this century the abomination of desolation was seen in the temple of the Lord; and in the see of St. Peter, reverenced by angels, were placed the most wicked of men, not pontiffs, but monsters."12 And King Eadgar of England, in a speech to the assembled bishops of his kingdom, declared: "We see in Rome but debauchery, dissolution, drunkenness, and impurity; the houses of the priests have become the shameful retreats of prostitutes, jugglers, and Sodomites; they gamble by night and day in the residence of the pope. Bacchanalian songs, lascivious dances, and the debauchery of a Messalina, have taken the place of fasting and prayers."13

66. BENEDICT IV, AUGUST, 900, TO OCTOBER, 903,

was the first pope in the tenth century. But of him there is nothing definite recorded as of the popes both preceding and following him, except that he crowned as emperor, Louis, King of Arles, or Provence -- Burgundy. His epitaph says that he was kind to the widows, the poor, and the orphans, cherishing them like his own children, and that he preferred the public to his private good. He was succeeded by --

LEO V, NOVEMBER, 903,

in opposition to the partisans of Sergius, who had been defeated and driven out by John IX. But, before two months were passed, Leo was dethroned, was cast into prison, and was strangled by one of his own presbyters and chaplains, who thus became Pope --

CHRISTOPHER, DECEMBER, 903, TO JUNE, 904.

But in less than seven months that Sergius, who had already been twice defeated in his attempts upon the papal throne, became Pope --

SERGIUS III, JUNE, 904, TO AUGUST, 911,

by dethroning Christopher, and imprisoning him first in a monastery and afterward in a dungeon,where he died. The party that from the beginning, had sustained Sergius in his aspirations to the papal throne, had for its chief the duke of Tuscany, the most powerful and the most wealthy, at that time, of all the nobles of Italy. And he, in turn, was supported by Charles the Simple, king of Germany.

67. "With Sergius, the vindictive spirit of the priest, the lubricity of the monk, and the violence of the fanatic, were placed on the throne of St. Peter. This pope, regarding John IX, and the three popes who had preceded him, as usurpers, erased all their acts, and spoke out against the memory of Formosus." By a council "he approved the proceedings of Stephen VII, against the dead Formosus;" and again by Sergius and his council" Formosus was solemnly declared to a sacrilegious pope, and his memory was anathematized." Cardinal Baronius says of Sergius III that "he was the slave of every vice, and was the most wicked of men." Thus much on his own part. But, in addition to his, it was during his reign of seven years that the papacy was delivered, and by him, to the influence and power of three licentious women and their paramours. for it was then that there began in Rome the reign of "the celebrated Theodora and her two daughters Marozia and Theodora. They were of a senatorial family, and no less famous for their beauty, their wit and address, than infamous for the scandalous lives they led. Theodora, and afterward her daughter Marozia, were the mistresses of Adalbert, duke of Tuscany. Adalbert seized the castle of St. Angelo, in the city of Rome, and gave it to Theodora and her daughters, who

"supported by the marquis and his party, governed Rome without control, and disposed of the holy see to whom they pleased. Adalbert had a son by Marozia, named Alberic; but she nevertheless prostituted herself to the pope, and his Holiness had by her a son called John, whom we shall soon see raised to the papal chair by the interest of his mother."-- Bower.14

ECE page 304 paragraph 1 68. Sergius was succeeded by --

ANASTIUS III, SEPTEMBER, 911, TO OCTOBER, 913,

and he by --

LANDO, OCTOBER, 913, TO APRIL, 914.

But of these is nothing more than the scant record. Following Lando came --

JOHN X, MAY 15, 914, TO JULY, 928,

who was made pope by the interest of Theodora the Elder, who was his paramour, both before and after his elevation to the papal chair. He had been a deacon, and entered into an intrigue with Theodora, and shortly afterward was made bishop of Bologna. But, before he was consecrated to that office, the archbishop of Ravenna died, and Theodora secured from Pope Lando the appointment and ordination of John, her paramour, to the archbishopric of Ravenna. And then, when Pope Lando died, "Theodora, exerting all her interest, as she could not live at the distance of two hundred miles from her lover, got him preferred to the pontifical chair." -- Luitprand.15

ECE page 304 paragraph 2 69, John X succeeded in forming against the Saracens in Italy a league of the dukes and the king of Lombardy, and even the emperor of the East; and, "with his casque on his head and his sword by his side, took the command of the troops, fought a great battle with the Arabs, and drove them entirely from the provinces which they occupied." And King Berengar, having assisted the pope in his campaign against the Arabs, the pope, in return, crowned him emperor, march 24, 916.

ECE page 304 paragraph 3 70. About this time it seems that both Adalbert and Theodora the Elder died. Marozia married Alberic, marquis of Camerina, by whom she had a son whom she named Alberic. About 925, Alberic Marozia's

305

husband, died, and she then married her step-son, Guido, the son of Adalbert, duke of Tuscany. John X incurred the displeasure of Marozia by allowing his brother Peter more of a place in his counsels than he gave to Marozia and her husband. For this Marozia stirred up Guido against him. Guido, with a band of followers, invaded the Lateran palace, killed Peter, seized the pope, and dragged him to prison, where, later, he was smothered. And --

LEO VI, JULY, 928, TO FEBRUARY, 929,

was made pope, but continued only about seven months, when he was succeeded by --

STEPHEN VIII, FEBRUARY, 929, TO MARCH, 931,

of whom nothing more is said. But, upon his death, Marozia was able to elevate to the papal throne her son, by Pope Sergius III, who, at the age of eighteen, reigned as --

JOHN XI, MARCH, 931, TO JANUARY, 936.

ECE page 305 paragraph 1 71. Guido died about the time of the elevation of John XI to the papal throne, and Marozia married Hugh of Burgandy, or Provence, who had become king of Italy. Hugh required of Marozia's son Alberic to hold the basin of water in which the king would wash his hands. Alberic happened to spill some of the water upon which Hugh struck him in the face. Alberic rushed out of the palace, exclaiming: "Shall these Burgundians, of old the slaves of Rome, tyrannize over Romans?" A bell was tolled, and the people flocked together, and, led by Alberic, they attacked the king in the castle of St. Angelo. King Hugh managed to escape. But the castle and Marozia were taken by Alberic; and, though Marozia was his mother, and the pope was also her son, Alberic imprisoned them both, and kept John a prisoner for four years, till the day of his death. Having possession of the castle of St. Angelo, and the favor of the nobles, Alberic II continued master of Rome as long as he lived -- twenty-two years. While still in prison, John XI was pope beyond the Alps. He was succeeded by --

LEO VII, JANUARY 9, 936, TO JULY 18, 939.

ECE page 305 paragraph 2 72. It was not in Rome and Italy alone that riot and disorder reigned: though there the conditions were worse than elsewhere. Leo

306

VII wrote to all the kings, dukes, bishops, and archbishops of Germany, "exhorting them to join in extirpating, with their temporal as well as their spiritual power, the many disorders which he was informed prevailed among them." He was succeeded by --

STEPHEN IX, JULY, 939, TO DECEMBER, 942.

Stephen was made pope by a faction that was opposed to Alberic II. Whereupon the party of Alberic raised a riot, stormed the papal palace, and so disfigured the pope that he would never afterward appear in public. He espoused the cause of Louis d'Outremer of France, and wrote letters to the nobles and people of France and Burgundy, commanding them to submit to Louis d'Outremer as their lawful sovereign, and to obey him whom God had placed over them, and before Christmas to send deputies to Rome, to announce that they did receive and obey him, or else suffer excommunication.

ECE page 306 paragraph 1 73. Stephen IX was succeeded by --

MARTIN III, DECEMBER, 942, TO JUNE, 946,

whom Alberic II caused to be elected a few days after the death of Stephen IX. "It is related of him, that during the three years and a half of his pontificate, he applied himself to nothing but the duties of religion and monastic practices. In consequence thereof, the priests of Rome exhibited a great contempt for this pontiff. They said of him, `that Christianity had never had such a pope; and that the reign of a man who understood the art of increasing the possessions of the holy see, and of causing the money of the people to flow into his purse, was of more advantage to them.' . . . Martin the Third, scrupulous and a bigot, allowed the temporal power, which was necessary for the maintenance of the spiritual, to weaken in his hands; hence he has come down to posterity with the reputation of having been a bad pope."

ECE page 306 paragraph 2 74. Martin III was succeeded by --

AGAPETUS II, JUNE, 946, TO 956;

and he by --

JOHN XII, NOVEMBER, 956, TO NOVEMBER, 963,

who was the son of Alberic II, who was the son of Marozia. Alberic II had died, in 954, and his son Octavian succeeded to the sovereignty of the city of Rome. And now, 956, this Octavian, the grandson of Marozia, being the supreme power in Rome, caused himself to be made pope, Page

307

changing his name to John XII; and still retaining and exercising his power as civil governor in his name of Octavian. He was but eighteen years of age when he became pope. The first thing that is recorded of him is his putting himself at the head of an army, in an attempt to seize the duchy of Spoleto. But, in the battle, he was defeated, and narrowly escaped falling into the hands of his opponents. He then disbanded his army, returned to Rome, "and there abandoned himself to all manner of wickedness and debauchery."

ECE page 307 paragraph 1 75. King Berengar of Italy and his son Adalbert had made themselves so oppressive to all the people that there was a great cry for deliverance. John XII, therefore, sent two representatives into Germany, to ask King Otto, the Great to come to Italy to deliver the Church and receive the imperial crown. Otto responded to the call, and marched to Italy in the end of the year 961. He went first to Pavia. On his arrival Berengar and Adalbert shut themselves up in their strongest fortresses, which relieved Italy of their oppressions. At Pavia Otto was crowned king of Lombardy, and, in February, 962, he arrived at Rome to be crowned emperor of the West. On his arrival " the entire population poured forth to meet him with cries of joy. The pope crowned him emperor, and swore on the body of the holy apostle Peter, never to renounce his obedience, nor to give any succor to Berengar, nor his son. The citizens, the priests, and the lords took the same oath. The new head of the empire of the West then restored to the Church all the territory of which it had been deprived by the deposed princes. He made to the sovereign pontiff in particular magnificent presents of gold and precious stones. He confirmed to the holy see, by an authentic deed, the immense donations of Pepin and Charlemagne, comprising Rome, its duchy and dependencies, several cities in Tuscany, the exarchate of Ravenna, the Pentapolis, the duchies of Spoleto and Beneventum, the isle of Corsica, the patrimony of Sicily, and several other places in Lombardy and Campania. `If God puts them in our power,' he adds with a wise restriction. This donation was copied word for word from that of Louis the Good-natured. Otto annexed to it Rieti, Amiterne, and five other cities of the kingdom which he came to conquer. At the end of this deed was placed this important and remarkable clause: `Saving our own power, and that of our son and descendants.' "

ECE page 307 paragraph 2 76. After this the emperor returned to Pavia. Although Pope John

had taken such a solemn oath of allegiance to Otto, yet the emperor had barely left Rome before John sent emissaries to Adalbert, who had taken refuge among the Saracens, proposing that they unite their interests in a revolt from the authority of Otto. Word of this was brought to Otto, but he would not believe it. He chose rather to think that some ill advisers had attempted to persuade John to such a thing, and that on account of the pope's youth, the suggestion might have received some attention; and he hoped that the young pope might be influenced by better advisers. He therefore sent two ambassadors to Rome, to inquire into the matter, and, that if it were found that there was truth in the report, John might change his purpose. The ambassadors not only found it to be true, but they returned to Otto with a long list of charges against John, made "by the unanimous voice of Rome " (Milman), as follows: --

ECE page 308 paragraph 1 "John the Twelfth hates Otto for the same reason that the devil hates his Creator. You, my lord, seek to please God, and desire the good of the Church and the State; the pope, on the other hand, blinded by a criminal passion, which he has conceived for the widow of his vassal, Rainier, has granted to her the government of several cities, and the direction of several convents; and to heighten the scandal, he has paid for his infamous pleasures with the golden crosses and chalices of the church of St. Peter.

ECE page 308 paragraph 2 "One of his concubines, Stephenette, died before our very eyes, in the palace of the Lateran, in giving birth to a son, whom she declared was the pontiff's. The sacred residence of the popes has become, under the reign of John, a frightful brothel, the refuge of prostitutes. Neither Roman nor strange females dare any longer to visit the churches, for this monster causes wives, widows, and virgins to be carried off from the very steps of the altar! Rich dresses or tattered rags, beauty or homeliness, all alike are used to gratify his execrable debaucheries! The temples of the apostles are falling into ruins, the rain of Heaven inundates the sacred table, and the roofs even threaten to bury the faithful beneath them. Such are the reasons why Adalbert is more agreeable to the pope than the emperor."

ECE page 308 paragraph 3 77. Otto was still inclined to excuse the pope on account of his youth, and to make allowance for the possible exaggeration of enemies; especially as John promised amendment. Yet, instead of making any amendment, the pope openly declared for Adalbert; sent ambassadors to Constantinople to secure the alliance of the Eastern emperor, against Otto;

and sent representatives to Hungary, for a like purpose there. These agents of the pope, Otto captured, with the pope's correspondence under his own signature and seal. The pope sent two legates to Otto at Pavia, to justify his alliance with Adalbert by charging Otto with having seized two of the pope's men, and compelling them to swear allegiance to himself; and with having failed to keep his oath to restore the pope's dominions. Otto answered that the two men whom he had seized were at the time on a mission to Constantinople hostile to him; and that others had been captured, who, under pretense of a religious mission to the Hungarians, were charged by the pope to stir up the Hungarians against the emperor Otto. He told the pope that these things did not rest upon rumor, nor even upon a formal report; but upon the pope's own letters, which he then had in his hands.

ECE page 309 paragraph 1 78. Shortly afterward Adalbert was received into Rome by the pope Otto marched to Rome; but the pope and Adalbert did not wait to defend themselves or the city. They plundered the church of St. Peter, and fled with the spoils. Otto was received by the nobles and people of the city, who took a new oath of allegiance to him, pledging themselves never to choose a pope without his consent or that of his successor. Three days afterward, at the request of the nobles, clergy, and people of Rome, Otto assembled a council for the purpose of bringing order, if possible, out of this Roman chaos. "At this council the emperor presided in person; and there were present thirteen cardinal priests, three cardinal deacons, the archbishops of Hamburg and of Treves, the bishops of Minden and Spire, and almost all the bishops of Italy, with many priests, deacons, and the chief nobility of Rome." -- Bower.16

ECE page 309 paragraph 2 79. Pope John was summoned by the council; but he made no response. The emperor asked the assembly why John stayed away. The council answered with one voice: --

ECE page 309 paragraph 3 "We are surprised that you should not know what is well known to the Babylonians, the Iberians, and even to the Indians. So public are his crimes, and he is so lost to all shame, that he does not even attempt to conceal them. He is not a wolf that condescends to sheep's clothing: his cruelty, his diabolical dealings, are open, avowed, disdain concealment."17

310

ECE page 310 paragraph 1 80. The emperor asked whether more specific charges could be made. "All the bishops and cardinals immediately arose spontaneously, and one after another spoke against the pope, accusing him of being guilty" of celebrating mass while he was drunk; of having ordained a deacon in a stable; of having ordained bishops for money, and among them had ordained as bishop of Todi a child ten years old; of having treated Benedict, his spiritual father, with such cruelty that he died under the hands of the executioner; that he had caused to be put to death in his presence, John,a subdeacon, after having mutilated him; of having "traversed the streets of Rome with a sword by his side, a casque on his head, and clothed with a cuirass; of keeping a pack of dogs and of horses for the chase; and of having turned the papal palace into a brothel:" with yet more shameful things.

ECE page 310 paragraph 2 81. Upon these awful charges, Otto remarked: "It sometimes happens, as we know from our own experience, that men who are elevated to dignities, are calumniated by the envious. Do not be astonished, if I am distrustful on hearing the horrible accusation which has been read by the deacon Benedict. I therefore conjure you, by the name of God, whom we can not deceive, by that of the holy mother, and by the body of the holy apostle Peter, in whose presence we are assembled, I beseech you to lay nothing to the charge of the pontiff John the Twelfth, of which he is not truly guilty, and which has not been seen by men worthy of credit."

ECE page 310 paragraph 3 82. To this speech the whole council again answered: --

ECE page 310 paragraph 4 "If Pope John is not guilty of the crimes laid to his charge, and of many other still more detestable enormities, may St. Peter, who opens the gates of heaven to the just, and shuts them against the unworthy, never absolve us from our sins; and let us be placed on the left hand at the last day. If you do not believe us, believe your army, who beheld him but five days ago, having a sword by his side, and armed with a shield, with a helmet and a cuirass."

ECE page 310 paragraph 5 83. The emperor observed: "There are as many witnesses of it as there are soldiers in my army. I believe all; and besides, do I not myself know that John has become guilty of perjury toward us, by his alliance with Adalbert ? We will, however, hear his defense before condemning him."

311

ECE page 311 paragraph 1 84. Accordingly, the emperor sent to Pope John the following letter: --

ECE page 311 paragraph 2 "Being come to Rome for the service of God, and not finding you here, we asked the Roman bishops, the cardinals, the presbyters, deacons, and people, why you had withdrawn from the city at our arrival, and would not see your defenders, and the defenders of your Church. They in their answer, charged you with such obscenities, as would make us blush, were they said of a stage-player. I shall mention to you a few of the crimes that are laid to your charge; for it would require a whole day to enumerate them all. Know, then, that you are accused, not by some few, but by all the clergy, as well as the laity, of murder, perjury, sacrilege, and incest with your own relations, and two sisters; that you are said to have drunk wine in honor of the devil, and to have invoked, at play, Jupiter, Venus, and the other demons. We therefore earnestly entreat you

to come and clear yourself from these imputations. If you are afraid of being insulted by the multitude, we promise you, upon oath, that nothing shall be done but what is warranted by the canons."

ECE page 311 paragraph 3 85. To this letter John returned the following short answer: --

ECE page 311 paragraph 4 "John, servant of the servants of God, to all bishops: We hear that you want to make another pope. If that is your design, I excommunicate you all in the name of the Almighty, that you may not have it in your power to ordain any other, or even to celebrate mass."

ECE page 311 paragraph 5 86. The council sent yet another letter to the pope, as follows: --

ECE page 311 paragraph 6 "Most holy father, you have not yet replied to the emperor Otto, and you have not sent deputies to explain your defense. Are you willing to give us the motives for so doing? If you come to the council, and clear yourself from the crimes that are laid to your charge, we shall pay all due respect to your authority. But if you do not come, and are not detained by lawful impediment, as you have no seas to cross, nor a very long journey to perform, we shall make no account of your excommunication, but retort it upon you. The traitor Judas received of our Lord the power of binding and loosing as well as the other apostles; and with that power he was vested so long as he continued faithful to his divine Master and Lord. But by betraying Him he forfeited all his power and authority, and could thenceforth bind none but himself."

ECE page 311 paragraph 7 87. Two members of the council were sent with this letter, to find John. But all the information they could obtain was that " the pope was gone out to shoot." Upon this the emperor appealed to the council for their judgment as to what should be done. The council replied: --

ECE page 311 paragraph 8 "Such an extraordinary evil must be cured by an extraordinary remedy. Had he hurt none but himself, he might, in some degree, be

borne with: but how many has his example perverted! How many, who would, in all likelihood, have led a pure and irreproachable life, have abandoned themselves to all manner of wickedness ! We beg, therefore, that this monster, without one single virtue to atone for his many vices, may be driven from the holy apostolic see; and another, who will set us a good example, be put in his room."

ECE page 312 paragraph 1 88. The emperor then declared: "It is our pleasure; and nothing will give us greater satisfaction than your raising to the holy apostolic see a person of that character." Accordingly, John was deposed Dec. 4, 963, and the council unanimously chose a layman, whom they in swift succession ordained to all the clerical offices from neophyte to pope; all of which and finally the emperor approved, and so he became Pope --

LEO VIII, DEC. 6, 963.

ECE page 312 paragraph 2 89. This seemed to the emperor to have brought peace to the city; and he therefore dismissed a considerable portion of his army. This was no sooner discovered by John, than he succeeded in raising a furious insurrection against the emperor and the new pope. The emperor put down the insurrection,and would have executed terrible vengeance upon the people, except for the pleadings of Pope Leo. Not long after this, the emperor himself marched away from Rome, against Berengar and Adalbert. But no sooner had he gone than the feminine partisans of John raised an insurrection against the new pope, and opened the gates of the city to John. John entered, Leo fled, and --

JOHN XII, FEB. 2 TO MAY 14, 964,

resumed his place upon the papal throne. Then "surrounded by Bacchantes, with disheveled hair, and his hideous satellites, John rose from his seat and pronounced the following discourse: --

ECE page 312 paragraph 3 "You know, my dear brethren, that I was torn from the holy see by the violence of the emperor. The synod also which you held during my absence and in contempt of ecclesiastical customs and canons, should be at once anathematized. You can not recognize as your temporal ruler, him who presided over that impious assembly, nor as your spiritual guide him whom you elected pope."

ECE page 312 paragraph 4 90. The council replied: --

ECE page 312 paragraph 5 "We committed a prostitution in favor of the adulterer and usurper Leo."

ECE page 312 paragraph 6 John, -- "You wish to condemn him?"

313

ECE page 313 paragraph 1 The council. -- "We do." John. -- "Can prelates ordained by us, ordain in our pontifical palace? And what do you think of the bishop Sicon, whom we consecrated with our own hands, and who has ordained Leo, one of the officers of our court, neophyte, leader, acolyte, subdeacon, deacon, priest, and, finally, without putting him to any proof, and contrary to all the orders of the Fathers, has dared to consecrate him to our episcopal see? What do you think of the conduct of Benedict, bishop of Porto, and of Gregory, of Albano, who blessed the usurper?"

ECE page 313 paragraph 2 The Council. -- "Let them be sought out and brought before us; if they are discovered before the expiration of our third sitting, they shall be condemned with the antipope,in order that for the future, none of the officers, neophytes, judges, or public penitents shall be rash enough to aspire to the highest honor in the Church."

ECE page 313 paragraph 3 91. Pope John then pronounced the sentence of condemnation upon Leo VIII, declared him deposed from all sacerdotal honors and all clerical functions, with a perpetual curse if he should attempt to re-enter the city of Rome. He degraded from their station all who had been ordained by Leo, requiring all of them to appear before him in their clerical robes, and to write with their own hand the confession: "My father, having nothing himself, could not lawfully give me anything." John then solemnly reinstated them all exactly as they were before. He next had brought before him three of the partisans of Leo and Otto: of one of these he caused the right hand to be cut off; another he caused to be horribly mutilated; and the third he caused to be whipped almost to death. Not long afterward John XII, still in the practice of his vices, was killed by the just indignation of a husband, whose home he had invaded.

ECE page 313 paragraph 4 92. At the death of this terrible John, --

BENEDICT V, 964,

succeeded to the papal throne, though Leo VIII, who had been driven out by John, was still living. At the time that Leo VIII was appointed pope by the emperor, the prelates and people, Benedict amongst them had taken an oath to acknowledge no other pope than Leo, while he lived; and not to allow any pope to be ordained without the emperor's consent. Nevertheless, John was no sooner dead than they all followed up their rebellion in restoring him, by electing and ordaining Benedict. But, as soon as the emperor heard of it, he marched to Rome. Benedict

314

defended the city against him: himself mounting "the ramparts, clothed in his pontifical habit, with a battle-ax in his hands, and from the top of the walls launched anathemas upon his assailants, and beat back the enemy who mounted to the assault."

ECE page 314 paragraph 1 93. Otto, however, captured the city and the pope. He reinstated, --

LEO VIII, 964,

and then assembled a council. Benedict was brought before the council in his full pontifical robes, when the cardinal archdeacon addressed him thus: --

ECE page 314 paragraph 2 "By what authority or by what law hast thou assumed these ornaments in the lifetime of the venerable pope Leo, whom thou madest choice of together with us in the room of John, whom we all condemned and rejected? Canst thou deny thy having promised upon oath to the emperor never to choose, nor to ordain a pope without his consent, or that of his son, King Otto?"18

ECE page 314 paragraph 3 94. Benedict answered: "I have sinned, take pity on me." The emperor asked the council to deal mercifully with Benedict, "provided he acknowledged his fault in the hearing of the whole council. At these words Benedict, throwing himself at Leo's feet, and the emperor's, owned aloud that he was a usurper, and begged the pope, the emperor, and the council to forgive him. He then took off his pall, and delivered it to the pope, with the pastoral staff, which Leo immediately broke, and showed it thus broken to the people. After this Leo ordered him to sit down on the ground, and having stripped him, in that posture, of all the pontifical ornaments, he pronounced the following sentence: --

ECE page 314 paragraph 4 "We divest Benedict, who has usurped the holy apostolic see, of the pontifical dignity, and the honor of priesthood. However, at the request of the emperor, who has restored us, we allow him to retain the order of deacon, but upon condition that he quits Rome, and goes into perpetual banishment."

ECE page 314 paragraph 5 95. The place of his exile was Hamburg, in Germany. Leo VIII died at the beginning of March, 965. The Romans sent an ambassador to Otto, who was then in Saxony, to ask him to name a successor. Otto was so pleased at this token of respect that he gave them full liberty themselves to choose the new pope; and they immediately chose Benedict, who

315

had been exiled to Hamburg. To this the emperor even consented; but, while these negotiations were being carried on between Rome and Saxony, Benedict died, July, 965. Then the Romans unanimously chose the bishop of Narni, who became Pope --

JOHN XIII, OCT. 1, 965.

Although he had been unanimously chosen, he acted so tyrannically that, before the end of the year, he was unanimously driven out. He took refuge in Capua, whence he appealed to the emperor, who, in 966, again marched to Rome, restored John to the pontifical throne; and he and the pope took a terrible vengeance upon the leaders of those who had driven out John. After this John was suffered to occupy the papal chair until his death, Sept. 5, 972. He was succeeded by --

BENEDICT VI, DECEMBER, 972-973.

ECE page 315 paragraph 1 96. Otto the Great died May 7, 973. This was no sooner known in Rome than there occurred a violent insurrection, led by Crescentius, governor of Rome, who was the grandson of Theodora and Pope John X. He invaded the Lateran palace, seized Pope Benedict VI, cast him into a dungeon, where, soon afterward, he was strangled; and Francon ascended the papal throne as Pope --

BONIFACE VII, 974.

But, within a month, he was driven out. He took all the treasures and all the sacred vessels from the church of St. Peter, and fled to Constantinople. The faction that had driven him out placed in the papal chair --

BENEDICT VII, 975-984.

Benedict was no sooner ordained than he assembled a council in the Lateran, by which he deposed, excommunicated, and anathematized Francon, Boniface VII.

ECE page 315 paragraph 2 97. By the support of Otto II, Benedict was able to maintain himself on the papal throne; for they simply terrorized the city. The emperor and the pope prepared in the Vatican " a sumptuous entertainment, to which were invited the grandees of Rome, the magistrates, and the deputies of the neighboring cities. Otto at first labored to inspire his guests with joy. Perfumed wines were poured out in profusion;

316

exquisite dished succeeded each other, without interruption, on the table, and the brightest gayety shone on every face. Then, upon a signal from the prince, a troop of soldiers suddenly entered the festive hall, with their drawn swords in their hands, and three guards placed themselves behind each guest. A spectacle so strange filled their hearts with fright, and the dread increased when an officer of the palace, displaying a long list, called out in a loud voice the unfortunate men who were destined for the executioner. Sixty victims were led from the banquet hall, and pitilessly massacred. During this butchery, Otto and the pope preserved the same amenity in their words and gestures. They pledged their guests in the best wines, and pointed out to them the most delicious dishes. But the frightful image of death was before all eyes, and their faces remained icy with terror. At length the horrible banquet was concluded."

ECE page 316 paragraph 1 98. In the time of Benedict VII, the thirst for money had grown so great "that they even sold the right to seats in the churches; from whence has arisen the traffic in chairs in the churches, which has been perpetuated to our own times, and still brings in immense revenues to the clergy." Benedict was succeeded by --

JOHN XIV, JULY, 983.

But when he had reigned eight months, he was deposed, imprisoned, and either starved or poisoned, by --

BONIFACE VII, MARCH, 984,

who had returned from Constantinople and had been able to raise sufficient power thus to seize upon the papal throne. However, his career ended in less than a year. At the conclusion of a debauch, he died of apoplexy or of poison, and by the populace his dead body was torn from its coffin, was dragged through the streets, and was hung up by the feet at the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius.

ECE page 316 paragraph 2 99. JOHN XV, 986-996,

was the next pope. He was soon driven out by Crescentius, but was able to make terms by which he was allowed to resume the throne, without having to contest it with another pope. During his pontificate, king Hugh Capet assembled a council at Rheims, to try the archbishop

317

of Rheims, for treason. The king wrote and sent ambassadors to the pope, to inform him of this. The bishops of the see of Rheims also wrote to the pope "to testify to the horror with which the treason of their superior inspired them." But neither to the king nor to the bishops did the pope make any reply whatever. The representatives of the king and the bishops went three days in succession to the pope's palace in Rome, each time waiting all day for some sort of a message; but they were utterly ignored, and were obliged to return to France without any answer.

ECE page 317 paragraph 1 100. The council assembled July 17, 991. Since the pope had completely ignored them all, it became necessary for them first of all to establish canonically the authority of the council. Some of the arguments by which this was done are worth quoting here. In the name of the king, the bishop of Orleans delivered a speech, the substance of which, if not the speech itself, had been composed by Gerbert, the secretary of the archbishop of Rheims, who had been educated in the Mohammedan school of Cordova. In it are the following passages: --

ECE page 317 paragraph 2 "We believe, my brethren, we should always honor the Roman Church, in memory of St. Peter, and we do not pretend to place ourselves in opposition to the pope. We, however, owe an equal obedience to the Council of Nice, and the rules laid down by the Fathers. We should consequently distrust the silence of the pope and his new ordinances, in order that his ambition or cupidity may not prejudice the ancient canons, which should always remain in force.

ECE page 317 paragraph 3 "Have we attained the privileges of the court of Rome by assembling regularly? -- No. If the pope is commendable for his intelligence and his virtues, we have no censure to fear. If, on the contrary, the holy father suffers himself to err through ignorance or passion, we should not listen to him. We have seen upon the throne of the apostle a Leo and a Gregory, pontiffs admirable for their wisdom and science, and yet the bishops of Africa opposed the vaunting pretensions of the court of Rome, because they foresaw the evils under which we now suffer.

ECE page 317 paragraph 4 "In fact, Rome has much degenerated! After having given shining lights to Christianity, it now spreads abroad the profound darkness which is extending over future generations. Have we not seen John the Twelfth plunged in ignoble pleasures, conspire against the emperor, cut off the nose, right hand, and tongue of the deacon John, and massacre the first citizens of Rome? Boniface the Seventh, that infamous parricide, that dishonest robber, that trafficker in indulgences, did he not reign under our very eyes?

ECE page 317 paragraph 5 "To such monsters, full of all infamy, void of all knowledge, human

and divine, are all the priests of God to submit: men distinguished throughout the world for their learning and holy lives? The Roman pontiff who so sins against his brother, who often admonished refuses to hear the voice of counsel, is as a publican and a sinner. Though he be seated on a lofty throne, glittering with purple and gold; if he be thus without charity, thus puffed up by vain knowledge, is he not antichrist? He is an image, an idol, whom to consult is to consult a stone.

ECE page 318 paragraph 1 "We must, however, avow that we are ourselves the cause of this scandal; for if the see of the Latin Church, before resplendent, is now covered with shame and ignominy, it is because we have sacrificed the interests of religion to our dignity and grandeur. It is because we have placed in the first rank, him who deserves to be in the last! Do you not know that the man whom you place upon a throne will allow himself to be beguiled by honors and flatteries, and will become a demon in the temple of Christ? You have made the popes too powerful, and they have become corrupt.

ECE page 318 paragraph 2 "Some prelates of this solemn assembly can bear witness, that in Belgium and Germany, where the clergy are poor, priests are yet to be found who are worthy of governing the people. It is there that we must seek for bishops capable of judging wisely erring ecclesiastics; and not at Rome, where the

balance of justice does not incline but under the weight of gold; where study is proscribed and ignorance crowned.

ECE page 318 paragraph 3 "There is not one at Rome, it is notorious, who knows enough of letters to qualify him for a doorkeeper. With what face shall he presume to teach, who has never learned? If King Hugh's ambassadors could have bribed the pope and Crescentius, his affairs had taken a different turn.

ECE page 318 paragraph 4 "The proud Gelasius said that the Roman pontiff should govern the whole world, and that mortals had no right to demand an account from him of the least of his actions. Who, then, gives us a pope whose equity is infallible? Can one believe that the Holy Spirit suddenly inspires him whom we elevate to the pontificate, and that he refuses his light to the other bishops who have been named? Has not Gregory written to the contrary, that bishops were all equal, so long as they fulfilled the duties of a Christian?

ECE page 318 paragraph 5 "If the arms of the barbarians prevent us from going to the holy city, or if the pontiff should be subjected to the oppression of a tyrant, would we then be obliged to hold no more assemblies, and would the prelates of all the kingdoms be constrained to condemn their princes, to execute the orders of an enemy who held the supreme see? The Council of Nice commands us to hold ecclesiastical assemblies twice a year, without speaking at all of the pope; and the apostle commands us not to listen even to an angel who would wish to oppose the words of Scripture.

ECE page 318 paragraph 6 "Let us follow, then, these sacred laws, and ask for nothing from

that Rome which is abandoned to every vice, and which God will soon engulf in a sea of sulphur and brimstone. Since the fall of the empire, it has lost the churches of Alexandria and Antioch, those of Asia and Africa. Soon Europe will escape from it; the interior of Spain no longer recognizes its judgments; Italy and Germany despise the popes: the man of sin, the mystery of iniquity.

ECE page 319 paragraph 1 "Let Gaul cease to submit to the disgraceful yoke of Rome, and then will be accomplished that revolt of the nations of which the Scriptures speak."19

ECE page 319 paragraph 2 101. Gerbert himself was elected archbishop of Rheims, in place of the deposed prelate. The pope, by a council of his Roman Clergy, issued a bull, annulling the ordination of Gerbert, and putting the see of Rheims under an interdict. Gerbert tore to pieces the bull, and forbade the clergy to respect the interdict. In 995 the pope sent a legate into France to execute on the spot the decree of the pope; and in 996, rather than to persist in an interminable war, Gerbert let them have the pope's way, and retired to the court of Otto III.

ECE page 319 paragraph 3 102. Under John XV, in 993, was begun the papal custom of canonizing saints; which is but a papal form that corresponds to the pagan Roman custom of deifying their heroes -- placing them among the gods. When John XV died, Otto III was in Italy; and he appointed as pope his nephew Bruno, twenty-four years old, who took the title of --

GREGORY V, 996.

But as soon as Otto had left Italy, the new pope was driven out by Crescentius, who set up as pope a certain Philagathes, archbishop of Placenza, who took the name of --

JOHN XVI, 997.

Otto returned from Germany, John XVI fled, but was captured, and with the usual dreadful mutilations, was either exiled or executed, and --

GREGORY V, 997,

was reinstated, and reigned undisturbed till his death, Feb. 18, 999.

320

In 998 the emperor Otto III had appointed Gerbert to the archbishopric of Ravenna. And now that Gregory was dead, the emperor appointed Gerbert to the vacant pontificate. He took the title of --

SYLVESTER II, APRIL, 999, TO MAY 12, 1003.

ECE page 320 paragraph 1 103. At the installation of Gerbert, the emperor issued the following decree: --

ECE page 320 paragraph 2 "We declare Rome to be the capital of the world, the Roman Church the mother of the churches; but the dignity of the Roman Church has been obscured by her neglectful and ignorant pontiffs; they have alienated the property of the Church without the city to the dregs of mankind [these were the feudatory princes of the Roman States], made everything venal, and so despoiled the very altars of the apostles. These prelates have thrown all law into confusion; they have endeavored to retrieve their own dilapidations by the spoliation of us; they have abandoned their own rights to usurp those of the empire."20

ECE page 320 paragraph 3 104. Otto declared that the immense donations of Constantine and Charlemagne to the papacy were prodigal and unwise. Nevertheless, he himself added to all the donations made by all the emperors before him, yet eight counties of Italy, out of gratitude to his friend Gerbert. Otto III was poisoned, and died in Rome, Jan. 22, 1002. The next year, May 12, 1003, Sylvester died, and was succeeded by --

JOHN XVII,

Whose reign continued only from June to December, 1003. He was succeeded by --

JOHN XVIII, DEC. 25, 1003, TO MAY 31, 1009;

he by --

SERGIUS IV, JUNE, 1009, TO JUNE, 1012;

and he by --

BENEDICT VIII, 1012-1024.

Benedict was driven out by a certain --

GREGORY,

who took the chair as pope. Benedict fled to Germany, to the protection of Henry II. Henry sent troops to accompany him to Italy. Gregory was then driven out, and --

321

BENEDICT VIII

was again seated.

ECE page 321 paragraph 1 105. In 1014 Henry went to Rome, to be crowned emperor by the pope. Henry confirmed all the donations of the emperors, from Charlemagne to Otto III, and added to them yet more. After

Henry had gone from Italy, the Saracens made an inroad and overspread all the coast of Tuscany. Benedict put himself at the head of an army and marched against him. The expedition was successful; many of the Saracens were slain, and the chief's wife was captured and delivered to the pope, who cut off her head and stripped her body of its golden jewels, of the value of a thousand pounds, and sent them as a present to the emperor Henry. On Good Friday, 1017, there was a heavy storm that continued through the following day, during which an earthquake was felt. The pope having been informed that some Jews were worshiping in their synagogue at the time, caused them all to be put to death: after which, says the historian of the time, the storm fell and there was no more earthquake.

ECE page 321 paragraph 2 106. About 1020 Benedict held a council at Pavia, at the opening of which he "read a long discourse in which he strongly censured the licentious lives of the clergy; he accused the priests of dissipating in orgies the property they had received by the liberality of kings, and of employing the revenues of the Church in the support of their prostitutes. . . . He invoked against them the canons of Nice, which recommended to ecclesiastics to preserve continence, and prohibited them from living with concubines; finally he called to their remembrance the decrees of St. Siricius and St. Leo, who condemned the marriage of priests and even of subdeacons." He went even beyond this, and "made a decree, divided into seven articles, to prohibit ecclesiastics from having wife or concubine; he extended it to all the clergy, regular and secular, without exception; he declared that the children of ecclesiastics should be regarded as serfs, and should belong to the dioceses, although the mothers were free women." When, in opposition to this, the Scriptures were cited which permit marriage, he declared that this was "not intended to apply to priests, but to laymen; and that those who should maintain this heresy should be excommunicated."

322

ECE page 322 paragraph 1 107. Benedict VIII was succeeded by his brother John, who bribed his way to the throne, and reigned as Pope --

JOHN XIX, 1024-1033.

In 1027 he crowed as emperor Conrad II, king of Germany; King Canute of England and King Rudolf of Burgundy being present and assisting in the ceremony. There were present also the archbishops of Milan and Ravenna. Each of these archbishops claimed the dignity of occupying the place at the right hand of the emperor. The archbishop of Ravenna boldly put himself in that place. But, by the direction of the pope, the emperor withdrew his hand from that of the archbishop, and called the bishop of Vercelli to his right hand. But the archbishop of Ravenna would not yield. The dispute became a fight amongst the partisans of the two archbishops. The party of Ravenna was defeated. A council then took up the question and gravely discussed it, and finally decided that the honor of a place at the right hand of the emperor or of the pope, should belong to the archbishop of Milan. But the archbishop of Ravenna rejected the decision.

ECE page 322 paragraph 2 108. John XIX was succeeded by his nephew, Theophylactus. He was a favorite of the counts of Tusculum, who by "intrigues, money, and threats," procured for him the papal throne, though he was only about ten or twelve years of age. He took the name of --

BENEDICT IX, 1033.

He made himself so odious by his vices and depredations that he was driven out of Rome. He was reinstated in 1038, by the emperor Conrad II. Pope Victor III declared that Benedict IX was "the successor of Simon the sorcerer," rather than of Simon the apostle; and that he led "a life so shameful, so foul, and execrable, that he shuddered to describe it. He ruled like a captain of banditti, rather than a prelate. Adulteries, homicides perpetrated by his own hand, passed unnoticed. unrevenged; for the patrician of the city, Gregory, was the brother of the pope: another brother, Peter, an active partisan. " -- Milman.21

ECE page 322 paragraph 3 109. In 1044 Benedict had again become so unbearable that again he was driven out, and another, who took the title of --

323

SYLVESTER III,

was set up in his stead; but in three months the new pope was driven out,and --

BENEDICT IX

was again restored. This time, in order that he might continue his dissipations without the danger of being driven out, after the manner of the emperors of earlier Rome's worst days, Benedict IX deliberately sold the office of pope, to John, his own archpriest, for fifteen thousand pounds. This John was said to be the most religious man in Rome. He was enthroned and ordained by Benedict himself, who had sold to him the papacy; and he reigned as --

JOHN XX, 1045.

ECE page 323 paragraph 1 110. And now Sylvester III, who had been driven out by Benedict IX, came back with a strong force, and took possession of the Vatican, as pope. Benedict IX, also, having dissipated the money for which he had sold the office of pope, gathered a force, and drove out of the Lateran palace John, to whom he had sold the papacy, and whom he himself had ordained; and set himself up again as pope, in the Lateran. John established himself in Santa Maria Maggiore. Then these three --

SYLVESTER III,

BENEDICT IX,

JOHN XX,

finding that in their rivalry they could not fare so well as they desired, joined their interests, and unitedly put up the papacy at public auction, to the highest bidder.

ECE page 323 paragraph 2 111. The papacy was bought this time by John Gratian, a priest who had heaped up enormous wealth "for pious uses," one of which uses, he said, was his own advancement; and another was that, by distributing it in general bribery, he should restore to people their right of election. This new buyer of the papacy reigned as Pope --

GREGORY VI, 1045-1046.

But he was deposed by the emperor Henry III and a council. Then the emperor asked the council to name another man for pope. But the assembled clergy declared that there was not a man among the Roman

324

clergy whom they could by any means recommend. The emperor then selected the bishop of Bamberg, in Germany, who was in his train. This man was immediately consecrated Pope --

CLEMENT II, DEC. 25, 1046, TO OCT. 9, 1047.

ECE page 324 paragraph 1 112. Clement crowned Henry III as emperor the same day that he himself was made pope. He also immediately assembled a council, to reform the Roman clergy. He proposed the deposition of all the bishops who had bought their way to the episcopate. But he was informed by the council that to do so, the Church would be undone; because there would not be left enough clergy to conduct the services in the churches. All that could be done was to enact canons forbidding the practice: and this by clergy who were all guilty of it! The thing that occupied most of the attention of the council, was another dispute between the archbishop of Milan and the archbishop of Ravenna, as to which should occupy the place of honor at the right hand of the pope. Again, after much discussion and grave deliberation, the question was decided; this time, in favor of the archbishop of Ravenna.

ECE page 324 paragraph 2 113. On the death of Clement III, the papacy was again seized by --

BENEDICT IX, NOV. 8, 1047, TO JULY 17, 1048,

who had twice sold the papacy at auction. But the emperor, Henry III, having chosen and sent to Rome to be pope, a certain Popponius, of Bavaria, Benedict yielded to the emperor's power, and Popponius reigned twenty-three days as Pope --

DAMASUS II, JULY 16 TO AUG. 8, 1048.

Upon the death of Damasus, the emperor assembled a council in Germany, at Worms, to elect a pope; and bishop Bruno of Toul was chosen. He arrived in Rome at the end of the year 1048, and was enthroned as --

LEO IX, FEB. 2, 1049, TO APRIL 13, 1954.

He, too, assembled a council to reform the Roman clergy. Again it was proposed to depose all who had bought their way to holy orders; but again this purpose had to be abandoned, because to do so would inevitably dissolve the Church: as they declared, it would "subvert the Christian religion." The new pope, therefore, had to be content with

the confirming of the decrees of Clement III, which imposed penalties and fines, and prohibited it for the future. This course was readily approved by the council of confessed bribers.

ECE page 325 paragraph 1 114. Leo next thought to push his reforming zeal amongst the clergy in France and Germany. He held a great council at Rheims. There, likewise, as already twice in Rome, the first important thing to be decided was a dispute between archbishops -- this time of Rheims and of Treves -- as to which should have the honor of sitting at the right hand of the pope. Leo not knowing how many more claimants there might be, cut the knot by having them all sit in a circle, with himself in the center. By this council very little more was done than by the councils that had already been held at Rome. After Leo had returned to Rome, Peter Damiani addressed a letter to him, asking for instruction in relation to the scandalous conduct of the clergy of his province; in which he said: --

ECE page 325 paragraph 2 "We have prelates who openly abandon themselves to all kinds of debauchery, get drunk at their feasts, mount on horseback, and keep their concubines in the episcopal palaces. These unworthy ministers push the faithful into the abyss, and the mere priests have fallen into an excess of corruption, without our being able to exclude them from sacred orders. The priesthood is so despised, that we are obliged to recruit ministers for the service of God from among simoniacs, adulterers, and murderers. Formerly, the apostle declared worthy of death, not only those who committed crimes, but even those who tolerated them! What would he say, if he could return to earth and see the clergy of our days? The depravity is so great now that the priests sin with their own children! These wretches make a pretext of the rules of the court of Rome, and, as they have a tariff for crimes, they commit them in all safety of conscience."

ECE page 325 paragraph 3 115. Peter complained of the lightness and the inequality of these tariffs, and then declared further: --

ECE page 325 paragraph 4 "I declare that the popes who framed these miserable laws are responsible to God for all the disorders of the Church; for the decrees of the synod of Ancyra condemn to twenty-five years of penance mere laymen who are guilty of the sin of the flesh. St. Basil and Pope Siricius declared every one suspected of these crimes unworthy of the priesthood. I hope, then, your Holiness, after having consulted the legislation of the Church and the doctors, will make a decision which will repress the disorders of our priests."

326

ECE page 326 paragraph 1 116. The only instruction that Leo was able to send in this matter, was that the sins which Peter had censured "deserved to be punished with all the rigor of the penitential laws, and by the deprivation of orders; but that the number of guilty clerics rendered that proceeding impracticable, and obliged him to preserve even the criminal in the Church."

ECE page 326 paragraph 2 117. Some Normans had penetrated into Italy and had taken possession of the province of Apulia. Leo IX led in person an army to drive them out, and take possession of that province for the papacy. June 16, 1053, his army was utterly routed, and he was taken prisoner. The Normans were all devout Catholics: and though a prisoner, Leo was allowed still to conduct the affairs of the papacy. The patriarch of Constantinople had written a letter in which he mentioned some points of difference between the Roman Church and the Eastern Church. This letter was brought to the attention of Leo, whereupon he wrote to the patriarch as follows: --

ECE page 326 paragraph 3 "They assure me, unworthy prelate, that you push your audacity so far as openly to condemn the Latin Church, because it celebrates the eucharist with unleavened bread. According to your opinion, the Roman pontiff, after exercising sovereign power for ten entire centuries, should learn from the bishop of Constantinople the proper mode of honoring their divine master. Are you ignorant then that the popes are infallible -- that no man has the right to judge them, and that it belongs to the holy see to condemn or absolve kings and people? Constantine himself decreed that it was unworthy of the divine majesty that the priest to whom God had given the empire of heaven, should be submissive to the princes of the earth. Not only did he give to Sylvester and his successors temporal authority, but he even granted to them ornaments, officers, guards, and all the honors attached to the imperial dignity. In order that you may not accuse us of establishing our sway through ignorance and falsehood, we send you a copy of the privileges which Constantine had granted to the Roman Church."

ECE page 326 paragraph 4 118. The emperor of the East, Constantine Monomachus, wrote to Leo a very favorable letter, to which the pope replied thus: --

ECE page 326 paragraph 5 "Prince, we praise you for having bowed before our supreme power, and for having been the first to propose to re-establish concord between your empire and our Church; for, in these deplorable times, all Christians should unite to exterminate that strange nation which wishes to raise itself up in opposition to us, the vicar of God. These Normans, our common enemies, have put to death our faithful soldiers beneath

327

their swords; they have invaded the patrimony of St. Peter, without regarding the holiness of our residence; they have forced convents, massacred monks, violated virgins, and burned churches. These savage people, the enemies of God and man, have resisted the prayers, threats, and anathemas of the holy see; these barbarians, hardened by pillage and murder, no more fear the divine vengeance. We have been obliged to call in aid from all sides to tame these northern hordes; and we, ourselves, at the head of an army, have wished to march against

them, and to unite with your faithful servant, the duke of Argyra, in order to confer with him about driving them from Italy; but these incarnate demons suddenly attacked us, cut all our troops to pieces, and seized upon our sacred person. Their victory, however, has inspired them with great fear, and they doubt lest Christian prices should come to crush them and free us from their hands.

ECE page 327 paragraph 1 "We will not falter in the holy mission which God has confided to us: we will not cease to excite other people against them, in order to exterminate this evil race. We will not imitate our predecessors, those mercenary bishops, who were more engaged with their own debaucheries than with the interests of the Roman Church. For our part, it is our desire to re-establish the holy see in its former splendor, and we will spare neither gold nor blood to render our throne worthy of the majesty of God. Already is the emperor Henry, our dear son, advancing to our aid with a powerful army; and we hope that you yourself will soon cover the Bosphorus with your sails, for the purpose of disembarking your soldiers on the shores of Apulia. What ought I now to hope, with such powerful aid, for the glory of the holy see!"

ECE page 327 paragraph 2 119. In another letter to the patriarch of Constantinople, he said: --

ECE page 327 paragraph 3 "It is said you are a neophyte and have not mounted by the proper steps, to the episcopate. It is said that you have dared to menace the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, with depriving them of their ancient prerogatives, in order to subjugate them to your sway, and that by a sacrilegious usurpation, you take the title of universal bishop, which only belongs to the bishop of Rome. Thus, in your pride, you dare to compare yourself with us, and to contest our infallibility in contempt of the decisions of the Fathers and orthodox councils; and even against the apostles. Finally, you persecute the faithful who receive the eucharist with unleavened bread, under the pretext that Jesus Christ used leavened bread in instituting the sacrament of the altar. I forewarn you, then, that your impious doctrines will be anathematized by our legates, and that your conduct will be publicly condemned, if you persist in refusing to take the oath of obedience to us."

ECE page 327 paragraph 4 120. The patriarch would not yield to the pope. The emperor tried to compel to submit; but he told the emperor that he might remove

him from the patriarchate, but that no power on earth could ever make him betray his trust by subjecting the see of the imperial city of Constantinople to that of Rome. Accordingly, the threat made by Leo was carried out by his legates in Constantinople, July 16, 1054, in their pronouncing a long arraignment and excommunication of the patriarch of Constantinople, and "all who should thenceforth receive the sacrament administered by any Greek who found fault with the sacrifice or mass of the Latins." A few days afterward that sentence was followed by another in the words: "Whoever shall find fault with the faith of the holy see of Rome, and its sacrifice, let him be anathematized, and not looked upon as a Christian Catholic, but as a Prozimite heretic. Fiat, fiat, fiat!"22

ECE page 328 paragraph 1 121. However, before these excommunications were actually pronounced, Leo's career had ended, he having died April 19, 1054. The people of Rome would not take any steps toward the election of a new pope without the express directions of the emperor. They therefore sent a subdeacon, Hildebrand, to the emperor in Germany, to ask him to name the one whom he should consider most worthy. Hildebrand had already, in his own mind, decided as to who should be chosen -- one to whom it was hardly possible that the emperor could object -- Gebhard, bishop of Eichstadt, the emperor's chief counselor. Hildebrand drew to his scheme the prelates of Germany, who begged the emperor to nominate Gebhard. Gebhard was chosen; and was installed as Pope --

VICTOR II, APRIL 13, 1055, TO JULY 28, 1057.

ECE page 328 paragraph 2 122. In 1056 the emperor Henry III finding that his end was drawing near called the pope to him in Germany. The emperor committed to the pope the care of his young son Henry IV, then about

five years old, and died October 5. The emperor's widow was named as regent during her young child's minority. But with Pope Victor as the chief counselor of the widow, and also practically the child's guardian, the pope was practically emperor as well as actually pope. And this was recognized by the pope; for "the ambition of Victor rose with his power; his grants assumed a loftier tone; the apostolic throne of

329

Peter, the chief of the apostles, is raised high above all people and all realms, that he may pluck up and destroy, plant and build in his name;" but "he suddenly died at Arezzo, and with him expired all these magnificent schemes of universal rule." -- Milman.23 He was succeeded by Frederick of Lorraine, who had been chancellor of the papacy and one of the legates to Constantinople to pronounce against the patriarch of Constantinople the excommunication launched by Leo IX. Frederick reigned as Pope --

STEPHEN X, AUG. 2, 1057, TO MARCH 29, 1058.

ECE page 329 paragraph 1 123. The new pope attempted to reform the clergy, and held several councils on the subject; but, as with former attempts, all that was done was to enact canons condemning their practices. He appointed to the cardinalate Peter Damiani, the monk who had written so plainly to Leo IX of the condition of the clergy. And as cardinal, Peter still kept up his exposure of the evil practices of the clergy. He wrote: --

ECE page 329 paragraph 2 "Ecclesiastical discipline is everywhere abandoned; the canons of the Church are trampled underfoot; priests only labor to satisfy their cupidity, or to abandon themselves to incontinence. The duties of the episcopate only consist in wearing garments covered with gold and precious stones, in enveloping one's self in precious furs, in possessing race horses in the stables, and in sallying forth with a numerous escort of armed horsemen. Prelates should, on the contrary, set an example for the purity of their morals and all Christian virtues. Misfortunes turn on those who lead a condemnable life, and anathemas on those who intrigue for the dignity of bishops for a guilty end. Shame on ecclesiastics who abandon their country, follow the armies of kings, and become the courtiers of princes, to obtain, in their turn, the power of commanding men, and of subjugating them to their sway! These corrupt priests are more sensitive to terrestrial dignities than to the celestial recompenses promised by the Saviour; and to obtain bishoprics, they sacrifice their souls and bodies. It would, however, be better for them openly to purchase the episcopal sees, for simony is less a crime than hypocrisy. Their impure hands are always open to receive presents from the faithful; their heads are always at work to invent new means of squeezing the people, and their viper-tongues are prodigal, by day and night, of flattery to tyrants. -- Thus I declare the bishops who have become the slaves of kings, three times simoniacal, and thrice damned!"

330

ECE page 330 paragraph 1 124. Before his death, Stephen had required the clergy to promise that they would not choose a pope before the return of Hildebrand, who was then in Germany. But, no sooner was Stephen dead than a strong party, led by the counts of Tusculum, chose the bishop of Veletri; and, against the opposition of the cardinals, they by night installed him as Pope --

BENEDICT X, APRIL TO DECEMBER, 1058.

ECE page 330 paragraph 2 But when Hildebrand returned from Germany, he caused the archbishop of Florence to be elected pope, who took the title of --

NICHOLAS II, JANUARY, 1059, TO JULY 22, 1061.

ECE page 330 paragraph 3 125. Thus again there were two popes at once. Peter Damiani being asked which of these was the true pope, who should be obeyed, replied: --

ECE page 330 paragraph 4 "He who is now upon the holy see was enthroned at night by troops of armed men, who caused him to be elected by distributing money among the clergy. On the day of his nomination, the patines, the holy pyxes, and the crucifixes from the treasury of St. Peter, were sold throughout the city. His election was then violent and simoniacal. He alleges in his justification, that he was forced to accept the pontificate; and I would not affirm that it is not so; for our pope is so stupid, that it would not be at all extraordinary if he were ignorant of the intrigues which the counts of Tuscanella have carried on in his name. He is guilty, however, for remaining in the abyss into which he has been cast, and for being ordained by an archpriest whose ignorance is so great, that he can not read a line without spelling every syllable. Although the election of Nicholas the Second was not entirely regular, I would submit more willingly to the authority of this pontiff, because he is sufficiently literary, possesses an active mind, pure morals, and is filled with charity. Still, if the other pope could compose a line, I will not say a psalm, but even a homily, I would not oppose him, and would kiss his feet."

ECE page 330 paragraph 5 126. A council was called by Nicholas, at Florence, which was attended by the cardinals and most of the bishops of Italy, to consider how to gain possession of the papal throne in Rome. The council unanimously declared Nicholas to have been lawfully elected, and passed a sentence of excommunication upon Benedict X. And, since Nicholas and his council had the support of Duke Godfrey of Lorraine,

as the representative of the emperor, Benedict yielded without any further contest. The excommunication was removed: he was deposed from the priesthood, and was required to spend the rest of his days in a monastery.

ECE page 331 paragraph 1 127. Nicholas assembled a council in Rome, and made the usual endeavor to reform the clergy, and with the usual results. With regard to those who had bribed their way to clerical office, he was obliged to confess: --

ECE page 331 paragraph 2 "As to those who have been ordained for money, our clemency permits them to preserve the dignities to which they have been promoted; because the multitude of these ecclesiastics is so great, that by observing the rigor of the canons with regard to them, we should leave almost all the churches without priests."

ECE page 331 paragraph 3 128. By this council the election of the pope was taken from the populace, and even from the clergy in general, and was confined to the cardinals: though there was left to the people a vague sort of right of approval. A heavy curse was laid by the council upon whomsoever should disregard this new law. They declared against him an irrevocable excommunication, and that he should be counted among the wicked to all eternity; and closed with the following words: --

ECE page 331 paragraph 4 "May he endure the wrath of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that of St. Peter and St. Paul, in this life and the next! May his house be desolate, and no one dwell in his tents! Be his children orphans, his wife a widow, his sons outcasts and beggars! May the usurer consume his substance, the stranger reap his labors; may all the world and all the elements war upon him, and the merits of all the saints which sleep in the Lord confound and inflict visible vengeance during this life! Whosoever, on the other hand, shall keep this law, by the authority of St. Peter, is absolved from all his sins."

ECE page 331 paragraph 5 129. Nicholas made peace with the Normans, to the great advantage of the papacy, both spiritually and temporally. For to the pope the famous Norman, Robert Guiscard, took the following oath of fealty: --

ECE page 331 paragraph 6 "I, Robert, by the grace of God and St. Peter, duke of Apulia and Calabria, and future duke of Sicily, promise to pay to St. Peter, to you, Pope Nicholas, my lord, to your successors, or to you

and their nuncios, twelve deniers, money of Pavia, for each yoke of oxen, as an acknowledgment for all the lands that I myself hold and possess, or have given to be held and possessed by any of the ultramontanes; and

332

this sum shall be yearly paid on Easter-Sunday by me, my heirs and successors, to you, Pope Nicholas, my lord, and to your successors. So help me, God, and these His holy Gospels."24

ECE page 332 paragraph 1 130. Upon the death Nicholas, the clergy and people were again divided into two powerful factions, each vigorously striving for the power that accrued in the electing of the pope. Neither party being able to prevail at once, messengers were sent into Germany, to the court of the child-emperor, to have the imperial council to name a man to be pope. But, for some reason, the messengers could not obtain an audience at the imperial court, and were obliged to return with the seals of their letters unbroken. Hildebrand then took the bold step of having a pope elected without any word at all from the imperial court; and the new pope was duly installed as --

ALEXANDER II, OCT. 7, 1061, TO APRIL 21, 1073.

The opposing faction sent off messengers to the emperor: a council was assembled at Basle, which declared Alexander deposed; and then elected as his successor the bishop of Parma, who was proclaimed and consecrated Pope --

HONORIUS II, OCT. 28, 1061, TO 1066.

ECE page 332 paragraph 2 131. This Honorius is described by Cardinal Damiani as having been "plainly a disturber of the Church, the overturner of apostolic discipline, the enemy of human salvation,. . . the root of sin, the herald of the devil, the apostle of anti-Christ; and what should I say more? He is an arrow from the quiver of Satan, the staff of Assur, a son of Belial, the son of perdition who is opposed and exalted above all that is called God, or that is worshiped: the gulf of lewdness, the shipwreck of chastity, the opprobium of Christianity, the ignominy of the priesthood, the progeny of vipers, the stench of the world, the smut of the race, the disgrace of the universe, . . . a slippery serpent, a crooked snake, a sink of crime, the dregs [Latin, sentina, -- bilgewater] of vice, the abomination of heaven, outcast from Paradise, food for Tartarus, the stubble of eternal fire." This does not exhaust the list of expletives applied by the cardinal to the new pope; but it is

333

sufficient to give an idea of the character of Honorius II, or of Cardinal Damiani himself: possibly of both.

ECE page 333 paragraph 1 132. There being now two popes, the next thing to be settled, of course, was which should be pope alone. Honorius II, with an army, marched from Basle direct to Rome. Pope Alexander fled; but Duke Godfrey, who had espoused his cause, met the army of Honorius and defeated it. Honorius himself was taken prisoner, but bribed his captors and escaped. When Alexander learned of the defeat of Honorius, he returned to Rome and occupied the papal chair. Honorius had gathered a stronger army, and in the spring of 1062, marched again into Italy, where he was received with joy by a large number of the bishops of the Lombard cities. The bishop of Albi went to Rome as the emissary of Honorius and the ambassador of the emperor. He there steadily worked by speech and by money, in the interests of Honorius. There was a great assembly in the hippodrome, at which Pope Alexander appeared on horseback. There in the presence of all, the bishop of Albi denounced Pope Alexander II: "Thou hast obtained thy election to the popedom by the aid of Normans, robbers, and tyrants, and by notorius bribery. Hildebrand, that son of Simon, Magus, was the chief agent in this detestable merchandise, for which ye have both incurred damnation before God and man." He commanded him to go to the court of the emperor to do penance. Alexander replied that in receiving the office of pope he had not broken his allegiance to the emperor, and that he would send his legate to the court of Henry.

Then, amid the hootings of the crowd -- "Away, leper! Out, wretch! Begone, hateful one!" -- Alexander rode away.

ECE page 333 paragraph 2 133. The supporters of Alexander met bribery with bribery. Nevertheless, the bishop of Albi was enabled to form in Rome a powerful party in support of Honorius; and, meanwhile, Honorius was marching with his army toward Rome. As he drew near, the army of Pope Alexander went out of the city to meet him. In the battle Alexander's army was defeated, and was obliged to take refuge within the walls of Rome. The army of Honorius was not sufficiently powerful to force the gates or walls, and he camped in the territory of the count of Tusculum, who was grandson of the famous Alberic, the son of Marozia. Just at this point the duke of Tuscany, who had not taken either side

334

in this papal quarrel, appeared with an army more powerful than that of either pope, and demanded that hostilities should cease; and that the rival popes should retire, each to his city, and await the decision of the emperor upon their rival claims.

ECE page 334 paragraph 1 134. About this time also the partisans of Alexander, in Germany, had made a powerful stroke in his favor: the principal archbishops and nobles had, by force, taken the young emperor from the care of his mother into their own hands. And now, in his name, a council was assembled at Augsburg, at which Cardinal Damiani was the chief pleader in behalf of Alexander. He justified the action of the archbishops in setting aside the emperor's mother, and taking him into their own control, by the argument that "in temporal affairs the mother of the emperor might guide her son; but the Roman Church was the mother of the emperor in a higher sense, and as his rightful guardian was to act for him in spiritual concerns." The council decided in favor of Alexander II, and declared him the rightful pope to whom belonged all the powers of the papacy.

ECE page 334 paragraph 2 135. However, Honorius was still alive, and had his friends, and even his army; and one of his friends even held the castle of St. Angelo, in Rome. In the spring of 1063, at the solicitation of his supporters in Rome, Honorius led his army again to that city. His faction held the gates of a portion of the city, and Honorius was enabled to enter the city without a battle. The troops of Alexander held the other parts of the city: a battle was fought: Honorius was defeated, and took refuge in the castle of St. Angelo, where he maintained himself for two years. "Rome had two popes with their armed troops glaring defiance at each other from opposite quarters of the city. The spiritual thunders -- each of course, and each in his synod, had hurled his direst excommunication at the other -- were drowned in the louder din of arms." -- Milman.25

ECE page 334 paragraph 3 136. In May, 1064, another council was assembled to decide the question again, as to who was rightful pope. This council met at Mantua, in Lombardy. The rival popes were summoned to appear at the council. Alexander, knowing that the managers of the council were favorable to him, went. Honorius refused to go, declaring that

335

no power could rightly summon him, as his election had been regularly accomplished by a council, and confirmed by the imperial authority. The council declared Alexander II to be legitimate pope. A portion of the army of Honorius raided the city of Mantua while the council was sitting. But Duke Godfrey had accompanied Alexander with an army, guaranteeing his safety, and these drove out the soldiers of Honorius. The episcopal partisans of Honorius in Lombardy deserted his cause and begged the forgiveness of the council. But Honorius II still held to his title of pope unto the day of his death, in 1066; and Alexander II reigned in papal peace for seven years, until April 21, 1073, when he also died, and was succeeded by the monk Hildebrand, as Pope --

GREGORY VII.

---

1 [Page 272] "History of the Popes," Stephen the Fifth. All the quotations in this chapter, not otherwise specially credited, are from De Cormenin. This work is made the standard because (1) it is written by a Catholic, and (2) it is the latest complete history of the popes. It was translated into English in 1846. Louis Marie de in Haye. viscount de Cormenin, was a French jurist, political writer, a leading statesman, an advocate of religious liberty, member of the Institute de France, and commander of Legion of Honor. He died May 6, 1868.

2 [Page 279] "History of Latin Christianity," book v. chap. ii, pars, 11, 12 from end.

3 [Page 285] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," book chap iv, note to par. 11.

4 [Page 287] "History of Latin Christianity," book v. chap. iv. par. 11.

5 [Page 291] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Hadrian II, par. 3 from end.

6 [Page 293] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. iii, book v. chap. vi, par. 2.

7 [Page 296] "History of Latin Christianity," book v, chap. vi, pars 8.

8 [Page 296] Id., par. 8.

9 [Page 297] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. iii, book v. chap. vi, par. 16.

10 [Page 298] "Lives of the Popes," Formosus, par 7.

11 [Page 302] Quoted by De Cormenin under Stephen VII.

12 [Page 302] Quoted by Bower under Benedict IV.

13 [Page 302] Quoted by De Cormenin, under Benedict IV.

14 [Page 304] "Lives of the Popes," Sergius III, par. 1. Also De Cormenin, under Sergius III, and Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. iii, book v, chap. xi.

15 [Page 304] Quoted by Bower, under John X.

16 [Page 309] "Lives of the Popes," John XII, par. 8.

17 [Page 309] Bower, John XII, par. 7: Milman's "Latin Christianity," Vol. iii, book v. chap. xii. par. 7.

18 [Page 314] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Leo VIII, par. 6.

19 [Page 319] De Cormenin, under John XV: Milman's "Latin Christianity," Vol. iii, book v, chap. xiii, par. 11. The Scripture here referred to is Rev. 17:16, 17: "And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. For God hath put in their hearts to fulfill His will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled."

20 [Page 320] Milman's "Latin Christianity," Id., par. 3 from end.

21 [Page 322] Id., chap. xiv. par 7.

22 [Page 328] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Leo IX, par. 5 from end.

23 [Page 329] "Latin Christianity," Vol. iii, book vi, chap. iii, par. 8.

24 [Page 332] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Nicholas II, par. 10.

25 [Page 334] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. iii, book vi, chap. iii, par. 30 from end.

16. THE PAPAL SUPREMACY -- GREGORY VII TO CALIXTUS II.

THE reign of Gregory VII was of such a character as to mark an era, even in the course of the papacy. It was the papacy that had restored the Western Empire. It was by the pope that Charlemagne was proclaimed emperor. Charlemagne, and his successors for a long period, received from the hands of the pope the imperial crown. For a while, indeed, because of the anarchy of the times, the popes had been enabled even to choose, as well as to crown, the emperor. But, for a long period, up to the time of Gregory VII the papacy in itself had grown so utterly degraded that instead of the popes choosing the emperors, to the emperors had fallen the choosing of the popes. It was the one settled purpose of Gregory VII to reverse this order, and to make the papacy again supreme.

2. It is upon this issue that the name of Hildebrand first appears in the history. When, because of his enormous cruelties and oppressions, Pope Gregory VI was rejected by the people, and even by the clergy of Rome, and, in behalf of clergy and people, had to be deposed and exiled by the emperor Henry, Hildebrand, who was then but a monk, publicly censured the Council of Sutri, which had granted to the emperor the power to depose the pope. About that time the monk Hildebrand took up his residence at the monastery of Cluny, in Burgundy, of which he soon became abbot. When Leo IX had been chosen pope by the emperor and his Diet at Worms, as he was on his journey to Rome, he stopped at the monastery of Cluny. There Hildebrand attacked Leo with his purpose of subjecting the authority of the emperor to that of the popes. Thus far on his journey, Leo had traveled as pope, in papal garb, with four bishops as his attendants. Hildebrand persuaded him to lay all this aside -- not to renounce the office of pope itself, but only the recognition of its bestowal by the emperor. He persuaded him to make

the rest of the journey as a simple pilgrim, and to present himself thus at Rome to the people as dependent alone upon their voice for the pontifical office.

3. Hildebrand was so successful in the abbey of Cluny in imposing upon Leo his scheme, that he followed up this success by abandoning his abbey, and his abbacy, and going with Leo to Rome, and remaining permanently there. Whether Hildebrand had then, or even for some time later, framed the purpose to be pope himself, on the throne, can not certainly be affirmed. But it can with certainty be affirmed that he had formed the fixed determination that, wherever he might be, and whatever he might be, so far as his power could be made to go, the papacy should be supreme. And in Rome, though not pope upon the throne, Hildebrand became pope behind the throne. He maintained his power over Leo IX. At the death of Leo, he was the ambassador who went to Germany and secured the appointment of Victor II. He was so successful in holding steadily this onward course, that in became a matter of public notoriety that Hildebrand was the pope of the pope. In the time of Alexander II, to Hildebrand, Cardinal Damiana wrote: "You make this one Lord: that one makes you God." "I am subject more to the lord of the pope than to the lord pope."

4. Another purpose to which Hildebrand was devoted, and which was essential to his grand scheme of the supremacy of the papacy, was the absolute and universal celibacy of the clergy. Monkery was, of course,

always opposed to the marriage relation. All of the clergy who were monks, were therefore celibate. And all the popes who were also monks had steadily warred against marriage; and the popes who were not monks rigidly maintained what those had done who were monks. In 748 Boniface, the monk, who was the papal missionary to Germany, after a long war against the married clergy in France, in which he was firmly supported by Charles Martel and his son Carloman, was obliged to confess that the married clergy, though driven out from all Church connection, were "much more numerous than those who as yet had been forced to compliance with the rules. Driven from the churches, but supported by the sympathizing people, they performed their ministry among the fields and in the cabins of the peasants, who concealed them from the ecclesiastical authorities. This is not

the description of mere sensual worldlings, and it is probable that by this time persecution had ranged the evil-disposed on the winning side. Those who thus exercised their ministry in secret and in wretchedness, retaining the veneration of the people, were therefore men who believed themselves honorably and legitimately married, and who were incapable of sacrificing wife and children for worldly advantage or in blind obedience to a rule which to them was novel, unnatural, and indefensible." -- Lea. 1

5. However gross might be the licentiousness of the unmarried clergy, to be married and live honorably with a wife was denounced as a greater sin than all this could be. It was the positive teaching of the Church that he who was guilty of practicing licentiousness, "knowing it to be wrong, was far less criminal than he who married, believing it to be right." -- Lea. 2 Such of the clergy as were not monks were designated as the "secular" clergy. And it would seem that of these there were more than there were of the monkish clergy. And in spite of the perpetual war of the monks and the popes against the marriage of the clergy, there were yet in the time of Gregory VII great numbers of these who recognized, honored, and enjoyed the marriage relation. In England, in France, in Normandy, in Germany, Burgundy, Lombardy, and the kingdom of Naples, there were large numbers of married clergy; and even in Rome itself there were some. Down to the time of Nicholas II, the whole clergy of the kingdom of Naples, from the highest to the lowest, openly and honorably lived with their lawful wives.

6. "Notwithstanding the pious fervor which habitually stigmatized the wives as harlots and the husbands as adulterers, Damiani himself allows us to see that the marriage relation was preserved with thorough fidelity on the part of the women, and was compatible with learning, decency, and strict attention to religious duty by the men. Urging the wives to quit their husbands, he finds it necessary to combat their scruples at breaking what was to them a solemn engagement, fortified with all legal provisions and religious rites, but which he pronounces a frivolous and meaningless ceremony. So, in deploring the habitual

practice of marriage among the Piedmontese clergy, he regards it as the only blot upon men who otherwise appeared to him as a chorus of angels, and as shining lights in the Church." 3 But all this, it was Hildebrand's fixed purpose utterly and universally to break down. Hildebrand's place and power in the affairs of the papacy is the secret of the councils and efforts of Leo IX, Stephen X, Nicholas II, and Alexander II against the marriage, or as they called it the "concubinage and adultery" of the clergy. It was the favoring of the marriage of the clergy that was the principal cause that Honorius II was so bitterly denounced by Cardinal Damiani.

7. The day after the death of Alexander II, while Hildebrand as archdeacon was conducting the funeral service, the cry was started and was at once taken up by the multitude, "Hildebrand is pope." St. Peter chooses the archdeacon Hildebrand." The funeral services thus interrupted were abandoned until Hildebrand was inducted to his new office, and, clothed in purple, was seated upon the papal throne, April 22, 1073, as --

GREGORY VII.

His very choice of his papal name was a signal of what was to be his attitude toward the imperial authority. His chosen name of Gregory VII was the open indorsement of the pontificate of Gregory VI, who had been deposed and exiled by the emperor, which action Hildebrand, the monk, had at the time publicly censured.

8. This open indorsement of the pontificate of Gregory VI by this "Caesar of the papacy" is notable also in another respect: Gregory VI was the priest John Gratian (page 323) who had accumulated so much wealth "for pious uses," which he employed in the "pious use" of buying the papacy when it was put up at auction by that papal triplicate, Benedict IX, John XX, and Sylvester III. Therefore when Hildebrand chose the name of Gregory VII, he not only twitted the imperial authority that had deposed Gregory VI, but he put his papal indorsement upon the whole course of Gregory VI. By this, Gregory VII set the papal seal of legitimacy upon the order of things by which there came to be a Gregory VI. And by that be settled it by the highest possible papal authority that there can not be any such thing as an

illegitimate attainment of the papacy. By the papacy itself there is thus certified that in her affairs, "whatever is, is right."

9. As much as Gregory VII hated any dependence of the papacy upon the sanction of the imperial authority, the situation of the papacy just at that time compelled him to defer to the imperial authority, to court its favor, and even to solicit its approval of his elevation to the papal chair. During the greater part of the reign of his immediate predecessor there had been two popes, and consequently war; and now the emperor was ready to raise up a pope in opposition to Gregory VII. To escape such an event and its consequences, Gregory was compelled to submit to the approval of the emperor his claims to the papal seat, though he was already elected pope. The very next day after his election he sent messengers to Henry IV in Germany, to announce to him what had occurred; and "that though he had not been able to withstand the earnest desire, or rather violence, of the Roman people, he had not suffered himself to be consecrated without the approbation and consent of the king. Hereupon, Henry immediately dispatched Count Eberhard to Rome, with orders to inquire on the sport whether the election of Hildebrand was canonical; and if it was not, to cause another to be chosen in his room." -- Bower. 4 Gregory was able to satisfy Count Eberhard, who returned with a favorable report to Henry, who then sent to Rome the chancellor of Italy, the bishop of Vercelli, to confirm the election of Gregory, and to assist at his consecration as pope.

10. Thus Gregory VII held the papal throne undisputed by either the imperial authority or a rival pope. And thus he confessed himself and the papacy dependent upon the imperial authority for the very power which he was determined to use to lift himself and the papacy above that authority. And this is but the story of Gregory's scheme throughout: While he was determined to exalt the papal power above the imperial, and make it supreme and absolute, yet he never for a moment thought of making the papacy independent of the imperial authority. The imperial power was to be the sword-arm of the Church, to be directed by the will of the Church, and to be wielded in behalf of the Church. This was made plain by Hildebrand in the reign of

Alexander II, in a letter that he wrote to the archbishop guardian of the young emperor Henry IV, about the year 1062. He said: --

"The royal and sacerdotal powers are united in Jesus Christ, in heaven. They should equally form an indissoluble union on earth; for each has need of the assistance of the other to rule the people. The priesthood is protected by the strength of royalty; and royalty is aided by the influence of the priesthood. The king bears the sword to strike the enemies of the Church; the pope bears the thunders of anathema to crush the enemies of the sovereign. Let the throne and the Church then unite, and the whole world will be subjected to their law." 5

11. This theory, more fully stated, is that "as God, in the midst of the celestial hierarchy, ruled blessed spirits in paradise, so the pope, His vicar, raised above priests, bishops, metropolitans, reigned over the souls of mortal men below. But as God is Lord of earth as well as of heaven, so must he (the imperator coelestis) be represented by a second earthly viceroy, the emperor (imperator terrenus), whose authority shall be of and for this present life. And as in this present world the soul can not act save through the body, while yet the body is no more than an instrument and means for the soul's manifestation, so must there be a rule and care of men's bodies as well as of their souls, yet subordinated always to the well-being of that which is the purer and the more enduring. It is under the emblem of soul and body that the relation of the papal and imperial power is presented to us throughout the Middle Ages.

12. "The pope, as God's vicar in matters spiritual, is to lead men to eternal life; the emperor, as vicar in matters temporal, must so control them in their dealings with one another that they may be able to pursue undisturbed the spiritual life, and thereby attain the same supreme and common end of everlasting happiness. In the view of this object his chief duty is to maintain peace in the world, while toward the Church his position is that of advocate, a title borrowed from the practice adopted by churches and monasteries of choosing some powerful baron to protect their lands and lead their tenants in war. The functions of advocacy are twofold: at home to make the Christian people obedient to the priesthood, and to execute their decrees

upon heretics and sinners; abroad to propagate the faith among the heathen, not sparing to use carnal weapons. Thus does the emperor answer in every point to his antitype the pope, his power being yet of a lower rank, created on the analogy of the papal, as the papal itself had been modeled after the elder empire.

13. "The parallel holds good even in its details; for just as we have seen the churchman assuming the crown and robes of the secular prince, so now did he array the emperor in his own ecclesiastical vestments, the stole, and the dalmatic, gave him a clerical as well as a sacred character, removed his office from all narrowing associations of birth or country, inaugurated him by rites every one of which was means to symbolize and enjoin duties in their essence religious. Thus the holy Roman Church and the holy Roman Empire are one and the same thing, in two aspects; and Catholicism, the principle of the universal Christian society, is also Romanism; that is, rests upon Rome as the origin and type of its universality; manifesting itself in a mystic dualism which corresponds to the two natures of its Founder. As divine and eternal, its head is the pope, to whom souls have been intrusted; as human and temporal, the emperor, commissioned to rule men's bodies and acts." -- Bryce.6

14. Gregory VII laid claim not only to the dominions that composed the holy Roman Empire, but to those far beyond: England, Norway, Denmark, Poland, Bohemia, Russia, Africa, and practically even the whole earth; for, all land that might be gained by conquest from the heathen was to be held as fief from the pope. He wrote to the kings of Spain, that whatever part of that dominion was conquered from the Mohammedans was to be considered as granted to the conquerors by the pope, and held by the conquerors as the pope's vassal. And, it was he who, in following up this idea, first conceived the idea of the Crusades. For, in thus gaining dominions in the East, he would have ecclesiastical authority in the East, and could hope thus to bring even the whole Eastern Church once more under the power of the papacy.

15. Gregory's conception of the Crusades is made clear in a letter to king Henry IV, as follows: --

"We are informed, my son, that the Christians beyond the sea, persecuted by the infidel, and pressed down by the misery which overwhelms them, have sent entreaties to the holy see, imploring our aid, lest during our reign, the torch of religion should be extinguished in the East. We are penetrated with a holy grief, and we ardently aspire after martyrdom. We prefer to expose our life to protect our brethren, rather than remain at Rome to dictate laws to the world, when we know that the children of God are dying in slavery. We have consequently

undertaken to excite the zeal of all the faithful of the West, and to lead them in our train to the defense of Palestine. Already have the Italians and Lombards, inspired by the Holy Spirit, heard our exhortations with enthusiasm, and more than fifty thousand warriors are preparing for this far distant expedition, determined to wrest the sepulcher of Christ from the hands of the infidel. I have the more decided to conduct this enterprise in person, as the Church of Constantinople asks to be reunited to ours, and that all the inhabitants may wait upon us to put an end to their religious quarrels. Our fathers have frequently visited these provinces, in order to confirm the faith by holy words; we wish in our turn to follow in their footsteps, if God permits; but as so great an enterprise needs a powerful auxiliary, we demand the aid of your sword." 7

16. He also "wrote a general letter on the same subject to all the nations of the West, in which he excited the princes to the holy war against the infidel, beseeching them to send ambassadors to Rome, with whom he could arrange the execution of an expedition beyond the sea. Gregory, however, notwithstanding his obstinate perseverance in the project of conquering the Holy Land, could not put it in execution, in consequence of the refusal of the king of Germany to become an associate in this dangerous enterprise. The pope, fearing the ambition of the prince, if he abandoned Italy to combat the infidels, renounced his designs, and applied himself only to augment the temporal grandeur of the holy see." -- De Cormenin.8

17. The year following his accession to the papal throne, Gregory assembled a council in Rome, March 9, and 10, 1074, to begin his war against the marriage of the clergy. "In that assembly the following decrees were proposed by the pope, and agreed to at his request by the bishops who composed it: --

"1. That they who had obtained by simony any dignity, office, or

degree in the Church, should be excluded from the exercise of the office thus obtained.

"2. That they, who had purchased churches with money, should quit them, and no man should thenceforth presume to sell or buy any ecclesiastical dignity whatever.

"3. That the married clerks should not perform any clerical office.

"4. That the people should not assist at mass celebrated by them, nor at any other sacred function.

"5. That they who had wives, or, as they are styled in the decree, concubines, should put them away, and none should thenceforth be ordained who did not promise to observe continence during his whole life." 9

18. As for these decrees which related to simony, they amounted practically to no more than had the like decrees which had been so often enacted; because all the wealth of the Church was not only still held, but was expected by Gregory to be greatly increased. "According to the strict law, the clergy could receive everything, alienate nothing." -- Milman.10 And as long as this continued, and even grew, there could be no force in legislation prohibiting it, when those who were to enforce the law were the ones who made the laws, and who committed the transgressions which were forbidden by the laws which they themselves had made. But, with the canons forbidding the marriage of the clergy, it was different. Here, in the monks, was a vast horde to be the pope's seconds in the condemnation and annihilation of marriage amongst the clergy. Yet, for all this, there was open and universal opposition by the married clergy.

19. The decrees of this council were sent to all the bishops of France and Germany, with the command of the pope that they "exert all their power and authority in causing them to be strictly observed in all places under their jurisdiction. Some bishops complied so far with that injunction as to cause the decrees of the council to be published throughout their dioceses, and exhort their clergy to conform to them. But such was the opposition they everywhere met with, that they did not think it advisable to exert their authority or to use any

kind of compulsion. Other bishops, such of them especially as were themselves married, instead of enforcing the observance of the papal decree, declared them

345

repugnant both to Scripture and reason. Among these was Otho, bishop of Constance, whom the pope summoned, on that account, to Rome, as `an encourager of fornication;' while the bishop maintained that vice and all manner of uncleanness, abhorred by him, to be encouraged by the pope. At the same time that Gregory wrote to Otho, citing him to Rome to give there an account of his writing and conduct, he absolved the clergy and people of Constance, by a letter directed to them, from all obedience to their bishop, so long as he persisted in his `disobedience to God and the apostolic see.'" -- Bower.11

20. The married bishops and clergy declared that "if the pope obstinately insisted on the execution of his decree, they were determined to quit the priesthood rather than their wives; and his Holiness might then see where he could get angels to govern the Church, since he rejected the ministry of men." The pope sent four bishops as his legates, into Germany, to hold a council there, to cause the bishops to execute the decrees of the council. King Henry met the legates at Nuremberg, and received and treated them with the greatest possible respect. But he counseled them against any attempt to hold a council, because the archbishop of Mainz was the legitimate papal legate in Germany; that therefore he alone had the right to call, and to preside at, all councils held in Germany; and that he, as sovereign, could not require the bishops of Germany to attend a council over which any other than the archbishop of Mainz presided.

21. Gregory's legates disregarded Henry's counsel, and attempted to call their council. But the German bishops unanimously declared that they would not attend any council called by anybody but the archbishop of Mainz, nor would they respect any decrees of a council at which he had not presided as legate. This caused virtually the defeat of the decrees of Gregory's council, and he resolved to hold another. Accordingly, Feb. 24-28, 1075, another council was held in Rome, at which "the decree against the marriage, or, as they called it, the concubinage, of the clergy, was confirmed, and ecclesiastics of all ranks were ordered, on pain of excommunication, to quit their wives or renounce the ministry." This decree was strengthened by forbidding all the laity everywhere "to assist

346

at any function whatever, performed by such as did not immediately obey that decree."

22. This latest turn decreed by the council, was merely Gregory's will adopted by the council. For, in the month before the council was called, Gregory had sent circular letters to the dukes and lords of the States of the empire, by which he placed in their hands the power to compel the bishops to execute the decrees of the council, saying: --

"Whatever the bishops may say or may not say concerning this, do you in no manner receive the ministrations of those who owe promotion or ordination to simony, or whom you know to be guilty of concubinage, . . . and, as far as you can, do you prevent, by force, if necessary, all such persons from officiating. And if any shall presume to prate and say that it is not your business, tell them to come to us and dispute about the obedience which we thus enjoin upon you."

23. In the letter also he made "bitter complaint of the archbishops and bishops, who, with rare exceptions, had taken no steps to put an end to these `execrable customs,' or to punish the guilty." And when this principle was adopted by this latest council, "the princes of Germany, who were already intriguing with Gregory for support in their perennial revolts against their sovereign, were delighted to seize the opportunity of at once obliging the pope, creating disturbance at home, and profiting by the Church property which they could manage to get into their hands by ejecting the unfortunate married priests. They accordingly proceeded to exercise, without delay and to the fullest extent, the unlimited power so suddenly granted them over a class which had

hitherto successfully defied their jurisdiction; nor was it difficult to excite the people to join in the persecution of those who had always held themselves as superior beings, and who were now pronounced by the highest authority in the Church to be sinners of the worst description. The ignorant populace were naturally captivated by the idea of the vicarious mortification with which their own errors were to be redeemed by the abstinence imposed upon their pastors, and they were not unreasonably led to believe that they were themselves deeply wronged by the want of purity in their ecclesiastics. Add to this the attraction which persecution always possesses for the persecutor, and the license of plunder, so dear to a turbulent and barbarous age, and it is not difficult

347

to comprehend the motive power of the storm which burst over the heads of the secular clergy, and which must have satisfied by its severity the stern soul of Gregory himself.

24. "A contemporary writer, whose name has been lost, but who is supposed by Dom Martene to have been a priest of Treves, gives us a very lively picture of the horrors which ensued, and as he shows himself friendly in principle to the reform attempted, his account may be received as trustworthy. He describes what amounted almost to a dissolution of society, slave betraying master and master slave; friend informing against friend; snares and pitfalls spread before the feet of all; faith and truth unknown. The peccant priests suffered terribly. Some, reduced to utter poverty, and unable to bear the scorn and contempt of those from whom they had been wont to receive honor and respect, wandered off as homeless exiles; others, mutilated by the indecent zeal of ardent puritans, were carried around to exhibit their shame and misery; others tortured in lingering death, bore to the tribunal on high the testimony of bloodguiltiness against their persecutors; while others, again, in spite of danger, secretly continued the connections which exposed them to all these cruelties. . . .

25. "When such was the fate of the pastors, it is easy to imagine the misery inflicted on their unfortunate wives. A zealous admirer of Gregory relates with pious gratulation, as indubitable evidence of divine vengeance, how, maddened by their wrongs, some of them openly committed suicide, while others were found dead in the beds which they had sought in perfect health; and this being proof of their possession by the devil, they were denied Christian sepulture. The case of Count Manigold of Veringen affords a not uninstructive instance of the frightful passions aroused by the relentless cruelty which thus branded them as infamous, tore them from their families, and cast them adrift upon a mocking world. The count put in force the orders of Gregory with strict severity throughout his estates in the Swabian Alps. One miserable creature thus driven from her husband, swore that the count should undergo the same fate; and, in the blindness of her rage, she poisoned the countess of Veringen, whose widowed husband, overwhelmed with grief, sought no second mate." -- Lea.12

348

26. At the same council by which this heaviest blow which it would be possible for even the papacy to strike at the Divine bonds of human society, there was enacted the following decree: --

"If any one shall henceforth accept of a bishopric or of an abbey from a layman, let him not be looked upon as a bishop or abbot, nor any respect be paid to him as such. We moreover exclude him from the grace of St. Peter, and forbid him to enter the Church, till he has resigned the dignity that he has got by ambition, and by disobedience, which is idolatry. And this decree extends to inferior dignities. In like manner, if any emperor, duke, marquis, count, or any other secular person whatever, shall take upon him to give the investiture of a bishopric, or of any other ecclesiastical dignity, he shall be liable to the same sentence." 13

27. This was the beginning of what is known as the War of Investitures. "In the eleventh century a full half of the land and wealth of the country, and no small part of its military strength, was in the hands of churchmen: their influence predominated in the Diet; the archchancellorship of the empire, highest of all offices, was held by, and eventually came to belong of right to, the archbishop of Mentz, as primate of Germany." -- Bryce. 14 This made these prelates to be, and, to all intents and purposes they actually were, temporal lords and

nobles, as well as churchmen. The sovereign held, and unto this time the claim was universally recognized, that, for these temporalities, the churchmen owed to the sovereign, fealty. The token of this fealty was that, at the induction of the prelate into his office, the sovereign expressed his "approbation by putting the elect in possession of the temporalities of his see, which was done by delivering to him a pastoral staff, or a crosier and a ring. And this was the ceremony known by the name of Investiture; and the elect was not ordained till it was performed." -- Bower.15

28. This decree of Gregory's second council, forbidding lay investiture, if made effective, would at one stroke rob the empire of half its temporalities, and place them absolutely under the power of the pope. Plainly, therefore, "this decree was a declaration of war against all Christian princes; for Gregory could not suppose that they would tamely

part with a right which they looked upon as one of the most valuable jewels of their crown, and which no pope had ever yet disputed. But he thought it a point well worth contending for, well worth all the confusion, civil wars, rebellions, bloodshed, that such a decree might occasion, since he would by carrying it into execution, engross to himself the disposal of the whole wealth of the Church, and thus make the clergy everywhere independent of their princes, and dependent upon him alone, as he alone could reward and prefer them." 16

29. The decree was intended as a declaration of war and especially against Henry IV, the head of the empire. And it is difficult to believe that the time was not deliberately chosen by Gregory VII for the contest. Gregory was sixty-two years old; Henry was but about twenty-two. Gregory had had thirty years of training in the dark, crafty, and arrogant school of the papacy; Henry had scarcely any training in the school of kingship, for from his infancy until his majority he had been held in the leading strings of the imperious ecclesiastics of Germany, who, in their ambition to rule the kingdom, "had galled him with all that was humiliating, with none of the beneficial effects of severe control. They had been indulgent only to his amusements: they had not trained him to the duties of his station, or the knowledge of affairs and of man. . . . Thus with all the lofty titles, the pomp without the power, the burden with nothing but the enervating luxuries, none of the lofty self-confidence of one born and fitly trained to empire, the character of Henry was still further debased by the shame of perpetual defeat and humiliation." -- Milman.17 In addition to this disadvantage of Henry in age and training, just at this time there was a revolt of the Saxon nobles, including the archbishop of Magdeburg, the bishops of Halberstadt, Hildesheim, Mersberg, Minden, Paderborn, and Meissen.

30. Such was the situation of Henry IV when Gregory VII through his second council, began the War of Investitures. The council was no sooner over than Gregory wrote to Henry, sending him a copy of the decrees, "reproaching him at the same time, in the letter, with still keeping and employing the ministers whom he had excommunicated; with suffering the bishops, whom he had deposed, to continue in their sees; with neglecting to publish in his dominions the decrees of the former

Council of Rome against simony, and the incontinence of the clergy; and lastly with protecting Godfrey, the usurper of the see of Milan, and communicating with the Lombard bishops his adherents, though cut off by the apostolic see from the communion of the Church. In the close of his letter he forbids the king thenceforth to meddle at all with ecclesiastical preferments, to grant investitures, or dispose of vacant churches, upon any pretense whatsoever; and threatens him with excommunication if he does not comply with the decree banishing such unlawful practices from the Church." -- Bower.18

31. Henry being engaged in his Saxon war, and thus not prepared for an open war with the pope, sent to Gregory a very kind reply, and promised that he would cause the decrees of the council against simony and marriage of the clergy, to be published in his dominions, and would do what he could to have them obeyed. But he entirely ignored both the decree and Gregory's letter, as far as they related to investitures; saying that later he

would send an embassy to Rome to consider and settle with the pope, other matters. Soon, however, Henry triumphed over the revolted Saxons; and, having this difficulty out of the way, he felt himself able to take up Gregory's challenge upon investitures. In this interval some vacancies had occurred in this bishoprics; and some of these Gregory had presumed to fill. Henry filled the sees that were vacant, and also by his own authority, those which Gregory had presumed to fill, excluding the bishops whom Gregory had appointed. And, upon all these appointees, Henry conferred investiture as had always been done.

32. When Gregory had learned of this disobedience on the part of Henry, he wrote a letter in which he said: --

"Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to King Henry health and apostolic benediction, if he obeys the apostolic see, as becomes a Christian king: Deeply and anxiously weighing the responsibilities of the trust committed to us by St. Peter, we have with great hesitation granted our apostolic benediction; for it is reported that thou still holdest communion with excommunicated persons. If this be true, the grace of that benediction avails thee nothing. Seek ghostly counsel of some sage priest, and perform the penance imposed upon thee. . . . The apostolic synod over which we presided this year, thought fit in the

decay of the Christian religion to revert to the ancient discipline of the Church, that discipline on which depends the salvation of man. This decree (however, some may presume to call it an insupportable burden or intolerable oppression) we esteem a necessary law; all Christian kings and people are bound directly to accept and to observe it. As thou art the highest in dignity and power, so shouldest thou surpass others in devotion to Christ. If, however, thou didst consider this abrogation of a bad custom hard or unjust to thyself, thou shouldest have sent to our presence some of the wisest and most religious of thy realm, to persuade us, in our condescension, to mitigate its force in some way not inconsistent with the honor of God and the salvation of men's souls. We exhort thee, in our parental love, to prefer the honor of Christ to thine own, and to give full liberty to the Church, the spouse of God." 19

33. To this communication Henry paid no attention whatever. It was therefore soon followed up by an embassy from Gregory to Henry, summoning him "to appear in person at Rome, on the Monday of the second week in Lent," Feb. 22, 1076, there to answer for his disobedience to the pope. The legates also declared, from the pope, that if Henry did not obey this summons, and appear on the very day appointed, on that day he should be excommunicated and placed under anathema. "Thus the king, the victorious king of the Germans, was solemnly cited as a criminal to answer undefined charges, to be amenable to laws which the judge had assumed the right of enacting, interpreting, enforcing by the last penalties. The whole affairs of the empire were to be suspended while the king stood before the bar of his imperious arbiter; no delay was allowed; the stern and immutable alternative was humble and instant obedience, or that sentence which involved deposition from the empire, eternal perdition." -- Milman.20

34. In reply to Gregory's summons and threat, Henry assembled a council at Worms, Jan. 24, 1076. At the council there appeared Cardinal Hugh the White, the same who had been spokesman for the crowd the day when Hildebrand was, by acclamation, proclaimed pope; but who had incurred the displeasure of Gregory, and had therefore been deposed, only a short time before the assembly of this council at Worms. Cardinal Hugh brought with him what he claimed to be "the authentic history of Gregory VII," in which he was charged with all sorts of evil

doing, even to magic and murders. Whether these charges were true or not, the effect of the evidences which Cardinal Hugh presented, was such that the whole council, with the exception of but two, declared "that the election of such a monster was a nullity, and that God had not been able to give to Satan the power to bind and loose;" and pronounced against him the following sentence of deposition: --

"Hildebrand, who, from pride, has assumed the name of Gregory, is the greatest criminal who has invaded the papacy until this time. He is an apostate monk, who adulterates the Bible, suits the books of the Fathers to the wants of his execrable ambition, and pollutes justice, by becoming at once accuser, witness, and judge. He separates husbands from their wives; he prefers prostitutes to legitimate spouses; he encourages the adulterous and incestuous; he excites the populace against their king, and endeavors to oblige sovereigns and bishops to pay the court of Rome for their diadems and miters; finally, he makes a public traffic of the priesthood and the episcopate; he buys provinces, sells the dignities of the Church, and causes all the gold of Christendom to flow into his treasury. We consequently declare, in the name of the emperor of Germany, of the princes and prelates, and in the name of the Senate, and the Christian people, that Gregory the Seventh is deposed from the apostolic throne, which he soils by his abominations." 21

35. Blanks were issued, which each bishop signed, running as follows: --

"I, . . . bishop of . . . disclaim from this hour all subjection and allegiance to Hildebrand, and will neither esteem, nor call, him pope." 22

36. With this decree of the council Henry sent to Gregory the following letter: --

"Henry, king by divine ordination and not by usurpation, to Hildebrand, no longer pope, but a false monk: You deserve to be thus saluted, after introducing, as you have done, the utmost confusion into the Church, and amongst all orders of men. You have trampled upon the archbishops and bishops, and treated the anointed of the Lord as your vassals and slaves, etc. All this we have borne out of the regard that is due to the apostolic see; but you, ascribing it to fear, have presumed to set yourself up against the royal dignity, and threaten to take it from us, as if we had received it from you and from God, who called us to the throne, but never called you to the chair. You owe your dignity to fraud, to craft, and to money. Your money procured you friends, and

your friends opened you the way to the chair of peace with the sword; being thus raised to the chair, you have made it your business to sow discord, to disturb the public tranquillity, to countenance disobedience in those whom all are bound to obey. You have not even spared me, though I have been, unworthy as I am, anointed king, and am, according to the doctrine taught by the fathers, to be judged only by God, and can only forfeit my kingdom by apostatizing from the faith. The holy bishops of old did not take upon them to depose the apostate emperor Julian, but left him to be judged and deposed by God, who alone could judge and depose him. Peter, who was a true pope, commanded all men to fear God, and honor the king; but you do neither, and your not honoring me can only proceed from your not fearing God. St. Paul anathematized even an angel from heaven, who should preach any other gospel. We therefore command you, struck with this anathema, and condemned by the judgment of all our bishops, to quit the see you have unjustly usurped. Let another be raised to the throne of St. Peter, who will not disguise his wicked attempts with the mask of religion; but teach the sound doctrine of that holy apostle. I, Henry, by the grace of God, king, command you, with all my bishops, to come down from the throne. Descende, descende -- come down, come down." 23

37. At the same time Henry sent also a letter to the clergy, lords, and people of Lombardy and Rome, in which he said: --

"Gregory would hazard his own life, or strip the king of his life and kingdom. Be the most loyal, the first to join in his condemnation. We do not ask you to shed his blood; let him suffer life, which, after he is deposed, will be more wretched to him than death. But if he resist, compel him to yield up the apostolic throne, and make way for one whom we shall elect, who will have both the will and the power to heal the wounds inflicted on the Church by their present pastor." 24

38. Under the leadership of the archbishop of Ravenna, the powerful party that had supported Honorius II in his claims to the papacy, stood with Henry. A council was held at Piacenza, which ratified the decree of the Council of Worms.

39. All this had occurred before that twenty-second of February, which Gregory had appointed for the appearance of Henry in person in Rome, to answer for the crimes laid against him. And now February 22 was at hand, and Gregory had assembled in the Lateran, February 21, a council of one hundred and ten bishops and abbots. Gregory "sat among his assembled bishops. The hymn had ceased which implored

the descent of the Holy Ghost" upon their assembly. Roland, bishop of Parma, had been sent to Rome by Henry, bearing the decree of the Council of Worms, and Henry's letter to Gregory. He now walked boldly into the council and up to the throne of the pope, and placed in Gregory's hand the documents which he carried. "The bold and sudden entrance of Roland was hardly perceived amid the grave occupation to which (as genuine descendants of the old Romans, who, when the fate of kings and nations depended on their vote, usually commenced their solemn council by consulting the augurs, and waiting for some significant omen) they had surrendered their absorbed attention. An egg had been found which, by its mysterious form, portended the issue of the conflict. What seemed a black serpent, the type of evil, rose as it were in high relief, and coiled around the smooth shell; but it had struck on what seemed a shield, and recoiled, bruised and twisting in a mortal agony. On this sat gazing the mute and ecclesiastical Senate. But the voice of Roland made itself heard. Addressing the pope, he exclaimed: --

"The king and the bishops of Germany send this mandate: Down at once from the throne of St. Peter! yield up the usurped government of the Roman Church! none must presume to such honor but those chosen by the general voice and approved by the emperor."

40. Then, turning to the council, he said: --

"Ye, my brethren, are commanded to present yourselves at the Feast of Pentecost before the king, my master, there to receive a pope and father; for this man is no pope, but a ravening wolf."

41. The king's messenger barely escaped with his life, Gregory checking the passion of the excited bishops and the soldiers, who were about to cut him to pieces. Gregory then read the decrees of the Council of Worms and Piacenza, and King Henry's letter to him; after which he addressed his council as follows: --

"My friends, let us not trouble the peace of the Church by becoming guilty of a useless murder. These are the coming and predicted days, in which it behooves the clergy to show the innocence of the dove, blended with the wisdom of the serpent. The forerunner of antichrist has arisen against the Church; the dry harvest is about to be wet with the blood of the saints. Now is the time when it will be shown who is ashamed of his Lord, of whom the Lord will be ashamed at His second coming. Better is it to die for Christ and His holy laws than, by shamefully

yielding to those who violate and trample them underfoot, to be traitors to the Church: not to resist such impious men were to deny the faith of Christ."

42. At this point Gregory held up before the council the remarkable egg which had attracted the awe of the assembly at the moment when Roland the messenger had broken in upon them. Gregory now interpreted its deep significance: The shield was the Church; the serpent was the dragon of the book of Revelation, personified in the rebellious Henry. The recoil and deathly agony of the serpent after having struck the shield, foretold the fate of Henry! Then Gregory continued his harangue of the council, as follows: --

"Now, therefore, brethren, it behooves us to draw the sword of vengeance; now must we smite the foe of God and of his Church; now shall his bruised head, which lifts itself in its haughtiness against the foundation of the faith and of all the churches, fall to the earth; there, according to the sentence pronounced against his pride, to go upon his belly, and eat the dust. Fear not, little flock, saith the Lord, for it is the will of your Father to grant you the kingdom. Long enough have ye borne with him; often enough have ye admonished him: let his seared conscience be made at length to feel!"

43. The council unanimously responded: --

"Let thy wisdom, most holy father, whom the divine mercy has raised up to rule the world in our days, utter such a sentence against this blasphemer, this usurper, this tyrant, this apostate, as may crush him to the earth, and make him a warning to future ages. . . . Draw the sword, pass the judgment, `that the righteous may rejoice when he seeth the vengeance, and wash his hands in the blood of the ungodly.'"

44. The further proceedings of the condemnation of Henry, were postponed until the next day; because Gregory had pledged himself to excommunicate Henry on February 22, if he did not comply with the papal summons. Accordingly, the next day, the council met in solemn conclave. Gregory stood up and addressed St. Peter in person, as follows: --

"Blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, hear me, your servant, whom you have nourished from his infancy, and have delivered this day from the hands of the wicked, who hate me because I am faithful to you. You are my witness, you and our Lady, the Mother of God, and your brother St. Paul, that your holy Roman Church placed me against my

will in your see, and that I had rather died an exile than raised myself to it by unlawful means, or the favor of men. But, being by your grace placed in it, I persuade myself that it pleases you that I should rule the Christian people committed to your care, and exert the power that God has given to me, as holding your place, the power of binding and loosening in heaven and on earth. In this persuasion it is, that for the honor and defense of your Church, on the part of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by your power and authority, I forbid King Henry, the son of the emperor Henry, who with an unheard-of pride has insulted your Church, to meddle henceforth with the government of the Teutonic kingdom or of Italy. I absolve all Christians from the oath of allegiance, which they have taken, or shall take to him, and forbid any one to serve him as king. For he, who attempts to lessen the honor of your Church, deserves to forfeit his own. And because he has refused to obey, as becomes a Christian, and has not returned to the Lord, whom he has forsaken, by communicating with the excommunicated persons, but despised the counsels which I gave him for his welfare, and endeavored to raise divisions in your Church, I now anathematize him in your name, that all nations may know, that thou art Peter, that upon this rock the Son of the living God has built His Church, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." 25

45. Henry's chief adherent, the bishop of Utrecht, in return, on behalf of Henry, excommunicated the pope. The archbishop of Ravenna assembled a council at Pavia, and likewise excommunicated him and laid him under an anathema. But, encouraged by Gregory's excommunication, all the discontented elements of Germany began to conspire against Henry. Superstition also worked against Henry; for his chief supporter, the bishop of Utrecht, died, and his cathedral was struck by lightning. This was used by Henry's enemies to excite the superstition of the populace, by declaring it a manifest token of the wrath of God against the rebellious king. Still further, the Saxon bishops, who had engaged in the late rebellion, and who had been taken prisoners, now escaped, and added so much strength to the conspiracy which had now become firmly organized under the leadership of the pope, who continued to issue his letters and excommunications against Henry and those who favored his cause. He commanded all people to break off all intercourse or communication of any kind whatever

with Henry; and the bishops must enforce this discipline everywhere: he declared that all who communicated with the king thereby themselves incurred excommunication;

357

and that consecration performed by any bishop who communicated with the excommunicated, was really an execration instead of a consecration.

46. These proceedings continued through the summer of 1076; and September 3 Gregory issued a letter to the bishops, nobles, and people of Germany, commanding them that, if Henry did not immediately repent, and "acknowledge that the Church was not subject to him as a handmaid, but superior as a mistress," and abandon all claim to the right of investiture, they should choose another sovereign -- one approved by the pope. This intensified the opposition to Henry by exciting the ambition of the leading dukes. Rudolph of Swabia and Otto of Saxony were confessed aspirants to the throne, if Henry should be set aside. Therefore, in pursuance of the pope's command, and the ambition of the leading nobles, a diet assembled at Tribur, Oct. 16, 1076, at which Henry, though not present, was arraigned, and was charged with a long list of offenses, political, ecclesiastical, and moral, covering his whole life from his boyhood. Henry offered submission, redress of grievances, and amendment of errors. But his enemies declared that they could not trust him. The diet finally decided, and laid upon Henry the obligation, that the whole question involved should be deferred to the decision of the pope; that a council should be held at Augsburg the following year, at which the pope should preside, for the decision of the case; and, until that council should meet, Henry should respect the authority of the pope, should disband his troops, lay aside all royal insignia, perform no act of authority as king, should not enter a church, should hold no communication with his counselors and friends who had incurred with him the excommunication of the pope, and should dwell at the city of Spires entirely as a private person. In addition to all this, the diet decided that if Henry should not succeed in clearing himself of the excommunication of the pope, by the twenty-second day of February, 1077, all right and title to the throne should that day be forfeited, and all his subjects be released from allegiance to him.

47. It was now the beginning of November, 1076. Less than four months' time remained for Henry in which to secure his throne by finding deliverance from his excommunication; and it was by no means certain that the council that was to be held at Augsburg would be convened

358

before that fatal twenty-second of February of the next year. He therefore resolved to make his submission to the pope, and, if possible, save his crown. He sent a messenger to ask of the pope permission to appear before him in Italy rather than in Germany. But Gregory declared that he would hold court at Augsburg; and that before the eighth of January he would be as far as to Mantua, on his way to Germany. Henry then determined to meet the pope in Italy without his permission. It was the coldest winter that had been known in Europe for years, the Rhine being frozen over from the beginning of November till the first of April. Henry, with his wife and infant son, and with a few attendants, started to make his way over the Alps into Italy, through a country not only frozen, and deep with snow but thick with his enemies. He succeeded in evading his enemies, and, through terrible hardships, in reaching the summit of the Alps, in the Mount Cenis pass. But the way down on the other side was yet more dangerous. "It looked like a vast precipice, smooth, and almost sheer." His wife and child they bound up in skins, and, by letting them and one another down by ropes, they crept and slid and tumbled down the steeps. Some of the king's attendants perished, others were so frozen as to lose the use of their limbs; but the king himself, his wife, and child, and the most of his train arrived safely in Italy.

48. As soon as his presence was known in Italy, the Lombard princes and bishops gathered to him in great numbers, even with their troops; for they supposed that he had come to depose the pope, in which enterprise they were glad to support him. Gregory also heard of Henry's arrival in Italy, and he was afraid that Henry had come to depose him. He therefore turned aside from his journey, and took refuge in the strong castle of the countess Matilda, at Canossa. This countess Matilda held the most extensive territories of any noble in

Italy, except the Normans. She herself was a relative of Henry's, but yet was bound more closely to Gregory. She was now a widow, and, "devoted herself entirely to Gregory, transacting nothing without consulting him, followed in everything his directions, and never parting from him, accompanied him wherever he went. Her intimacy with Gregory and the extraordinary regard he on all occasions showed for her, gave occasion to many scandalous reports, that were industriously propagated by the

359

pope's enemies, especially the ecclesiastics, of whom he exacted the strictest celibacy. Their attachment for each other was not, perhaps, criminal; but it is allowed even by those who most admire the pope, to have been at least on his side, as he had so many enemies, very imprudent." -- Bower. 26 Gregory was not only Matilda's chief and most confidential counselor, but she was his; for her relations to him were closer and freer than was that of even his chamberlains.

49. Henry would not allow himself to be persuaded by the Lombard nobles and bishops to make war upon the pope, until he had obtained the removal of the excommunication. And it was now less than a month before the expiration of the period set by the rebellious diet of Tribur. Therefore Henry proceeded to Canossa. He first obtained an interview with Matilda, whom with other intercessors he sent to Gregory to plead for him. Gregory answered: "Let him appear on the appointed day at Augsburg, and he shall receive rigid and impartial justice." Henry, by his intercessors, pleaded that he was willing to appear at Augsburg and submit his case to judgment there; but that his possession of the crown depended on his being freed from the excommunication: only let the pope grant that, and he would do all else that might be required. Then the pope replied: --

"If he be truly penitent, let him place his crown and all the ensigns of royalty in my hands, and openly confess himself unworthy of the royal name and dignity."

50. Henry accepted the terms, and appeared at the castle gate. There he was informed that he must leave outside all his guards and attendants and enter alone. The castle was surrounded with three walls. Henry passed through the gate of the first wall, and the gate was shut behind him. There he was required not merely to lay aside all royal apparel, but to unclothe himself entirely, and clothe himself with the thin, single, sackcloth garment of a penitent; "a broom and scissors were placed in his hands as a sign that he consented to be whipped and shaven." and he was then admitted within the second wall. And there, "on a dreary winter morning, Jan. 25, 1077, with the ground deep in snow, the king, the heir of a long line of emperors," stood bareheaded

360

and barefooted, awaiting the will of the pope. Thus fasting, he passed the first day and night. The second day and night he passed in the same way, pleading for the pope to hear him and deliver him. The third day came with the pope still unrelenting. Even the pope's company began to murmur that his conduct "instead of being the gravity of apostolic severity, was the cruelty of an iron tyranny." Matilda at last was melted to sincere pity, and went to Gregory, and by her influence, persuaded him to put an end to Henry's sufferings, by admitting him to the papal presence.

51. On the fourth day Henry was admitted to his desired interview with the pope. "The terms exacted from Henry, who was far too deeply humiliated to dispute anything, had no redeeming touch of gentleness or compassion." -- Milman.27 These conditions were: --

"1. That he should appear at the time and the place, which the pope should appoint, to answer, in a general diet of the German lords, the charge brought against him, and should own the pope for his judge.

"2. That he should stand to the pope's judgment, should keep or resign the crown as he should by the pope be found guilty or innocent, and should never seek to revenge himself upon his accusers.

"3. That till judgment was given and his cause was finally determined, he should lay aside all badges of royalty, should not meddle, upon any pretense whatever, with public affairs, and should levy no money upon the people but what was necessary for the support of his family.

"4. That all who had taken an oath of allegiance to him, should be absolved from that oath before God as well as before men.

"5. That he should forever remove from his presence, Robert, bishop of Bamberg, Udalric of Cosheim, and all evil counselors together with them.

"6. That if he should clear himself of the crimes laid to his charge and remain king, he should be ever obedient and submissive to the pope, and concur with him, to the utmost of his power, in reforming the abuses that custom had introduced, against the laws of the Church, into his kingdom.

"7. Lastly, if he failed in any of these conditions, his absolution should be null; he should be deemed guilty of the crimes laid to his charge as if he had owned them; should never again be heard; and the lords of the kingdom, absolved from their oaths, should be at full liberty to elect another king in his room." 28

52. To these terms Henry submitted, and promised, upon oath, faithfully to observe them. But the pope demanded that there should be security given for the faithful fulfillment of the terms: Matilda and several bishops and nobles giving the required security, the longed for absolution was granted to Henry, and he was king once more. "But even yet the unforgiving Hildebrand had not forced the king to drink the dregs of humiliation. He had degraded Henry before men, he would degrade him in the presence of God: he had exalted himself to the summit of earthly power, he would appeal to Heaven to ratify and to sanction this assumption of unapproachable superiority." -- Milman.29

53. Together the king and the pope went to the celebration of mass in the great church of the city of Canossa. In the midst of the service Gregory "took the consecrated host in his hand, and, turning to the king, addressed him thus: --

"I long ago received letters from you and from those of your party, charging me with having raised myself to the apostolic see by simony, and having polluted my life, before as well as after my episcopacy, with other crimes, for which I ought, according to the canons, to have been forever excluded from the holy orders: and though I could disprove these calumnies with the testimony of those who very well know what life I have led from my infancy, and of those who were the authors of my promotion to the episcopal dignity; yet that I may not be thought to rely more upon the judgment of men than upon that of God, and that no room may be left for the least suspicion of scandal, let the body of our Lord, which I am going to take, be this day a proof of my innocence. Let God absolve me by His judgment if I am innocent, and strike me suddenly dead, if I am guilty."

54. Gregory then ate a part of the wafer, and as he did not fall dead, the whole congregation shouted aloud their joy and approval of his demonstrated innocence! When silence was once more obtained, Gregory proceeded to address Henry as follows: --

"Do, my son, if you please, what you have seen me do. The German lords accuse you daily to us of many enormous crimes, for which they say you ought not only to be removed from the administration of all public affairs, but excluded forever from the communion of the Church, and even from human society. As I wish you well, and you have implored the protection of the apostolic see in your distress, do what I advise you: If you are conscious to yourself of your own innocence, and

know that you are falsely and maliciously accused, deliver the Church from that scandal, and yourself from all perplexity, as the issue of human judgments is very certain. Take the other part of the host, that your innocence thus proved may silence your enemies, that I may become your warmest friend, and the German lords being reconciled with you by my means, you may be replaced on the throne, and the wished-for tranquillity restored to the State." 30

55. As bad as Henry may have been, he had not yet acquired such a spirit of blasphemy as had the pope. He therefore declined Gregory's challenge and told him that the coming diet could properly judge his case.

56. But Gregory had overshot his mark. His extreme pressure upon Henry really worked his own defeat. It turned back to their allegiance to Henry all those who, in Germany, had been wavering; and increased many fold their hatred of the pope who would so degrade and humiliate their king. It seemed for a moment that it had fairly undone Henry's cause in Italy; for the Normans who had stood by him, even to the extent of wanting to aid him to depose the pope, were so disgusted at his yielding everything to the pope, that they threatened to repudiate him and to take his young son who was with him, declare him emperor, and have him crowned by a pope which they themselves would make, after they had deposed Gregory. In their wrath some of the Norman princes did abandon him and return to their fortresses. Those that remained, held themselves aloof, waiting to see what he would do.

57. Henry, finding his crown again in danger, decided to retain it with the support of the Normans, by disregarding the terms which he had accepted from Gregory. He recalled to him the bishops and nobles whom the terms with Gregory had obliged him especially to dismiss. He informed Gregory that he would not attend the appointed diet at Augsburg, and asked the pope to hold a general council at Mantua. Since Henry kept well guarded all the passes of the Alps, Gregory knew that he could not reach Augsburg if he should try. He therefore at least seemed to assent to Henry's request for a council at Mantua. Both started to Mantua; but before Gregory reached the place, his fear of meeting Henry overcame him and Matilda, and he was hurried back to Canossa.

58. Henry sent to Gregory at Canossa, messengers to ask permission that he should be crowned king of Italy; and this, by churchmen whom Gregory had excommunicated! It is hardly possible that Henry expected any such request to be granted; but, technically, it made a show of respect to the authority of the pope, and thus laid upon the pope the responsibility of refusing Henry's submission, and of rejecting his overtures. But Gregory was able to elude the dilemma without positively doing either. Then Henry threw off even any seeming submission to the pope; and again, in an assembly of the Lombard princes, openly denounced his harshness and tyranny. This restored the confidence of the Lombard princes, who unanimously rallied to his support, and Henry found himself in possession of an army that was strong enough to meet successfully any force that the pope might be able to gather.

59. The enemies of Henry, in Germany, finding that the Diet of Augsburg could not be held, appointed one to be held at Forsheim, March 13, 1077, to elect a new king, in place of Henry, because Henry had broken his treaty with the pope. To this diet at Forsheim Gregory sent his legates. The diet elected Duke Rudolph, of Swabia, as king, who was "consecrated by the archbishops of Mentz and Magdeburg, in the presence of the pope's legates and all the lords of the assembly, who, acknowledging him for their lawful sovereign, took an oath allegiance to him as such." Henry in Italy learning of this, immediately marched to Germany with such troops as he could take with him; and his army constantly grew as he marched. War raged throughout Germany. "Bishop rose against bishop; the clergy against the clergy; the people against the people; father against son, son against father, brother against brother. . . . Swabia first paid the penalty for the ambition of her prince. From the Necker to the Main all was laid waste." -- Milman.31 First Rudolph was defeated; next Henry.

60. Gregory returned to Rome, and made a treaty with Robert Guiscard and his Normans, who were under excommunication by him, in order to gain their strength to defend him from what might come from Henry.

There, in the week of Lent, 1078, Gregory assembled a council. By this council Gregory attempted to make his voice to be heard in the confusion which he had created in Germany. He demanded

364

that a council should be called, at which he, or his legates, should preside, to decide between the claims of the rival kings of Germany. And,in announcing this to the people of Germany, Gregory wrote: --

"If either of these kings, inflated by pride, shall in any way impede our journey to you, and conscious of his unjust cause, decline the judgment of the Holy Ghost, resisting, in his disobedience to his holy mother, the Catholic Church, him despise ye as a brood of antichrist, a destroyer of the Christian religion, and respect any sentence which our legates may pronounce against him. To those, on the other hand, who shall humbly submit to our judgment, pay all reverence and honor." 32

61. In a second address to the German nation, Gregory wrote: --

"If any one shall attempt to prevent our legates from executing this, our resolution, be he king, archbishop, bishop, duke, count, or marquis, we bind and anathematize him, not only in his soul, but likewise in his body, and by our apostolic authority deprive his arms of victory. In all his acts may he feel the vengeance of Almighty God; in every battle may he find his strength fail; may he never obtain a victory, but, prostrate in humble contrition, be abased and confounded, till he is brought to true repentance." 33

62. Yet no council was held in Germany. In November, 1078, another council was held in Rome, at which appeared messengers from both Henry and Rudolph, promising on oath the safety of the pope or his legates in attending a council in Germany. In February, 1079, Gregory held another council in Rome, to discuss transubstantiation, and to examine into the case of Berengar, who was the chief propagator of "heresy" in connection with that doctrine. To this council ambassadors from both the rival kings were sent, each laying heavy complaints against the other, and both pledging that, instead of offering any hindrance to the assembling of a council in Germany, they would both aid in it, and would assure to the pope or his legates safe conduct, going and returning. The great question before this council so occupied the time that the summer passed with no council yet held in Germany.

63. Henry's fortunes were reviving again. His power was so increasing daily as to threaten the defeat of Rudolph. Gregory decided to throw all his influence positively on the side of Rudolph. He therefore

365

assembled another council, in Rome, by which he renewed his first decree against lay investitures, and March 7, 1080, pronounced another excommunication against Henry. Again addressing St. Peter and St. Paul, Gregory inveighed against Henry thus: --

"Blessed apostles, you are my witnesses that the German lords and bishops, without our advice, chose Duke Rudolph as their king; and that this prince immediately sent ambassadors to our legate, declaring that he had undertaken, despite of himself, the government of the kingdom, and that he was ready to obey us in all things; offering, as a proof of his sincerity, to send us rich presents, and to give us as hostages, his son and that of Duke Berthold. You know that Henry, at the same time, besought us to declare in his favor, against Rudolph, and that we replied, that we would act our own will, after having heard these two princes in a council. But as soon as Henry supposed that he could overthrow his competitor without our aid, he repulsed our interference with contempt.

"Wherefore, trusting in the justice and mercy of God, and of His blessed mother, the ever-blessed Virgin Mary, on your authority, the above named Henry and all his adherents I excommunicate and bind him in the fetters of anathema; on the part of God Almighty; and on yours, I interdict him from the government of all

Germany and of Italy. I deprive him of all royal power and dignity. I prohibit every Christian from rendering him obedience as king. I absolve from their oaths all who have sworn or shall swear allegiance to his sovereignty. In every battle may Henry and his partisans be without strength, and gain no victory during his life. And that Rudolph, whom the Germans have elected for their king, may he rule and defend that realm in fidelity to you! On your part, I give and grant to those who shall faithfully adhere to the said Rudolph, full absolution of all their sins, and in entire confidence, blessing in this life and in the life to come. As Henry, for his pride, disobedience, and falsehood, is justly deposed from his royal dignity, so that royal power and dignity is granted to Rudolph, for his humility, obedience, and truth.

"Come then, blessed St. Peter and St. Paul, let all the world understand and know, that since ye have power to bind and loose in heaven, ye have power to take away and to grant empires, kingdoms, principalities, duchies, marquisates, counties, and the possessions of all men according to their deserts. Ye have often deprived wicked and unworthy men of patriarchates, primacies, archbishoprics, bishoprics, and bestowed them on religious men. If ye then judge in spiritual affairs, how great must be your power in secular! and if ye are to judge angels, who rule over proud princes, what may ye not do to these their servants? Let kings, then, and all the princes of the world learn what ye are, and how great is your power, and fear to treat with

disrespect the mandates of the Church; and do ye on the aforesaid Henry fulfill your judgment so speedily that he may know that it is through your power, not by chance, that he hath fallen. May God confound him, that he be brought to repentance by his ruin, that his soul may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."34

64.This decree Gregory sent to Rudolph, accompanied by a splendid crown of gold and precious stones, upon which was inscribed: "Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rudolfo" -- "He gave a rock to Peter, Peter a diadem to Rudolph." But this thunder of the pope was deprived of its force by Henry's gaining a signal victory over Rudolph shorty afterward. This further encouraged Henry,and, April 12, 1080, he assembled a council at Mentz, which formulated charges against Gregory; but as there were none of the bishops of Italy present, the council was adjourned to meet at Brixen, in the Tyrol, June 25, 1080. At this council when it met there were thirty bishops from Italy and Germany. They unanimously excommunicated and deposed the pope, by the following decree: --

"We, assembled by the authority of God in this place, having read the letter from the synod of nineteen bishops, held at Mentz, against the licentious Hildebrand, the preacher of sacrilegious and incendiary doctrines; the defender of perjury and murder; who, as an old disciple of the heretic Berengar, has endangered the Catholic and apostolic doctrine of the body and blood of Christ; the worshiper of divinations and of dreams; the notorious necromancer; himself possessed with an evil spirit, and therefore guilty of departing from the truth -- him we adjudge to be canonically deposed and expelled from his see, and, unless, on hearing our judgment, he shall descend from his throne, to be condemned for everlasting."35

65. This was immediately followed by the election, by this council, of Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, as pope, who took the name of --

CLEMENT III, JUNE 25, 1080, TO SEPTEMBER, 1100.

As soon as Gregory learned of the election of Clement, he broke out: --
"They have been forced to renew their old conspiracy; they have chosen as their chief a heretic, a sacrilegious person, a perjurer, an assassin who wished to wrest from us our tiara and our life -- an antichrist -- a Guibert!! In a cabal composed of demoniacal and concubinary

prelates, our enemies have even pushed their fury so far as to condemn us, because we refused to their entreaties and their threats pardon for their crimes. But God sustains us, He will make us triumph over the wicked, and we despise their anathemas."36

66. Gregory followed this up with a prophecy, written in a letter to the people of Germany, in favor of Rudolph, saying that the apostle Peter had appeared to him and announced that "a false king" would die this year; and "if this prediction be not accomplished, I swear before God and men that I am unworthy to be pope." The two kings, with their armies, met in the battle of the Elster, June 15, 1080. "It might seem a religious no less than a civil war. Henry was accompanied to the battle by the archbishops of Cologne and Treves, and fourteen other prelates. The Saxons advanced to the charge, with the bishops of their party, and the clergy chanting the eighty-second psalm: `God standeth in the congregation of the princes.'"

67. The troops of Henry were defeated; but Rudolph was slain. In the battle one of Rudolph's hands had been cut off by a saber. As he was dying, he looked at his severed hand, and said: "With this hand I ratified my oath of fealty to my sovereign Henry. I have now lost life and kingdom. Bethink ye, ye who have led me on, in obedience to whose counsels I have ascended the throne, whether ye have guided me right." On this same day of the battle of the Elster, Henry's party in Italy defeated the army of Countess Matilda and the pope.

68. Henry was now victorious in Germany and in Italy: he had a pope of his own; and, as early as possible in the spring of 1081, he marched to Rome, to install Clement III, and to put Gregory finally out of the way, as pope. July 7 he reached Rome, and for three years besieged it. In June, 1083, was his first success in the taking of a part of the city, and causing Gregory to take refuge in the castle of St. Angelo. Christmas, 1083, the city was surrendered to him; and, with Gregory besieged in the castle of St. Angelo, Palm Sunday, March 29, 1084, Clement III was consecrated pope, in the church of St. Peter; and, on Easter Day, King Henry was crowned emperor by Clement III.

69. Presently, however, news was received that Robert Guiscard was advancing with all haste, with six thousand knights, and thirty

thousand footmen, to the rescue of the pope, and the deliverance of Rome. "It was a strange army of the faith: from every quarter men had rushed to his banner, some to rescue the pope, others from love of war. The Saracens had inlisted in great numbers." -- Milman. The long siege had so reduced Henry's army that it was impossible for him to meet Robert Guiscard with any hope of success. He therefore destroyed the strongest fortifications, that had resisted him, and withdrew. Three days after Henry had left the city, Robert arrived with his army. Although Robert came to the rescue of the pope, the Romans dreaded his army more than they did that of Henry, and he found the gates closed, and the walls manned, against him. But, the very first day, Robert's troops succeeded in surprising one of the gates, and so got possession of the city. He immediately released Gregory, and escorted him to the Lateran palace. "But Gregory must now witness those horrors which, as long as they afflicted Germany or northern Italy, he had contemplated unmoved: intent on building his all-ruling theocracy. From the feet of the pope, having just received his blessing, the Normans spread through the city, treating it with all the cruelty of a captured town: pillaging, violating, murdering, wherever they met with opposition.

70. "The Romans had been surprised, not subdued. For two days and nights they brooded over their vengeance; on the third day they broke out in general insurrection, rushed armed into the streets, and began a terrible carnage of their conquerors. The Normans were feasting in careless security; but with the discipline of practiced soldiers, they flew to arms; the whole city was one wild conflict. The Norman horse poured into the streets, but the Romans fought at advantage, from their possession of the houses, and their knowledge of the ground. They were gaining the superiority; the Normans saw their peril. The remorseless Guiscard gave the word to fire the houses. From every quarter the flames rushed up -- houses, palaces, convents, churches, as the night

darkened, were seen in awful conflagration. The distracted inhabitants dashed wildly into the streets, no longer endeavoring to defend themselves, but to save their families. They were hewn down by hundreds. The Saracen allies of the pope had been the foremost in the pillage, and were now the foremost in the conflagration

and the massacre. No house, no monastery, was secure from plunder. murder, rape. Nuns were defiled, matrons forced, the rings cut from their living fingers. Gregory exerted himself, and without success, in saving the principal churches. It is probable, however, that neither Goth nor Vandal, neither Greek nor German, brought such desolation on the city as this capture by the Normans. . . .

71. "Guiscard was at length master of the ruins of Rome, but the vengeance of the pope's deliverer was yet unappeased. Many thousand Romans were sold publicly as slaves -- many carried into the remotest parts of Calabria. We have heard no remonstrance from the bishop, from the sovereign of Rome, on this hateful alliance with the enemies of the faith, the Saracens. Of this, perhaps, he was ignorant when in the castle of St. Angelo. No powerful intercession is now made -- no threatened excommunication is now menaced -- in behalf of his rebellious, his perfidious, yet subdued subjects -- most of the sufferers, no doubt, guiltless and defenseless. The ferocious Guiscard is still recognized as his ally, his protector, perhaps his avenger. Unprotected by his foreign guard, the pope could not now trust himself in the city, which would, no doubt, and not without justice, attribute its ruin and misery to his obstinacy. In the company of Robert Guiscard, oppressed with shame and affliction, he retired from the smoking ruins and the desolated streets of the city of St. Peter, first to the monastery of Monte Casino afterward to the Norman's strong castle of Salerno. From Salerno, unshaken by the horrors which he had witnessed, or the perils he had escaped, Hildebrand thundered out again the unmitigated excommunication against Henry, the antipope Clement, and all their adherents." -- Milman.37

72. At Salerno, May 25, 1085, Gregory VII died. When asked by the attending bishops and Matilda to forgive his enemies, he replied: --

"No, my hatred is implacable. I curse the pretended emperor Henry, the antipope Guibert, and the reprobates who sustain them. I absolve and bless the simple who believe that a pope has power to bind and loose."38

73. As he was dying he said: "I have loved righteousness and hated

iniquity; therefore I die in exile." Then lifting his eyes to heaven he said to the bishops and cardinals, "Thither I am going, and shall incessantly recommend you to the protection and favor of the Almighty."

74. And so died Gregory VII, the pope who, above all, so far, had made the highest and boldest claims for the papacy; and who had given up Germany and Italy to confusion, bloodshed, and desolation, to maintain his exorbitant claims in behalf of the papacy. He left twentyseven "Maxims," as follows: --

1. The Roman Church was founded by none but our Lord.

2. The Roman pontiff alone should of right be styled universal bishop.

3. He alone can depose and restore bishops.

4. The pope's legate, though of an inferior rank, is in councils to take place of all bishops, and can pronounce sentence of deposition against them.

5. The pope can depose absent bishops.

6. No man ought to live in the same house with persons excommunicated by him.

7. The pope alone can make new laws, can establish new churches, can divide rich bishoprics, and unite poor ones.

8. He alone can wear the imperial ornaments.

0 9. All princes are to kiss his foot, and to pay that mark of distinction to him alone.

1 10. His name alone ought to be commemorated in the churches.

2 11. There is no name in the world but his [that is, as some understand it, he alone is styled pope. The name of pope, formerly common to all bishops, was appropriated, as Father Paul observes, by Gregory VII to the Roman pontiff].

3 12. It is lawful for him to depose emperors.

4 13. He can translate bishops from one see to another when thought necessary.

5 14. He can ordain a clerk in any church whatever.

6 15. A clerk ordained by him must not be preferred to a higher degree by any other bishop.

7 16. No general council is to be assembled without his order.

8 17. No book is to be deemed canonical, but by his authority.

9 18. His judgments no man can reverse, but he can reverse all other judgments.

0 19. He is to be judged by no man.

1 20. No man shall presume to condemn the person that appeals to the apostolic see.

2 21. The greater causes of all churches ought to be brought before the apostolic see.

22. The Roman Church never has erred, nor will she ever, according to Scripture.

23. The Roman pontiff, canonically elected, becomes undoubtedly holy by the merits of St. Peter, according to the testimony of St. Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, and many of the Fathers, as is related in the decrees of Pope Symmachus.

24. With his leave an inferior may accuse his superior.

25. He can depose and restore bishops without assembling a synod.

26. He is not to be deemed a Catholic, who does not agree with the Roman Church.

27. The pope can absolve subjects from the oath of allegiance which they have taken to a bad prince.39

75. On his deathbed Gregory VII had urged the cardinals to choose as his successor a certain Desiderius, the abbot of Monte Casino. There at Salerno, the place of the death of Gregory, the cardinals asked Desiderius to accept the office of pope: but, viewing the ruined city of Rome, and fearing a continuance of the wars that brought it about, he declined, and went away to his monastery, and it was two years before he was made pope. Then, at a public assembly in Rome, Desiderius was suddenly seized and hurried into the church of St. Lucia, and proclaimed Pope --

VICTOR III, MARCH 23 TO SEPT. 16, 1087.

76. The prince of Salerno demanded of the new pope that he should ordain a favorite of the prince to the archbishopric of Salerno. Victor refused: the capital was seized by the troops, and, four days after his election, Victor fled from Rome, threw off all the papal insignia, and returned to his abbey. May 9 he returned to Rome, accompanied by a body of Norman troops, and camped before the church of St. Peter which was held by Pope Clement with a garrison. But Victor and the Normans drove out Clement and captured the church, where Victor was solemnly consecrated Pope. After eight days Victor returned to

his abbey, and came back to Rome to celebrate St. Peter's day, June 29. On the eve of St. Peter's day, a messenger from the emperor Henry arrived in Rome, and called upon the nobles and people of Rome to abandon the cause of Victor. The people obeyed the call, and rose against the troops of Matilda and Victor "who still from the heights above maintained possession of the church of St. Peter. This became the center of the bloody strife; men warred with the utmost fury as to who should celebrate the apostle's holy day in his great church. Neither party obtained this triumph; the alter remained the whole day without light, incense, or sacrifice; for the discomfited troops of the pope were forced to take refuge in the castle of St. Angelo. . . .

77. "Guibert celebrated high mass in the neighboring church of St. Maria, with the two towers or belfries, from both of which he had just smoked or burned out the garrison. The next day the partisans of Guibert took possession of St. Peter's, washed the altar clean from the pollution of the hostile mass, and then celebrated the holy eucharist. But their triumph too was short; the following day they were again driven out; and Pope Victor ruled in St. Peter's." -- Milman.40

78. In August, 1087, Victor held a council at Benevento, by which he renewed the excommunication and anathema against Clement III, whom he denounced as "the forerunner of antichrist, as a ravenous wolf let loose against the flock of Christ." -- Bower.41 The council also renewed Gregory's denunciation of lay investiture. But, even while the council was in session, Victor was attacked by the dangerous illness which caused his death September 16. Upon his deathbed he had recommended to the cardinals the election of a certain Otto, bishop of Ostia. An assembly was appointed to meet at Terracina, in Campania, the first week in Lent, 1088. And there, on Sunday, March 12, the bishop of Ostia was unanimously chosen to the papal office, and so became Pope --

URBAN II, MARCH 12, 1088, TO JULY 29, 1099.

79. Urban immediately notified the nobles and sovereigns of all countries that he was pope. In the year 1099 he held a council in Rome, in which he excommunicated Clement III, and the emperor

Henry, and all their adherents, of which he wrote to Henry's chief episcopal enemy in Germany, thus: --

"I place in the first rank of the excommunicated the heretic Guibert of Ravenna, the usurper of the apostolic throne, and the king Henry; then those who sustain them; and finally all the clergy or laity who commune with these two criminals. We do not, however, pronounce an anathema especially against all; but we

do not admit them to our communion without imposing on them a penance, which we regulate according to the degree of sin, whether these guilty ones have acted from ignorance, fear, or necessity. We wish to treat with extreme severity those who have voluntarily fallen into the abyss. We confirm you in the power of governing in our stead in Saxony, Germany, and the other neighboring countries, in order that you may regulate all ecclesiastical affairs, in accordance with the interests of the Church."42

80. Later in the same year he held a council at Melfi, at which he renewed the decree of Gregory against lay investitures, and the marriage of the clergy. To this confirmed decree of Gregory against the marriage of the clergy, Urban added a decree empowering the laity to make slaves of the wives of the married clergy, wherever they could find them. These acts of Urban, through his councils, were a notice to the world that he would perpetuate the war which Gregory had begun, and which Victor had continued. It is too much to repeat the details of intrigue, slaughter, and devastation that accompanied this war. The only new feature about it was that Urban and his party succeeded in winning Henry's son, Prince Conrad, to their side, and to take up arms in actual war, against his father. "So completely was the churchman's interest to absorb all others, that crimes thus against nature not only were excused by the ordinary passions of men, but by those of the highest pretensions to Christian holiness. What pope ever, if it promised advantage, refused the alliance of a rebellious son?" -- Milman.43

81. It was as the stirrer up of the Crusades that Urban II specially gained papal distinction. We have seen that Gregory VII designed a Crusade: it remained for Urban II, "the most faithful of his disciples" to accomplish it. The Turks had taken Jerusalem from the Saracens in 1076. Among the many thousands who made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem was a hermit, named Peter, from the province of Picardy.

in France. The Turks had not only taken Jerusalem, but "both Cilicias, Syria, Isauria, Lycia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, Cappadocia, Galatia, the one and the other Pontus, and Bithynia." When Peter the Hermit appealed to the patriarch of Jerusalem to know why the Greek emperors could endure to have the Turks possess the "holy sepulcher," the patriarch could only assure him of the weakness of the successors of Constantine. Then, exclaimed Peter, "I will rouse the martial nations of Europe in your cause!" "From Jerusalem the pilgrim returned an accomplished fanatic; but as he excelled in the popular madness of the times, Pope Urban the Second received him as a prophet, applauded his glorious design, promised to support it in a general council, and encouraged him to proclaim the deliverance of the Holy Land." -- Gibbon.44

82. Thus encouraged, Peter set forth in his coarse hermit garb, bareheaded and barefooted, mounted on an ass; and traversed Italy and France, preaching everywhere -- in the churches, in the streets, at the cross-roads, on the highways. With sighs, and tears, and groans, and smiting upon his breast; with appeals to heaven, to the Virgin Mary, to all the saints, and the angels; with intensely drawn pictures of the oppressions of the holy pilgrims by the unbelieving Turks; he worked upon the feelings, and appealed to the passions, of the superstitious, ignorant, and weak-minded multitude everywhere. "The most perfect orator of Athens might have envied the success of his eloquence: the rustic enthusiast inspired the passion which he felt, and Christendom expected with impatience the counsels and decrees of the supreme pontiff."45

83. Urban held a council at Placentia, March, 1095, which was composed of two hundred bishops of Italy, France, Burgundy, Swabia, and Bavaria, and at which were assembled four thousand other clergy and thirty thousand laity. To the council came also ambassadors from the Eastern emperor, pleading for aid to protect Europe from the victorious Turks. "At the sad tale of the misery and perils of their Eastern brethren, the assembly burst into tears: the most eager champions declared their readiness to march; and the Greek ambassadors were dismissed with the assurance of a speedy and powerful succor. The

relief of Constantinople was included in the larger and most distant project of the deliverance of Jerusalem; but the prudent Urban adjourned the final decision to a synod which he proposed to celebrate in some city of France in the autumn of the same year."46

84. The city of France that was chosen for this second council was Clerment; and the council was held in November, 1095. "Besides his court and council of Roman cardinals, Urban was supported by thirteen archbishops and two hundred and twenty-five bishops; the number of mitered prelates was computed at four hundred. . . . From the adjacent kingdoms, a martial train of lords and knights of power and renown, attended the council, in high expectation of its resolves; and such was the ardor of zeal and curiosity that the city was filled, and many thousands, in the month of November, erected their tents or huts in the open field. A session of eight days produced some useful or edifying canons for the reformation of manners; a severe censure was pronounced against the license of private war.... But a law, however venerable be the sanction, can not suddenly transform the temper of the times; and the benevolent efforts of Urban deserve the less praise, since he labored to appease some domestic quarrels, that he might spread the flames of war from the Atlantic to the Euphrates. From the synod of Placentia, the rumor of his great design had gone forth among the nations: the clergy on their return had preached in every diocese the merit and glory of the deliverance of the Holy Land; and when the pope ascended a lofty scaffold in the market-place of Clermont, his eloquence was addressed to a well-prepared and impatient audience."47 From that scaffold Urban II declaimed as follows: --

"We are beyond doubt, happy to see our presence excite acclamations in this great and illustrious assembly; but we can not conceal beneath the appearances of deceitful joy, the marks of profound sadness; and your hearts will see in bitterness, and your eyes will shed torrents of tears, when you regard with me, my brethren, the misfortunes of Christianity, and our negligence of the faithful of the East. "Thanks be to God, we have almost entirely extirpated the heresy which desolated the Western Church; we have exterminated obstinate schismatics by fire or sword; we have reformed the abuses and augmented the domains and riches of the holy see. Notwithstanding this

success our soul remains plunged in sadness, and we declare to you that we will taste of no repose until the implacable enemies of the Christian name shall be driven from the Holy Land, which they outrage by their impious and sacrilegious conduct.

"Yes, dear brethren, Jerusalem, the city of God, that heritage of Christ, which has been bequeathed to us by the Saviour, that venerated land, in which all the divine mysteries have been accomplished, has been for several centuries in the sacrilegious hands of the Saracens and Turks, who triumph over God himself. Who can tell the horrible profanations which they commit in these holy places? They have overthrown the altars, broken the crosses, destroyed the churches; and if in their rage they have spared the church of St. Sepulchre, it was only from a sentiment of avarice, for they have speculated on the devotion of the faithful, who go from all parts of the world to the divine tomb. They exact a ransom from pilgrims to permit them to penetrate into the holy places; they then despoil them, when they permit them to go away, and even attack them when they regain their vessels; in order to seize on their persons and reduce them to the harshest slavery. "And we, children of Christ, contemplate the massacre of our brethren, coldly and without indignation: we appear indifferent to outrages which the barbarians commit on God; we abandon quietly to them a heritage which belongs to us alone; we allow them peacefully to enjoy a conquest which is the shame of all Christendom, and we remain their tributaries without daring to claim our rights by force of arms. "Christians, however, do not shun battle, since almost all Europe is almost constantly at war; but the swords which should exterminate the enemies of Christ are drawn against himself and strike His sacred members. How long will you leave the Mussulmans masters of the East? Arise from your lethargy, which has destroyed our holy religion! A single one of our armies could easily triumph over the infidel; but our quarrels and intestine wars constantly decimate us, and add strength to our foes. What great things we could accomplish if the princes of the West were not obliged to keep their troops about them in order to defend them from the attacks of their neighbors, and if the Spirit of God would unite our efforts in so beautiful an enterprise! We hope that he will lend eloquence to our words, and will descend into your hearts, that

you may comprehend this important truth. "We have chosen from preference this most Christian kingdom to give an example to other people, because we recollect that it was your ancestors, the Franks, who exhibited so great a zeal for religion, and because we hoped you would reply to the voice of God, and draw all Europe in your steps. The people of the Gauls have already been formidable adversaries to the Huns, the African Moors, and the Arabs; already under the leading of Charles Martel and of Charlemagne, have they exterminated armies of infidels more numerous than the sands of the sea; now your legions will be still more terrible, your victories

brilliant, because you will combat under the standard of the God of armies, who sends you to conquer the heritage of His Son, and who orders you to drive the infidels from the holy sepulcher.

"Follow, intrepid Franks, the chief who calls you to the succor of religion, to the succor of your brethren of the East, to the succor of Christ himself! See that divine Saviour who sallied forth victorious over the world, death, and hell; He is now a slave to the Saracens; He presents to you His cross; He gives it to you as the sacred emblem under which you are to conquer His enemies and acquire eternal glory. Do not forget that God, by my mouth, promises you the victory and abandons to you the rich spoils of the infidels. Those who shall shed their blood in this sacred war, shall receive the ineffable crown of martyrdom; if, however, fear of death -- "

85. Here the pope was interrupted by the cry: "Deus lo volt! Deus lo volt!" -- God wills it! -- as with one voice, from thousands of the excited multitude. Urban replied: --

"What more magnificent expression of the divine will can there be than these simple words, `God wills it' issuing simultaneously from every mouth! Dear children, you have followed the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and we receive this revelation as an oracle which guarantees the success of a war which God himself comes to declare. Let this sublime expression be the device of the army; let us engrave it on our standards and our breasts, that it may become the cry of soldiers and chiefs in combat. Yes, God wills it! Let us march to the holy sepulcher; let us go to deliver Christ, and until the blessed day on which we restore Him to liberty, let us carry like Him, on our right shoulders, the holy cross, on which He expired to snatch us from the slavery of sin. His cross is the symbol of your salvation. Wear it, a red, a bloody cross, as an external mark, on your breasts or shoulders, as a pledge of your sacred and irrevocable engagement."48

86. The pope "proclaimed a plenary indulgence to those should enlist under the banner of the cross: the absolution of all their sins, and a full receipt for all that might be due of canonical penance." -- Gibbon.49 When the council adjourned, the bishops were solemnly enjoined by Urban to cause the crusade to be preached by the clergy throughout all their dioceses. "The cold philosophy of modern times is incapable of feeling the impression that was made on a sinful and fanatic world. At the voice of their pastor, the robber, the incendiary, the homicide, arose by thousands to redeem their souls, by repeating

on the infidels the same deeds which they had exercised against their Christian brethren; and the terms of atonement were eagerly embraced by offenders of every rank and denomination. None were pure; none were exempt from the guilt and penalty of sin; and those who were the least amenable to the justice of God and the Church, were the best entitled to the temporal and eternal recompense of their pious courage. If they fell, the spirit of the Latin clergy did not hesitate to adorn their tomb with the crown of martyrdom; and should they survive, they could expect without impatience the delay and increase of their heavenly reward."50

87. The ignorant and superstitious multitude everywhere, "both the great and small, were taught to believe every wonder, of lands flowing with milk and honey, of mines and treasures, of gold and diamonds, of palaces of marble and jasper, and of odoriferous groves of cinnamon and frankincense. In this earthly paradise, each warrior depended on his sword to carve a plenteous and honorable establishment, which he measured only

by the extent of his wishes. Their vassals and soldiers trusted their fortunes to God and their master: the spoils of a Turkish emir might enrich the meanest follower of the camp; and the flavor of the wines, the beauty of the Grecian women, were temptations more adapted to the nature, than to the profession, of the champions of the cross. The love of freedom was a powerful incitement to the multitudes who were oppressed by feudal or ecclesiastical tyranny. Under this holy sign, the peasants and burghers, who were attached to the servitude of the glebe, might escape from a haughty lord, and transplant themselves and their families to a land of liberty. The monk might release himself from the discipline of his convent: the debtor might suspend the accumulation of usury, and the pursuit of his creditors; and outlaws and malefactors of every caste might continue to brave the laws and elude the punishment of their crimes."51

88. The Council of Clerment had designated Aug. 15, 1096, as the time of the departure of the crusade. But the enthusiasm was so great that a great rabble was ready to start in March: about one hundred thousand, in three bands, led respectively by Peter the Hermit; a certain Walter, for cause named the Penniless; and a monk named

Godescal. These were followed, as early as the month of May, by a horde of two hundred thousands, appropriately led by a goose and a goat. These hosts were composed of "the most stupid and savage refuse of the people, who mingled with their devotion a brutal license of rapine, prostitution, and drunkenness;" and who were so utterly ignorant "that at the sight of the first city or castle beyond the limits of their knowledge, they were ready to ask whether that was not the Jerusalem, the term and object of their labors."52

89. From the first step onward in their march, their crusading zeal was poured out in a general massacre of the Jews along their route. "At Verdun, Treves, Mentz, Spires, Worms, many thousands of that unhappy people were pillaged and massacred: nor had they felt a more bloody stroke since the persecution of Hadrian." This was continued all down the Danube. Yet the affliction that befell the people in general, along the route of the crusaders, was only less terrible than that which befell the Jews. For the immense crowd had to have supplies: they took none with them, and, perforce, must live off the people in the countries through which they passed. If the people hesitated, what was wanted was taken by force; if they refused, they exposed themselves to murder. So dreadful was this invasion by the crusaders that the perfect of Bulgaria and the king of Hungary were compelled to muster their armies to defend their countries and peoples.

90. When the crusaders arrived at Constantinople, the emperor of the East hoped to save from the certain destruction which he knew must befall them from the Turks, as soon as they should enter Asia. But they presently proved themselves so destructive that, for the safety of his country, his city, and his people, he was glad to help them across the Bosphorus. This, to be sure, was pleasing to the crusaders; for it would bring them within reach of the hated objects of their crusading zeal, whom they expected promptly to sweep away, as chaff before the whirlwind, and come speedily to Jerusalem and the holy sepulcher. They were safely landed on the soil of Asia. In two battles, which, to the Turks, were hardly more than skirmishes, the whole multitude was blocked out. "A pyramid of bones informed their companions of the place of their defeat. Of the first crusaders, three

hundred thousand had already perished, before a single city was rescued from the infidels; before their graver and more noble brethren had completed the preparations of their enterprise."53 "Never, perhaps, were expeditions so utterly, hopelessly disastrous, so wildly prodigal of human life, as the popular crusade which set off first under Peter the Hermit." -- Milman.54

91. Next came the month of August, the time appointed by the pope for the regular departure of the crusade. And the numbers who reached Constantinople were so vast that an eyewitness, a historian, thought that Europe must have been loosened from its foundations, to supply such multitudes. It is estimated that about six

million started; but many soon turned back; many others perished by the way. Yet, the sober estimate of standard history is "that a large number has never been contained within the lines of a single camp, than at the siege of Nice, the first operation of the Latin princes." -- Gibbon.55 Since a like estimate of the army of Xerxes, when it was counted, after its first assembly on European soil, gives the number as 5,283,220,56 it is evident that the number of crusaders that composed the first crusade must have been fully five million.57 These were led by the first princes and the ablest warriors of Europe; and they accomplished a successful march through Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine. They besieged and captured Nice and Antioch, May, 1097, to June 3, 1098. June 7, 1099, they began the siege of Jerusalem,and captured it July 15. "On a Friday at three in the afternoon, the day and hour of the Passion, Godfrey of Bouillon stood victorious on the walls of Jerusalem. His example was followed on every side by the emulation of valor; and about four hundred and sixty years after the conquest of Omar, the holy city was rescued from the Mohammedan yoke." -- Gibbon.58

92. "No barbarian, no infidel, no Saracen, ever perpetrated such wanton and cold-blooded atrocities of cruelty as the wearers of the cross of Christ (who, it is said, had fallen on their knees, and burst into a pious hymn at the first view of the Holy City), on the capture

of the city. Murder was mercy, rape tenderness, simple plunder the mere assertion of the conqueror's right. Children were seized by their legs, some of them plucked from their mothers' breasts, and dashed against the walls, or whirled from the battlements. Others were obliged to leap from the walls; some tortured, roasted by slow fires, They ripped up prisoners to see if they had swallowed gold. Of 70,000 Saracens there were not left enough to bury the dead; poor Christians were hired to perform the office. Every one surprised in the temple was slaughtered, till the reek from the dead bodies drove away the slayers. The Jews were burned alive in their synagogue. Even the day after, all who had taken refuge on the roofs, notwithstanding Tancred's resistance, were hewn to pieces. Still later the few Saracens who had escaped (not excepting babes of a year old) were put to death to avenge the insults to the dead, and lest they should swell the numbers of the advancing Egyptian army." -- Milman.59

93. Then "after every enemy was subdued and slaughtered," with the streets of Jerusalem flowing with blood and covered with the bodies of the slain, the triumphant crusaders threw aside their weapons still reeking with blood, and turned their steps toward the "holy sepulcher." They gathered at this the goal of their long and deadly march; and there at the imagined tomb of the Saviour, with their hands and garments all bloody from their indiscriminate slaughter of men, women, and innocent children, they presumed with tears and anthems and devout attitude to express their gratitude to Him who from Sinai had thundered, "Thou shalt not kill," and who, absolutely unresisting, had yielded His life and breathed His dying prayer for His enemies! And among the bloody, fanatical crowd we catch a last glimpse of the chief cause of the whole fanatical project -- Peter the Hermit.

94. Then was established the kingdom of Jerusalem, of which Godfrey of Bouillon was unanimously chosen the first ruler. This kingdom continued from 1099 to 1187, when Jerusalem was retaken by the Mohammedans, under Saladin. At his taking of the city, Saladin "consented to accept the city, and spare the inhabitants. The Greek and Oriental Christians were permitted to live under his dominion; but it was stipulated that in forty days all the Franks and Latins should evacuate

Jerusalem, and be safely conducted to the seaports of Syria and Egypt; that ten pieces of gold should be paid for each man, five for each woman, and one for each child; and that those who were unable to purchase their freedom should be detained in perpetual slavery. Of some writers it is a favorite and invidious theme to compare the humanity of Saladin with the massacre of the first crusade. The difference would be merely personal; but we should not forget that the Christians had offered to capitulate, and that the Mohammedans of Jerusalem sustained the last extremities of an assault and storm. Justice is indeed due to the fidelity with which the Turkish conqueror

fulfilled the conditions of the treaty; and he may be deservedly praised for the glance of pity which he cast on the misery of the vanquished. Instead of a rigorous exaction of his debt, he accepted a sum of thirty thousand byzants, for the ransom of seven thousand poor; two or three thousand more were dismissed by his gratuitous clemency; and the number of slaves was reduced to eleven or fourteen thousand persons. In his interview with the queen, his words, and even his tears, suggested the kindest consolations; his liberal alms were distributed among those who had been made orphans or widows by the fortune of war; and while the knights of the hospital were in arms against him, he allowed their more pious brethren to continue, during the term of a year, the care and service of the sick.

95. "In these acts of mercy the virtue of Saladin deserves our admiration and love: he was above the necessity of dissimulation, and his stern fanaticism would have prompted him to dissemble, rather than to affect, this profane compassion for the enemies of the Koran. After Jerusalem had been delivered from the presence of the strangers, the sultan made his triumphant entry, his banners waving in the wind, and to the harmony of martial music. The great mosque of Omar, which had been converted into a church, was again consecrated to one God and His prophet Mohammed; the walls and pavement were purified with rosewater; and a pulpit, the labor of Noureddin, was erected in the sanctuary. But when the golden cross that glittered on the dome was cast down, and dragged through the streets, the Christians of every sect uttered a lamentable groan, which was answered by the joyful shouts of Moslems. In four ivory chests the patriarch had collected the crosses, the images, the vases, and the relics of the holy

place: they were seized by the conqueror, who was desirous of presenting the caliph with the trophies of Christian idolatry. He was persuaded, however, to intrust them to the patriarch and prince of Antioch; and the pious pledge was redeemed by Richard of England, at the expense of fifty-two thousand byzants of gold." -- Gibbon.60

96. This epidemic of the fanaticism and savagery of the Crusades continued for nearly two hundred years. In this time nearly seven millions of people left Western Europe for Jerusalem, very few of whom ever returned, and these merely as individuals. Thus, this vast number of people were called by the popes to slaughter: and this without a single redeeming feature, and without a solitary justifying cause. "The obstinate perseverance of Europe may indeed excite our pity and admiration: that no instruction should have been drawn from constant and adverse experience; that the same confidence should have repeatedly grown from the same failures; that six succeeding generations should have rushed headlong down the precipice that was open before them; and that men of every condition should have staked their public and private fortunes on the desperate adventure of possessing or recovering a tombstone two thousand miles from their country." -- Gibbon.61 "The Crusades -- contemplated not with cold and indifferent philosophy, but with that lofty spiritualism of faith which can not consent to limit the ubiquitous God, and Saviour, and Holy Spirit to any place, or to any peculiar mountain or city, and to which a war of religion is essentially, irreconcilably oppugnant to the spirit of Christianity -- may seem the height of human folly. The Crusades, if we could calculate the incalculable waste of human life from first to last (a waste without achieving any enduring human result) and all the human misery which is implied in that loss of life, may seem the most wonderful frenzy which ever possessed mankind." -- Milman.62

97. Yet it all redounded to the enrichment, and therefore to the glory of the papacy. First of all, all the interests in this world and in the next, of every crusader, were taken under the special guardianship of the pope; and, since scarcely any who went returned, this

guardianship became perpetual, and, under the native encroaching spirit of the papacy, was easily merged in absolute control. Besides this, all were in need of ready money with which to furnish themselves for the Crusades. The property of such a multitude to be disposed of, all at once caused it to be salable only at a very

greatly reduced price. And, from the accumulated treasures of centuries, and at exorbitant rates, the Church loaned upon valuables and landed estates the needed money. For instance, Godfrey of Bouillon mortgaged to the bishop of Verdun and the bishop of Liege the greater part of his great estates; and since he never returned, those possessions to this day are held by the Church of Rome. "For at least two centuries this traffic went silently on, the Church always receiving, rarely alienating: and this, added to the ordinary offerings of devotion, the bequests of deathbed remorse, the exactions for hard-wrung absolution, the prodigal bribes of superstitious terror, the alms of pure and self-denying charity.

98. "Whoever during the whole period of the Crusades sought to whom he might intrust his lands as guardian, or in perpetuity, if he should find his grave or richer possessions in the Holy Land, turned to the Church, by whose prayers he might win success, by whose masses the sin which clung to the soul even of the soldier of the cross might be purged away. If he returned, he returned often a disappointed and melancholy man, took refuge from his despondent religious feelings in the cloister, and made over his remaining rights to his brethren. If he returned no more, the Church was in possession. The churchman who went to the Holy Land did not hold in himself the perpetual succession to the lands of his see or of his monastery; it was in the Church or in the fraternity. Thus in every way the all-absorbing Church was still gathering in wealth, encircling new lands within her hallowed pale, the one steady merchant who in this vast traffic and sale of personal and of landed property never made a losing venture, but went on accumulating and still accumulating, and for the most part withdrawing the largest portion of the land in every kingdom into a separate estate, which claimed exemption from all burdens of the realm." -- Milman.63

99. Urban II did not return from France to Rome until September,

1096; and then he was escorted by a troop of crusaders, by whose aid the pontiff entered Rome in triumph, and drove the partisans of Clement III from the fortresses which they occupied, except the castle of St. Angelo. Later, Urban made a journey to Salerno, when the partisans of Clement III rose again, and established Clement's power. A council composed of cardinals, bishops, priests, deacons, and monks, to a great number, was held, which excommunicated Urban, and put him under an anathema, declaring: --

"We are unwilling to leave the faithful in ignorance, that we have assembled in council to destroy the heresies introduced into the Church by the monk Hildebrand and the imitators of his policy. We consequently publish the condemnation of Pope Urban, and of all who recognize him. We, however, permit the guilty to plead their cause before us, promising them, even though they should be condemned, entire safety for their persons until the festival of All-Saints, because we do not thirst for blood, and sincerely desire peace, truth, and unity in the Church."

100. Soon afterward, however, early in the year 1099, Urban returned, and again drove out Clement III. July 29, 1099, Urban II died. In his place was elected Cardinal Rainerius, who took the title of --

PASCAL II, AUG. 13, 1099, TO JAN. 21, 1118.

Pascal continued against Henry IV the war which had been begun by Gregory VII, and which had been maintained by Victor III and Urban II. Clement III died in September, 1100. A successor was immediately elected by Henry's party; but by Pascal he was taken prisoner the day of his election, and was confined in a monastery. Another was elected in his place, who, in one hundred and five days after his election, was also captured and imprisoned by Pascal. Yet a third was elected, who took the name of --

SYLVESTER IV.

But in a few days he was driven from Rome by Pascal, and died before he could return to Rome.

101. The war between the pope and the emperor which Gregory VII had begun and his successors had continued, was waged most bitterly by Pascal. The emperor's first son, Conrad, whom the papal party

386

had stirred up against his father, had died. Then they succeeded in turning against the emperor his second son, Henry; and though it can not be proved that the pope himself was directly engaged in the rebellion of the young Henry against his father, yet it is certain that "the first act of the young Henry was to consult the pope as to the obligation of his oath of allegiance. The holy father, daringly ascribing this dissension between the son and his parent to the inspiration of God, sent him without reserve the apostolic blessing, and gave him absolution, on condition that he should rule with justice and be faithful to the Church: for his rebellion against his father, an absolution in the final judgment of Christ." -- Milman.64

102. By means of this second rebellious son, the papacy succeeded in driving the emperor Henry IV unto his death, Aug. 7, 1106. Nor did she stop even then; but, when he had been buried by the bishop of Liege, where he died, the bishop was compelled to dig up the body, and to exclude it from "consecrated ground." "Thus was this great prince, Henry, the fourth emperor of that name, in defiance of all laws human and divine, persecuted to his grave, and beyond it, by his own subjects and his own children, with the approbation, if not at the instigation of four popes successively, for not yielding up to them a prerogative, that his predecessors had all enjoyed as their undoubted right, and no pope, how daring soever and ambitious, had presumed to claim till the time of that incendiary, Gregory VII." -- Bower. 65

103. But, now that the pope had gotten rid of Henry IV, it may be said that his troubles had only fairly begun. With the accession of Henry V, the pope fell into rougher hands than he had ever yet found. For, although the young Henry had joined the papacy in the war against his father, to win for the papacy, from the emperor, the sole right of investiture; yet the young Henry was no sooner become the emperor Henry V, than he asserted, with all his power, against the papacy the same right of investiture for which his father had always contended. Thus the pope found himself more deeply involved in war than he was before.

387

104. Pascal made a journey into France. To him, at Chalons, Henry sent an embassy to state before him the legality of the imperial claims to the right of investiture. In reply, the bishop of Placentia, speaking in the pope's name, declared that "the staff and the ring belonged to the altar, and consequently could not be disposed of by laymen; and that it was highly unbecoming that hands consecrated by the body and blood of Christ should receive the ensigns of their dignity and power from hands imbrued in blood shed by the sword!" Henry's ambassadors interrupted the archbishop with the word: "This is not the place where we are to decide the dispute: the sword must decide it at Rome." In a letter to Anselm, of England, Pascal declared: --

"Know that I never did, and that I never will, suffer the king of Germany to give investitures. I only wait till the fierceness of that nation be somewhat tamed. But if the king continues to follow the wicked example of his father, he shall feel, in due time, the weight of the sword of St. Peter, which we have already begun to draw."66

105. Henry proposed a treaty, by which he would surrender all claims to investitures, provided the pope would surrender to him all the possessions and temporalities that had been bestowed upon the papacy from the time of Charlemagne to the present, with the bishops of their own consent agreeing. The pope agreed to it, and Henry went to Rome to ratify the treaty which had been arranged by his ambassadors, and to be crowned emperor by the pope. Feb. 11, 1111, he arrived at Rome with an army of thirty-four thousand men. He was gladly received by Jews and Greeks, the clergy and the nuns, and a great multitude of people, and by them was escorted to the Vatican. There Henry "dismounted from his horse, ascended the steps of St. Peter, approached the pope, who was encircled by the cardinals, by many bishops, by the whole clergy and choir of the Church. He

kissed first the feet, and then the mouth of the pontiff; they embraced three times, and three times in honor of the Trinity, exchanged the holy kiss on the forehead, the eyes, and the lips. . . . The king took the right hand of the pope; the people rent the air with acclamations. The king made his solemn declaration to observe the treaty; the pope declared him emperor, and

388

again the pope bestowed the kiss of peace. They now took their seats within the porphyry chancel." -- Milman.67

106. But each knew that he could not trust the other. Each one hesitated to make his renunciation in behalf of the other, lest, if he should make it first, the other would refuse, and so he would be caught. As each sat waiting for the other, the pope was first to break silence by asking the king to make the renunciation of the investitures. The king replied that he had agreed to renounce investitures only on condition that the bishops of Italy should agree to the pope's renunciation of the temporalities, and that he could not make his renunciation of investitures until he could know for certain that the bishops, of their own free will, joined with the pope in renouncing temporalities. Presently the king stepped aside to confer with the bishops who were present. The conference continued so long that the pope sent and asked him to return and fulfill his part of the treaty. When Henry returned to where the pope was sitting, the bishops and some of the king's guard came with him. The bishops unanimously declared that they would never agree to any surrender of their estates, that the pope had no right to make any agreement that it should be done; and that at any rate it could not be done, because, since the temporalities had been given to the Church by the emperors, those temporalities were inalienable. The pope tried to persuade them, saying: --

"It is just to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. He who serves God ought not to be taken up with the affairs of this world. The use of arms, and consequently the possession of castles and strongholds, is, according to St. Ambrose, foreign to the office of a bishop."68

107. But the bishops would not be persuaded. Yet the pope, pleading that he had fulfilled his part of the treaty, insisted that the king should fulfill his part. As the dispute grew warmer, a member of the king's retinue stepped up to the pope, and said to him: "To what purpose so many speeches? What have we to do with your articles and treaties? Know that our lord, the emperor, will have you to crown him without any of your articles or conditions, as your predecessors

389

crowned Charles, Louis, and Pepin." The pope answered that he neither could nor would crown him until he had executed the treaty. But, since the king's part of the treaty rested definitely upon the condition that the bishops should agree to the renunciation of the temporalities, Henry insisted that since the bishops had refused so to do, he was not in any wise bound to renounce investitures. But the pope pressed his demand. Henry put an end to the quarrel by commanding his guards to surround the pope and his bishops. It was Quinquagesima Sunday, and the pope was allowed to conduct the regular service and to say mass. Henry had caused the gates and towers of the Vatican and St. Peter's to be occupied by his soldiers. And when the service was over, and the pope and his cardinals were about to retire, the soldiers occupied all the doors, and so held them. Henry caused the pope, with his cardinals (except two who managed to escape), to be taken to an adjoining building, where they were held under guard.

108. The two cardinals who had escaped spread through the city the word that the pope was imprisoned. The populace rose in fury, and slew many of the German soldiers who, not knowing of the occurrences at St. Peter's, were scattered, unarmed, through the city. Then the angry crowd rushed to St. Peter's, and attacked even the armed troops. The emperor, who led a charge upon them, was torn from his horse and wounded; and would have certainly lost his life, had not one of his nobles given to him his own horse. By this sacrifice, the nobleman himself was captured by the crowd, and was literally ton to pieces and cast to the dogs in the streets. Henry's army prevailed, and there was again a great slaughter. The pope was imprisoned in a castle, the cardinals were

bound and confined in a separate castle not far from Rome. Thus they were kept close prisoners, none but Germans being allowed to communicate with them. At the end of two months, the bishops and cardinals so effectually pleaded their own distresses, and those of the people of Rome, and the whole neighborhood, whom Henry perpetually embarrassed and scourged, that Pope Pascal II surrendered to the dictates of Henry V, as completely as Henry IV had surrendered to Gregory VII: with the difference, however, that Pope Pascal was in no wise humiliated or caused to suffer by Henry V, as had been Henry IV by Gregory VII.

390

109. The following agreement was made: of course at the dictation of the emperor, and by the surrender and submission of the pope: --

ON THE PART OF THE POPE.

ECE CHAPTER XVI. THE PAPAL SUPREMACY page 390 paragraph 2 "Pope Pascal shall not molest King Henry on account of giving investitures to the bishops and abbots of his kingdom; he shall not concern himself with them, nor shall he ever excommunicate the king for granting them, or for any injury he has done, on occasion of this dispute, to him or his friends and adherents; the king shall invest, as he has done hitherto, with the crosier and the ring, the bishops and abbots, who shall have been elected freely, without simony, and with his approbation; the archbishops and bishops shall consecrate those whom the king shall have thus invested, and none shall be consecrated till he shall have invested them; the pope shall crown the emperor forthwith, shall assist him to preserve his kingdom, and shall confirm to him, by a special bull, the right of investing."

ON THE PART OF THE EMPEROR.

ECE CHAPTER XVI. THE PAPAL SUPREMACY page 390 paragraph 3 "I, Henry, on Wednesday or Thursday next, shall set at liberty Pope Pascal, and all the cardinals, bishops, and other persons, as well as hostages who have been taken with him and for him; and shall cause them to be conducted safe to the gate of the trans-Tiberine city. I shall not henceforth arrest, or cause any to be arrested, who shall be faithful to Pope Pascal; and the Roman people, as well as the inhabitants of the trans-Tiberine city, shall enjoy peace and safety, unmolested both in their persons and estates: I shall restore the patrimonies and demesnes of the Roman Church, which I have taken, shall help and assist her to recover and to hold whatever in justice belongs to her, as my ancestors have done, and shall obey Pope Pascal, saving the honor of my kingdom and empire, as the Catholic emperors have obeyed the Catholic popes."69

ECE CHAPTER XVI. THE PAPAL SUPREMACY page 390 paragraph 4 110. This treaty was arranged in the emperor's camp, a short distance from Rome. However, there was one item that yet must be fulfilled before the pope could have his liberty. The pope's part of the agreement was that he should confirm "by a special bull," the emperor's right of investiture; and Henry required that this bull should be regularly issued to him by the pope before he should be released. The pope objected that he did not have the papal seal with him, and how could he issued the bull? Henry caused the seal to be brought from the pope's palace to the camp. Then Pope Pascal II signed and regularly sealed the following papal bull: --

391

"Pascal, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his beloved son Henry, king of the Germans, and by the grace of God emperor of the Romans, health and apostolic benediction. As your kingdom has been always distinguished by its attachment to the Church, and your predecessors have deserved by their probity to be honored with the imperial crown at Rome, it has pleased the Almighty to call you my beloved son Henry, in like manner to that dignity, etc. We therefore grant to you that prerogative, which our predecessors have granted to yours, namely, that you invest the bishops and abbots of your kingdom with the staff and ring, provided they shall have been elected freely and without simony, and that they be consecrated, after you shall have invested them, by the bishops, whose province it is. If any shall be chosen by the people and the clergy, without your

approbation, let him not be consecrated till you have invested him. The bishops and archbishops shall be at full liberty to consecrate the bishops and abbots whom you shall have invested. For your predecessors have so endowed and enriched the Church out of their own demesnes, that the bishops and abbots ought to be the foremost in contributing to the defense and support of the State; and it behooves you on your part to suppress the popular dissensions that happen at elections. If any person, whether clerk or layman, shall presume to infringe this our concession, he shall be struck with anathema, and shall forfeit his dignity. May the mercy of the Almighty protect those who shall observe it, and grant your majesty a happy reign."70

111. Then the pope was set fully at liberty. He and the emperor entered the city together and went straight to St. Peter's, where the pope crowned Henry emperor, Sunday, April 12, 1111. When the coronation ceremony was ended, the pope celebrated mass; and when he came to the communion, he took the wafer and broke it in two. Giving one part to Henry and holding the other himself, he said: --

"We give you, Emperor Henry, the body of our Lord Jesus Christ the same that was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered on the cross, as we are taught by the holy Catholic Church: we give it you in confirmation of the peace we have made. And as this part of the vivifying sacrament is divided from the other, so may he who shall attempt to break this agreement be divided from our Lord Jesus Christ, and excluded from His kingdom."71

112. A deputation of the Roman people was then admitted to the Church. They presented the emperor with the golden crown and with the insignia of the patriciate and defensorship of the city of Rome. Henry demanded that, in the presence of all, the pope should hand

to him the bull which had been issued in the camp. The pope refused at first, but was compelled to do it, to escape most probably another experience such as that through which he had just passed. Henry received the bull from the pope's hand; and with his army departed immediately for Germany.

113. But the pope's troubles were not yet ended. Such of the cardinals and bishops as had not been prisoners, and the clergy of Rome, demanded that he should immediately revoke the bull that he had granted, and declare null and void all that he had done in the treaty with Henry. They held a council and themselves unanimously declared null and void all the concessions that Pascal had made, and renewed the decrees of Gregory and his successors against lay investiture. They condemned "all who should act, or who should support any who acted contrary to those decrees." The tide of opposition grew so strong that the pope himself assembled a council, March 28, 1112, composed of "twelve archbishops, one hundred and fourteen bishops, fifteen cardinal priests, eight cardinal deacons, a great number of abbots and ecclesiastics of all ranks." To the council he gave an account of all that had occurred in the contest-with Henry. He confessed that he had not done well in making the concessions that he had made, and that the matter ought in some way to be corrected; and asked the council to assist him in finding out how the difficulty could be remedied, since he had granted to the emperor, by that special bull, the right of investiture, and had also pledged that he would not excommunicate him.

114. The council asked for time to deliberate, which, of course, was granted. The result of their deliberation was the opinion expressed by the bishop of Angouleme, and which "was received by all as dictated by the Holy Ghost,' that "as the pope had only promised not to excommunicate the emperor, he might excommunicate his own bull" and the treaty which that bull confirmed! Accordingly, the council unanimously adopted the following decree: --

"All of us who are assembled in this holy council, condemn by the authority of the Church and the judgment of the Holy Ghost, the privilege extorted from the pope by King Henry. And that it may forever be void and null, we excommunicate the said privilege: it being thereby ordained that a bishop, though canonically elected, shall not be consecrated till he has received investiture from the king, which is

against the Holy Ghost, and inconsistent which canonical institution. Amen! Amen! Fiat! Fiat!"72

115. Although the pope had pledged himself not to excommunicate the emperor, and although he had held fast to that pledge, and had excommunicated only his bull and treaty; yet everywhere his legates excommunicated Henry, and Pope Pascal confirmed their excommunication. And, indeed, their excommunication was of itself valueless except as it was confirmed by the pope. Also the Council of Vienne, presided over by the pope's legate, and held in September, 1112, excommunicated the emperor; and this decree of that council the pope definitely confirmed, in a letter dated November 17 of the same year, "thus doing by others what he was solemnly sworn not to do himself: allowing what was usually supposed an inferior tribunal to dispense with the oath which he dared not himself retract; by an unworthy sophistry trying to obtain the advantage, without the guilt, of perjury." -- Milman.73 And thus the pope subjected himself to the dividing which he himself decreed upon the broken wafer, Sunday, April 12, 1111.

116. Thus when Pascal II passed from the papal stage he left to the future popes the great papal lesson that "there was no limit to which they might not advance their pretensions for the aggrandizement of the hierarchy; but to retract the least of these pretensions was beyond their otherwise illimitable power." -- Milman.74 The war was continued after the death of Pascal II, as it was before. It was continued throughout the reign of his successor, --

GELASIUS II, 1118;

and nearly through the reign of his successor, --

CALIXTUS II, 1119 TO DEC. 12, 1124.

In September, 1122, a diet was held at Worms, at which the legates of Pope Calixtus II were present, and at which, after a conference of ten days, the war of investitures was ended by the following agreement: --

ON THE PART OF THE POPE.

ECE CHAPTER XVI. THE PAPAL SUPREMACY page 393 paragraph 3 "We, the legates of the holy see, grant to the emperor the power of causing the bishops and abbots of the kingdom of Germany to be

chosen in his presence, without employing violence or simony, and under the auspices of the metropolitan and coprovincial prelates. The elected shall receive from the prince the investiture of the regalia by the scepter, and not the ecclesiastical regalia, and he shall perform such duties to his sovereign as are imposed on him by his title of subject. By virtue of this treaty, we grant to Henry a durable peace, and the same to those who embraced his side during the unhappy times of our discords."

ON THE PART OF HENRY V.

"For the love of God, and the holy Roman Church, of Pope Calixtus, and the safety of our soul, we renounce the privilege of investitures by the ring and the cross, and we grant to all the churches of our empire, canonical elections and free consecrations. We restore to the holy see the lands and royalties on which we have seized during our divisions, and we promise our assistance to the pope to recover those on which our subjects have seized. We will also restore to the churches, lords, and citizens, the domains which are in our possession. Finally, we grant an entire and durable peace to Pope Calixtus, the holy Roman Church, and all those who have aided it during our discords."

117. "These two deeds were read and exchanged on a plain on the left bank of the Rhine, where tents and an altar had ben erected. Thanks were then returned to God, and a solemn mass celebrated by the bishop of Ostia, at which he admitted the emperor to communion, and gave him the kiss of peace. He also gave his absolution to the troops who surrounded them, and to all those who had taken part in the schism. Thus the pope and the king cemented their union, after having devastated Germany and Italy, and murdered the people of Saxony, Bavaria, Lorraine, and Lombardy, for half a century, for a miserable quarrel about investitures." -- De Cormenin.75

118. To follow the detailed history of the popes in succession through this century, three quarters of which time there were two popes at once, would be only to impose upon the reader a wearisome repetition of intrigue, blasphemy, and arrogance; of wickedness, war, and woe. The testimony of Catholic contemporaries will be a sufficient description of the whole twelfth century: Cardinal Baronius, the annalist of the popes, avows that "it appeared as if antichrist then governed Christendom." And, since the pope was the governor of Christendom, this statement very accurately designates who antichrist is.

119. St. Bernard, who lived at the time, in a letter, wrote: --

"Having had for some days the happiness of seeing the pious Nobert, and of listening to some words from his mouth, I asked him what were his thoughts with regard to antichrist. He replied to me that this generation would certainly be exterminated by the enemy of God and of men; for his reign had commenced."

120. Bernard of Morlaix, a monk of Cluny, who also lived in this century, wrote: --

"The golden ages are past; pure souls exist no longer; we live in the last times; fraud, impurity, rapine, schisms, quarrels, wars, treasons, incests, and murders desolate the Church. Rome is the impure city of the hunter Nimrod: piety and religion have deserted its walls. Alas! the pontiff, or rather the king, of this odious Babylon, tramples underfoot the Gospels and Christ, and causes himself to be adored as a god."

121. Honorius of Antron, a priest, declared: --

"Behold these bishops and cardinals of Rome! These worthy ministers who surround the throne of the Beast! They are constantly occupied with new iniquities, and never cease committing crimes. . . . The reign of God has finished, and that of antichrist has commenced. A new law has replaced the old. Scholastic theology has sallied from morality, tenets, nor worships -- and lo! the last times, announced in the Apocalypse have come!"76

1[Page 338] "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy." Chap. ix, par. 14.

2[Page 338] Id., chap. xii, par. 9 from end.

3[Page 339] Id., par. 7 from end.

4[Page 340] "Lives of the Popes," Gregory VII, par. 1.

5[Page 341] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," Alexander II.

6[Page 342] "The Holy Roman Empire," chap. vii, par. 12.

7[Page 343] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes, "Gregory VII.

8 Id.

9[Page 344] Bower's "Lives of the Popes, "Gregory VII, par. 4.

10[Page 344] "Latin Christianity," Vol. iii, book vii, chap. i, par. 15.

11[Page 345] "Lives of the Popes," Gregory VII, par. 6.

12[Page 347] "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy," chap. xiv, pars. 17-19.

13[Page 348] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Gregory VII, par. 13.

14[Page 348] "The Holy Roman Empire," chap. viii, par. 6.

15[Page 348] "Lives of the Popes," Gregory VII, par. 13.

16[Page 349] Id.

17[Page 349] "Latin Christianity," Vol. iii, book vii, chap. ii, par. 6.

18[Page 350] "Lives of the Popes," Gregory VII, par. 14.

19[Page 351] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. Id. book vii, chap. ii, par. 29.

20[Page 351] Id., par. 31.

21[Page 352] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," Gregory VII.

22[Page 352] Milman's "Latin Christianity," Id., par. 34.

23[Page 353] Id., par. 35, and Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Gregory VII, par. 48.

24[Page 353] Milman's "Latin Christianity," Id., par. 36.

25[Page 356] Milman, Id., pars. 36-44; Bower and De Cormenin under Gregory VII.

26[Page 359] "Lives of the Popes," Gregory VII, par. 29.

27[Page 360] "Latin Christianity," Id., par. 71.

28[Page 360] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Gregory VII, par. 31.

29[Page 361] "Latin Christianity," Id., par. 73.

30[Page 362] Bower, Id., par. 32.

31[Page 363] "Latin Christianity," Id., chap. iii, par. 9.

32[Page 364] Id., par. 15.

33[Page 364] Id., par. 16.

34[Page 366] Id., par. 24, with Bower and De Cormenin, Gregory VII.

35[Page 366] Id., par.

36[Page 367] De Cormenin "History of the Popes," Gregory VII.

37[Page 369] "Latin Christianity," Vol. III, book VII, chap. III, pars. 47, 48.

38[Page 369] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," Gregory VII.

39[Page 371] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Gregory VII, par. 64. As translated and summarized by De Cormenin, Gregory's "Maxims" stand thus: "God is a Spirit. He rules matter. Thus the spiritual is above the temporal power. The pope is the representative of God on earth; he should then govern the world. To him alone pertain infallibility and universality. All men are submitted to his laws, and he can only be judged by God. He ought to wear imperial ornaments. People and kings should kiss his feet. Christians are irrevocably submitted to his orders. They should murder their princes, fathers, and children if he commands it. No council can be declared universal without the orders of the pope. No book can be received as canonical without his authority. Finally, no good nor evil exists but in what he has condemned or approved."

40[Page 372] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. III, book VII, chap. IV, par. 4.

41[Page 372] "Lives of the Popes," Victor III.

42[Page 373] De Cormenin "History of the Popes," Urban II.

43[Page 373] "History of Latin Christianity," Id., chap. v. par. 8.

44[Page 374] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. 1VIII. par. 1.

45[Page 374] Id.

46[Page 375] Id., pars. 2.

47[Page 375] Id., par. 3.

48[Page 377] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," Urban II.

49[Page 377] "Decline and Fall," chap. 1VIII, par. 5.

50[Page 378] Id.

51[Page 378] Id., par. 6.

52[Page 379] Id., chap. 1VIII, pars. 8, 7.

53[Page 380] Id., par. 9.

54[Page 380] "Latin Christianity," Vol. IV, book VII, chap. VI, par. 27.

55[Page 380] Id., par. 16.

56[Page 380] "Great Empires of Prophecy," chap. IX, par. 2.

57[Page 380] It has been estimated at "six millions." -- "Decline and Fall," chap. 1VIII, par.16.

58[Page 380] Id., par. 24.

59[Page 381] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. IV, book VII, chap. VI, par. 28.

60[Page 383] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. 1IX, par. 11.

61[Page 383] "Id., par. 6.

62[Page 383] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. IV, book VII, chap. VI, par. 23.

63[Page 384] Id., par. 37.

64[Page 386] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. IV, book VIII, chap. 1, par. 12 from end.

65[Page 386] "Lives of the Popes," Pascal II.

66[Page 387] Bower's Lives of the Popes," Pascal II. par. 36.

67[Page 388] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. IV, book VIII, chap. II, pars. 19, 20.

68[Page 388] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Pascal II, par. 41.

69[Page 390] Id., par. 44.

70[Page 391] Id., par. 45.

71[Page 391] Id., par. 46.

72[Page 393] Id., par. 49.

73[Page 393] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. IV, book VIII, chap. II, par. 39.

74[Page 393] Id., par. 5 from end.

75[Page 394] "History of the Popes," Calixtus II.

76[Page 395] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," Pascal II, first paragraphs.

17. THE PAPAL SUPREMACY -- INNOCENT III TO BONIFACE VIII

IN the year 1143 the city of Rome declared itself a Republic. A patrician was elected; the Senate was restored. In March, 1144, this republic declared a separation of Church and State; and notified the pope -- Lucius II -- that they would recognize, and be submissive to, his authority in spiritual things, but in spiritual things only. "They declared that the pope and the clergy must content themselves, from that time, with the tithes and oblations of the people:" because "all the temporalities, the royalties, and rights of sovereignty" fell now to the temporal power vested in the patrician of the republic. Pope Lucius at the head of the armed nobles attempted to

crush the new republic of Rome; and in an attempt to storm the capital he received a mortal wound, and died Feb. 25, 1145.

2. The successor of Lucius II -- Eugenius III -- was expelled from Rome. Late in the year he recovered the city and celebrated Christmas; but in March, 1146, he was again obliged to fly, and entered it no more except only as a bishop, until his death, July 7, 1153. The successor of Eugenius III died Dec. 2, 1154, and he was immediately succeeded by Nicolas Breakspear, the only Englishman who was ever pope of Rome, who reigned as Pope.

HADRIAN IV, DEC. 4, 1154, TO SEPT. 1, 1159.

In the war with the new republic, Hadrian commanded all the churches of Rome to be closed; forbade all the clergy to perform any religious services whatever, except at christenings and deaths. The clergy stirred up the superstitious people who were deprived of their religious rites and festivals and processions. Easter was near; and the prospect that there should be no celebration of that great papal festival, was

unbearable to the populace. They clamored for the restoration of their religion. Thus "the clergy and people compelled the Senate to yield. Hadrian would admit of no lower terms than the abrogation of the republican institutions," and the banishment of the leaders. "The republic was at an end," March, 1155.

3. In 1156 Henry II of England asked the pope's favor to his design of invading and subjecting Ireland. Ireland had received Christianity at the same time as had the Britons in the first centuries of the Christian era. But "the pope regarded as the surest mark of their imperfect conversion, that they followed the doctrines of their first teachers; and had never acknowledged any subjection to the see of Rome." -- Hume.1 Therefore in the same year (1156) Hadrian IV issued a bull granting Ireland to England, with the reservation of Peter's pence to the papacy, and commissioning Henry to take possession of the island. This he did, because, as he declared "Ireland and all islands converted to Christianity belonged to the special jurisdiction of St. Peter; " and therefore he had the right to sanction the invasion and possession of Ireland by England "on the ground of its advancing civilization and propagating a purer faith among the barbarous and ignorant people." -- Milman.2

4. During the reign of Hadrian IV there was also war between the papacy and the emperor -- Frederick Barbarossa -- which was used by Hadrian as occasion of yet further magnifying the already enormous claims of the papacy. In opposition to the emperor Frederick Barbarossa, Pope Hadrian IV wrote to the archbishops of Treves, Mentz, and Cologne as follows: --

"Glory be to God in the highest, that ye are found tried and faithful, while these flies of Pharaoh, which swarmed up from the bottom of the abyss, and, driven about by the whirling winds while they strive to darken the sun, are turned to the dust of the earth. And take ye heed that ye be not involved in the sins of Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin; and behold a worse than Jeroboam is here. Was not the empire transferred by the popes from the Greeks to the Teutons? The king of the Teutons is not emperor before he is consecrated by the pope. Before his consecration he is but king; after it, emperor and Augustus. From whence, then, the empire but from us? Remember what were these Teutonic kings before Zacharias gave his benediction to Charles,

the second of that name, who were drawn in a wagon by oxen, like philosophers ! Glorious kings, who dwelt, like the chiefs of synagogues, in these wagons, while the mayor of the palace administered the affairs of the empire. Zacharias I promoted Charles to the empire, land gave him a name great above all names. . . . That which we have bestowed on the faithful German we may take away from the disloyal German. Behold, it is in our power to grant to whom we will. For this reason are we placed above nations and kingdoms, that we may

destroy and pluck up, build and plant. So great is the power of Peter, that whatsoever is done by us worthily and rightfully must be believed to be done by God!"3

5. John of Salisbury, countryman of Hadrian IV, and afterward bishop of Chartres, visited Hadrian and was received on terms of intimacy. The pope one day in an exchange of confidences asked John to tell him freely and honestly "what opinion the world entertained of him and the Roman Church. John, using the liberty the pope allowed him, told his Holiness, that since he wanted to know what the world thought of the Roman Church, he would not dissemble, but tell him with all the freedom of a friend what he had heard in the different provinces, through which he had traveled, and began thus: `They say, holy father, that the Roman Church, the mother of all churches, behaves toward other churches more like a step-mother, than a true mother; that scribes and Pharisees sit in her, laying heavy weights upon men's shoulders, which they themselves touch not with a finger; that they domineer over the clergy; but are not an example to the flock, nor do they lead the right way to life; that they covet rich furniture, load their tables with silver and gold, and yet, out of avarice, live sparingly; that they seldom admit or relieve the poor, and when they relieve them, it is only out of vanity they do it; that they plunder the churches, sow dissensions, set the clergy and the people at variance, are not affected with the miseries and sufferings of the afflicted, and look upon gain as godliness and piety; that they do justice, not for justice' sake, but for lucre; that all things are venal, that for money you may obtain to-day what you please, but the next day you will get nothing without it. I have heard them compared to the devil, who is thought to do good when he ceases from doing mischief: I except some few, who answer the name of pastors, and fulfill the duty: the Roman pontiff

himself is, they say, a burden to all almost insupportable. All complain, that while the churches, that the piety of our ancestors erected, are ready to fall, or lie in ruins, while the altars are neglected, he builds palaces, and appears gorgeously attired in purple and in gold. The palaces of the priests are kept clean, but the Church of Christ is covered with filth. They plunder whole provinces, as if they aimed at nothing less than the wealth of Croesus. But the Almighty treats them according to their deserts, often leaving them a prey to the very refuse of mankind; and while they thus wander out of the way, the punishment they deserve must and will overtake them, the Lord saying, with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. This, holy father, is what people say, since you want to know it.

6. "`When I had done, the pope asked me my opinion. I answered, that I was at a loss what to do, that I should be deemed a liar, or a sycophant, if I alone contradicted the people, and that on the other hand it would be no less a crime than treason for me to open my mouth against Heaven. However, as Guido Clemens, cardinal presbyter of St. Pudentiana, agrees with the people, I will not presume to disagree with him; and he says, that double-dealing, contrary to the simplicity of the dove, prevails in the Roman Church, and with it avarice, the root of all evil. This he said not in a corner, but publicly in a council, at which Pope Eugenius presided in person. However, I will not take upon me to say that I have nowhere met with ecclesiastics of greater probity, or who abhor avarice more, than in the Roman Church. Who can but admire the contempt of riches and the disinterestedness of Bernard of Rennes, cardinal deacon of St. Cosmas and St. Damian? The man is not yet born, of whom he received any trifle or gift. What shall I say of the bishop of Praeneste, who, out of a tenderness of conscience, would not receive even what was his due. Many equal Fabricius himself in gravity and moderation. Since you press and command me, and I must not lie to the Holy Ghost, I will speak the truth: we must obey your commands, but must not imitate you in all your actions. Why do you inquire into the lives of others, and not into your own? All applaud and flatter you, all call you lord and father; if father, why do you expect presents from your children? If lord, why do you

not keep your Romans in awe and subjection? You are not father in the right way. Give freely what you have received freely. If you oppress others, you will be more grievously oppressed yourself. When I had done

speaking, the pope smiled, commended me for the liberty I had taken, and ordered me to let him know immediately whatever I might hear amiss of him.'"4

7. The next of the popes worthy of special note is one in whom all papal characteristics were summed up, --

INNOCENT III, JAN. 8, 1198, TO JULY 16, 1216,

who was chosen "on account of his irreproachable character, his learning and his excellent parts;" and by whom "the papal power rose to its utmost height." "In his inauguration sermon broke forth the character of the man: the unmeasured assertion of his dignity: protestations of humility which have a sound of pride," as follows: --

"Ye see what manner of servant that is whom the Lord hath set over His people: no other than the vicegerent of Christ, the successor of Peter. He stands in the midst between God and man: below God, above men; less than God, more than man. He judges all, is judged by none, for it is written: `I will judge.' But he whom the pre-eminence of dignity exalts is lowered by his office of a servant, that so humility may be exalted, and pride abased; for God is against the high-minded, and to the lowly He shows mercy; and he who exalteth himself shall be abased. Every valley shall be lifted up, every hill and mountain laid low."5

8. The first things that Innocent did was to usurp the place of the emperor, in Rome. "The prefect of the city as well as the other magistrates, had hitherto taken an oath of allegiance to the emperor only. But Innocent, the very next day after his consecration, insisted upon their taking that oath to him: and to him they all took it accordingly as their lawful sovereign, quite independent of the emperor. He invested the prefect in his office, delivering to him the mantle which he had hitherto received at the hands of the emperor or his minister." -- Bower.6 Clement III, in 1187, had secured the recognition of the

pope as civil governor of the city of Rome, and the abolition of the patriciate, and an oath of allegiance to him as sovereign of the city. Yet, with all this, allegiance to the emperor was still held by the people, and recognized by the pope. But Innocent excluded all allegiance to the emperor, and turned it all to the pope. He "substituted his own justiciaries for those appointed by the Senate: the whole authority emanating from the pope, and was held during his pleasure; to the pope alone the judges were responsible; they were bound to resign when called upon by him." -- Milman.7

9. In 1199 Innocent began a contest with the king of France, Philip Augustus, "the most ambitious, unscrupulous, and able man who had wielded the scepter of France." The occasion of it was this: In the year 1195 Philip Augustus had married Ingeburga, the daughter of the king of Denmark. For some reason, never known by anybody but himself, and possibly Ingeburga, Philip, from the day of his marriage, had refused to recognize her as his wife. The obsequious clergy of France, with the archbishop of Rheims at their head, pronounced at once the avoidance of the marriage "upon the grounds that it was within the degrees of relationship forbidden by the Church. When Ingeburga was informed of this, she exclaimed: "Mala Francia! mala Francia! Roma, Roma!" -- Wicked France! wicked France! Rome! Rome! She refused to recognize their decision. Her father appealed to the pope, Celestine III, in her behalf. The pope sent two legates, who held a council at Paris, of all the archbishops, bishops, and abbots of the kingdom, to consider the case. This council pronounced in favor of the king, and their decision was confirmed by the legates. Their action, however, was repudiated by Celestine, who commanded Philip to take back Ingeburga, and prohibited him from marrying any other woman in her lifetime. King Philip, however, paid no attention to the command of the pope, and in 1196 married Agnes of Meran, the daughter of the duke of Bohemia. Ingeburga wrote to the pope, asking him again to urge her cause. But Celestine paid no further attention to the matter.

10. Thus stood the case when, in 1199, Innocent III made it the occasion by which he would assert the absolutism of papal power in

France against the august Philip. He sent his legate into France, to command Philip to take back Ingeburga; and, if Philip refused, to place the whole kingdom under interdict. The effect of an interdict was to shut heaven to all the people of the place or country interdicted: the activities of all the saints were shut off, their images were covered with crape: no church rites nor festivals were celebrated: no sermons were preached: no burials were allowed in "consecrated" ground: marriages were celebrated only in the graveyards; and only the christening of infants, and extreme unction to the dying, were allowed. The legate delivered his message to the king. But Philip would not obey. A council was assembled at Dijon, Dec. 6, 1199. Two of the number were sent to cite the king, but he drove them from his presence, and sent messengers protesting against any action of the council, and appealing to the pope. "At midnight of the seventh day of the council, each priest holding a torch, were chanted the Miserere and the prayers for the dead, the last prayers that were to be uttered by the clergy of France during the interdict."

11. Philip declared that he would forfeit half his kingdom before he would part from Agnes. As time went on, the superstitious people began to show their discontent. Discontent grew to resentment. There came mutinous mutterings from all over France. Philip sent an embassy to Rome to inform the pope that he was ready to abide by the sentence of Rome. Innocent inquired: "What sentence? That which has been already delivered, or that which is to be delivered? He knows our decree: let him put away his concubine, receive his lawful wife, reinstate the bishops whom he has expelled, give them satisfaction for their losses; then we will raise the interdict, receive his sureties, examine into the alleged relationship, and pronounce our decree." At this answer Philip exclaimed, in his wrath: "I will turn Mohammedan! Happy Saladin, who has no pope above him!" He assembled his parliament: but they would say nothing. Philip asked: "What is to be done?" The parliament answered: "Obey the pope, dismiss Agnes, receive back Ingeburga." Philip demanded of the archbishop of Rheims, who had granted the divorce, whether the pope had declared that action a mockery. The archbishop consented that it was so. "Then," said Philip, "what a fool wert thou, to utter such a sentence!"

12. Philip sent a new embassy to Rome. With it Agnes herself sent a letter to the pope, in which she said: "I, a stranger, the daughter of a Christian prince, have been married, young and ignorant of the world, to the king, in the face of God and of the Church. I have borne him two children. I care not for the crown. It is on my husband that I have set my love. Sever me not from him." In reply Innocent only sent a new legate, to insist that Philip should make complete satisfaction, and banish Agnes not only from his side, but from his kingdom; publicly receive back Ingeburga; and give his oath and surety to abide by the sentence of the Church. The whole kingdom was filled with superstitious lamentation that was likely any moment to break out in fury against him, and Philip surrendered.

13. "To the king's castle of St. Leger came the cardinals, the prelates; and in their train Ingeburga. The people thronged round the gates: but the near approach of Ingeburga seemed to rouse again all the king's insuperable aversion. The cardinals demanded that the scene of reconciliation should be public; the negotiation was almost broken off; the people were in wild despair. At last the king seemed to master himself for a strong effort. With the legates and some of the churchmen he visited her in her chamber. The workings of his countenance betrayed the struggle within: `The pope does me violence,' he said. `His Holiness requires but justice,' answered Ingeburga. She was led forth, presented to the council in royal apparel; a faithful knight of the king came forward, and swore that the king would receive and honor her as queen of France. At that instant the clanging of the bells proclaimed the raising of the interdict. The curtains were withdrawn from the images, from the crucifixes; the doors of the churches flew open, the multitude streamed in to satiate their pious desires, which had been suppressed for seven months. The news spread throughout France; it reached Dijon in six days, where the edict first proclaimed was abrogated in form." -- Milman.8

14. That the case of Ingeburga was used by Innocent III solely as the occasion of asserting papal supremacy over Philip Augustus, and not because of the justice of Ingeburga's claim, is plain, not only from the whole character of the papacy itself, but from the conduct of Innocent

404

himself in other instances. If Ingeburga had been the guilty one, and justice had been on the side of Philip Augustus, as it seems to have been on the side of Ingeburga, the course of the pope would just as likely have been the same; because such it had been time and again in the history of the popes. This is proved by the next instance of Innocent's assertion of papal arrogance: that of John of England. Bad as Philip may have been, in whatever respect, history shows that in all respects John, of England, must have been worse. John, as Philip, had put away his wife, and, as in the case of Philip, his action in this was sanctioned by an archbishop -- the archbishop of Bordeaux -- for the ever-convenient reason that the marriage was within the prohibited degrees of relationship. John had then betrothed a daughter of the king of Portugal; but, before a marriage had taken place, he found Isabella, who was betrothed to the count of la Marche, and had carried her off and made her his wife. "But although this flagrant wrong, and even the sin of adultery, is added to the repudiation of his lawful wife, no interdict, no censure is uttered from Rome, either against the king or the archbishop of Bordeaux. The pope, whose horror of such unlawful connections is now singularly quiescent, confirms the dissolution of the marriage (against which, it is true, the easy Havoise enters no protest, makes no appeal); for John, till bought over with the abandonment of Arthur's claim to the throne by the treacherous Philip Augustus, is still the supporter of Otho: he is the ally of the pope, for he is the ally of the papal emperor." -- Milman.9

15. Not only did Innocent not attempt any correction of John on account of his illicit marital relations, but he actually made himself the defender of John, against Philip of France and his party, when, in their effort to punish him for the indignity which he had put upon Count Hugh, by robbing him of his betrothed, Isabella, they had summoned John to their court, to do homage as vassal for his province of Aquitaine. And, when Philip declared that the pope had no business to interfere between him and his vassal, Innocent expressed himself as "astonished at the language of the king of France, who presumed to limit the power in spiritual things conferred by the Son of God on the

405

apostolic see, which was so great that it could admit no enlargement," and continued: --

"Every son of the Church is bound, in case his brother trespasses against him, to hear the Church. Thy brother, the king of England, has accused thee of trespass against him; he has admonished thee; he has called many of his great barons to witness of his wrongs: he has in the last resort appealed to the Church. We have endeavored to treat you with fatherly love, not with judicial severity; urged you, if not to peace, to a truce. If you will not hear the Church, must you not be held by the Church as a heathen and a publican? Can I be silent? -- No. I command you now to hear my legates, the archbishop of Bourges and the abbot of Casamaggiore, who are empowered to investigate, to decide the cause. We enter not into the question of the feudal rights of the king of France over his vassal, but we condemn thy trespass -- thy sin -- which is unquestionably within our jurisdiction. The decretals, the law of the empire, declare that if throughout Christendom one of two litigant parties appeals to the pope, THE OTHER IS BOUND TO ABIDE BY THE AWARD. The king of France is accused of perjury in violating the existing treaty, to which both have sworn, and perjury is a crime so clearly amenable to the ecclesiastical courts, that we can not refuse to take cognizance of it before our tribunal."10

16. The occasion of Innocent's assertion of power over England, was this: In 1205 died Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury. One section of monks chose a successor: another section of the monks chose another man as successor to the archbishopric. This latter party was favored by the king, and their choice was actually installed in the presence, and by investment, of the king. The candidate of the other party had gone immediately to Rome, with the injunction from those who elected him, to keep secret the fact of his election, until he reached Rome. But, when he reached Flanders, he let out his secret because he thought it more becoming that he should

travel to Rome as archbishop-elect of England, than as a mere pilgrim. When this was learned in England, the other party sent twelve monks to Rome, to plead the cause of their candidate.

17. When Innocent had heard the pleas of the respective parties, he set aside both, and commanded them to elect as archbishop of Canterbury, a cardinal, an Englishman who was then in Rome, Stephen Langton. This was in 1207. Innocent, feeling well assured that this

would be displeasing to John of England, and knowing that John had a special weakness for fine jewelry, sent to him a wonderful ring, with elaborate explanations of its symbolic meanings. It seems to have been a combination of four rings in one. Innocent "begged him to consider seriously the form of the rings, their number, their matter, and their color. Their form, he said, being round, shadowed out eternity which had neither beginning nor end; and he ought thence to learn his duty of aspiring from earthly objects to heavenly, from things temporal to things eternal. The number four, being a square, denoted steadiness of mind, not to be subverted either by adversity or prosperity, fixed forever on the firm basis of the four cardinal virtues. Gold, which is the matter, being the most precious of metals, signified wisdom, which is the most valuable of all accomplishments, and justly preferred by Solomon to riches, power, and all exterior attainments. The blue color of the sapphire represented faith; the verdure of the emerald, hope; the redness of the ruby, charity; and the splendor of the topaz, good works." -- Hume.11

18. When his beautiful present had had, as he supposed, its proper effect, Innocent followed it with a letter recommending to the king, Stephen Langton as archbishop-elect of Canterbury, speaking most highly of his fitness for that high office. But rumor of what had occurred in Rome had reached England, and the pope's messengers were forbidden to enter the kingdom beyond their landing at Dover. In Italy, Innocent consecrated Langton as archbishop of Canterbury, and primate of all England. John was furious. He threatened to burn over their heads the cloister of the monks of Canterbury. They fled to Flanders. To the pope John wrote that he was insulted, both by the pope's rejection of the elect whom he had approved, and by the election of Langton who was unknown to him and had spent the most of his time in France amongst the enemies of England. The pope replied extolling Langton John declared that it was only at his peril that Stephen Langton should set his foot on the soil of England. Then Innocent commissioned the bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester to demand, for the last time, the king's acknowledgment of Langton, and, if the king refused, then to declare from the pope the kingdom of England

under interdict. When the bishops presented to John the ultimatum of the pope, the king, with fearful oaths swore that if they "dared to place his realm under an interdict, he would drive the whole of the bishops and clergy out of the kingdom, and put out the eyes and cut off the noses of all the Romans in the realm." The bishops, having delivered their message, withdrew, and, March 24, 1208, published the interdict, and protected themselves by immediate flight from England.

19. Then, "throughout England, as throughout France, without exception, without any privilege to church or monastery, ceased the divine offices of the Church. From Berwick to the British Channel, from the Land's-End to Dover, the churches were closed, the bells silent; the only clergy who were seen stealing silently about were those who were to baptize newborn infants with a hasty ceremony; those who were to hear the confession of the dying, and to administer to them, and to them alone, the holy eucharist. The dead (no doubt the most cruel affliction) were cast out of the towns, buried like dogs in some unconsecrated place -- in a ditch or a dung-heap -- without prayer, without the tolling bell, without the funeral rite. Those only can judge the effect of this fearful malediction who consider how completely the whole life of all orders was affected by the ritual and daily ordinances of the Church. Every important act was done under the counsel of the priest or the monk. Even to the less serious, the festivals of the Church were the only holidays, the processions of the Church the only spectacles, the ceremonies of the Church the only amusements. To those of deeper religion, to those, the far

greater number, of abject superstition, what was it to have the child thus almost furtively baptized, marriage unblessed, or hardly blessed; the obsequies denied; to hear neither prayer nor chant; to suppose that the world was surrendered to the unrestrained power of the devil, and his evil spirits, with no saint to intercede, no sacrifice to avert the wrath of God; when no single image was exposed to view, not a cross unveiled: the intercourse between man and God utterly broken off; souls left to perish, or but reluctantly permitted absolution in the instant of death?" -- Milman.12

20. Yet in the case of John the interdict did not bring the results that it did in the case of Philip Augustus. One year after another

408

passed, until five were gone, and still John did not surrender. The interdict was thus fast losing its terrors, and, with that, the prestige of the pope was fading. Something more must be done. Accordingly, in 1213, Innocent declared King John excommunicated, all subjects were absolved from their fealty, and the king of England was declared deposed, and his domains the lawful spoil of whosoever could take them. Philip Augustus had the disposition, and considered that he had sufficient cause, and was the only one who had the power, to undertake to seize the domains of John thus declared by the pope to be forfeited. And now, Philip was the good and dutiful son of the Church. Now "the interests of the pope and the king of France were as intimately allied as they had been implacably opposed. At a great assembly in Soissons appeared, April 8, 1213, Stephen Langton, the bishops of London and Ely, newly arrived from Rome, the king of France, the bishops, clergy, and people of the realm. The English bishops proclaimed the sentence of deposition; enjoined the king of France and all others, under the promise of their remission of sins, to take up arms; to dethrone the impious king of England; to replace him by a more worthy sovereign. Philip Augustus accepted the command of this new crusade."13

21. John, like Philip, threatened to turn Mohammedan. He sent a secret embassy to the caliph of Cordova, offering to become his vassal. This, however, was not followed up. Just then there arrived in England a legate, Pandulph, whom Innocent had sent without the knowledge of Philip. He magnified the danger of the threatened invasion; and declared to John that Philip had already the signatures of almost all of the English barons, inviting him to come over. He further urged the great benefits that would accrue to him by having the friendship, rather than the opposition, of the pope. John surrendered, and a treaty was arranged, by which Archbishop Langton was to be acknowledged; all affairs of the Church were to be fully restored; and the king of England placed in the legate's hands a document "signed, sealed, and subscribed with his own name," and with the name of an archbishop, a bishop, nine earls, and four barons, as attesting witnesses, which ran as follows: --

409

"Be it known to all men, that having in many points offended God and our holy mother of the Church, as satisfaction for our sins, and duly to humble ourselves after the example of Him who for our sake humbled himself to death, by the grace of the Holy Ghost, with our own free will and the common consent of our barons, we bestow and yield up to God, to His holy apostles Peter and Paul, to our lord, the pope Innocent, and his successors, all our kingdom of England and all our kingdom of Ireland, to be held as a fief of the holy see with the payment of 1,000 marks, and the customary Peter's pence. We reserve to ourselves, and to our heirs, the royal rights in the administration of justice. And we declare this deed irrevocable; and if any of our successors shall attempt to annul our act, we declare him thereby to have forfeited his crown."

22. The next day afterward, swearing upon the Gospels, King John made the following oath of feality as the vassal of the pope: --

"I, John, by the grace of God, king of England and lord of Ireland, from this day forth and forever, will be faithful to God and the everblessed Peter, and to the Church of Rome, and to my lord the pope Innocent, and to his Catholic successors. I will not be accessory, in act or word, by consent or counsel, to their loss of life, of limb, or of freedom. I will save them harmless from any wrong of which I may know; I will avert all in my

power; I will warn them by myself or by trusty messengers, of any evil intended against them. I will keep profoundly secret all communications with which they may intrust me by letter or by message. I will aid in the maintenance and defense of the patrimony of St. Peter, especially this kingdom of England and Ireland, to the utmost of my power, against all enemies. So help me God and His holy Gospels."14

23. Then, with a sum of eight thousand pounds sterling as damage money to the exiled clergy, Pandulph crossed the channel to the camp of Philip Augustus, and appeared in the presence of the king of France, "and in the name of the pope briefly and peremptorily forbade him from proceeding to further hostilities against John, who had now made his peace with the Church." In a rage, Philip demanded: "Have I at the cost of sixty thousand pounds assembled at the summons, at the entreaty, of the pope one of the noblest armaments which has ever met under a king of France? Is all the chivalry of France, in arms around their sovereign, to be dismissed like hired menials when there is no more use for

their services?" But Philip's rage was vain, and his protests were fruitless.

24. In England there followed the action of the nobles in requiring of John the great charter. And the chief in this great transaction, was that Stephen Langton whom Innocent III had by such immense effort, just now succeeded in installing in the archbishopric of Canterbury, as primate of all England. When the news of the granting of Magna Charta reached Innocent, he exclaimed: --

"What! Have the barons of England presumed to dethrone a king who has taken the cross, and placed himself under the protection of the apostolic see? Do they transfer to others the patrimony of the Church of Rome? By Saint Peter, we can not leave such a crime unpunished."

25. He immediately issued a bull, in which he attributed the action of the barons to the inspiration of the devil, and expressed himself as astonished that they had not brought their grievances before his tribunal, and there sought redress; and continues: --

"Vassals, they have conspired against their lord -- knights against their king: they have assailed his lands, seized his capital city, which has been surrendered to them by treason. Under their violence, and under fears which might shake the firmest man, he has entered into a treaty with the barons; a treaty not only base and ignominious, but unlawful and unjust; in flagrant violation and diminution of his rights and honor. Wherefore, as the Lord has said by the mouth of His prophet, -- `I have set thee above the nations, and above the kingdoms, to pluck up and to destroy, to build up and to plant;' and by the mouth of another prophet, -- `break the leagues of ungodliness, and loose the heavy burthens;' we can no longer pass over in silence such audacious wickedness, committed in contempt of the apostolic see, in infringement of the rights of the king, to the disgrace of the kingdom of England, to the great peril of the crusade. We therefore, with the advice of our brethren, altogether reprove and condemn this charter, prohibiting the king, under pain of anathema, from observing it, the barons from exacting its observation; we declare the said charter, with all its obligations and guarantees, absolutely null and void."

26. "The bull of excommunication against the barons followed rapidly the abrogation of the charter. It was addressed to Peter, bishop of Winchester, the abbot of Reading, and the papal envoy. It expressed the utmost astonishment and wrath, that Stephen, archbishop

of Canterbury, and his suffragans, had shown such want of respect to the papal mandate and of fidelity to their king; that they had rendered him no aid against the disturbers of the peace; that they had been privy to, if not actively engaged in, the rebellious league. `Is it thus that these prelates defend the patrimony of Rome; thus that they protect those who have taken up the cross? Worse than the Saracens, they would drive from his realm a

king in whom is the best hope of the deliverance of the Holy Land.' All disturbers of the king and of the realm are declared to be in the bonds of excommunication; the primate and his suffragans are solemnly enjoined to publish this excommunication in all the churches of the realm, every Sunday and festival, with the sound of bells, until the barons shall have made their absolute submission to the king. Every prelate who disobeys these orders is suspended from his functions." -- Milman.15

27. When this excommunication was presented to Archbishop Langton, by Pandulph, the legate, he positively refused to publish it. He claimed that it could have been only by false representations, that the pope could be brought to issue it. He therefore demanded a delay, till the matter could be fairly set before the pope. But no delay was allowed. "The papal delegates declared the primate suspended from his office," and themselves published the excommunication. Archbishop Langton, as a Roman cardinal, attended a great council held by Innocent, in November, 1215, and there his suspension, which had been declared by the legate in England, "was solemnly ratified by pope and council, and even when it was subsequently relaxed, it was on the condition that he should not return to England. Stephen Langton remained at Rome, though not in custody, yet no less a prisoner."16

28. During all this time of Innocent's contest with Philip of France and John of England, he was also conducting a war in Germany. In 1197 had died the emperor, Henry VI leaving an infant son, Frederick of Sicily, as his only heir. In 1198 this child's mother died, having in her will chosen innocent III as the guardian of the child. The pope accepted the guardianship, as he said, "not only in word, but in deed." The nobles of Germany assembled in a diet, and elected as king of Germany the emperor's brother, Philip of Swabia. A minority party

elected Otto, the second son of Henry the Lion of Saxony. Philip was under the ban of the Church, and when Otto was elected in opposition, since he owed his election to a few prominent churchmen, he was declared "champion of the Church." By both Philip and Otto, appeal was made to Innocent III, and, as a consequence, "ten years of strife and civil war in Germany are to be traced, if not to the direct instigation, to the inflexible obstinacy of Pope Innocent III." -- Milman.17

29. First of all Innocent made this appeal the occasion of exalting the papacy. He entered into a long argumentative analysis of the claims of the child-heir of Henry VI of Philip, and of Otto, all of which he issued as a bull, which opened thus: --

"It belongs to the apostolic see to pass judgment on the election of the emperor, both in the first and last resort: in the first, because by her aid and on her account the empire was transplanted from Constantinople; by here as her sole authority for this transplanting, on here behalf and for her better protection: in the last resort, because the emperor receives the final confirmation of his dignity from the pope; is consecrated, crowned, invested in the imperial dignity by him. That which must be sought, is the lawful, the right, the expedient."

30. He admitted that the child-heir had been lawfully recognized: that the princes of the empire had twice given their oath to him; but yet Innocent rejected the child's claims, because he was a child of only two years old, and because, "Woe unto the realm, saith the Scripture, whose king is a child." He argued that the child Frederick, in riper years, could never justly reproach the see of Rome with having robbed him of his empire, because it was the child's own uncle, Philip, who had deprived him of the crown, by accepting the election to the imperial office!

31. Yet, neither did Innocent allow the crown to Philip, who, in his argument, he makes responsible for the pope's denial of the crown to the child Frederick, whose guardian the pope himself was. Of Philip's election he also admits: "Neither can any objection be raised against the legality of the election of Philip. It rests upon the gravity, the dignity, the number, of those who chose him. It may appear vindictive, and therefore unbecoming in us, because his father and his brother have been persecutors of the Church, to visit their sins on him. He is

mighty, too, in territory, in wealth, in people; is it not to swim against the stream to provoke the enmity of the powerful against the Church, we who, if we favored Philip, might enjoy that peace which it is our duty to ensue? Yet is it right that we should declare against him?"

32. The reasons why Innocent considers it right, against right, to declare against Philip, are that he had been excommunicated by Innocent's predecessors; because his fathers, the emperors, had made war with his predecessors, the popes; because Philip himself had claimed lands that the pope also claimed, and "if while his power was yet unripe, he so persecuted the holy Church, what would he do if emperor? It behooves us to oppose him before he has reached his full strength. That the sins of the father are visited upon the sons, we know from Holy Writ, we know from many examples, Saul, Jeroboam, Baasha." A further reason is that Philip had sworn fealty to the child Frederick, and was therefore guilty of perjury in accepting the imperial office himself. It is true that Innocent had declared that oath null and void; yet he claimed that, though the oath was null and void, Philip was not released from the oath except by the special absolution of the pope. This, because "the Israelites, when they would be released from their oath concerning Gibeon, first consulted the Lord: so should he first have consulted us, who can alone absolve from oaths."

33. "Now, as to Otto. It may seem not just to favor his cause because he was chosen but by a minority; not becoming, because it may seem that the apostolic chair acts not so much from good will toward him, as from hatred of the others; not expedient because he is less powerful. But as the Lord abases the proud, and lifts up the humble, as he raised David to the throne, so it is just, befitting, expedient, that we bestow our favor upon Otto. Long enough have we delayed, and labored for unity by our letters and our envoys; it beseems us no longer to appear as if we were waiting the issue of events, as if like Peter we were denying the truth which is Christ; we must therefore publicly declare ourselves for Otto, himself devoted to the Church, of a race devoted to the Church, by his mother's side from the royal house of England, by his father from the duke of Saxony, all, especially his ancestor, the emperor Lothair, the loyal sons of the Church; him, therefore,

we proclaim, acknowledge, as king; him then we summon to take on himself the imperial crown."

34. The party of Philip, "the largest and most powerful part of the empire," refused to believe that this really came from the pope. They insisted that it must have been the sole production of the papal legate. They therefore wrote immediately to the pope thus: --

"Who has ever heard of such presumption? What proof can be adduced for pretensions, of which history, authentic documents, and even fable itself is silent? Where have ye read, ye popes! where have ye heard, ye cardinals! that your predecessors or your legates have dared to mingle themselves up with the election of a king of the Romans, either as electors or as judges? The election of the pope indeed required the assent of the emperor, till Henry I in his generosity removed that limitation. How dares his Holiness, the pope, to stretch forth his hand to seize that which belongs not to him? There is no higher council in a contested election for the empire, than the princes of the empire. Jesus Christ has separated spiritual from temporal affairs. He who serves God should not mingle in worldly matters; he who aims at worldly power is unworthy of spiritual supremacy. Punish, therefore, most holy father, the bishop of Palestrina for his presumption, acknowledge Philip whom we have chosen, and, as it is your duty, prepare to crown him."18

35. Innocent answered, declaring that it was not his intention to interfere with the rights of the electors, but it was his right, his duty, to examine and to prove the fitness of him whom he had solemnly to consecrate and to crown.

36. Two years already had Germany been war-swept; and for eight years longer, with only "short intervals of truce, Germany was abandoned to all the horrors of civil war. The repeated protestations of Innocent, that he was not the cause of these fatal discords, betray the fact that he was accused of the guilt; and that he had to wrestle with his own conscience to acquit himself of the charge. It was not a war of decisive battles, but of marauding, desolation, havoc, plunder, wasting of harvests, ravaging open and defenseless countries; war waged by prelate against prelate, by prince against prince; wild Bohemians and bandit soldiers of every race were roving through every province. Throughout the land there was no law: the high roads were impassable

on account of robbers; traffic cut off, except on the great rivers from Cologne down the Rhine, from Ratisbon down the Danube; nothing was spared, nothing sacred, church or cloister. Some monasteries were utterly impoverished, some destroyed. The ferocities of war grew into brutalities; the clergy, and sacred persons, were the victims and perpetrators."19

37. June 22, 1208, Philip was assassinated, in satisfaction of the private vengeance of "one of the fiercest and most lawless chieftains of those lawless times." This left Otto undisputed emperor. To the pope's legates in Germany he made oath as follows: --

"I promise to honor and obey Pope Innocent as my predecessors have honored and obeyed his. The elections of bishops shall be free, and the vacant sees shall be filled by such as have been elected by the whole chapter or by a majority. Appeals to Rome shall be made freely, and freely pursued. I promise to suppress and abolish the abuse that has obtained of seizing the effects of deceased bishops and the revenues of vacant sees. I promise to extirpate all heresies, to restore to the Roman Church all her possessions, whether granted to her by my predecessors or by others, particularly the march of Ancona, the dukedom of Spoleto, and the territories of the countess Matilda, and inviolately to maintain all the rights and privileges enjoyed by the apostolic see in the kingdom of Sicily."20

38. In the autumn of the same year, Otto went to Italy to receive the imperial crown. "The pope and his emperor met at Viterbo; they embraced, they wept tears of joy in remembrance of their common trials, in transport of their common triumph." Yet, the pope was suspicious of his emperor, and "demanded security that Otto would surrender, immediately after his coronation, the lands of the Church, now occupied by his troops. Otto almost resented the suspicion of his loyalty; and Innocent, in his blind confidence, abandoned his demand." October 24, Otto IV was crowned emperor, with great magnificence, in St. Peter's, by Innocent III. Yet this was no sooner done than they were at swords' points. The lands which Innocent hoped would be restored by Otto to the Church, the mere asking for which Otto had pretended to resent as an unjust suspicion of his loyalty to the Church, -- these were as far removed from the hopes of the Church as ever before.

"After all his labor, after all his hazards, after all his sacrifices, after
all his perils, even his humiliations, Innocent had raised up to himself a more formidable antagonist, a more bitter foe, than even the proudest and most ambitious of the Hohenstaufen."

39. Otto spent nearly three years in Italy. The child Frederick was now seventeen, and the party of Philip, in Germany, and many of the nobles of Italy, invited him to become emperor. Otto, hearing of this, hurried to Germany. March, 1212, Frederick came to Rome, where "he was welcomed by the pope, the cardinals, and the Senate;and received from Pope Innocent counsel, sanction, and some pecuniary aid for his enterprise." From Rome Frederick passed on to Germany, arriving at Constance, which shut its gates against Otto, and declared for Frederick. Germany all along the Rhine also declared for him; and December 2, he was chosen emperor, at Frankfort. The battle of Bouvines, May 27, 1214, so weakened Otto's forces as to destroy all hopes of success against Frederick, with whom Philip Augustus was now allied; and, in 1215, he practically retired to

the home of his youth, where he died, July 25, 1217. But, already, May 19, 1217, young Frederick had been regularly crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, with the silver crown of Germany.

40. Innocent III also stirred up a crusade -- the fourth -- against the Mohammedans, which, indeed, had unexpected and remarkable consequences. It was a crusade by sea; and was raised and sent forth under the auspices of Innocent, and the doge of Venice. It was a crusade intended for the recovery of the Holy Land from the successors of Saladin. But, instead of going to Jerusalem, they attacked Constantinople, which they took by storm, April 13, 1204. And, though Constantinople was a "Christian city," yet it fared only less ill than had Turkish Jerusalem when it fell into the hands of the first crusaders. Even Innocent III lamented the barbarous proceedings of the crusaders. He exclaimed: "How shall the Greek Church return to ecclesiastical unity and to respect for the apostolic see, when they have beheld in the Latins only examples of wickedness and works of darkness, for which they might well abhor them worse than dogs? Those who were believed not to seek their own, but the things of Christ Jesus, steeping those swords which they ought to have wielded against the

pagan, in Christian blood, spared neither religion, nor age, nor sex; they were practicing fornications, incests, adulteries, in the sight of men; abandoning matrons and virgins dedicated to God to the lewdness of grooms. Nor were they satisfied with seizing the wealth of the emperor, the spoils of the princes and the people: they lifted their hands to the treasuries of the churches -- what is more heinous! the very consecrated vessels; tearing the tablets of silver from the very altars, breaking in pieces the sacred things, carrying off crosses and relics."

41. In the great church of St. Sophia, which had been built by Justinian, "the silver was stripped from the pulpit; an exquisite and highly prized table of oblation was broken in pieces; the sacred chalices were turned into drinking cups; the gold fringe was ripped off the veil of the sanctuary. Asses and horses were led into the churches to carry off the spoil. A prostitute mounted the patriarch's throne, and sang, with indecent gestures, a ribald song. The tombs of the emperors were rifled, and the Byzantines saw, at once with amazement and anguish, the corpse of Justinian -- which even decay and putrefaction had for six centuries spared in his tomb -- exposed to the violation of a mob. It had been understood among those who instigated these atrocious proceedings that the relics were to be brought into a common stock, and equitably divided among the conquerors! But each ecclesiastic seized in secret whatever he could." -- Draper.21 Fire was also added to these other terrors of Innocent's crusaders. "On the night of the assault more houses were burned than could be found in any three of the largest cities in France."

42. Although Innocent could recount the barbarities of his crusaders, he did not hesitate a day to reap all the benefit from this conquest of the Eastern Empire. He immediately took under his protection, as pope, the new order of things in the capital and the empire of the East. "The bishop of Rome at last appointed the bishop of Constantinople. The acknowledgment of papal supremacy was complete. Rome and Venice divided between them the ill-gotten gains of their undertaking."22 Yet, beyond all these things, Innocent III stands pre-eminent

as the great persecutor. The crusading spirit, in its fanaticism and savagery, he turned against the "heretics," especially the Albigenses; he was the founder of the Inquisition. His exploits in these things, however, will have to be deferred to another chapter.

43. By the ministry of Innocent III all Christendom -- not only all Europe, but Constantinople, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, even the whole East -- had been brought into subjection to the papacy. Every ruler, every power of the recognized world, excepting only the Mohammedan, was subject to the papacy. And this triumph was crowned -- this, too, by Innocent III -- with the calling of "the Parliament of Christendom, the twelfth general council." The council assembled Nov. 1, 1215, and Innocent's boundless "ambition was gratified in opening and presiding over the most august assemblage that Latin Christianity had ever seen. The Frankish occupation of Constantinople gave opportunity for the reunion, nominal at least, of the Eastern and the Western

churches, and patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem were there in humble obedience to St. Peter. All that was foremost in Church and State had come, in person or by representative. Every monarch had his ambassador there, to see that his interests suffered no detriment from a body, which, acting under the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and under the principle that temporal concerns were wholly subordinate to spiritual, might have little respect for the rights of sovereigns. The most learned theologians and doctors were at hand to give counsel as to points of faith and intricate questions of canon law. The princes of the Church were present in numbers wholly unprecedented. Besides patriarchs, there were seventy-one primates and metropolitans, four hundred and twelve bishops, more than eight hundred abbots and priors, and the countless delegates of these prelates who were unable to attend in person." -- Lea.23

44. The claims of the papacy which had been lifted to such a prodigious height by Innocent III, was at that height maintained by his successors. Through all the years that followed the reign of Innocent III there was almost constant war between the successive popes and the emperor Frederick II, until the death of Frederick in 1250. In

June, 1243, Cardinal Fiesco was elected to the papal throne. "He took the name of --

INNOCENT IV, JUNE 24, 1243, TO DEC. 7, 1254,

an omen and a menace that he would tread in the footsteps of Innocent-III." While he was only Cardinal Fiesco, he had been a personal friend, and even a partisan, of Frederick II, in his contest with the ever-increasing encroachment of the papacy. When the Cardinal Fiesco was elected pope, Frederick was congratulated that his good friend was now pope. But Frederick understood the papacy better than did those who thus congratulated him; and, in his reply, he pierced to the heart of the very genius of the papacy: "In the cardinal I have lost my best friend; in the pope I shall find my worst enemy."

45. This observation of Frederick's not only expressed a general truth of the whole papacy, but he found it abundantly true in his own experience. In 1245 the new pope excommunicated Frederick. Frederick defied him, and appealed to Christendom. Against Frederick's defiance and appeal, Innocent IV set forth anew the claims of the papacy, carrying them yet higher than ever. Hitherto the popes had traced only to Constantine their title to temporal and imperial power; but now, by Innocent IV, it is carried even to Christ himself. In reply to Frederick II, Innocent IV wrote to Christendom as follows: --

"When the sick man who has scorned milder remedies is subjected to the knife and the cautery, he complains of the cruelty of the physician: when the evil-doer, who has despised all warning is at length punished, he arraigns his judge. But the physician only looks to the welfare of the sick man, the judge regards the crime, not the person of the criminal. The emperor doubts and denies that all things and all men are subject to the see of Rome. As if we who are to judge angels are not to give sentence on all earthly things. In the Old Testament priests dethroned unworthy kings; how much more is the vicar of Christ justified in proceeding against him who, expelled from the Church as a heretic, is already the portion of hell! Ignorant persons aver that Constantine first gave temporal power to the see of Rome; it was already bestowed by Christ himself, the true king and priest, as inalienable from its nature and absolutely unconditional. Christ founded not only a pontifical but a royal sovereignty, and committed to Peter the rule both of an earthly and a heavenly kingdom, as is indicated and visibly proved by the plurality of the keys. 'The power of the sword is in the

Church and derived from the Church;' she gives it to the emperor at his coronation, that he may use it lawfully and in her defense; she has the right to say, 'Put up thy sword into its sheath.' He strives to awaken the jealousy of other temporal kings, as if the relation of their kingdoms to the pope were the same as those of the electoral kingdom of Germany and the kingdom of Naples. The latter is a papal fief; the former inseparable from the

empire, which the pope transferred as a fief from the East to the West. To the pope belongs the coronation of the emperor, who is thereby bound by the consent of ancient and modern times to allegiance and subjection."24

46. From the high point thus reached by Innocent IV, it was but a single step to the pinnacle of papal claim as respects temporal power. This step was taken, the pinnacle was reached, the absolute unity of Church and State was attained, by --

BONIFACE VIII, DEC. 24, 1294, TO OCT. 11, 1303.

"As Gregory VII appears the most usurping of mankind till we read
the history of Innocent III, so Innocent III is thrown into the shade by the superior audacity of Boniface VIII." -- Hallam.25

47. In 1300 there was a papal jubilee. Boniface issued a bull "granting a full remission of all sins" to such as should, "in the present year, or in any other hundredth year," visit the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome. This brought to Rome an immense crowd of people: at times as many as two hundred thousand strangers at once. Early in that year also came the ambassadors of an emperor-elect. Boniface declared to them that the election of their master was null, and that he did not recognize him as either king of the Romans or as emperor. Then, on a great day of the jubilee, Boniface himself appeared in the sight of the multitude, clothed in a cuirass, with a helmet on his head, and a sword in his hand held aloft, and exclaimed: --

"There is no other Caesar, nor king, nor emperor, than I, the sovereign pontiff and successor of the apostles."

48. And when, afterward, he did recognize as emperor the one who had been elected, he would do so only upon the exaction of the following declaration from the emperor-elect: --

"I recognize the empire to have been transferred by the holy see from the Greeks to the Germans, in the person of Charlemagne; that the right of choosing the king of the Romans has been delegated by the pope to certain ecclesiastical or secular princes; and, finally, that the sovereigns receive from the chiefs of the Church the power of the material sword."26

49. Two years later, 1302, this was followed by a confirming bull, unum sanctum, in which Pope Boniface VIII, ex cathedra, declared: --

"There are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal: our Lord said not of these two swords, 'It is too much,' but, 'it is enough.' Both are in the power of the Church: the one the spiritual, to be used by the Church, the other the material, for the Church: the former that of priests, the latter that of kings and soldiers, to be wielded at the command and by the sufferance of the priest. One sword must be under the other, the temporal under the spiritual. . . . The spiritual instituted the temporal power, and judges whether that power is well exercised. It has been set over the nations and over the kingdoms to root up and pull down. If the temporal power errs, it is judged by the spiritual. To deny this, is to assert, with the heretical Manicheans, two coequal principles. We therefore assert, define, and pronounce that it is NECESSARY TO SALVATION to believe that every human being is subject to the pontiff of Rome."27

50. "Another bull pronounces all persons of whatever rank obliged to appear when personally cited before the audience or apostolical tribunal at Rome; 'since such is our pleasure, who, by divine permission, rule the world.'"28

51. It is perfectly fitting that this height of papal arrogance should have been reached in Boniface VIII, for "of all the Roman pontiffs, Boniface has left the darkest name for craft, arrogance, ambition, even for avarice

and cruelty. . . . Boniface VIII has not merely handed down, and justly, as the pontiff of the loftiest spiritual pretensions, pretensions which, in their language at least, might have appalled Hildebrand or Innocent III, but almost all contemporary history as well as poetry, from the sublime verse of Dante to the vulgar but vigorous rhapsodies of Jacopone da Todi, are full of those striking and unforgotten touches of haughtiness and rapacity . . . which, either by adherence to

principles grown unpopular, or by his own arrogance and violence, he had raised in great part of Christendom. Boniface was hardly dead when the epitaph, which no time can erase, from the impression of which the most candid mind strives with difficulty to emancipate itself, was proclaimed to the unprotesting Christian world: 'He came in like a fox, he ruled like a lion, he died like a dog.'"29

1[Page 397] "History of England," chap. ix, par. 2.

2[Page 397] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. iv, book viii, chap, vii, par. 4.

3[Page 398] Id., last paragraph but one.

4[Page 400] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Hadrian IV, last paragraph but one.

5[Page 400] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. iv, book ix, chap. i, par. 8.

6[Page 400] "Lives of the Popes,"Innocent III, par. 2.

7[Page 401] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. iv, book ix, chap. 4, par.11.

8[Page 403] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. iv, book ix, chap. iv, par. 4 form end.

9[Page 404] "Id., Vol. v, book ix, chap. v, par. 3.

10[Page 405] "Id., par. 5.

11[Page 406] "History of England," chap. xi, par. 24.

12[Page 407] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. v. book ix, chap. v. par.11.

13[Page 408] "Id., par. 15.

14[Page 409] "Id., par. 17.

15[Page 411] "Id., para. 26-28.

16 Id.

17[Page 412] Id., book ix, chap. ii, par. 4.

18[Page 414] Id., para. 15-19.

19[Page 415] Id., par. 21.

20 Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Innocent III.

21[Page 417] "History of the Intellectual Development of Europe," Vol. ii, chap. ii, par. 43.

22 Id., par. 44.

23[Page 418] "History of the Inquisition," Vol. i, p. 181.

24[Page 420] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. v. book x, chap. v. par. 21.

25 "Middle Ages," or chap. vii, par 27 from end.

26[Page 421] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," Boniface VIII.

27 Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vi, book xi, chap. ix, par. 27.

28 Id., par. 24 from end.

29[Page 422] Id., chap. vii, par. 1

18. THE PAPAL EMPIRE

THE dominion claimed by the papacy is the heart and life, the soul, of man. As essential to the proper administration of this dominion, she claimed that the temporal power of the world must be absolutely subject to her will. This power she had now gained. By it her dominion over man had become complete. Particular acts of individual popes were often contested; but the legitimacy and power of her empire there was none to dispute.

2. Therefore the proper inquiry next to be made is, How did the papacy use her power? The answer to this question is as full, direct, and explicit as any one can reasonably ask. This answer is given more fully, and yet more briefly, in Lea's "History of the Inquisition" than in any other single work. This history of the Inquisition is the latest that has been written: published in 1888; its evidences are unquestionable; while its opinions are so favorable to the papacy as to almost, if not altogether, an apology for her. For these reasons, it will here be largely quoted.1 We have seen how the papacy treated the Mohammedans and the Jews. We have seen how she treated the people of the Greek Church. We have seen how she treated those of her own who were emperors, kings, and nobles. How did she treat the common people and the poor of her own acknowledged people -- those who were heart, soul, and body her own?

3. As the twelfth century drew to a close, the Church was approaching a crisis in its career. The vicissitudes of a hundred and fifty years, skillfully improved, had rendered it the mistress of Christendom. . . . Over soul and conscience" the "empire" of "priests was complete. No Christian could hope for salvation who was not in all things an obedient son of the Church, and who was not ready to take up arms in

its defense. . . The ancient independence of the episcopate was no more. Step Ly step the supremacy of the Roman see had been asserted and enforced, until it enjoyed the universal jurisdiction which enabled it to bend to its wishes every prelate, under the naked alternative of submission or expulsion. The papal mandate, just or unjust, reasonable or unreasonable, was to be received and implicitly obeyed, of there was no appeal from the representative of St. Peter. In a narrower sphere, and subject to the pope, the bishop held an authority which, at

least in theory, was equally absolute; while the humbler minister of the alter was the instrument by which the decrees of pope and bishop were enforced among the people; for the destiny of a all men lay in the hands which could administer or withhold the sacraments essential to salvation.

4. "Beside supervision over matters of faith and discipline, of marriage, of inheritance, and of usury, which belonged to them by general consent, there were comparatively few questions between man and man which could not be made to include some case of conscience involving the interpolation of spiritual interference, especially when agreements were customarily confirmed with the sanction of the oath; and the cure of souls implied a perpetual inquest over the aberrations, positive or possible, of every member of the flock. It would be difficult to set bounds to the intrusion upon the concerns of every man which was thus rendered possible, or to the influence thence derivable. Not only did the humblest priest wield a supernatural power which marked him as one elevated above the common level of humanity, but his person and possessions were alike inviolable. No matter what crimes he might commit, secular justice could not take cognizance of them, and secular officials could not arrest him. He was amenable only to the tribunals of his own order, which were debarred from inflicting punishments involving the effusion of blood, and from whose decisions an appeal to the supreme jurisdiction of distant Rome conferred too often virtual immunity."

5. In England conditions were not any worse than on the Continent, if they were so bad, and there "crimes of the deepest dye murders, robberies, adulteries rapes, were daily committed with impunity by the ecclesiastics. It had been found, for instance on inquiry,that no less than a hundred murders had since the king's [Henry II] accession [1154-1163], been perpetrated by men of the profession, who had never

been called to account for these offenses; and holy orders were become a full protection for all enormities."

6. It was held by the Church that "spiritual penalties alone could be inflicted" in cases of offenses of the clergy. When a cleric had ruined a gentleman's daughter, and to protect himself had murdered her father, and King Henry II required that "the clerk should be delivered up and receive condign punishment from the magistrate, Becket insisted on the Privileges of the Church; confined the criminal in the bishop's prison, lest he should be sized by the kings's officers; maintained that no greater punishment could be inflicted on him than degradation; and when the King demanded that immediately after he was degraded he should be tried by the civil power, the primate asserted that it was iniquitous to try a man twice upon the same offense." -- Hume.2 "The same privilege protected ecclesiastical property, conferred on the Church by the piety of successive generations, and covering no small portion of the most fertile lands of Europe. Moreover, the seignoral rights attaching to those lands often carried extensive temporal jurisdiction, which gave to their ghostly possessors the power over life and limb enjoyed by feudal lords.

7. "The Church militant was thus an army encamped on the soil of Christendom, with its outposts everywhere, subject to the most efficient discipline, animated with a common purpose, every soldier panoplied with inviolability and armed with the tremendous weapons which slew the soul. There was little that could not be dared or done by the commander of such a force, whose orders were listened to as oracles of God, from Portugal to Palestine and from Sicily to Iceland. `Princes,' says John of Salisbury, 'derive their power from the Church, and are servants of the priesthood.' 'The least of the priestly order is worthier than any king,' exclaims Honorius of Autun; 'prince and people are subjected to the clergy, which shines superior as the sun to the moon.' Innocent III used a more spiritual metaphor when he declared that the priestly power was as superior to the secular as the soul of man was to his body; and he summed up his estimate of his own position by pronouncing himself to be the vicar of Christ, the Christ of the Lord, the God of Pharaoh, placed midway between God and man, this side of God

but beyond man, less than God but greater than man, who judges all, and is judged by none. That he was supreme over all the earth -- over pagans and infidels as well as over Christians -- was legally proved and universally taught by the mediaeval doctors.

8. "Yet, in achieving this supremacy, much had been of necessity sacrificed. The Christian virtues of humility and charity and self-abnegation had virtually disappeared in the contest which left the spiritual power dominant over the temporal. The affection of the populations was no longer attracted by the graces and loveliness, of Christianity; submission was purchased by the promise of salvation, to be acquired by faith and obedience, or was extorted by the threat of perdition, or by the sharper terrors of earthly persecution. If the Church, by sundering itself completely from the laity, had acquired the services of a militia devoted wholly to itself, it had thereby created an antagonism between itself and the people.

9. "Practically, the whole body of Christians no longer constituted the Church; that body was divided into two essentially distinct classes, the shepherds and the sheep; and the lambs were often apt to think, not unreasonably, that they were tended only to be shorn. The worldly prizes offered to ambition by an ecclesiastical career drew into the ranks of the Church able men, it is true, but men whose object was worldly ambition rather than spiritual development. The immunities and privileges of the Church, and the enlargement of its temporal acquisitions were objects held more at heart than the salvation of souls, and its high places were filled, for the most part, with men whom worldliness was more conspicuous than the humbler virtues.

10. "While angles would have been required to exercise becomingly the tremendous powers claimed and acquired by the Church, the methods by which clerical preferment and promotion were secured were such as to favor the unscrupulous rather than the deserving. To understand fully the causes which drove so many thousands into schism and heresy, leading to wars and persecutions, and the establishment of the Inquisition, it is necessary to cast a glance at the character of the men who represented the Church before the people, and at the use which they made, for good cr for evil, of the absolute spiritual despotism which had become established. In wise and devout hands it might elevate incalculably the

moral and material standards of European civilization; in the hands of the selfish and depraved it could become the instrument of minute and all-pervading oppression, driving whole nations to despair.

11. "As regards the methods of election to the episcopate there can not be said at this period to have been any settled and invariable rule. The ancient form of election by the clergy, with the acquiescence of the people of the diocese, was still preserved in theory, but in practice the electoral body consisted of the cathedral canons; while the confirmation required of the king, or semi-independent feudal noble, and of the pope, in a time of unsettled institutions, frequently rendered the election an empty form, in which the royal or papal power might prevail, according to the tendencies of time and place. The constantly increasing appeals to Rome, as to the tribunal of last resort, by disappointed aspirants, under every imaginable pretext, gave to the holy see a rapidly growing influence, which, in many cases, amounted almost to the power of appointment; and Innocent II, at the Lateran Council of 1139, applied the feudal system to the Church by declaring that all ecclesiastical dignities were received and held of the popes like fiefs.

12. "Whatever rules, however, might be laid down, they could not operate in rendering the elect better than the electors. The stream will not rise above its source, and a corrupt electing or appointing power is not apt to be restrained from the selection of fitting representatives of itself by methods, however ingeniously devised, which have not the inherent ability of self-enforcement. The oath which cardinals were obliged to take on entering a conclave -- `I call God to witness that I choose him whom I judge according to God ought to be chosen'-- was notoriously inefficacious in securing the election of pontiffs fitted to serve as the vicegerents of God; and so, from the humblest parish priest to the loftiest prelate, all grades of the hierarchy were likely to be filled by worldly, ambitious, self-seeking, and licentious men. The material to be selected from, moreover, was of such a character that even the most exacting friends of the Church had to content themselves when the least

worthless was successful. St. Peter Damiani, in asking Gregory VI the confirmation of a bishop-elect of Fossombrone, admits that he is unfit, and that he ought to undergo penance before undertaking the episcopate, but yet there is nothing better to be done, for in the whole

428

diocese there was not a single ecclesiastic worthy of the office; all were selfishly ambitious, too eager for preferment to think of rendering themselves worthy of it, inflamed with desire for power, but utterly careless as to its duties.

13. "Under these circumstances simony, with all its attendant evils, was almost universal, and those evils made themselves everywhere felt on the character both of electors and elected. In the fruitless war waged by Gregory VII and his successors against this all-pervading vice, the number of bishops assailed is the surest index of the means which had been found successful, and of the men who thus were enabled to represent the apostles. As Innocent III declared, it was a disease of the Church immedicable by either soothing remedies or fire; and Peter Cantor, who died in the odor of sanctity, relates with approval the story of a Cardinal Martin, who, on officiating in the Christmas solemnities at the Roman court, rejected a gift of twenty pounds sent him by the papal chancellor, for the reason that it was notoriously the product of rapine and simony.

14. "It was related as a supreme instance of the virtue of Peter, cardinal of St. Chrysogono, formerly bishop of Meaux, that he had, in a single election, refused the dazzling bribe of five hundred marks of silver. Temporal princes were more ready to turn the power of confirmation to profitable account, and few imitated the example of Philip Augustus, who, when the abbacy of St. Denis became vacant, and the Provost, the treasurer, and the cellarer of the abbey each sought him secretly, and gave him five hundred livres for the succession, quietly, went to the abbey, picked out a simple monk standing in a corner, conferred the dignity on him, and handed him the fifteen hundred livres. The Council of Rouen, in 1050, complains bitterly of the pernicious custom by which ambitious men accumulated, by every possible means, presents wherewith to gain the favor of the prince and his courtiers in order to obtain bishoprics, but it could suggest no remedy. . . .

15. "Under such influences it was in vain that the better class of men who occasionally appeared in the ranks of the hierarchy . . . struggled to enforce respect for religion and morality. The current against them was too strong, and they could do little but protest and offer an example which few were found to follow. In those days of violence

429

the meek and humble had little chance, and the prizes were for those who could intrigue and chaffer, or whose martial tendencies offered promise that they would make the rights of their churches and vassals respected. In fact, the military character of the mediaeval prelates is a subject which it would be interesting to consider in more detail than space will here admit. The wealthy abbeys and powerful bishoprics came to be largely regarded as appropriate means to provide for younger sons of noble houses, or to increase the influence of leading families. By such methods as we have seen they passed into the hands of those whose training had been military rather than religious. The miter and cross had no more scruple than the knightly pennon to be seen in the forefront of battle. When excommunication failed to bring to reason restless vassals or encroaching neighbors, there was prompt recourse to the fleshly arm, and the plundered peasant could not distinguish between the ravages of the robber baron and of the representative of Christ. . . .

16. "The people, on whom fell the crushing weight of these conflicts, could only look upon the baron and priest as enemies both; and whatever might be lacking in the military ability of the spiritual warriors, was compensated for by their seeking to kill the souls as well as the bodies of their foes. This was especially the case in Germany, where the prelates were princes as well as priests, and where a great religious house like the abbey of St. Gall was the temporal ruler of the cantons of St. Gall and Appenzell, until the latter threw off the yoke after a long and devastating war. The historian of the abbey chronicles with pride the martial virtues of

successive abbots, and in speaking of Ulric III, who died in 1117, he remarks that, worn out with many battles, he at last passed away in peace. All this was in some sort a necessity of the incongruous union of feudal noble and Christian prelate, and though more marked in Germany than elsewhere, it was to be seen everywhere."

17. "The impression which these worldly and turbulent men made upon their quieter contemporaries was, that pious souls believed that no bishop could reach the Kingdom of heaven. There was a story widely circulated of Geoffroi de Peronne, prior of Clairvaux, who was elected bishop of Tournay, and who was urged by St. Bernard and Eugenius III to accept, but who cast himself on the ground, saying, 'If you turn me

out, I may become a vagrant monk, but a bishop never!' On his deathbed he promised a friend to return and report as to his condition in the other world, and did so as the latter was praying at the altar. He announced that he was among the blessed, but it had been revealed to him by the Trinity that if he had accepted the bishopric, he would have been numbered with the damned. Peter of Blois, who relates this story, and Peter Cantor, who repeats it, both manifested their belief in it by persistently refusing bishoprics; and not long after an ecclesiastic in Paris declared that he could believe all things except that any German bishop could be saved, because they bore the two swords, of the spirit and of the flesh.

18. "All this Caesarius of Heisterbach explains by the rarity of the worthy prelates, and the superabounding multitude of wicked ones; and he further points out that the tribulations to which they were exposed arose from the fact that the hand of God was not visible in their promotion. Language can scarce be stronger than that employed by Louis VII, in describing the worldliness and pomp of the bishops, when he vainly appealed to Alexander III to utilize his triumph over Frederick Barbarossa by reforming the Church. In fact, the records of the time bear ample testimony of the rapine and violence, the flagrant crimes and defiant immorality of these princes of the Church. The only tribunal to which they were amenable was that of Rome. It required the courage of desperation to cause complaints to be made there against them, and when such complaints were made, the difficulty of proving charges, the length to which proceedings were drawn out, and the notorious venality of the Roman curia, afforded virtual immunity. . . . We can readily believe the assertion of a writer of the thirteenth century, that the process of deposing a prelate was so cumbrous that even the most wicked had no dread of punishment.

19. "Even where the enormity of offenses did not call for papal intervention, the episcopal office was prostituted in a thousand ways of oppression and exaction which were sufficiently within the law to afford the sufferers no opportunity of redress. How thoroughly its profitable nature was recognized, is shown by the case of a bishop who, when fallen in years, summoned together his nephews and relatives that they might agree among themselves as to his succession. They united

upon one of their number, and conjointly borrowed the large sums requisite to purchase the election. Unluckily the bishop-elect died before obtaining possession, and on his deathbed was heartily objurated by his ruined kinsmen, who saw no means of repaying the borrowed capital which they had invested in the abortive episcopal partnership. As St. Bernard says, boys were inducted into the episcopate at an age when they rejoiced rather at escaping from the ferule of their teachers than at acquiring rule; but, soon growing insolent, they learn to sell the altar and empty the pouches of their subjects!

20. "In thus exploiting their office the bishops only followed the example set them by the papacy, which, directly or through its agents, by its exactions, made itself the terror of the Christian churches. Arnold. who was archbishop of Treves from 1169 to 1183, won great credit for his astuteness in saving his people from spoliation by papal nuncios; for whenever he heard of their expected arrival, he used to go to meet them, and by heavy bribes induce them to bend their steps elsewhere, to the infinite relief of his own flock. In 1160 the Templars

complained to Alexander III that their labors for the Holy Land were seriously impaired by the extortions of papal legates and nuncios, who were not content with the free quarters and supply of necessaries to which they were entitled, and Alexander graciously granted the Order special exemption from the abuse, except when the legate was a cardinal.

21. "It was worse when the a pope came himself. Clement V, after his consecration at Lyons, made a progress to Bordeaux, in which he and his retinue so effectually plundered the churches on the road that, after his departure from Bourges, Archbishop Gilles, in order to support life, was obliged to present himself daily among his canons for a share in the distribution of provisions; and the papal residence at the wealthy priory of Grammont so impoverished the house that the prior resigned in despair of being able to re-establish its affairs, and his successor was obliged to levy a heavy tax on all the houses of the Order.

22. "England, after the ignominious surrender of King John, was peculiarly subjected to papal extortion. Rich benefices were bestowed on foreigners, who made no pretext of residence, until the annual revenue thus withdrawn from the island was computed to amount to seventy thousand marks, or three times the income of the crown, and all resistance

was suppressed by excommunications which disturbed the whole kingdom. At the general Council of Lyons, held in 1245, an address was presented in the name of the Anglican Church, complaining of these oppressions in terms more energetic than respectful, but it accomplished nothing. Ten years later the papal legate, Rustand, made a demand in the name of Alexander IV for an immense subsidy -- the share of the abbey of St. Albans was no less than six hundred marks -- when Fulk, bishop of London, declared that he would be decapitated, and Walter of Worcester that he would be hanged, sooner than submit; but this resistance was broken down by the device of trumping up fictitious claims of debts due Italian bankers for moneys alleged to have been advanced to defray expenses before the Roman curia, and these claims were enforced by excommunication. When Robert Grosseteste of Lincoln found that his efforts to reform his clergy were rendered nugatory by appeals to Rome, where the offenders could always purchase immunity, he visited Innocent IV in hopes of obtaining some change for the better, and on utterly failing, he bluntly exclaimed to the pope, 'Oh, money, money, how much thou canst effect, especially in the Roman court!'"

23. "This was by no means the only mode in which the supreme jurisdiction of Rome worked inestimable evil throughout Christendom. While the feudal courts were strictly territorial and local, and the judicial functions of the bishops were limited to their own dioceses so that every man knew to whom he was responsible in a tolerably well-settled system of justice, the universal jurisdiction of Rome gave ample opportunity for abuses of the worst kind. The pope, as supreme judge, could delegate to any one any portion of his authority, which was supreme everywhere; and the papal chancery was not too nice in its discrimination as to the character of the persons to whom it issued letters empowering them to exercise judicial functions and enforce them with the last dread sentence of excommunication -- letters, indeed, which, if the papal chancery is not wronged, were freely sold to all able to pay for them. Europe was thus traversed by multitudes of men armed with these weapons, which they used without remorse for extortion and oppression. Bishops, too, were not backward in thus farming out their more limited jurisdictions, and, in the confusion thus arising, it was not difficult for reckless adventurers to pretend to the possession of these delegated powers

and use them likewise for the basest purposes, no one daring to risk the possible consequences of resistance.

24. "These letters thus afforded a carte blanche through which injustice could be perpetrated and malignity gratified to the fullest extent. An additional complication which not unnaturally followed was the fabrication and falsification of these letters. It was not easy to refer to distant Rome to ascertain the genuineness of a papal brief confidently produced by its bearer, and the impunity with which powers so tremendous could be

assumed was irresistibly attractive. When Innocent III ascended the throne, he found a factory of forged letters in full operation in Rome, and although this was suppressed, the business was too profitable to be broken up by even his vigilance. To the end of his pontificate the detection of fraudulent briefs was a constant preoccupation. Nor was this industry confined to Rome. About the same period Stephen, bishop of Tournay, discovered in his episcopal city a similar nest of counterfeiters, who had invented an ingenious instrument for the fabrication of the papal seals. To the people, however, it mattered little whether they were genuine or fictitious; the suffering was the same whether the papal chancery had received its fee or not.

25. "Thus the Roman curia was a terror to all who were brought in contact with it. Hildebert of le Mans pictures its officials as selling justice, delaying decisions on every pretext, and, finally, oblivious when bribes were exhausted. They were stone as to understanding, wood as to rendering judgment, fire as to wrath, iron as to forgiveness, foxes in deceit, bulls in pride, and Minotaurs in consuming everything. In the next century Robert Grosseteste boldly told Innocent IV and his cardinals that the curia was the source of all the vileness which rendered the priesthood a hissing and a reproach to Christianity, and, after another century and a half, those who knew it best described it as unaltered.

26. "When such was the example set by the head of the Church, it would have been a marvel had not too many bishops used all their abundant opportunities for the fleecing of their flocks. Peter Cantor, an unexceptional witness, describes them as fishers for money and not for souls, with a thousand frauds to empty the pockets of the poor. They have, he says, three hooks with which to catch their prey in the depths -- the confessor, to whom is committed the hearing of confessions and the

cure of souls; the dean, archdeacon, and other officials, who advance the interest of the prelate by fair means or foul; and the rural provost, who is chosen solely with regard to his skill in squeezing the pockets of the poor and carrying the spoil to his master. These places were frequently farmed out, and the right to torture and despoil the people was sold to the highest bidder. The general detestation in which these gentry were held is illustrated by the story of an ecclesiastic who, having by an unlucky run of the dice lost all his money but five sols, exclaimed in blasphemous madness that he would give them to any one who would teach him how most greatly to offend God, and a bystander was adjudged to have won the money when he said, 'If you wish to offend God beyond all other sinners, become an episcopal official or collector.' Formerly, continues Peter Cantor, there was some decent concealment in absorbing the property of rich and poor, but now it is publicly and boldly seized through infinite devices and frauds and novelties of extortion. The officials of the prelates are not only their leeches, who suck and are squeezed, but are strainers of the milk of their rapine, retaining for themselves the dregs of sin.

27. "From this honest burst of indignation we see that the main instrument of exaction and oppression was the judicial functions of the episcopate. Considerable revenues, it is true, were derived from the sale of benefices and the exaction of fees for all official acts, and many prelates did not blush to derive a filthy gain from the licentiousness universal among a celibate clergy by exacting a tribute known as `cullagium,' on payment of which the priest was allowed to keep his concubine in peace; but the spiritual jurisdiction was the source of the greatest profit to the prelate and of the greatest misery to the people. Even in the temporal courts, the fines arising from litigation formed no mean portion of the income of the seigneurs; and in the Courts Christian, embracing the whole of spiritual jurisprudence and much of temporal, there was an ample harvest to be gathered. Thus, as Peter Cantor says, the most holy sacrament of matrimony, owing to the remote consanguinity coming within the prohibited degrees, was made a subject of derision to the laity by the venality with which marriages were made and unmade to fill the pouches of the episcopal officials.

28. "Excommunication was another fruitful source of extortion. If

an unjust demand was resisted, the recalcitrant was excommunicated, and then had to pay for reconciliation in addition to the original sum. Any delay in obeying a summons to the Court of Officiality entailed excommunication with the same result of extortion. When litigation was so profitable, it was encouraged to the utmost, to the infinite wretchedness of the people. When a priest was inducted into a benefice, it was customary to exact of him an oath that he would not overlook any offenses committed by his parishioners, but would report them to the Ordinary, that the offenders might be prosecuted and fined, and that he would not allow any quarrels to be settled amicably; and though Alexander III issued a decretal pronouncing all such oaths void, yet they continued to be required. As an illustration of the system a case is recorded where a boy in play accidentally killed a comrade with an arrow. The father of the slayer chanced to be wealthy, and the two parents were not permitted to be reconciled gratuitously. Peter of Blois, archdeacon of Bath, was probably not far wrong when he described the episcopal Ordinaries as vipers of iniquity transcending the malice all serpents and basilisks, as shepherds, not of lambs, but of wolves, and as devoting themselves wholly to malice and rapine.

29. "Even more efficient as a cause of misery to the people and hostility toward the Church was the venality of many of the episcopal courts. The character of the transactions and of the clerical lawyers who pleaded before them is visible in an attempted reformation by the Council of Rouen, in 1231, requiring the counsel who practiced in these courts to swear that they would not steal the papers of the other side or produce forgeries or perjured testimony in support of their cases. The judges were well fitted to preside over such a bar. They are described as extortioners who sought by every device to filch the money of suitors to the last farthing, and when any fraud was too glaring for their own performance they had subordinate officials ever ready to play into their hands, rendering their occupation more base than that of a pimp with his bawds.

30. "That money was supreme in all judicial matters was clearly assumed when the abbey of Andres quarreled with the mother-house of Charroux, and the latter assured the former that it could spend in court one hundred marks of silver against every ten livres that the other

could afford; and in effect, when the ten-years' litigation was over, including three appeals to Rome, Andres found itself oppressed with the enormous debt of fourteen hundred livres varisis, while the details of the transaction show the most unblushing bribery. The Roman court set the example to the rest, and its current reputation is visible in the praise bestowed on Eugenius III for rebuking a prior who commenced a suit before him by offering a mark of gold to win his favor.

31. "There was another source of oppression which had a loftier motive and better results, but which was none the less grinding upon the mass of the people. It was about this time that the fashion set in of building magnificent churches and abbeys; and the invention of stained glass and its rapid introduction show the luxury of ornamentation which was sought. While these structures were in some degree the expression of ardent faith, yet more were they the manifestation of the pride of the prelates who erected them, and in our admiration of these sublime relics of the past, in whatever reverential spirit we may view the towering spire, the long-arched nave, and the glorious window, we must not lose sight of the supreme effort which they cost -- an effort which inevitably fell upon suffering serf and peasant. Peter Cantor assures us that they were built out of exactions on the poor, out of the unhallowed gains of usury, and out of the lies and deceits of the quaestuarii or pardoners; and the vast sums lavished upon them, he assures us, would be much better spent in redeeming captives and relieving the necessities of the helpless.

32. "It was hardly to be expected that prelates such as filled most of the sees of Christendom should devote themselves to the real duties of their position. Foremost among these duties was that of preaching the Word of God and instructing their flocks in faith and morals. The office of preacher, indeed, was especially an episcopal function; he was the only man in the diocese authorized to exercise it; it formed no part of the duty or training of the parish priest, who could not presume to deliver a sermon without a special license from his superior. It need not surprise us, therefore, to see this portion of Christian teaching and devotion utterly

neglected, for the turbulent and martial prelates of the day were too wholly engrossed in worldly cares to bestow a thought upon a matter for which their unfitness was complete.

437

33. "The character of the lower orders of ecclesiastics could not be reasonably expected to be better than that of their prelates. Benefices were mostly in the gift of the bishops, though, of course, advowsons were frequently held by the laity; special rights of patronage were held by religious bodies, and many of these latter filled vacancies in their own ranks by co-optation. Whatever was the nominating power, however, the result was apt to be the same. It is the universal complaint of the age that benefices were openly sold, or were bestowed through favor, without examination into the qualifications of the appointee, or the slightest regard as to his fitness. . . . It is true that the canon law was full of admirable precepts respecting the virtues and qualifications requisite for incumbents, but in practice they were a dead letter.

34. "Alexander III was moved to indignation when he learned that the bishop of Coventry was in the habit of giving churches to boys under ten years of age, but he could only order that the cures should be intrusted to competent vicars until the nominees reached a proper age, and this age he himself fixed at fourteen; while other popes charitably reduced to seven the minimum age for holding simple benefices or prebends. No effectual check for abuses of patronage, of course, could be expected of Rome, when the curia itself was the most eager recipient of benefit from the wrong. Its army of pimps and parasites was ever on the watch to obtain fat preferments in all the lands of Europe, and the popes were constantly writing to bishops and chapters demanding places for their friends."

35. "A clergy recruited in such a manner and subjected to such influences could only, for the most part, be a curse to the people under their spiritual direction. A purchased benefice was naturally regarded as a business investment, to be exploited to the utmost profit, and there was little scruple in turning to account every device for extorting money from parishioners, while the duties of the Christian pastorate received little attention."

36. "If the faithful Christian was thus mulcted throughout life at every turn, the pursuit of gain was continued to his deathbed, and even his body had a speculative value which was turned to account by the ghouls who quarreled over it. The necessity of the final sacraments for salvation gave rise to an occasional abuse by which they were refused

438

unless an illegal fee or perquisite was paid, such as the sheet on which the dying sinner lay, but this we may well believe was not usual. More profitable was the custom by which the fears of approaching judgment were exploited and legacies for pious uses were suggested as an appropriate atonement for a life of wickedness or cruelty. It is well known how large a portion of the temporal possessions of the Church was procured in this manner, and already in the ninth century it had become a subject of complaint. In 811 Charlemagne, in summoning provincial councils throughout his empire, asks them whether that man can be truly said to have renounced the world who unceasingly seeks to augment his possessions, and by promises of heaven and threats of hell persuades the simple and unlearned to disinherit their heirs, who are thus compelled by poverty to robbery and crime.

37. "To this pregnant question the Council of Chalons, in 813, responded by a canon forbidding such practices, and reminding the clergy that the Church should succor the needy rather than despoil them; that of Tours replied that it had made inquiry and could find no one complaining of exheredation; that of Rheims prudently passed the matter over in silence; and that of Mainz promised restoration in such cases. This check was but temporary; the Church continued to urge its claims on the fears of the dying, and finally Alexander III, about 1170, decreed that no one could make a valid will except in the presence of his parish priest. In some places the notary drawing a will in the absence of the priest was excommunicated and the body of the testator was refused Christian burial. The reasons sometimes alleged for this was the preventing of a heretic from leaving

his property to heretics, but the flimsiness of this is shown by the repeated promulgation of the rule in regions where heresy was unknown, and the loud remonstrances against local customs which sought to defeat this development of ecclesiastical greed. Complaints were also sometimes made that the parish priest converted to his personal use legacies which were left for the benefit of pious foundations.

38. "Even after death the control which the Church exercised over the living, and the profit to be derived from him, were not abandoned. So general was the custom of leaving considerable sums for the pious ministrations by which the Church lightened the torments of purgatory,

439

and so usual was the bestowal of oblations at the funeral, that the custody of the corpse became a source of gain not to be despised, and the parish in which the sinner had lived and died claimed to have a reversionary right in the ashes which were thus so profitable. Occasionally intruders would trespass upon their preserves, and some monastery would prevail upon the dying to bequeath his fertilizing remains to his care, giving rise to unseemly squabbles over the corpse and the privilege of burying it, and saying mortuary masses for its soul."

39. "On no point were the relations between the clergy and the people more delicate than on that of sexual purity. . . . At the period under consideration the enforced celibacy of the priesthood had become generally recognized in most of the countries owing obedience to the Latin Church. It had not been accompanied, however, by the gift of chastity so confidently promised by its promoters. Deprived as was the priesthood of the gratification afforded by marriage to the natural instincts of man, the wife at best was succeeded by the concubine; at worst by a succession of paramours, for which the functions of priest and confessor gave peculiar opportunity. So thoroughly was this recognized that a man confessing an illicit amour was forbidden to name the partner of his guilt for fear it might lead the confessor into the temptation of abusing his knowledge of her frailty. No sooner had the Church, indeed, succeeded in suppressing the wedlock of its ministers, than we find it everywhere and incessantly busied in the apparently impossible task of compelling their chastity -- an effort the futility of which is sufficiently demonstrated by its continuance to modern times. . . .

40. "The spectacle of a priesthood professing ascetic purity as an essential prerequisite to its functions, and practicing a dissoluteness more cynical than that of the average layman, was not adapted to raise it in popular esteem; while the individual cases in which the peace and honor of families were sacrificed to the lusts of the pastor necessarily tended to rouse the deepest antagonism. As for darker and more deplorable crimes, they were sufficiently frequent, not alone in monasteries from which women were rigorously excluded; and, moreover, they were committed with virtual immunity.

41. "Not the least of the evils involved in the artificial asceticism ostensibly imposed on the priesthood was the erection of a false standard

440

of morality which did infinite harm to the laity as well as to the Church. So long as the priest did not defy the canons by marrying, everything could be forgiven. Alexander II, who labored so strenuously to restore the rule of celibacy, in 1064 decided that a priest of Orange, who had committed adultery with the wife of his father, was not to be deprived of communion for fear of driving him to desperation; and, in view of the fragility of the flesh, he was to be allowed to remain in holy orders, though in the lower grades. Two years later the same pope charitably diminished the penance imposed on a priest of Padua who had committed incest with his mother, and left it to his bishop whether he should be retained in the priesthood. It would be difficult to exaggerate the disastrous influence on the people, of such examples."

42. "If the irregular though permanent connections which everywhere prevailed had been the only result of the prohibition of marriage, there might perhaps have been little practical evil flowing from it, except to the

Church itself and to its guilty members. When the desires of man, however, are once tempted to seek through unlawful means the relief denied to them by artificial rules, it is not easy to set bounds to the unbridled passions which, irritated by the fruitless effort at repression, are no longer restrained by a law which has been broken or a conscience which has lost its power. The records of the Middle Ages are accordingly full of the evidence that indiscriminate license of the worst kind prevailed throughout every rank of the hierarchy.

43. "Even supposing that this fearful immorality were not attributable to the innumerable laws of nature revenging themselves for their attempted violation, it could readily be explained by the example set by the central head. Scarcely had the efforts of Nicholas and Gregory put an end to sacerdotal marriage in Rome when the morals of the Roman clergy became a disgrace to Christendom. How little the results of the reform corresponded with the hopes of the zealous puritans who had brought it about, may be gathered from the martyrdom of a certain Arnolfo, who, under the pontificate of Honorius II, preached vehemently against the scandals and immorality of the ecclesiastics of the apostolic city. They succeeded in making way with him, notwithstanding the protection of Honorius, and the veneration of the nobles and people who regarded him as a prophet.

44. "When such was the condition of clerical virtue, we can scarcely wonder that sufficient suffrages were given in 1130 by the sacred college to Cardinal Pier-Leone to afford him a plausible claim to the papacy, although he was notoriously stained with the foulest crimes. Apparently his children by his sister Tropea, and his carrying about with him a concubine when traveling in the capacity of papal legate, had not proved a bar to his elevation in the Church, nor to his employment in the most conspicuous and important affairs. A severer satire on the standard of ecclesiastical morality could scarcely be imagined than the inculcation by such a man, in his capacity as pope, of the canons requiring the separation of priests from their wives, on the plea of the spotless purity required for the service of the altar."

45. "While thus attaching so fanciful a holiness to virginity, the Church came practically to erect a most singular standard of morality, the influence of which could but be most deplorable on the mass of the laity. In the earlier days of celibacy, the rule was regarded by the severer ecclesiastics as simply an expression of the necessity of purity in the minister of God. Theophilus of Alexandria, in the fifth century, decided that a man, who as lector had been punished for unchasity and had subsequently risen to the priesthood, must be expelled on account of his previous sin. We have seen, however, how, when celibacy was revived under Damiani and Hildebrand, the question of immorality virtually disappeared, and the essential point became, not that a priest should be chaste, but that he should be unmarried, and this was finally adopted as the recognized law of the Church.

46. "In 1213 the archbishop of Lunden inquired of Innocent III whether a man who had had two concubines was ineligible to orders as a digamus, and the pontiff could only reply that no matter how many concubines a man might have, either at one time or in succession, he did not incur the disability of digamy. When such was the result of seven centuries of assiduous sacerdotalism in a Church which was daily growing in authority; when the people thus saw that sexual excesses were no bar to ecclesiastical preferment in that Church which made extravagant pretensions to purity; when the strict rules which forbade ordination to a layman who had married a widow, were relaxed in favor of those who were stained with notorious impurity, it is no wonder that

the popular perceptions of morality became blunted, and that the laity did not deny themselves the indulgences which they saw tacitly allowed to their spiritual guides.

47. "Nor was it only in stimulating this general laxity of principle that the influence of the Church was disastrous. The personal evil wrought by a dissolute priesthood was a widespreading contagion. The abuse of the

lawful authority given by the altar and the confessional, was a subject of sorrowful and indignant denunciation in too many synods for a reasonable doubt to be entertained of its frequency or of the corruption which it spread through innumerable parishes and nunneries. The almost entire practical immunity with which these and similar scandals were perpetrated led to an undisguised and cynical profligacy which the severer churchmen acknowledged to exercise a most deleterious influence on the morals of the laity, who thus saw the exemplars of evil in those who should have been their patterns of virtue.

48. " In his bull of 1259, Alexander IV does not hesitate to declare that the people, instead of being reformed, are absolutely corrupted by their pastors. Thomas of Cantinpre, one of the early lights of the Dominican Order, indeed, is authority for the legend which represents the devil as thanking the prelates of the Church for conducting all Christendom to hell; and the conviction which thus expressed itself is justified by the reproach of Gregory X, who, in dismissing the second Council of Lyons, in 1274, told his assembled dignitaries that they were the ruin of the world. Unfortunately, his threat to reform them if they did not reform themselves, remained unexecuted, and the complaint was repeated again and again."3

49. "In thus reviewing the influence which a nominally celibate clergy exercised over those intrusted to their care, it is perhaps scarcely too much to conclude that they were mainly responsible for the laxity of morals which is a characteristic of mediaeval society. No one who has attentively examined the records left to us of that society, can call in question the extreme prevalence of the licentiousness which everywhere infected it. Christianity had arisen as the great reformer of a world utterly corrupt. How earnestly its reform was directed to correcting

sexual immorality is visible in the persistence with which the apostles condemned and forbade a sin that the Gentiles scarcely regarded as a sin. The early Church was consequently pure, and its very asceticism is a measure of the energy of its protest against the all-pervading license which surrounded it. Its teachings, as we have seen, remained unchanged. Fornication continued to be a mortal sin, yet the period of its unquestioned domination over the conscience of Europe was the very period in which license among the Teutonic races was most unchecked. A Church which, though founded on the gospel, and wielding the illimitable power of the Roman hierarchy, could yet allow the feudal principle to extend to the `jus primae noctis' or `droit de marquette,' and whose ministers in their character of temporal seigneurs could even occasionally claim the disgusting right themselves, was evidently exercising its influence not for good but for evil.

50. "There is no injustice in holding the Church responsible for the lax morality of the laity. It had assumed the right to regulate the consciences of men, and to make them account for every action and even for every thought. When it promptly caused the burning of those who ventured on any dissidence in doctrinal opinion or in matters of pure speculation, it could not plead lack of authority to control them in practical virtue. Its machinery was all-pervading, and its power autocratic. It had taught that the priest was to be venerated as the representative of God, and that his commands were to be implicitly obeyed. It had armed him with the fearful weapon of the confessional, and by authorizing him to grant absolution and to pronounce excommunication, it had delegated to him the keys of heaven and hell. By removing him from the jurisdiction of the secular courts it had proclaimed him as superior to all temporal authority. Through ages of faith the populations had humbly received these teachings and bowed to these assumptions, until they entered into the texture of the daily life of every man. While thus grasping supremacy and using it to the utmost possibility of worldly advantage, the Church therefore could not absolve itself from the responsibilities inseparably connected with power; and chief among these responsibilities is to be numbered the moral training of the nations thus subjected to its will. While the corruption of the teachers thus had necessarily entailed the corruption of the

taught, it is not too much to say that the tireless energy devoted to the acquisition and maintenance of power, privileges, and wealth, if properly directed, under all the advantages of the situation, would have sufficed to render mediaeval society the purest that the world has ever seen.

51. "That the contrary was notoriously the case resulted naturally from the fact that the Church, after the long struggle which finally left it supreme over Europe, contented itself with the worldly advantages derivable from the wealth and authority which surpassed its wildest dreams. If, then, it could secure a verbal submission to its doctrines of purity, it was willing to issue countless commands of chastity and to tacitly connive at their perpetual infraction. The taint of corruption infected equally its own ministers and the peoples committed to their charge, and the sacerdotal theory gradually came to regard with more and more indifference obedience to the gospel in comparison with obedience to man and subservience to the temporal interests of the hierarchy. As absolution and indulgence grew to be a marketable commodity, it even became the interest of the traders in salvation to have a brisk demand for their wares. When infraction of the divine precepts could be redeemed with a few pence or with the performance of ceremonies that had lost their significance, it is not surprising if priest and people at length were led to look upon the violation of the Decalogue with the eye of the merchant and customer rather than with the spirit of the great Lawgiver."4

52. "Yet perhaps the most efficient cause of demoralization in the clergy, and of hostility between them and the laity, was the personal inviolability and the immunity from secular jurisdiction which they succeeded in establishing as a recognized principle of public law. . . . When requested to decide whether laymen could arrest and bring before the episcopal court a clerk caught red-handed in the commission of gross wickedness, Innocent III replied that they could only do so under the special command of a prelate -- which was tantamount to granting virtual impunity in such cases. A sacerdotal body, whose class-privileges of wrongdoing were so tenderly guarded, was not likely to prove itself a desirable element of society; and when the orderly enforcement

of law gradually established itself throughout Christendom, the courts of justice found in the immunity of the ecclesiastic a more formidable enemy to order than in the pretensions of the feudal seigniory. Indeed, when malefactors were arrested, their first effort habitually was to prove their clergy, that they wore the tonsure, and that they were not subject to the jurisdiction of the secular courts, while zeal for ecclesiastical rights, and possibly for fees, always prompted the episcopal officials to support their claims and demand their release. The Church thus became responsible for crowds of unprincipled men, clerks only in name, who used the immunity of their position as a stalking-horse in preying upon the community.

53. "The similar immunity attaching to ecclesiastical property gave rise to abuses equally flagrant. The cleric, whether plaintiff or defendant, was entitled in civil cases to be heard before the spiritual courts, which were naturally partial in his favor, even when not venal, so that justice was scarce to be obtained by the laity. That such, in fact, was the experience is shown by the practice which grew up of clerks purchasing doubtful claims from laymen and then enforcing them before the Courts Christian -- a speculative proceeding, forbidden, indeed, by the councils, but too profitable to be suppressed. Another abuse which excited loud complaint consisted in harassing unfortunate laymen by citing them to answer in the same case in several spiritual courts simultaneously, each of which enforced its process remorselessly by the expedient of excommunication, with consequent fines for reconciliation, on all who by neglect placed themselves in an apparent attitude of contumacy, frequently without even pausing to ascertain whether the parties thus amerced had actually been cited. To estimate properly the amount of wrong and suffering thus inflicted on the community, we must bear in mind that culture and training were almost exclusively confined to the ecclesiastical class, whose sharpened intelligence thus enabled them to take the utmost advantage of the ignorant and defenseless."

54. We have seen the principles and practices of monkery in the first ages of the papacy. With the growth of the papacy through the Middle Ages the evils of monkery increased in equal ratio, if not indeed greater, since monkery was always the leading element in the power of

the papacy. "It abased the episcopate; it increased the authority of the holy see, both directly and indirectly, through the important allies thus acquired in its struggles with the bishops; and it was, moreover, a source of revenue, if we may believe the abbot of Malmesbury, who boasted that for an ounce of gold per year paid to Rome he could obtain exemption from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Salisbury.

55. "In too many cases the abbeys thus became centers of corruption and disturbance, the nunneries scarce better than houses of prostitution, and the monasteries feudal castles where the monks lived riotously and waged war upon their neighbors as ferociously as the turbulent barons, with the added disadvantage that, as there was no hereditary succession, the death of an abbot was apt to be followed by a disputed election producing internal broils and outside interference. Thus in a quarrel of this kind occurring in 1182 the rich abbey of St. Tron was attacked by the bishops of Metz and Liege, the town and abbey were burned, and the inhabitants put to the sword. The trouble lasted until the end of the century, and when it was temporarily patched up by a pecuniary transaction, the wretched vassals and serfs were reduced to starvation to raise the funds which bought the elevation of an ambitious monk.

56. "It is true that all establishments were not lost to the duties for which they had received so abundantly of the benefactions of the faithful. . . . But for the most part the abbeys were sources of evil rather than of good. This is scarce to be wondered at if we consider the material from which their inmates were drawn. It is the severest reproach upon their discipline to find so enthusiastic an admirer of the strict Cistercian rule as Caesarius of Heisterbach asserting as an admitted fact that boys bred in monasteries made bad monks and frequently became apostates. As for those who took the vows in advanced life, he enumerates their motive as sickness, poverty, captivity, infamy, mortal danger, dread of hell or desire of heaven, among which the predominance of selfish impulses was not likely to secure a desirable class of devotees. In fact, he assures us that criminals frequently escaped punishment by agreeing to enter monasteries, which thus in some sort became penal settlements, or prisons, and he illustrates this with the case of a robber baron in 1209, condemned to death for his crimes by the count Palatine

Henry, who was rescued by Daniel, abbot of Schonau, on condition of his entering the Cistercian Order. Scarcely less desirable inmates were those who, moved by a sudden revulsion of conscience, would turn from a life stained with crime and violence to bury themselves in the cloister while yet in the full vigor of strength and with passions unexhausted, finding, perhaps, at last, their fierce and untamed natures unfitted to bear the unaccustomed restraint. . . . If, as sometimes happened, these untamable souls chafed under the irrevocable vow, after the fit of repentance had passed, they offered ample material for internal sedition and external violence."

57. "The name of monk was rendered still more despicable by the crowds of `gyrovagi' and `sarabaitae' and `stertzer' -- wanderers and vagrants, bearded and tonsured, and wearing the religious habit, who traversed every corner of Christendom, living by begging and imposture, peddling false relics and false miracles. This was a pest which had afflicted the Church ever since the rise of monachism in the fourth century, and it continued unabated. Though there were holy and saintly men among these ghostly tramps, yet they were all subjected to common abhorrence. They were often detected in crime and slain without mercy; and in a vain attempt to suppress the evil, the Synod of Cologne, early in the thirteenth century, absolutely forbade that any of them should be received to hospitality throughout that extensive province.

58. "It was not that earnest efforts were lacking to restore the neglected monastic discipline. Individual monasteries were constantly being reformed, to sink back after a time into relaxation and indulgence. Ingenuity was taxed to frame new and severer rules, such as the Premonstratensian, the Carthusian, the Cistercian, which should repel all but the most ardent souls in search of ascetic self-mortification, but as each order grew in repute for holiness, the liberality of the faithful showered wealth upon it, and with wealth came corruption. Or the humble hermitage founded by a few self-denying anchorites, whose only thought was to secure salvation by

macerating the flesh and eluding temptation would become possessed of the relics of some saint, whose wonder-working powers drew flocks of pious pilgrims and sufferers in search of relief. Offerings in abundance would flow in, and the fame and riches thus showered on the modest retreat of the hermits speedily

448

changed it to a splendid structure where the severe virtues of the founders disappeared amid a crowd of self-indulgent monks, indolent in all good works, and active only in evil.

59. "Few communities had the cautious wisdom of the early denizens in the celebrated priory of Grammont, before it became the head of a powerful Order. When its founder and first prior, St. Stephen of Thiern, after his death in 1124, commenced to show his sanctity by curing a paralytic knight and restoring sight to a blind man, his single-minded followers took alarm at the prospect of wealth and notoriety thus about to be forced upon them. His successor, Prior Peter, of Limoges, accordingly repaired to his tomb, and reproachfully addressed him: `O servant of God, thou hast shown us the path of poverty and hast earnestly striven to teach us to walk therein. Now thou wishest to lead us from the straight and narrow way of salvation to the broad road of eternal death. Thou hast preached the solitude, and now thou seekest to convert the solitude into a market-place and a fair. We already believe sufficiently in thy saintliness. Then work no more miracles to prove it, and at the same time to destroy our humility. Be not so solicitous for thy own fame as to neglect our salvation; this we enjoin on thee, this we ask of thy charity. If thou dost otherwise, we declare, by the obedience which we have vowed to thee, that we will dig up thy bones, and cast them into the river.'

60. "This mingled supplication and threat proved sufficient, and until St. Stephen was formally canonized he ceased to perform the miracles so dangerous to the souls of his followers. The canonization, which occurred in 1189, was the result of the first official act of Prior Girard, in applying for it to Clement III, and as Girard had been elected in place of two contestants set aside by papal authority, after dissensions which had almost ruined the monastery, it shows that worldly passions and ambition had invaded the holy seclusion of Grammont, to work out their inevitable result. In the failure of all these partial efforts at reform to rescue the monastic orders from their degradation, we hardly need the emphatic testimony of the venerable Gilbert, abbot of Gemblours, about 1190, when he confesses with shame that monachism had become an oppression and a scandal, a hissing and a reproach to all men.

449

61. "The religion which was thus exploited by priest and monk had necessarily become a very different creed from that taught by Christ and Paul. . . . The theory of justification by works, to which the Church owed so much of its power and wealth, had, in its development, to a great extent deprived religion of all spiritual vitality, replacing its essentials with a dry and meaningless formalism. It was not that men were becoming indifferent to the destiny of their souls, for never, perhaps, have the terrors of perdition, the bliss of salvation, and the never-ending efforts of the archfiend possessed a more burning reality for man; but religion had become in many respects a fetichism. Teachers might still inculcate that pious and charitable works to be efficient, must be accompanied with a change of heart, with repentance, with amendment, with an earnest seeking after Christ and a higher life; but in a gross and hardened generation it was far easier for the sinner to fall into the practices habitual around him, which taught that absolution could be had by the repetition of a certain number of Pater Nosters or Ave Marias, accompanied by the magical sacrament of penitence; nay, even that if the penitent himself were unable to perform the penance enjoined, it could be undertaken by his friends, whose merits were transferred to him by some kind of sacred jugglery. When a congregation, in preparation for Easter, was confessed and absolved as a whole, or in squads and batches, as was customary with some careless priests, the lesson taught was that the sacrament of penitence was a magic ceremony or incantation, in which the internal condition of the soul was a matter of virtual indifference.

62. "More serviceable to the Church, and quite as disastrous in its influence on faith and morals, was the current belief that the posthumous liberality of the deathbed, which founded a monastery or enriched a cathedral

out of the spoils for which the sinner had no further use, would atone for a lifelong course of cruelty and rapine; and that a few weeks' service against the enemies of a pope, would wipe out all the sins of him who assumed the cross to exterminate his fellow Christians."

63. "The Church was the depository of the treasure of salvation, accumulated through the merits of the crucifixion and of the saints; and the pope, as the vicar of God, had the unlimited dispensation of

450

that treasure. It was for him to prescribe the methods by which the faithful could partake of it, and no theologian before Wicklif was hardy enough to question his decisions. According to the modern theory of indulgences they shorten, by specified times, the duration of torment in purgatory, after the soul has escaped condemnation to hell by confession and absolution. In the Middle Ages the distinction was not so nice, and the rewards promised were more direct. At first they consisted in a remission for specified times of the penance imposed for absolution, in return for pious works, pilgrimages to shrines, contributions toward the building of churches, bridges, etc., -- for a spiritual punishment could be commuted to a corporal or to a pecuniary one, and the power to grant such indulgence was a valuable franchise to the Church which obtained it, for it served as a constant attraction to pilgrims.

64. "Abuses, of course, crept in, denounced by Abelard, who vents his indignation at the covetousness which habitually made a traffic of salvation. Alexander III, about 1175, expressed his disapproval of these corruptions, and the great Council of Lateran, in 1215, sought to check the destruction of discipline and the contempt felt for the Church, by limiting to one year the amount of penance released by any one indulgence. Great opposition was excited when St. Francis of Assisi procured, in 1223, from Honorius III the celebrated `Portiuncula' indulgence, whereby all who visited the church of Santa Maria de Portiuncula, at Assisi, from the vespers of August 1 to the vespers of August 2 obtained complete and entire remission of all sins committed since baptism; and even the fact that St. Francis had been directed by God to apply to Honorius for it, and the admission of Satan that this indulgence was depopulating hell, did not serve to reconcile the Dominicans to so great an advantage given to the Franciscans. Boniface VIII, when he conceived the fruitful idea of the jubilee, carried this out still farther by promising to all who should perform certain devotions in the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul during the year 1300, not only plena venia, but plenissima, of all their sins.

65. "By this time the idea that an indulgence might confer entire forgiveness of all sins, had become familiar to the Christian mind. When the Church sought to arouse Europe to supreme exertion for the

451

redemption of the holy sepulcher, some infinite reward was requisite to excite the enthusiastic fanaticism requisite for the Crusades. If Mohammed could stimulate his followers to court death by the promise of immediate and eternal bliss to him who fell fighting for the Crescent, the vicegerent of the true God must not be behindhand in his promises to the martyrs of the cross. It was to be a death-struggle between the two faiths, and Christianity must not be less liberal than Islam in its bounty to its recruits. Accordingly, when Urban II held the great Council of Clermont, which resolved on the first crusade, and where thirteen archbishops, two hundred and fifteen bishops, and ninety mitered abbots represented the universal Church militant, the device of plenary indulgence was introduced, and the military pilgrims were exhorted to have full faith that those who fell repentant would gain the completest fruit of eternal mercy.

66. "The device was so successful that it became an established rule in all the holy wars in which the Church engaged; all the more attractive, perhaps, because of the demoralizing character of the service, for it was a commonplace of the jongleurs [street minstrels, jugglers] of the period, that the crusader, if he escaped the perils of sea and land, was tolerably sure to return home a lawless bandit, even as the pilgrim who went to Rome to secure pardon, came back much worse than he started. As the novelty of crusading wore off, still greater promises were necessary. Thus, in 1291, Nicholas IV promised full remission of sins to every one who would

send a crusader, or go at another's expense; while he who went his own expense was vaguely told that, in addition, he would have an increase of salvation -- a term which the Decretalists perhaps could not find it easy to explain. Finally, forgotten sins were included in the pardon, as well as those confessed and repented."

67. A more demoralizing system of indulgences was that of sending out quaestuarii, or pardoners, sometimes furnished with relics, by a church or hospital in need of money, and sometimes merely carrying papal or episcopal letters, by which they were authorized to issue pardons for sins, in return for contributions. Though these letters were cautiously framed, yet they were ambiguous enough to enable thepardoners to promise, not only the salvation of the living, but the

liberation of the damned from hell, for a few small coins. Already, in 1215, the Council of Lateran inveighs bitterly against these practices, and prohibits the removal of relics from the churches; but the abuse was too profitable to be suppressed.

68. "Needy bishops and popes were constantly issuing such letters, and the business of the pardoner became a regular profession, in which the most impudent and shameless were the most successful; so that we can readily believe the pseudo Peter of Pilichdorf, when he sorrowfully admits that the `indiscreet' but profitable granting of indulgences to all sorts of men, weakened the faith of many Catholics in the whole system. As early as 1261 the Council of Mainz can hardly find words strong enough to denounce the pestilent sellers of indulgences, whose knavish tricks excite the hatred of all men, who spend their filthy gains in vile debauchery, and who so mislead the faithful that confession is neglected on the ground that sinners have purchased forgiveness of their sins. Complaint was useless, however, and the lucrative abuse continued unchecked until it aroused the indignation which found a mouthpiece in Luther."

69. "The sale of indulgences illustrates effectively the sacerdotalism which formed the distinguishing feature of mediaeval religion. The believer did not deal directly with his Creator -- scarce even with the Virgin, or hosts of intercessory saints. The supernatural powers claimed for the priest, interposed him as the mediator between God and man; his bestowal or withholding of the sacraments decided the fate of immortal souls; his performance of the mass diminished or shortened the pains of purgatory; his decision in the confessional determined the very nature of sin itself. The implements which he wielded -- the eucharist, the relics, the holy water, the chrism, the exorcism, the prayer -- became in some sort fetiches, which had a power of their own, entirely irrespective of the moral or spiritual condition of him who employed them, or of him for whom they were employed; and in the popular view the rites of religion could hardly be more than magic formulas which, in some mysterious way, worked to the advantage, temporal and spiritual, of those for whom they were performed.

70. "How sedulously this fetichism was inculcated by those who profited from the control of the fetiches, is shown by a thousand stories

and incidents of the time. Thus a twelfth-century chronicler piously narrates that when, in 887, the relics of St. Martin of Tours were brought home from Auxerre, whither they had been carried to escape the Danish incursions, two cripples of Touraine, who earned an easy livelihood by beggary, on hearing of the approach of the saintly bones, counseled together to escape from the territory as quickly as possible, lest the returning saint should cure them, and thus deprive them of claims on the alms of the charitable. Their fears were well founded, but their means of locomotion were insufficient, for the relics arrived in Touraine before they could get beyond the bounds of the province, and they were cured in spite of themselves. The eagerness with which rival princes and republics disputed with each other the possession of these wonder-working fetiches, and the manner in which the holy objects were obtained by force or fraud, and defended by the same methods, form a curious chapter in the history of human credulity, and show how completely the miraculous virtue was held to reside in

the relic itself, wholly irrespective of the crimes through which it was acquired, or the frame of mind of the possessor.

71. "Thus in the above case, Ingelger of Anjou was obliged to reclaim from the Auxerrois the bones of St. Martin, at the head of an armed force, more peaceful means of recovering the venerated relics having failed; and in 1177 we see a certain Martin, canon of the Breton Church of Bomigny stealing the body of St. Petroc from his own Church, for the benefit of the abbey of St. Mevennes, which would not surrender it until the intervention of King Henry II was brought to bear. Two years after the capture of Constantinople, the Venetian leaders, in 1206, forcibly broke into the church of St. Sophia, and carried off a picture of the Virgin, said to have been painted by St. Luke, in which popular superstition imagined her to reside, and kept it in spite of excommunication and interdict launched against them by the patriarch, and confirmed by the papal legate." "Examples such as these could be multiplied almost indefinitely, but they would only serve to weary the reader. What I have given will probably suffice to illustrate the degeneracy of the Christianity superimposed upon paganism, and wielded by a sacerdotal body so worldly in its aspirations as that of the Middle Ages.

454

72. "The picture which I have drawn of the Church in its relations with the people, is perhaps too unrelieved in its blackness. All popes were not like Innocent IV and John XXII; all bishops were not cruel and licentious; all priests were not intent solely on impoverishing men and dishonoring women. In many sees and abbeys, and in thousands of parishes, doubtless, there were prelates and pastors earnestly seeking to do God's work, and illuminate the darkened souls of their flocks with such gospel light as the superstition of the time would permit. Yet the evil was more apparent than the good; the humble workers passed away unobtrusively, while pride and cruelty and lust and avarice were demonstrative and far-reaching in their influence. Such as I have depicted the Church, it appeared to all the men of the time who had the clearest insight and the loftiest aspirations; and its repulsiveness must be understood by those who would understand the movements that agitated Christendom.

73. "No more unexceptionable witness as to the Church of the twelfth century can be had, than St. Bernard, and he is never weary of denouncing the pride, the wickedness, the ambition, and the lust that reigned everywhere. When fornication, adultery, incest, palled upon the exhausted senses, a zest was sought in deeper depths of degradation. In vain the cities of the plain were destroyed by the avenging fire of heaven; the enemy has scattered their remains everywhere, and the Church is infected with their accursed ashes. The Church is left poor and bare and miserable, neglected and bloodless. Her children seek not to bedeck, but to spoil her; not to guard her, but to destroy her; not to defend, but to expose; not to institute, but to prostitute; not to feed the flock, but to slay and devour it. They exact the price of sins and give no thought to sinners. `Whom can you show me among the prelates who does not seek rather to empty the pockets of his flock than to subdue their vices?' St. Bernard's contemporary, Potho of Pruhm, in 1152, voices the same complaints. The Church is rushing to ruin, and not a hand is raised to stay its downward progress; there is not a single priest fitted to rise up as a mediator between God and man, and approach the divine throne with an appeal for mercy."

74. "One of the main objects in convoking the great Council of Lateran in 1215, was the correction of the prevailing vices of the clergy;

455

and it adopted numerous canons looking to the suppression of the chief abuses, but in vain. Those abuses were too deeply rooted, and four years later Honorius III, in an encyclical addressed to all the prelates of Christendom, says that he has waited to see the result. He finds the evils of the Church increasing rather than diminishing. The ministers of the altar, worse than beasts wallowing in their dung, glory in their sins, as in Sodom. They are a snare and a destruction to the people. Many prelates consume the property committed to their trust, and scatter the stores of the sanctuary throughout the public places; they promote the unworthy, waste the revenues of the Church on the wicked, and convert the churches into conventicles of their kindred."

75. "What was accomplished by this earnest exhortation, may be estimated from the description which Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, gave of the Church, in the presence of Innocent IV and his cardinals, in 1250. The details can well be spared, but they are summed up in his assertion that the clergy were a source of pollution to the whole earth; they were antichrists and devils, masquerading as angels of light, who made the house of prayer a den of robbers. When the earnest inquisitor of Passau, about 1260, undertook to explain the stubbornness of the heresy which he was vainly endeavoring to suppress, he did so by drawing up a list of the crimes prevalent among the clergy, which is awful in the completeness of its details. A Church such as he describes, was an UNMITIGATED CURSE, POLITICALLY, SOCIALLY, AND MORALLY."

1[Page 423] All quotations in this chapter not otherwise credited, are from Lea's "History of the Inquisition."

2[Page 425] "History of England," chap. viii, par. 2.

3[Page 442] The matter from par. 42 to this point is from Lea's "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy," pp. 341-352, 349-351.

4[Page 444] Pars. 50 and 51 are from the "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy," pp. 355, 356.

19. "THAT WOMAN JEZEBEL."

IN the first chapter of this book attention was called to the first three of the Seven Churches, and the first three of the Seven Seals. There was pointed out the apostasy from the first love, and the development of the papacy. Now, to the Church in her fourth phase the Head of the Church writes: "I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols."1

2. The original Jezebel was that heathen woman of Phenicia, the daughter of Ethbaal, king of Tyre, who was married to Ahab, king of Israel; and who brought with her into Israel her idolatrous worship -- which was but a worship of the sun, under the forms of Baal and Ashtaroth, or Astarte. She brought with her also four hundred and fifty priests of Baal and four hundred of Ashtaroth, -- eight hundred and fifty in all, -- "who ate at Jezebel's table." This original Jezebel caused King Ahab to be worse than he otherwise would have been, as it is written: "There was none like unto Ahab, which did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord, whom Jezebel his wife stirred up."2 And, when the wickedness which she would do was greater than even Ahab could bear to do, she herself did it, in his name, and was merry in it: legalizing her enormities by documents written in the king's name, and sealed with his seal.3

3. Further, Jezebel set herself positively to establish her idolatrous worship as the sole worship of the dominion. She therefore exerted all the power of the kingdom absolutely to obliterate the worship of the Lord and to establish her heathen worship in its stead. With the zealous aid of her eight hundred and fifty celibate priests, she searched

out, and cut off, all the worshipers of the Lord that could be found. This work was done so thoroughly that, in all Israel, there could be found but seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal; and these were so scattered, in caves and solitary places, that they were not known to one another. Even Elijah, the prophet of the

Lord, supposed that he alone was left of all who worshiped Jehovah; and, even he was so persistently hunted that, when he could not be found within the limits of Israel, messengers were sent into all the kingdoms, and amongst all the nations round about, to seek him; and, when he was not found, each nation and kingdom was required to take an oath that he was not there.4

4. And now this Jezebel is cited by the Lord as the illustration of the corrupt, deceiving, destroying power that worked against His Church in her fourth phase. It has been pointed out and made plain, that it was in the time of the third phase of the true Church that the papacy was formed.5 It is therefore certain that this warning to the true Church in the fourth phase of her experience, against the seductions of "that woman Jezebel," has direct reference to the workings of the papacy in the period following the formation and establishment of the papacy. And how thoroughly this expression, "that woman Jezebel," fits the papacy, can be clearly seen by a glance at the history which so far has been traced.

5. The two things especially singled out by Christ in His letter to His Church, concerning which He warns against the seductions of this Jezebel, are fornication, and the honoring of idols. And we have seen how that the continuous war of the papacy upon marriage -- directly, the marriage of the clergy; and thus indirectly the marriage of all -- filled Europe with fornication. We have also seen how that by a war of more than a hundred years, the papacy established the use of images, and, therefore, of idolatry, as an essential part of Christian worship.

6. Another specification concerning "that woman Jezebel" is that she "calleth herself a prophetess." A prophet or prophetess is a spokesman, or mouthpiece for God: one especially commissioned to speak the words of God." This is precisely the claim of the papacy: that she

alone is the interpreter of the Scriptures, the infallible channel of the divine will to men.

7. Another word concerning this Jezebel refers to "them that commit adultery with her." This is all spoken to the Church, of a Church. Of this Church, described in the word "Jezebel," it is written in other places, that she is one "with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication."7 This characteristic has been made plain in both its principle and its practice. The word "Jezebel" means "not cohabited." Any one at all acquainted with the religious system of which Jezebel of Tyre was a representative, knows how utterly incongruous with her name, was her character. And yet every evidence on the subject only goes farther to demonstrate how perfectly that incongruity fits the papacy. She claims to be "the spouse" of Christ the Lord; and yet all her history shows that she has ever lived in illicit connection with every other lord whom she could possibly allure or coerce into her toils.

8. That characteristic of the original Jezebel, manifested in her ruling the king and stirring him up to do more than the usual evil of kings, and more than he would otherwise have done, is seen displayed throughout the whole course of the papacy after her establishment as a world-power; and is specifically fastened upon her by the Scripture in describing her as "the woman . . . which reigneth over the kings of the earth."8 And the unanimous voice of history for a thousand years witnesses to the truth of that word. The farther characteristic of Jezebel, manifested in herself doing, in the king's name, and under his seal, enormities at the which even the king balked, will equally appear in the history now to be traced: as also that supreme characteristic of Jezebel, the persistent persecutor of the worshipers of the true God.

9. It is perfectly plain that in essence, Europe in the Middle Ages was but the papacy in the Middle Ages. It is equally plain that it would be difficult to conceive a worse condition of human society than was this papacy in the Middle Ages. All know that the papacy claims to have been, in the Middle Ages, not only Christianity, but the only Christianity. None can hide the fact that the condition of human society under the sole dominion of the papacy -- and more than anything else the product of the papacy -- was about as bad as it could be and survive.

Because of this, many people justly repudiate the papacy. And, accepting the statement that the papacy was then Christianity, when they repudiate the papacy they think that they repudiate Christianity. Others, accepting the claim that the papacy was Christianity, and also desiring to hold fast to Christianity, are at an utter loss to find their bearings as to Christianity, in view of the indisputable character of the papacy in the Middle Ages. The difficulty in both these cases centers in their acceptance of the premise: that the papacy was Christianity. This is an utter error. The papacy and Christianity, in the Middle Ages, nor at any other time. The papacy was not Christianity are antagonistic systems. How far the papacy is from being Christianity is made plain by the words of Christ in His third letter to His own Church, in which He designates as His faithful martyrs, those believers in Him who were against the papacy -- "Anti-pas was my faithful martyr."9 The papacy in the Middle Ages was only "that woman Jezebel."

10. Where, then, was Christianity in the Middle Ages? -- It was where the worshipers of the true God were in the days of the original Jezebel -- in dens and caves, in the solitary and obscure places of the earth, cast out, and persecuted. We have seen that the successive steps in the course of the apostasy, as noted in the Seven Seals, in synchronous with the successive phases of the experience of the true Church, as noted in the Seven Churches. The letter of Christ to His Church in the fourth phase, warns her against the seductions of "that woman Jezebel;" and in that phase of the apostasy noted in the Fourth Seal, there is described the open workings of "that woman Jezebel." And, so it is written: "And when he had opened the Fourth Seal, I heard the voice of the fourth living creature saying, Come and see. And I looked and behold a pale horse: and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hell followed with him. And power was given unto him over the fourth part of the earth, to kill with sword, and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth."10 And that these who were so slain were non other than the saints of God, is made certain by the very next verse, which says that they "were slain for the word of God, and the testimony which they held."

11. We have seen how the papacy treated the Mohammedans and the

Jews; we have seen how she treated the people of the Greek Church; how she treated her own people -- emperors, kings, nobles, all those whom she acknowledged to be, and who were, completely her own. Now we shall see how she treated those who were the people of God. Already in the times of Constantine and Theodosius, we have had glimpses of the disposition of the papacy toward dissenters;11 for "it is impossible not to attribute to ecclesiastical influence the successive edicts by which from the time of Theodosius the Great, persistence in heresy was punished with death." -- Lea.12 We have seen how Pope Pelagius I sought to persuade Narses to compel conformity to the will of the papacy by the assurance that "he alone persecutes who forces to evil. But to restrain men from doing evil, or to punish those who have done it, is not persecution, or cruelty, but love of mankind."13 And when such was her disposition and her will while the imperial power was supreme, what might not be expected of her when her own power became supreme!

12. From the time when the union of Church and State was first formed: from the days of Constantine and Sylvester, when the papacy was made, and even before, in the time of the shaping of events that made the papacy, there were faithful Christians who protested against it. The chief ones of these in the West, where the papacy was formed, were the Vaudois des Alpes, or Waldenses, who dwelt in the valleys of Piedmont, in northern Italy, west of Turin, and not far from that city. At the time of the union of Church and State the diocese of Milan, "which included the plain of Lombardy, the Alps of Piedmont, and the southern provinces of France," was not subject to the see of Rome. As late as 555, Pope Pelagius said: "The bishops of Milan do not come to Rome for ordination." It was the clergy of this region who were the dissidents whom this same Pope Pelagius urged Narses to compel to conformity to Rome.

13. At the beginning of the ninth century Turin itself was the center of a diocese. In the year 820, by the Emperor Louis there was appointed to the see of Turin, Clemens Claudius. "This man beheld with dismay the stealthy approaches of a power which, putting out the eyes of men, bowed their necks to its yoke, and bent their knees to idols. He

461

grasped the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, and the battle which he so courageously waged, delayed, though it could not prevent, the fall of his Church's independence, and for two centuries longer the light continued to shine at the foot of the Alps. Claudius was an earnest and indefatigable student of Holy Scripture. That Book carried him back to the first age, and set him down at the feet of the apostles, at the feet of One greater than apostles; and, while darkness was descending on the earth, around Claudius still shone the day.

14. "The truth, drawn from its primeval fountains, he proclaimed throughout his diocese, which included the valleys of the Waldenses. Where his voice could not reach, he labored to convey instruction by his pen. He wrote commentaries on the Gospels; he published expositions of almost all the epistles of Paul, and several books of the Old Testament; and thus he furnished his contemporaries with the means of judging how far it became them to submit to a jurisdiction so manifestly usurped as that of Rome, or to embrace tenets so undeniably novel as those which she was now foisting upon the world. The sum of what Claudius maintained was that there is but one Sovereign in the Church, and He is not on earth; that Peter had no superiority over the other apostles, save in this, that he was the first who preached the gospel to both Jews and Gentiles; that human merit is of no avail for salvation, and that faith alone saves us. On this cardinal point he insists with a clearness and breadth which remind one of Luther. The authority of tradition he repudiates, prayers for the dead he condemns, as also the notion that the Church can not err. As regards relics, instead of holiness he can find in them nothing but rottenness, and advises that they be instantly returned to the grave, from which they ought never to have been taken . . .

15. "The worship of images was then making rapid strides. The bishop of Rome was the greatest advocate of this ominous innovation; it was on this point that Claudius fought his great battle. He resisted it with all the logic of his pen and all the force of his eloquence; he condemned the practice as idolatrous, and he purged those churches in his diocese which had begun to admit representations of saints and divine persons within their walls, not even sparing the cross itself." -- Wylie.14

462

In a letter to Theodemir, Bishop Claudius wrote: "Appointed bishop by Louis, I came to Turin. I found all the churches full of the filth of abominations and images. . . . If Christians venerate the images of saints, they have not abandoned idols, but only changed their names."15

16. These facts show that there was at that time a practical separation from the papacy, of two great bishoprics of northern Italy. With this also there stands the important fact that while the Lombard kings remained, they had always excluded the clergy from their councils of State.16 This practical exclusion of the papacy, and papal principles, from northern Italy, for seven hundred years, gave free scope to the development of the true Christian worship in that region, and enabled it to take such firm root as to be able to withstand all the violence of the papal storms of later ages. For it was not till 1059 that the dioceses of Milan and Turin became one with Rome. Then the Vaudois (pronounced vodwah), "retired within the mountains; and, spurning alike the tyrannical yoke and the corrupt tenets of the Church of the Seven Hills, they preserved in its purity and its simplicity the faith their fathers had handed down to them. Rome manifestly was the schismatic: she it was that had abandoned what was once the common faith of Christendom, leaving by that step to all who remained on the old ground the indisputably valid title of the true Church. Behind this rampart of mountains, which Providence, foreseeing the approach of evil days, would almost seem to have reared on purpose, did the remnant of the early apostolic Church of Italy kindle her lamp, and here did that lamp continue to burn all through the long night which descended on Christendom.

17. "There is a singular concurrence of evidence in favor of their high antiquity. Their traditions invariably point to an unbroken descent from the earliest times, as regards their religious belief. The Nobla Leycon [Noble Lesson], which dates from the year 1100, goes to prove that the Waldenses of Piedmont did not owe their rise to Peter Waldo of Lyons, who did not appear till the latter half of that century (1160). The Nobla Leycon, though a poem, is in reality a confession of faith, and could have been composed only after some considerable study of the system of Christianity, in contradistinction to the errors of Rome. How could a Church have arisen with such a document in her hands?

Or how could these herdsmen and vinedressers, shut up in their mountains, have detected the errors against which they bore testimony, and found their way to the truths of which they made open profession, in times of darkness like these? If we grant that their religious beliefs were the heritage of former ages, handed down from an evangelical ancestry, all is plain; but if we maintain that they were the discovery of the men of those days, we assert what approaches almost to a miracle. Their greatest enemies, Claude Seyssel of Turin (1517), and Reynerius the Inquisitor (1250), have admitted their antiquity, and stigmatized them as 'the most dangerous of all heretics, because the most ancient.'" -- Wylie.17

18. "We may accept, for we can not refute, the narrative of their early history given by the Vaudois themselves. The Vaudois writers concur in placing their own origin at a period before Constantine. The Scriptures became their only guide; the same belief, the same sacraments they maintain to-day they held in the age of Constantine and Sylvester. They relate that, as the Romish Church grew in power and pride, their ancestors repelled its assumptions and refused to submit to its authority; that when, in the ninth century, the use of images was enforced by superstitious popes, they, at least, never consented to become idolaters; that they never worshiped the Virgin, nor bowed at an idolatrous mass. When, in the eleventh century, Rome asserted its supremacy over kings and princes, the Vaudois were its bitterest foes. The three valleys formed the theological school of Europe. The Vaudois missionaries traveled into Hungary and Bohemia, France, England, even Scotland, and aroused the people to a sense of the fearful corruption of the Church. They pointed to Rome as the antichrist, the center of every abomination. They taught, in the place of Romish innovations the pure faith of the apostolic age." -- Lawrence.18

19. In the Eastern Empire there was a Christian people called Paulicians,who occupied a position there which corresponds exactly to that of the Waldenses in the West. "Some obscurity rests upon their origin, and additional mystery has on purpose been cast upon it, but a fair and impartial examination of the matter leaves no doubt that the Paulicians

are the remnant that escaped the apostasy of the Eastern Church, just as the Waldenses are the remnant saved from the apostasy of the Western Church. Doubt too, has been thrown upon their religious opinions; they have been painted as a confederacy of Manichaeans, just as the Waldenses were branded as a synagogue of heretics; but in the former case, as in the latter, an examination of the matter satisfies us that these imputations had no sufficient foundation, that the Paulicians repudiated the errors imputed to them, and that as a body their opinions were in substantial agreement with the doctrine of Holy Writ. Nearly all the information we have of them is that which Petrus Siculus, their bitter enemy, has communicated. He visited them when they were in their most flourishing condition, and the account he has given of their distinguished doctrines sufficiently proves that the Paulicians had rejected the leading errors of the Greek and Roman churches; but it fails to show that they had embraced the doctrines of Manes, or were justly liable to be styled Manichaeans." -- Wylie.19

20. They were called Paulicians because, to observers, they seemed to use pre-eminently the epistles of Paul. To any one who at all understands the epistles of Paul, this is sufficient evidence of their being true Christians. They were not unwilling to accept the name given to them, and to recognize the name Paulicians as a

proper designation. From the statements of their enemies it appears certain that they had a thorough and true understanding of the character and work of Satan; his relationship to this world, and opposition to God, as it stands from beginning to end in the Scriptures. Yet, to the pagan minds and conceptions of the papists, it appeared that the Paulicians held the doctrine of two principles as propagated by Zoroaster and Manes. Thus by their persecutors they were ever changed with being Manichaeans; and to the lips of the papists of those times, the charge of Manichaeism came as trippingly as did the term Samaritan to the lips of those who persecuted Jesus.20 But "the Paulicians sincerely condemned the memory and opinions of the Manichaean sect, and complained of the injustice which impressed that invidious name on the simple votaries of St. Paul and of Christ." -- Gibbon.21

21. A mighty impulse to the faith of the Paulicians was given in 653, through the conversion of an Armenian named Constantine, who lived near Samosata. A Paulician deacon in his journey homeward from captivity was entertained overnight by Constantine. In the morning, before his departure, the Paulician presented to Constantine a copy of the New Testament. "Constantine studied the sacred volume. A new light broke upon his mind: the errors of the Greek Church stood clearly revealed, and he instantly resolved to separate himself from so corrupt a communion. He drew others to the study of the Scriptures, and the same light shone into their minds which had irradiated his. Sharing his views, they shared with him his secession from the established Church of the empire. . . . These disciples multiplied. A congenial soil favored their increase, for in these same mountains, where are placed the sources of the Euphrates, the Nestorian remnant had found a refuge.

22. "The attention of the government at Constantinople was at length turned to them; persecution followed. Constantine, whose zeal, constancy, and piety had been amply tested by the labors of twenty-seven years, was stoned to death. From his ashes arose a leader still more powerful. Simeon, an officer of the palace, who had been sent with a body of troops to superintend his execution, was converted by his martyrdom, and like another Paul, after the stoning of Stephen, began to preach the Paulician faith which he had once persecuted. Simeon ended his career, as Constantine had done, by sealing his testimony with his blood, the stake being planted beside the heap of stones piled above the ashes of Constantine.

23. "Still the Paulicians multiplied; other leaders arose to fill the place of those who had fallen, and neither the anathemas of the hierarchy nor the sword of the State could check their growth. All through the eighth century they continued to flourish. The worship of images was now the fashionable superstition in the Eastern Church, and the Paulicians rendered themselves still more obnoxious to the Greek authorities, lay and clerical, by the strenuous opposition which they offered to that idolatry of which the Greeks were the great advocates and patrons. It was now, in the end of the eighth century, that the most remarkable perhaps of all their leaders, Sergius, rose to head them, a

man of truly missionary spirit and of indomitable courage . . . During thirty-four years, and in the course of innumerable journeys, he preached the gospel from East to West, and converted great numbers of his countrymen. The result was, more terrible persecution, which continued through successive reigns. Foremost in this work we find the emperor Leo, the patriarch Nicephorus, and notably the empress Theodora." -- Wylie.22

24. "The feeble Michael the First, the rigid Leo the Armenian, were foremost in the race of persecution; but the prize must doubtless be adjudged to the sanguinary devotion of Theodora, who restored the images to the Oriental Church. Her inquisitors explored the cities and mountains of the Lesser Asia, and the flatterers of the empress have affirmed that, in a short reign, one hundred thousand Paulicians were extirpated by the sword, the gibbet, or the flames." -- Gibbon.23 The persecution continued. Some relief was found through friendly emperors, who, in the ninth and tenth centuries, removed many of the Paulicians into Europe, and planted them in colonies in Thrace. "The shadow of the Saracenic woe was already blackening over the Eastern Empire, and God removed His witnesses betimes from the destined scene of judgment.

25. "The arrival of the Paulicians in Europe was regarded with favor rather than disapproval. Rome was becoming by her tyranny the terror, and by her profligacy the scandal, of the West; and men were disposed to welcome whatever promised to throw an additional weight into the opposing scale. The Paulicians soon spread themselves over Europe, and though no chronicle records their dispersion, the fact is attested by the sudden and simultaneous outbreaks of their opinions in many of the Western countries. They mingled with the host of the crusaders returning from the Holy Land through Hungary and Germany; they joined themselves to the caravans of merchants who entered the harbor of Venice and the gates of Lombardy; or they followed the Byzantine standard into southern Italy, and by these various routes settled themselves in the West. They incorporated with the pre-existing bodies of oppositionists, and from this time a new life was seen to animate

the efforts of the Waldenses of Piedmont, the Albigenses of southern France, and of others who, in other parts of Europe, revolted by the growing superstitions. had begun to retrace their steps toward the primeval fountains of truth." -- Wylie.24

26. "In peace and in war they freely conversed with strangers and natives, and their opinions were silently propagated in Rome, Milan, and the kingdoms beyond the Alps. It was soon discovered that many thousand Catholics of every rank, and of either sex, had embraced the Manichaean heresy, and the flames which consumed twelve canons of Orleans was the first act and signal of persecution. The Bulgarians [another name for the Paulicians], a name so innocent in its origin, so odious in its application, spread their branches over the face of Europe. . . . A confession of simple worship and blameless manners is extorted from their enemies; and so high was their standard of perfection, that the increasing congregations were divided into two classes of disciples, of those who practiced, and of those who aspired. It was in the country of Albigeois, in the southern provinces of France, that the Paulicians were most deeply implanted; and the same vicissitudes of martyrdom and revenge which had been displayed in the neighborhood of the Euphrates, were repeated in the thirteenth century on the banks of the Rhone. The laws of the Eastern emperors were revived by Frederic the Second. The insurgents of Tephrice were represented by the barons and cities of Languedoc: Pope Innocent III surpassed the sanguinary fame of Theodora. It was in cruelty alone that her soldiers could equal the heroes of the Crusades; and the cruelty of her priests was far excelled by the founders of the Inquisition; an office more adapted to confirm, than to refute, the belief of an evil principle." -- Gibbon.25

27. In the middle of the eleventh century Berengar of Tours incurred the wrath of the papacy by preaching the gospel, especially exposing the absurdity of transubstantiation. In 1087 it was written against him "that Berengarius of Tours, being fallen into heresy, had already almost corrupted all the French, Italians, and English." He was charged by the archbishop of Canterbury not only with having opposed transubstantiation, but as being "guilty of all the heresies of the Waldenses; and as maintaining with them that the Church remained

with them alone, and that Rome was `the congregation of the wicked and the seat of Satan.'" Berengar published a commentary on the book of Revelation, which fact easily explains how that his persecutors could charge him with saying that Rome was "the congregation of the wicked and the seat of Satan."26 He died in 1088.

28. About the end of this century also Peter de Bruys preached the gospel in the provinces of Dauphine, Provence, and Languedoc. Many were thus brought to the light of salvation in the knowledge of the truth of Christ; and from the name of Peter de Bruys were called Petrobrussians. From the charges of their enemies, it is found that they held "that baptism avails not without faith; that Christ is only spiritually present in the sacrament; that prayers and alms profit not dead men; that purgatory is a mere invention; and that the Church is not made up of cemented stones, but of believing men."27 Peter de Bruys was put to death by burning in 1126, after twenty years of faithful preaching of the gospel.

29. Peter was followed, however, in the good work, by an Italian of the name of Henri. He was a monk who had become a Christian. From his name his converts were called Henricians. His persecutors declared that "his orations were powerful but noxious, as if a whole legion of concerning him, to the count of Toulouse: "How many disorders do we every day hear that Henri commits in the Church of God! That ravenous demons had been speaking through his mouth." St. Bernard wrote wolf is within your dominions, clothed with a sheep's skin, but we know him by his works. The churches are like synagogues, the sanctuary despoiled of its holiness, the sacraments looked upon as profane institutions, the feast days have lost their solemnity, men grow up in sin, and every day souls are borne away before the terrible tribunal of Christ without first being reconciled to and fortified by the holy communion. In refusing Christians baptism they are denied the life of Jesus Christ."28 In 1148 Henri was seized, and prosecuted before Pope Eugenius III, at a council in Rheims, where he was condemned and imprisoned: and he is no more heard of.

30. Immediately following Henri came Arnold of Brescia. He also

was a monk who had become a Christian. "Profoundly convinced that the evils of Christendom arose from the worldliness of the ecclesiastical body, he taught that the Church should hold neither temporal possessions nor jurisdiction, and should confine itself rigidly to its spiritual function. Of austere and commanding virtue, irreproachable in his self-denying life, trained in all the learning of the schools, and gifted with rare persuasive eloquence, he became the terror of the hierarchy." -- Lea.29 Since the papacy as it then was, consisted in the union of Church and State, it is easy to understand how such teaching as this would be the terror of the hierarchy; for wherever it prevailed, it would mean only the annihilation of the papacy.

31. Yet it was not only, nor especially, the separation of Church and State that Arnold preached. He preached the gospel, the truth as it is in Jesus: which, in itself, meant, and always means, the separation of Church and State in all who accept it. Thus the doctrine of separation of Church and State was but the consequence of the fundamental truth of Christ which he preached -- that "the Church of Christ is not of this world." Therefore, said he, "the ministers of the Church ought not to fill temporal offices and discharge temporal employment. Let these be left to the men whose duty it is to see to them, even kings and statesmen. Nor do the ministers of Christ need, in order to the discharge of their spiritual functions, the enormous revenues which are continually flowing into their coffers. Let all this wealth, those lands, palaces, and hoards, be surrendered to the rulers of the State; and let the ministers of religion henceforward be maintained by the frugal yet competent provision of the tithes, and the voluntary offerings of their flocks. Set free from occupations which consume their time, degrade their office, and corrupt their heart, the clergy will lead their flocks to the pastures of the gospel, and knowledge and piety will again revisit the earth."30

32. The bishop of Brescia complained of Arnold to Pope Innocent II. The pope called a council and summoned Arnold to appear there. Arnold went. The pope and his council condemned the preaching of Arnold, and passed upon him the sentence of silence. Arnold would not

keep silence; and in 1140 a council held at Sens sentenced him to imprisonment, and decreed that his writings should be burned. This sentence Innocent II approved. But, before effect could be given to this decree of the council and the pope, Arnold had left Italy, crossing the Alps and stopping at Zurich, where he preached and planted seeds of the truth of the gospel amongst "a brave and simple people who imbibed, and long retained the color of his opinions; and his art, or merit, seduced the bishop of Constance, and even the pope's legate, who forgot for his sake, the interest of their master and their order." -- Gibbon.31

33. When Innocent II died, Arnold adopted "the desperate measure of erecting his standard in Rome itself, in the face of the successor of St. Peter. Yet the courage of Arnold was not devoid of discretion: he was protected, and had perhaps been invited, by the nobles and people; and in the service of freedom, his eloquence

thundered over the Seven Hills. Blending in the same discourse the texts of Livy and St. Paul; uniting the motives of gospel, and of classic, enthusiasm; he admonished the Romans how strangely their patience and the vices of the clergy had degenerated from the primitive times of the Church and the city."32 Beyond the spiritual enlightenment and conversion, in heart and life, of many of the people, one remarkable result of Arnold's preaching in Rome was that universal rising of the people, which established the new Republic in Rome, and expelled the popes from the city, as already noticed. When Hadrian IV succeeded in recovering Rome to the papacy, the banishment of Arnold was the condition of his releasing the city from general condemnation. And when Frederick Barbarossa went to Italy, to be crowned emperor by Hadrian IV, one of the conditions made by the pope to Frederick's receiving the imperial crown at his hands, was the capture and delivering up of Arnold. Therefore, Arnold was seized, and conveyed to the city of Rome, where he was put to death. "For the cruel ending the Church sought to shirk the responsibility, but there would seem to be no reasonable doubt that he was regularly condemned by a spiritual tribunal as a heretic; for he was in holy orders, and could be tried only by the Church, after which he was handed over to the secular arm for punishment. He was offered pardon if he would recant his erroneous doctrines; but he persistently

refused, and passed his last moments in silent prayer. Whether or not he was mercifully hanged before being reduced to ashes, is perhaps doubtful; but those ashes were cast into the Tiber to prevent the people of Rome from preserving them as relics and honoring him as a martyr." -- Lea.33

34. Arnold's "teachings left a deep impress in the minds of the population, and his followers in secret cherished his memory and his principles for centuries. It was not without a full knowledge of the position, that the Roman curia scattered his ashes in the Tiber, dreading the effect of the veneration which the people felt for their martyr. Secret associations of Arnaldistas were formed, who called themselves `Poor Men,' and adopted the tenet that the sacraments could be administered only by virtuous men." -- Lea.34

35. The faith of the Waldenses received a great impetus in 1160 and onward, by the conversion of Peter Valdes, or Waldo, a rich merchant in Lyons, who, by his wealth, which he devoted wholly to the cause, was able to accomplish the publication of the complete New Testament in "the Lingua Romana, or Romaunt tongue, the common language of the south of Europe from the eighth to the fourteenth century. It was the language of the troubadours and of the men of letters of the Dark Ages. Into this tongue -- the Romaunt -- was the first translation of the whole of the New Testament made as early as the twelfth century. All of the books of the New Testament were translated from the Latin Vulgate into the Romaunt. This was the first literal version since the fall of the empire; and was the first translation available for popular use. There were numerous earlier translations, but only of parts of the Word of God; and many of these were rather paraphrases or digests of Scripture, than translations: and, moreover, they were so bulky, and by consequence so costly, as to be utterly beyond the reach of the common people. This Romaunt version was the first complete and literal translation of the New Testament of Holy Scripture; it was made . . . not later than 1180, and so is older than any complete version in German, French, Italian, Spanish, or English. This version was widely spread in the south of France, and in the cities of Lombardy. It was

in common use among the Waldenses of Piedmont; and it was no small part, doubtless, of the testimony borne to truth by these mountaineers to preserve and circulate it." -- Wylie.35

36. Peter Waldo was such a diligent student of the Scriptures that he learned the whole New Testament by heart. By this knowledge of the Word of God he "arrived at the conviction that nowhere was the apostolic life observed as commanded by Christ. . . . Devoting himself to preaching the gospel through the streets and by the wayside, admiring imitators of both sexes sprang up around him, whom he dispatched as missionaries to the neighboring towns. They entered houses, announcing the gospel to the inmates; they preached in the churches, they discoursed in the public places, and everywhere they found eager listeners; for, as we have seen, the

negligence and indolence of the clergy had rendered the function of preaching almost a forgotten duty. According to the fashion of the time, they speedily adopted a peculiar form of dress, including, in imitation of the apostles, a sandal with a kind of plate upon it, whence they acquired the name of the `Shoed,' Insabbatati, or Zaptati -- though the appellation which they bestowed upon themselves was that of Li Poure de Lyod, or Poor Men of Lyons." -- Lea.36

37. The text-book of the Waldensian youth was the Scriptures; and "they were required to commit to memory, and be able accurately to recite, whole Gospels and Epistles. This was a necessary accomplishment on the part of public instructors, in those ages when printing was unknown, and copies of the Word of God were rare. Part of their time was occupied in transcribing the Holy Scriptures, or portions of them, which they were to distribute when they went forth as missionaries. . . . After passing a certain time in the school of the barbes, it was not uncommon for the Waldensian youth to proceed to the seminaries in the great cities of Lombardy, or to the Sorbonne at Paris. There they saw other customs, were initiated into other studies, and had a wider horizon around them than in the seclusion of their native valleys. Many of them became expert dialecticians, and often made converts of the rich merchants with whom they traded, and the landlords in whose houses

473

they lodged. The priests seldom cared to meet in argument the Waldensian missionary.

38. "To maintain the truth in their own mountains was not the only object of this people. They felt their relations to the rest of Christendom. They sought to drive back the darkness, and reconquer the kingdoms which Rome had overwhelmed. They were an evangelistic as well as an evangelical Church. It was an old law among them that all who took orders in their Church should, before being eligible to a home charge, serve three years in the mission field. The youth on whose head the assembled barbes laid their hands, saw in prospect not a rich benefice, but a possible martyrdom. The ocean they did not cross. Their mission field was the realms that lay outspread at the foot of their own mountains. They went forth two and two, concealing their real character under the guise of a secular profession, most commonly that of merchants or peddlers. They carried silks, jewelry, and other articles, at that time not easily purchasable save at distant marts, and they were welcomed as merchants where they would have been spurned as missionaries. The door of the cottage and the portal of the baron's castle stood equally open to them. But their address was mainly shown in vending, without money and without price, rarer and more valuable merchandise than the gems and silks which had procured them entrance. They took care to carry with them, concealed among their wares or about their persons, portions of the Word of God, their own transcription commonly, and to this they would draw the attention of the inmates. When they saw a desire to possess it, they would freely make a gift of it where the means to purchase were absent.

39. "There was no kingdom of southern and central Europe to which these missionaries did not find their way, and where they did not leave traces of their visit in the disciples whom they made. On the west they penetrated into Spain. In southern France they found congenial fellow-laborers in the Albigenses, by whom the seeds of truth were plentifully scattered over Dauphine and Languedoc. On the east, descending the Rhine and the Danube, they leavened Germany, Bohemia, and Poland with their doctrines, their track being marked with the edifices for worship and the stakes of martyrdom that arose around their steps. Even the Seven-hilled City they feared not to enter, scattering

474

the seed on ungenial soil, if perchance some of it might take root and grow. Their naked feet and coarse woolen garments made them somewhat marked figures, in the streets of a city that clothed itself in purple and fine linen; and when their real errand was discovered, as sometimes chanced, the rulers of Christendom took care to further, in their own way, the springing of the seed, by watering it with the blood of the men who had sowed it." -- Wylie.37

40. The Paulicians in the West were called by several names; but the one by which they were most generally known is Cathari -- the Pure Ones. In their knowledge of the Scriptures, their pure Christian lives and missionary zeal, these were not surpassed even by the Waldenses. "They were mostly simple folk, industrious peasants and mechanics, who felt the evils around them and welcomed any change. The theologians who combated them ridiculed them as ignorant churls, and in France they were popularly known as texerant (tisserands) [weavers], on account of the prevalence of the heresy among the weavers, whose monotonous occupation doubtless gave ample opportunity for thought. Rude and ignorant they might be for the most part, but they had skilled theologians for teachers, and an extensive popular literature which has utterly perished, saving a Catharan version of the New Testament in Romance, and a book of ritual. Their familiarity with Scripture is vouched for by the warning of Lucas, bishop of Tuy, that the Christian should dread their conversation as he would a tempest, unless he is deeply skilled in the law of God, so that he can overcome them in argument." -- Lea.38

41. "Their proselyting zeal was especially dreaded. No labor was too severe, no risks too great, to deter them from spreading the faith which they deemed essential to salvation. Missionaries wandered over Europe through strange lands to carry the glad tidings to benighted populations, regardless of hardship, and undeterred by the fate of their brethren, whom they saw expiate at the stake the hardihood of their revolt."39 Like the Waldenses, these traveled also as peddlers and artisans: at times changing their occupations and their manner of dress, the

475

better to avoid detection. As they traveled, they would leave with the people, where they could safely do so, or scatter by the wayside, brief writings containing portions of Scripture, with expressions of their own of Christian thought. These were picked up by the shepherds, or the wayfarers, and, so, were the means by which salvation reached many souls. Those who could not read well would take the leaflets to the priests for an explanation; and, in the interpreting of these writings to the unlearned ones, the light of the truth reached many of the priests, who themselves gladly bore the guilt of heresy.

42. Thus, while the papacy was climbing her bloody way to the headship of all the kingdoms of the world, Christianity was silently and gradually permeating society throughout all of those very kingdoms. And, when the papacy had attained to that height of dominion at which she beheld at her feet all kingdoms, and was ready to congratulate herself that all opposition was entirely subdued, she was compelled to awake to the fact that here was a power which, more than any she had ever yet met, threatened her supremacy. It is true the Christians had not been wholly ignored by the papacy. Some of the popes had been obliged to notice an occasional archheretic; there had been, comparatively, a few local burnings of heretics. But, to the papacy, all these were but mere passing incidents, calling for hardly more than a mere glance as she pursued her ambitious way to the high goal which she had in view. But now, having attained that goal, she found that all the power of which she was by all means possessed, must be exercised not merely to maintain herself at the height of power which she had gained, but to maintain her very existence.

43. Northern Italy and southern France formed the general region in which were clustered the centers of all these Christians. The mountains and valleys of Piedmont were the center of the Waldenses: Albi, in southern France, was the center of the Cathari, Petrobrussians, Henricians -- all of whom were included in the one name Albigeois, or Albigenses. And though in the papal decrees many names are sometimes used, yet generally speaking, all these are referred to by the papacy under the two designations of heretics and Waldenses, the word "heretics" invariably referring to the Cathari or Albigenses; and charges against all are summed up in the words "heresy and Waldensianism."

476

44. In 1405 the bishop of Chalons applied to Bishop Wazo, of Liege, for advice as to what he had better do with the Cathari, who were multiplying in his diocese: "whether the secular arm should be called in to prevent

the leaven from corrupting the whole people." Bishop Wazo replied that "they should be left to God," for the reason that "those whom the world now regards as tares may be garnered by Him as wheat when comes the harvest time. Those whom we deem the adversaries of God, He may make superior to us in heaven." However, there were exceedingly few prelates like Bishop Wazo of Liege. Through this century there were not a few Christians put to death in different countries. But so far the persecution was not systematic, nor was it directed by specific acts, either of States or of the Church. Individual popes and individual kings ordered it in cases of archheretics; or it was accomplished through the fanatical wrath of the local populace. But, in the twelfth century all the power of both Church and State was brought to bear, to accomplish the death of heretics.

45. In 1139, by the second general Lateran Council, Pope Innocent II "issued a decisive decree which is interesting as the earliest example of the interpellation of the secular arm. Not only were the Cathari condemned and expelled from the Church, but the temporal authorities were ordered to coerce them and all those who favored or defended them. This policy was followed up in 1148 by the Council of Rheims, which forbade any one to receive or maintain on his lands the heretics dwelling in Gascony, Provence, and elsewhere, and not to afford them shelter in passing or give them a refuge, under pain of excommunication and interdict."

46. "When Alexander III was exiled from Rome by Frederick Barbarossa and his antipope Victor, and came to France, he called, in 1163, a great council at Tours. It was an imposing assemblage, comprising seventeen cardinals, one hundred and twenty-four bishops (including Thomas Becket), and hundreds of abbots, besides hosts of other ecclesiastics, and a vast number of laymen. This august body, after performing its first duty of anathematizing the rival pope, proceeded to deplore the heresy, which, arising in the Toulousain, had spread like a cancer throughout Gascony, deeply infecting the faithful everywhere. The prelates of those regions were ordered to be vigilant in suppressing it by

anathematizing all who should permit heretics to dwell on their lands or should hold intercourse with them, in buying or selling, so that, being cut off from human society, they might be compelled to abandon their errors. All secular princes, moreover, were commanded to imprison them and to confiscate their property.

47. "By this time, it is evident that heresy was no longer concealed, but displayed itself openly and defiantly; and the futility of the papal commands at Tours to cut heretics off from human intercourse was shown two years later at the council, or rather colloquy, of Lombers, near Albi. This was a public disputation between representatives of orthodoxy and the bos homes, bos Crestias, or `good men,' as they styled themselves, before judges agreed upon by both sides, in the presence of Pons, archbishop of Narbonne, and sundry bishops, beside the most powerful nobles of the region -- Constance, sister of King Louis VII and wife of Raymond of Toulouse, Trencavel of Beziers, Sicard of Lautree, and others. Nearly all of the population of Lombers and Albi assembled, and the proceedings were evidently regarded as of the greatest public interest and importance.

48. "A full report of the discussion, including the decision against the Cathari, has reached us from several orthodox sources, but the only interest which the affair has is its marked significance in showing that heresy had fairly outgrown all the means of repression at command of the local churches; that reason had to be appealed to in place of force; that heretics had no scruple in manifesting and declaring themselves; and that the Catholic disputants had to submit to their demands in citing only the New Testament as an authority. The powerlessness of the Church was still farther exhibited in the fact that the council, after its argumentative triumph, was obliged to content itself with simply ordering the nobles of Lombers no longer to protect the heretics. What satisfaction Pons of Narbonne found the next year in confirming the conclusions of the Council of Lombers, in a council held at Cabestaing, it would be difficult to define. So great was the prevailing demoralization that when some monks of the strict Cistercian Order left their monastery of Villemagne, near Agde, and publicly took wives, he was unable to punish this gross infraction of their vows, and the interposition of Alexander III was invoked -- probably without result.

49. "Evidently the Church was powerless. When it could condemn the doctrines and not the persons of heretics it confessed to the world that it possessed no machinery capable of dealing with opposition on a scale of such magnitude. The nobles and the people were indisposed to do its bidding, and without their aid the fulmination of its anathema was an empty ceremony. The Cathari saw this plainly, and within two years of the Council of Lombers they dared, in 1167, to hold a council of their own at St. Felix de Caraman, near Toulouse. Their highest dignitary, Bishop Nicetas, came from Constantinople to preside, with deputies from Lombardy; the French Church was strengthened against the modified dualism of the Concorrezan school; bishops were elected for the vacant sees of Toulouse, Val d' Aran, Carcassonne, Albi, and France north of the Loire, the latter being Robert de Sperone, subsequently a refugee in Lombardy, where he gave his name to the sect of the Speronistae; commissioners were named to settle a disputed boundary between the sees of Toulouse and Carcassonne; in short, the business was that of an established and independent Church, which looked upon itself as destined to supersede the Church of Rome. Based upon the affection and reverence of the people, which Rome had forfeited, it might well look forward to ultimate supremacy.

50. "In fact, its progress during the next ten years was such as to justify the most enthusiastic hopes. Raymond of Toulouse, whose power was virtually that of an independent sovereign, adhered to Frederick Barbarossa, acknowledged the antipope Victor and his successors, and cared nothing for Alexander III, who was received by the rest of France; and the Church, distracted by the schism, could offer little opposition to the development of heresy."40

51. In England, in 1166, thirty Cathari who had fled from persecution in Flanders, were arrested. King Henry II "called a council of bishops at Oxford, and presided over it, to determine their faith. They openly avowed it, and were condemned to be scourged, branded in the face with a key, and driven forth. The importance which Henry attached to the matter is shown by his devoting, soon after, in the Assizes of Clarendon, an article to the subject, forbidding any one to receive them under penalty of having his house torn down; and requiring

all sheriffs to swear to the observance of the law, and to make all stewards of the barons and all knights and franc-tenants swear likewise -- the first secular law on the subject in any statute book since the fall of Rome."41

52. "In 1177, however, Alexander III triumphed, and received the submission of Frederic. Raymond necessarily followed his suzerain (a large portion of his territories was subject to the empire), and suddenly awoke to the necessity of arresting the progress of heresy. Powerful as he was he felt himself unequal to the task. The burgesses of his cities, independent and intractable, were for the most part Cathari. A large portion of his knights and gentlemen were secretly or avowedly protectors of heresy; the common people throughout his dominions despised the clergy and honored the heretics. When a heretic preached, they crowded to listen and applaud; when a Catholic assumed the rare function of religious instruction, they jeered at him, and asked him what he had to do with proclaiming the Word of God. In a state of chronic war with powerful vassals and more powerful neighbors, like the kings of Aragon and England, it was manifestly impossible for Raymond to undertake the extermination of a half or more than half of his subjects."42

53. In 1178 Pope Alexander III in publishing the call to the third council of the Lateran, mentioned as one of the subjects for the consideration of the council "the tares which choke the wheat, and must be pulled up by the roots." And, by that council, in 1179, there was issued the following decree: --

"The Church, as the holy Leo saith, whilst it rejects bloody executions from its code of morals, does not omit them in practice, because the fear of corporal punishments sometimes causes sinners to recur to spiritual remedies. Thus the heretics who are called Catharins, Patarins, or Publicans, are so strongly fortified in Gascony, among the Albigenses, and in the territory of Toulouse, that they no longer conceal themselves, but openly teach their errors; it is on that account we anathematize them as well as those who grant them an asylum or protection, and if they die in their sin, we prohibit oblations being made for them, or sepulture being granted to them. As for

the Brabancons, Arragoneses, Navarese, Basques, Cotterels, Triabechins, who respect neither churches nor monasteries, who spare neither widow nor orphan, nor age nor sex,

480

and who pillage plains and cities, we also order those who shall receive, protect, or lodge them, to be denounced and excommunicated in all the churches at the solemn feasts; nor do we permit them to be absolved, until after they shall have taken up arms against these abominable Albigenses. We also declare, the faithful who are bound to them by any treaties, to be entirely free from their oaths; and we enjoin on them for the remission of their sins, to be wanting in faith to these execrable heretics, to confiscate their goods, reduce them to slavery, and put to death all who are unwilling to be converted. We grant to all Christians who shall take up arms against the Catharins, the same indulgences as to the faithful who take the cross for the holy sepulcher."43

54. "Immediately on his return from the council, Pons, archbishop of Narbonne, made haste to publish this decree, with all its anathemas and interdicts. . . The cardinal of Albano `was forthwith sent as papal legate to preach and lead the crusade. His eloquence enabled him to raise a considerable force of horse and foot, with which, in 1181, he fell upon the territories of the viscount of Beziers, and laid siege to the stronghold of Lavaur, where the viscountess Adelaide, daughter of Raymond of Toulouse, and the leading Patarins had taken refuge. We are told that Lavaur was captured through a miracle, and that in various parts of France consecrated wafers dropping blood announced the success of the Christian arms. . . The short term for which the crusaders had enlisted expired; the army disbanded itself, and the next year the cardinal-legate went back to Rome, having accomplished, virtually, nothing except to increase the mutual exasperation by the devastation of the country through which his troops had passed. Raymond of Toulouse, involved in desperate war with the king of Aragon, seems to have preserved complete indifference as to this expedition, taking no part in it on either side."44

55. In 1184, by a council held at Verona, Pope Lucius III confirmed the foregoing decree of Alexander III, and sent forth a bull, as follows: --

"Ecclesiastical justice could not show too much rigor in annihilating the heresies which now multiply in a large number of the provinces. Already has Rome braved the thunders of the holy see; and her intractable people have dared, from hatred of one person, to lay a sacrilegious hand upon our priests. But the day of vengeance is preparing; and,

481

until we can return to those Romans the evils they have inflicted on us, we excommunicate all heretics, whatever may be their appellation. Among others, the Catharins, the Patarins, those who falsely call themselves the Humiliated, or the Poor of Lyons, as well as the Passagins, the Josephins, the Arnaudists; and, finally, all those wretches who call themselves Vaudois, or enemies of the holy see. We strike these abominable sectarians with a perpetual anathema; we condemn those who shall give them shelter or protection to the same penalties, and who shall call themselves Consoled, Perfect Believers, or by any other superstitious name.

"And as the severity of ecclesiastical discipline is sometimes despised and powerless, we order that those who shall be convicted of favoring heretics, if they are clergy or monks, shall be despoiled of their sacerdotal functions, and of their benefices, and shall be abandoned to all the rigors of secular justice; if laymen, we order that they suffer the most horrid tortures, be proved by fire and sword, torn by stripes, and burned alive. We add, by advice of the bishops, and on the remonstrances of the emperor and the lords, that every prelate shall visit, several times during the year, either in person or by his archdeacon, all the cities of his diocese, and particularly the places in which he shall judge that the heretics hold their assemblies. They shall cause the inhabitants, and especially the old men, women, and children, to be seized. They shall interrogate them to know if there are any Vaudois in their country, or people who hold secret assemblies, and who lead a life differing from that of the faithful. Those who shall hesitate to make denunciations, shall be immediately put to the torture.

When the bishop or archdeacon shall discover the guilty, he shall cause them to be arrested, and shall exact from them an abjuration; or, on their refusal, shall execute the sentence we have pronounced.

"We order, besides, the counts, barons, rectors, and consuls of cities, and other places, to engage by oath, in accordance with the warning of the bishops, to persecute heretics and their accomplices, when they shall be so required to do by the Church; and to execute, with all their power, all that the holy see and the empire have appointed in regard to the crimes of heresy: otherwise, we declare them deprived of their offices and dignities, without the power ever again to hold any employment; and, moreover, they shall be excommunicated forever, and their property placed under interdict.

"The cities which shall resist our orders, or which, having been warned by the bishops, shall neglect to pursue the heretics, shall be excluded from all commerce with other cities, and shall lose their rank and privileges. The citizens shall be excommunicated, noted with perpetual infamy, and as such declared unfit to fill any public or ecclesiastical function. All the faithful shall have the right to kill them, seize their goods, and reduce them to slavery."45

482

56. This bull had so little practical effect that the condemnation had to be repeated by the same pope, at a council held at Narbonne in the same year. And even this was so little effective that the Poor Men of Lyons, of the Waldenses, "agreed, about 1190, to take the chances of a disputation held in the cathedral of Narbonne, with Raymond of Daventry, a religious and God-fearing Catholic, as judge. Of course the decision went against them, and of course they were as little inclined as before to submit, but the colloquy has an interest as showing what progress at that period they had made in dissidence from Rome. The six points on which the argument was held were, first, that they refused obedience to the authority of pope and prelate; second, that all, even laymen, can preach; third, that, according to the apostles, God is to be obeyed rather than man; fourth, that women may preach; fifth, that masses, prayers, and alms for the dead are of no avail, with the addition that some of them denied the existence of purgatory; and sixth that prayer in bed, or in a chamber, or in a stable, is as efficacious as in a church."

57. "Good prelates, they held who led apostolic lives, were to be obeyed, and to them alone was granted the power to bind and loose -- which was striking a mortal blow at the whole organization of the Church. Merit and not ordination, conferred the power to consecrate and bless, to bind and to loose; every one, therefore, who led an apostolic life had this power, and as they assumed that they all led such a life, it followed that they, although laymen, could execute all the functions of the priesthood. It likewise followed that the ministrations of sinful priests were invalid, though at first the French Waldeness were not willing to admit this, while the Italians boldly affirmed it. A further error was, that confession to a layman was as efficacious as to a priest, which was a serious attack upon the sacrament of penitence; though, as yet, the Fourth Council of Lateran had not made priestly confession indispensable, and Alain is willing to admit that in the absence of a priest, confession to layman is sufficient.

58. "The system of indulgences was another of the sacerdotal devices which they rejected; and added three specific rules of morality which became distinctive characteristics of the sect: Every lie is a mortal sin; every oath, even in a court of justice, is unlawful; and homicide is under

483

no circumstances to be permitted, whether in war or in execution of judicial sentences. This necessarily of involved nonresistance, rendering the Waldenses dangerous only from such moral influence as they could acquire. Even as late as 1217, a well-informed contemporary assures us that the four chief errors of the Waldenses were, their wearing sandals after the fashion of the apostles, their prohibition of oaths and of homicide, and their assertion that any member of the sect, if he wore sandals, could in case of necessity consecrate the eucharist.

59. "All this was a simple-hearted endeavor to obey the commands of Christ and make the gospel an actual standard for the conduct of family life; but these principles, if universally adopted, would have reduced the Church to a condition of apostolic poverty, and would have swept away much of the distinction between priest and layman. Besides, the sectaries were inspired with the true missionary spirit; their proselyting zeal knew no bounds; they wandered from land to land promulgating their doctrines, and finding everywhere a cordial response, especially among the lower classes, who were ready enough to embrace a dogma that promised to release them from the vices and oppressions of the clergy. We are told that one of their chief apostles carried with him various disguises, appearing now as a cobbler, then as a barber, and again as a peasant, and though this may have been, as alleged, for the purpose of eluding capture, it shows the social stratum to which their missions were addressed. The Poor Men of Lyons multiplied with incredible rapidity throughout Europe; the Church became seriously alarmed, and not without reason, for an ancient document of the sectaries shows a tradition among them that under Waldo, or immediately afterward, their councils had an average attendance of about seven hundred members present."46

60. "The admitted failure of the crusade of 1181 seems to have rendered the Church hopeless, for the time, of making headway against heresy. For a quarter of a century it was allowed to develop in comparative toleration throughout the territories of Gascony, Languedoc, and Provence. It is true that the decree of Lucius III, issued at Verona in 1184, is important as attempting the foundation of an organized inquisition, but it worked no immediate effect. It is true that in 1195 another

papal legate, Michael, held a provincial council at Montpelier, where he commanded the enforcement of the Lateran canons on all heretics and Mainatae, or brigands, whose property was to be confiscated and whose persons reduced to slavery; but all this fell dead upon the indifference of the nobles, who, involved in perpetual war with each other, preferred to risk the anathemas of the Church rather than to complicate their troubles by attempting the extermination of a majority of their subjects at the behest of a hierarchy which no longer inspired respect or reverence. Perhaps, also, the fall of Jerusalem, in 1186, in arousing an unprecedented fervor of fanaticism, directed it toward Palestine, and left little for the vindication of the faith nearer home. Be this as it may, no effective persecution was undertaken until the vigorous ability of Innocent III, after vainly trying milder measures, organized overwhelming war against heresy.

61. "During this interval the Poor Men of Lyons arose, and were forced to make common cause with the Cathari; the proselyting zeal which had been so successful in secrecy and tribulation had free scope for its development, and had no effective antagonism to dread from a negligent and disheartened clergy. The heretics preached and made converts, while the priests were glad if they could save a fraction of their tithes and revenues from rapacious nobles and rebellious or indifferent parishioners. Heresy throve accordingly. Innocent III admitted the humiliating fact that the heretics were allowed to preach and teach and make converts in public, and that unless speedy measures were taken for their suppression, there was danger that the infection would spread to the whole Church.

62. William of Tudela says that the heretics possessed the Albigeois, the Carcasses, and the Lauragais, and that to describe them as numerous throughout the whole district from Beziers to Bordeaux is not saying enough. Walter Mapes asserts that there were none of them in Britanny, but that they abounded in Anjou, while in Aquitaine and Burgundy their number was infinite. William of Puy-Laurens assures us that Satan possessed in peace the greater part of southern France; the clergy were so despised that they were accustomed to conceal the tonsure through very shame, and the bishops were obliged to admit to holy orders whoever was willing to assume them; the whole land, under a

curse, produced nothing but thorns and thistles, ravishers and bandits, robbers, murderers, adulterers, and usurers. Caesarius of Heisterbach declares that the Albigensian errors increased so rapidly that they soon infected a thousand cities, and he believes that if they had not been repressed by the sword of the faithful, the whole of Europe would have been corrupted.

63. "A German inquisitor informs us that in Lombardy, Provence, and other regions there were more schools of heresy than of orthodox theology, with more scholars; that they disputed publicly, and summoned the people to public debates; that they preached in the market-places, the fields, the houses; and that there were none who dared to interfere with them, owing to the multitude and power of their protectors. As we have seen, they were regularly organized in dioceses; they had their educational establishments for the training of women as well as men; and, at least in one instance, all the nuns of a convent embraced Catharism without quitting the house or the habit of their order. Such was the position to which corruption had reduced the Church. Intent upon the acquisition of temporal power, it had well-nigh abandoned its spiritual duties; and its empire, which rested on spiritual foundations, was crumbling with their decay, and threatening to pass away like an unsubstantial vision."47

64. Then the archpope Innocent III entered the lists to save the papacy. "In his consecration sermon he announced that one of his principal duties would be the destruction of heresy; and of this he never lost sight to the end, amid his endless conflicts with emperors and princes."48 He was consecrated Feb. 22, 1198; and, as early as April 1 he wrote to the archbishop of Ausch, "deploring the spread of heresy and the danger of its becoming universal. The prelate and his brethren are ordered to extirpate it by the utmost rigor of ecclesiastical censures, and if necessary by bringing the secular arm to bear through the assistance of princes and people. Not only are heretics themselves to be punished, but all who have any dealings with them, or who are suspected by reason of undue familiarity with them.

65. "In the existing posture of affairs, the prelates to whom these commands were addressed, can only have regarded them with mingled

derision and despair; and we can readily imagine the replies in which they declared their zeal and lamented their powerlessness. Innocent probably was aware of this in advance, and did not await the response. By April 21 he had two commissioners ready to represent the holy see on the spot -- Rainier and Gui -- whom he sent armed with letters to all the prelates, princes, nobles, and people of southern France, empowering them to enforce whatever regulations they might see fit to employ to avert the imminent peril to the Church arising from the countless increase of Cathari and Waldenses, who corrupted the people by simulated works of justice and charity. These heretics who will not return to the true faith are to be banished, and their property confiscated; these provisions are to be enforced by the secular authorities under penalty of interdict for refusal or negligence, and with the reward for obedience of the same indulgences as those granted for a pilgrimage to Rome or Compostella; and all who consort or deal with heretics or show them favor or protection are to share their punishment."49

66. In point of time Innocent III had been a little forestalled by fierce persecutions in Spain. "In 1194, the note of persecution was sounded by Alonso II of Aragon, in an edict which is worthy of note as the first secular legislation, with the exception of the assizes of Clarendon, in the modern world against heresy. The Waldenses and all other heretics anathematized by the Church are ordered, as public enemies, to quit his dominions by the day after All-Saints'. Any one who receives them to his hands, listens to their preaching, or gives them food shall incur the penalties of treason, with confiscation of all his goods and possessions. The decree is to be published by all pastors on Sundays, and all public officials are ordered to enforce it. Any heretic remaining after three days' notice of the law can be despoiled by any one, and any injury inflicted on him, short of death or mutilation, so far from being an offense, shall be regarded as meriting the royal favor.

67. "The ferocious atrocity of these provisions, which rendered the heretic an outlaw, which condemned him in advance, and which exposed him without a trial to the cupidity or malice of every man, was exceeded three years later by Alonso's son, Pedro II. In a national council of Girona, in 1197, he renewed his father's legislation, adding the penalty

487

of the stake for the heretic. If any noble failed to eject these enemies of the Church, the officials and people of the diocese were ordered to proceed to his castle, and seize them without responsibility for any damages committed, and any one failing to join in the foray was subjected to the heavy fine of twenty pieces of gold to the royal fisc. Moreover, all officials were commanded, within eight days after summons, to present themselves before their bishop, or his representative, and take an oath to enforce the law."50

68. And what were the crimes, what was the wickedness, of the people who were thus to be hunted to death? By the testimony of Catholics themselves, the testimony of their persecutors, yea, the testimonies of the very inquisitors who tormented them to death, what were the crimes, what the wickedness, of these who had incurred this flood of the wrath of Rome? We have seen that all the names of the Christians were summed up by the papacy in the expression "heresy and Waldensianism," and that the "heresy" was embraced under the general name of "Albigenses."

69. Of the Albigenses, or Cathari, St. Bernard, who was the principal preacher of one of the chief crusades against them, says: "If you interrogate them, nothing can be more Christian. As to their conversation, nothing can be less reprehensible; and what they speak they prove by deeds. As for the morals of the heretic, he cheats no one, he oppresses no one, he strikes no one: his cheeks are pale with fasting, he eats not the bread of idleness, his hands labor for his livelihood."51 As to rites and ceremonies, the Cathari "cast aside all the machinery of the Church. The Roman Church indeed was the synagogue of Satan, in which salvation was impossible. Consequently, the sacraments, the sacrifices of the altar, the suffrages and interposition of the Virgin and saints, purgatory, relics, images, crosses, holy water, indulgences, and the other devices by which the priest procured salvation for the faithful, were rejected, as well as the tithes and oblations which rendered the procuring of salvation so profitable. Yet the Catharan Church, as the Church of Christ, inherited the power to bind and to loose, bestowed by Christ on His disciples; the Consolamentum, or baptism of the Spirit, wiped out all sin, but no prayers were of use for the sinner who persisted in wrongdoing."52

488

70. Of the other class, those guilty of "Waldensianism," "an inquisitor who knew them well describes them: `Heretics are recognizable by their customs and speech, for they are modest and well regulated. They take no pride in their garments, which are neither costly nor vile. They do not engage in trade, to avoid lies and oaths and frauds, but live by their labor as mechanics -- their teachers are cobblers. They do not accumulate wealth, but are content with necessaries. They are chaste and temperate in meat and drink. They do not frequent taverns or dances or other vanities. They restrain themselves from anger. They are always at work; they teach and learn and consequently pray but little. They are to be known by their modesty and precision of speech, avoiding scurrility and detraction and light words and lies and oaths."

71. "But their crowing offense was their love and reverence for Scripture, and their burning zeal in making converts. The inquisitor of Passau informs us that they had translations of the whole Bible in the vulgar tongue, which the Church vainly sought to suppress, and which they studied with incredible assiduity. He knew a peasant who could recite the book of Job word for word; many of them had the whole of the New Testament by heart, and, simple as they were, were dangerous disputants. As for the missionary spirit, he tells of one who, on a winter night, swam the river Ips to gain a chance of converting a Catholic; and all, men and women, old and young, were ceaseless in learning and teaching. After a hard day's labor they would devote the night to instruction; they sought the lazar houses to carry salvation to the leper; a disciple of ten day's standing would seek out another whom he could instruct, and when the dull and untrained brain would fain abandon the task in

despair they would speak words of encouragement: `Learn a single word a day, in a year you will know three hundred, and thus you will gain in the end.'"

72. "Such is the general testimony; and the tales which were told as to the sexual abominations customary among them may safely be set down as devices to excite popular detestation, grounded possibly on extravagances of asceticism, such as were common among the early Christians, for the Waldenses held that connubial intercourse was only lawful for the procurement of offspring. An inquisitor admits his disbelief as to these stories, for which he had never found a basis worthy

489

of credence."53 That horrible tales were concocted "to excite popular detestation," can be easily understood from the fact that the Brabancons, Arragoneses, Navarese, Basques, Cotterels, Triabechins, named in the decree of Alexander III against the heretics, were simply freebooters, composed of "fugitives from serfdom, outlaws, escaped criminals, worthless ecclesiastics, outcast monks," who "preyed upon the community in bands of varying size. . . . The chronicles of the times are full of lamentations over their incessant devastations."54 And yet, in that decree, the Catharins, Patarins, and the Albigenses are classed with them in the same decree of excommunication and condemnation. yet even in that same decree the freebooters are more favored than are the Christians; for while for the Christians there is no sort of favor announced, for the freebooters there is absolution "after they shall have taken up arms against these abominable Albigenses."

73. "Surely if ever there was a God-fearing people it was these unfortunates under the ban of Church and State, whose secret passwords were, `Ce dit sainct Pol, Ne mentir' [St. Paul says, Do not lie], `Ce dit, sainct Jacques Ne jurer' [St. James says, Do not swear], `Ce dit sainct Pierre, Ne rendre mal pour mal, mais biens contraires' [St. Peter says, Do not render evil for evil, but contrariwise, good]. The `Nobla Leyczon' scarce says more than the inquisitors, when it bitterly declares that the sign of a Vaudois, deemed worthy of death, was that he followed Christ and sought to obey the commandments of God." Indeed, so thoroughly did the papacy hate righteousness and love iniquity, that evil-doing was the merit that delivered from her condemnation. "About 1220 a clerk of Spire, whose austerity subsequently led him to join the Franciscans, was only saved by the interposition of Conrad, afterward bishop of Hildesheim, from being burned as a heretic, because his preaching led certain women to lay aside their vanities of apparel and behave with humility."55 And, when a certain Catholic, Jean Teisseire, was by mistake cited before the tribunal of the Inquisition, amongst the proofs that he offered, that he was not a heretic, were: "I eat flesh, and lie, and swear, and am a faithful Christian."56 Thus, the whole power of the papacy was devoted to compelling mankind to sin.

490

74. The actual work of crushing out all the good that was in the world, Innocent III was obliged to begin in Italy, and almost within the very borders of the papal territory. "All the northern half of the peninsula, from the Alps to the patrimony of St. Peter, was honeycombed with it, and even as far south as Calabria it was to be found. When Innocent III, in 1198, ascended the papal throne, he at once commenced active proceedings for its extermination, and the obstinacy of the heretics may be estimated by the struggle in Viterbo, a city subject to the temporal as well as spiritual jurisdiction of the papacy. In March, 1199, Innocent, stimulated by the increase of heresy and the audacity of its public display, wrote to the Viterbians, renewing and sharpening the penalties against all who received or favored heretics. Yet, in spite of this, in 1205, the heretics carried the municipal election, electing as chamberlain a heretic under excommunication. Innocent's indignation was boundless. If the elements, he told the citizens, should conspire to destroy them, without sparing age or sex, leaving their memory an eternal shame, the punishment would be inadequate.

75. "He ordered obedience to be refused to the newly elected municipality, which was to be deposed; that the bishop, who had been ejected, should be received back, that the laws against heresy should be enforced, and that if all this was not done within fifteen days the people of the surrounding towns and castles were commanded to take up arms and make active war upon the rebellious city. Even this was insufficient. Two years

later, in February, 1207, there were fresh troubles, and it was not until June of that year, when Innocent himself came to Viterbo, and all the Patarins fled at his approach, that he was able to purify the town by tearing down all the houses of the heretics and confiscating all their property. This he followed up in September with a decree addressed to all the faithful in the patrimony of St. Peter, ordering measures of increasing severity to be inscribed in the local laws of every community, and all podesta and other officials to be sworn to their enforcement under heavy penalties. Proceedings of more or less rigor, commanded in Milan, Ferrara, Verona, Rimini, Florence, Prato, Faenza, Piacenza, and Treviso, show the extent of the evil, the difficulty of restraining it, and the encouragement given to heresy by the scandals of the clergy.

491

76. "It was in southern France, however, that the struggle was deadliest and the battle was fought to its bitter end."57 "The Church admitted that it had brought upon itself the dangers which threatened it -- that the alarming progress of heresy was caused and fostered by clerical negligence and corruption. In his opening address to the great Lateran Council, Innocent III had no scruple in declaring to the assembled fathers: `The corruption of the people has its chief source in the clergy. From this arise the evils of Christendom: faith perishes, religion is defaced, liberty is restricted, justice is trodden underfoot, the heretics multiply the schismatics are emboldened, the faithless grow strong, the Saracens are victorious;" `and after the futile attempt of the council to strike at the root of the evil, Honorius III, in admitting its failure, repeated the assertion. In fact this was an axiom which none were so hardy as to deny, yet when, in 1204, the legates whom Innocent had sent to oppose the Albigenses, appealed to him for aid against prelates whom they had failed to coerce, and whose infamy of life gave scandal to the faithful and an irresistible argument to the heretic, Innocent curtly bade them attend to the object of their mission and not allow themselves to be diverted by less important matters. The reply fairly indicates the policy of the Church. Thoroughly to cleanse the Augean stable was a task from which even Innocent's fearless spirit might well shrink. It seemed an easier and more hopeful plan to crush revolt with fire and sword."

77. At the beginning of the reign of Innocent III, Raymond VI was count of Toulouse. "Though not a heretic, his indifference on religious questions led him to tolerate the heresy of his subjects. Most of his barons were either heretics or favorably inclined to faith which, by denying the pretensions of the Church, justified its spoliation or, at least, liberated them from its domination." When the Council of Montpelier, in 1195, had anathematized "all princes who neglected to enforce the Lateran canons against heretics and mercenaries," Raymond had paid no attention to the decree. "It would, in fact, have required the most ardent fanaticism to lead a prince so circumstanced to provoke his vassals, to lay waste his territories, to massacre his subjects, and to invite assault from watchful rivals, for the purpose of enforcing

492

uniformity in religion, and subjugation to a Church known only by its rapacity and corruption. Toleration had endured for nearly a generation; the land was blessed with peace, after almost interminable war, and all the dictates of worldly prudence counseled him to follow in his father's footsteps. . . . Enjoying the love of his subjects, nothing could have appeared to him more objectless than a persecution such as Rome held to be the most indispensable of his duties."

78. But that pure Christianity which, to the papacy, was the greatest possible evil, "was constantly increasing; and unless checked, it seemed only a question of time when the Church would disappear throughout all the Mediterranean provinces of France. Yet it must be said for the credit of the heretics, that there was no manifestation of a persecuting spirit on their part. The rapacity of the barons, it is true, was rapidly depriving the ecclesiastics of their revenues and possessions. as they neglected their duties, and as the law of the strongest was all-prevailing, the invader of Church property had small scruple in despoiling lazy monks and worldly priests whose numbers were constantly diminishing; but the Cathari, however much they may have deemed themselves the Church of the future, seem never to have thought of extending their faith by force. They reasoned and argued and disputed when they found a Catholic zealous enough to contend with them, and they preached to the people,

who had no other source of instruction; but, content with peaceable conversions and zealous missionary work, they dwelt in perfect amity with their orthodox neighbors.

79. "To the Church this state of affairs was unbearable. It has always held the toleration of others to be persecution of itself. By the very law of its being it can brook no rivalry in its domination over the human soul; and, in the present case, as toleration was slowly but surely leading to its destruction, it was bound by its sense of duty no less than of self-preservation, to put an end to a situation so abhorrent. Yet, before it could resort effectually to force, it was compelled to make what efforts it could at persuasion -- not of heretics, indeed, but of their protectors."58

80. We have seen that as early as April 21, 1198, less than a month

after his installation, Innocent III had sent two commissioners into southern France. But they found both magistrates and clergy indifferent to their appeals for the crushing of heresy. The indifference, and indeed the opposition, on the part of the clergy, was caused by the fact that, in order for them with any success to engage in the destruction of the heretics, they must first inaugurate a reformation of themselves; for one of the greatest helps to the Christian in gaining converts, was the notoriously evil lives of the clergy. And the magistrates could not easily be induced to persecute to death the most honest and harmless of the people, while the clergy, even to archbishops, were leading notoriously violent and licentious lives. When Pons de Rodelle, "a knight renowned for wisdom, and a good Catholic," was asked, "why he did not drive from his lands those who were so manifestly in error," he replied: "How can we do it? We have been brought up with these people. We have kindred among them, and we see them live righteously." "Dogmatic zeal fell powerless before such kindliness; and we can readily believe the monk of Vaux-Cernay, when he tells us that the barons of the land were nearly all protectors and receivers of heretics, loving them fervently and defending them against God and the Church;"59

81. "Enough time had been lost in half-measures while the evil was daily increasing in magnitude, and Innocent proceeded to put forth the whole strength of the Church. To the monks of Fontfroide he adjoined as chief legate the `Abbot of abbot,' Arnaud of Citeaux, head of the great Cistercian Order, a stern, resolute, and implacable man, full of zeal for the cause, and gifted with rare persistency. Since the time of St. Bernard the abbots of Citeaux had seemed to feel a personal responsibility for the suppression of heresy in Languedoc, and Arnaud was better fitted for the work before him than any of his predecessors. To the legation thus constituted, at the end of May, 1204, Innocent issued a fresh commission of extraordinary powers. The prelates of the infected provinces were bitterly reproached for the negligence and timidity which had permitted heresy to assume its alarming proportions. They were ordered to obey humbly whatever the legates might

see fit to command, and the vengeance of the holy see was threatened for slackness or contumacy. Wherever heresy existed, the legates were armed with authority `to destroy, throw down, or pluck up whatever is to be destroyed, thrown down, or plucked up, and to plant and build whatever is to be built or planted.'

82. "With one blow the independence of the local churches was destroyed, and an absolute dictatorship was created. Recognizing, moreover, of how little worth were ecclesiastical censures, Innocent proceeded to appeal to force, which was evidently the only possible cure for the trouble. Not only were the legates directed to deliver all impenitent heretics to the secular arm for perpetual proscription and confiscation of property, but they were empowered to offer complete remission of sins, the same as for a crusade to the Holy Land, to Philip Augustus and his son Louis Coeur-de-Lion, and to all nobles who should aid in the suppression of heresy.

83. "The dangerous classes were also stimulated by the prospect of pardon and plunder, through a special clause authorizing the legates to absolve all under excommunication for crimes of violence, who would join in persecuting heretics -- an offer which subsequent correspondence shows was not unfruitful. To Philip

Augustus, also, Innocent wrote at the same time, earnestly exhorting him to draw the sword and slay the wolves who had thus far found no one to withstand their ravages in the fold of the Lord. If he could not proceed in person, let him send his son, or some experienced leader, and exercise the power conferred on him for the purpose by Heaven. Not only was remission of sins promised him, as for a voyage to Palestine, but he was empowered to seize and add to his dominions the territories of all nobles who might not join in persecution and expel the hated heretic."

84. All these efforts, however, were in vain. Neither king nor nobles, nor adventurers would respond to Innocent's call. One of the pope's legates was so discouraged that he begged the pope to permit him to return to his abbey. "A second urgent appeal to Philip, in February, 1205, was equally fruitless; and a concession in the following June, to Pedro of Aragon, of all the lands that he could acquire from heretics, and a year later of all their goods, was similarly without result, except that Pedro seized the castle of Escure, Belonging to the papacy,

which had been occupied by Cathari. If something appeared to be gained when at Toulouse, in 1205, some dead heretics were prosecuted and their bones exhumed, it was speedily lost; for the municipality promptly adopted a law forbidding trials of the dead who had not been accused during life, unless they had been hereticated on the deathbed."

85. In the summer of 1206, the three legates of the pope held a conference together, and decided to give up as hopeless the task at which they had been set by the pope. But, just at that time, a bishop from Spain happened to pass through Languedoc, and stopped to visit them; and, learning that they had decided to give up the work and leave the country, he suggested that they dismiss "their splendid retinues and worldly pomp, and go among the people, barefooted and poor like the apostles, to preach the Word of God. The idea was so novel that the legates hesitated; but finally assented, if an example were set them by one in authority." The bishop offered himself to set them the desired example. They agreed. The bishop dismissed all but one attendant. That attendant was Domingo, or Dominic, de Guzman, who became the founder of the Inquisition; the founder of the Order of Dominicans; and, at last, St. Dominic.

86. The bishop, the legates, Dominic, and such others as they could enlist, began their work by passing about amongst the people, and attempting to imitate the Christians in the ministrations of the gospel. Their efforts only helped the Christian cause: First, it was a confession that the claims of the Christians, with regard to the separation of the Church from Christianity, were correct, and that their methods were also correct; and, secondly, since they had adopted the profession of preachers of the Word, this brought on discussions everywhere they went, which from private, or wayside, discussions, presently rose to public discussions between the Christian preachers and these new-made Catholic preachers. In these discussions, which were attended by multitudes, the difference was easily detected between the true Christian preacher and the mere formalist, the imitator for effect. "For three months they thus labored diligently, like real evangelists, finding thousands of heretics and few orthodox; but the harvest was scanty, and conversions rarely rewarded their pains -- in fact, the only practical result was to excite the heretics to renewed missionary zeal.

It speaks well for the tolerant temper of the Cathari, that men who had been invoking the most powerful sovereigns of Christendom to exterminate them with fire and sword, should have incurred no real danger in a task apparently so full of risk."

87. Plainly this scheme could not be depended upon for success. The legates therefore determined to appeal again to the sword. The nobles of the territory were so divided amongst themselves, and even at war, that there was no hope of enlisting even the sword with success, unless they could be united. One of the legates, therefore, left his preaching and visited the nobles, to labor with them to make peace amongst themselves. This he accomplished by diligent effort, and the use of excommunication; and Count Raymond of Toulouse was one

who incurred excommunication. Indeed, not much was required on the part of Count Raymond, to incur this penalty; for "by this time, in fact, Raymond had acquired the special hatred of the papalists, through his obstinate neglect to persecute his heretical subjects, in spite of his readiness to take what oaths were required of him."

88. Innocent III "promptly confirmed the sentence of his legate, May 29, 1207, in an epistle to Raymond which was an unreserved expression of the passions accumulated through long years of zealous effort frustrated in its results. In the harshest vituperation of ecclesiastical rhetoric, Raymond was threatened with the vengeance of God here and hereafter. The excommunication and interdict were to be strictly observed until due satisfaction and obedience were rendered; and he was warned that these must be speedy or he would be deprived of certain territories which he held of the Church: and if this did not suffice, the princes of Christendom would be summoned to seize and partition his dominions, so that the land might be forever freed from heresy. Yet in the recital of misdeeds which were held to justify this rigorous sentence there was nothing that had not been for two generations so universal in Languedoc that it might almost be regarded as a part of the public law of the land."

89. "Innocent waited awhile to prove the effect of this threat and the results of the missionary effort so auspiciously started by Bishop Azevedo. Both were null. Raymond, indeed, made peace with the Provencal nobles, and was released from excommunication, but he

showed no signs of awakening from his exasperating indifference on the religious question, while the Cistercian abbots, disheartened by the obstinacy of the heretics, dropped off one by one, and retired to their monasteries. . . . Everything thus had been tried and had failed, except the appeal to the sword, and to this Innocent again recurred with all the energy of despair. A milder tone toward Philip Augustus with regard to his matrimonial complications between Ingeburga of Denmark and Agnes of Meran, might predispose him to vindicate energetically the wrongs of the Church; but, while condescending to this, Innocent now addressed, not only the king, but all the faithful throughout France, and the leading magnates were honored with special missives.

90. "Nov. 16, 1207, the letters were sent out, pathetically representing the incessant and alarming growth of heresy and the failure of all endeavors to bring the heretics to reason, to frighten them with threats, or to allure them with blandishments. Nothing was left but an appeal to arms; and to all who would embark in this good work, the same indulgences were offered as for a crusade to Palestine. The lands of all engaged in it were taken under the special protection of the holy Church, and those of the heretics were abandoned to the spoiler. All creditors of crusaders were obliged to postpone their claims without interest, and clerks taking part were empowered to pledge their revenues in advance for two years."

91. Yet even these persuasions were all in vain. But just at that time, one of the pope's legates "became entangled in an angry religious dispute with one of the gentlemen of the court" of Raymond, and, in the quarrel, was killed. Count Raymond "was greatly concerned at an event so deplorable, and would have taken summary vengeance on the murderer but for his escape and hiding with friends at Beaucaire." The accounts of this murder which were sent to the pope, by the pope's agents, were intensely falsified, to the prejudice of Count Raymond. "The crime gave the Church an enormous advantage, of which Innocent hastened to make the most. On March 10 he issued letters to all the prelates in the infected provinces, commanding that, in all churches, on every Sunday and feast-day, the murderers and their abettors, including Raymond, be excommunicated with bell, book, and candle, and every place cursed with their presence was declared under interdict.

As no faith was to be kept with him who kept not faith with God, all of Raymond's vassals were released from their oaths of allegiance, and his lands were declared the prey of any Catholic who might assail them, while, if he applied for pardon, his first sign of repentance must be the extermination of heresy throughout his dominions.

92. "These letters were likewise sent to Philip Augustus and his chief barons, with eloquent adjurations to assume the cross and rescue the imperiled Church from the assaults of the emboldened heretics; commissioners were sent to negotiate and enforce a truce for two years, between France and England, that nothing might interfere with the projected crusade." The head of the Order of Cistercian monks called together the chiefs of his Order, and by these it was unanimously resolved to devote all the energies of the Order "to preaching the crusade, and soon multitudes of fiery monks were inflaming the passions of the people, and offering redemption in every church and on every market-place in Europe."

93. By this general appeal to the mercenary spirit, and the stirring up of the savage passions of all the kingdoms, Innocent III succeeded at last in starting a crusade against the Albigenses, which in character, was equal in every respect to that of the first crusade against the Turks. The chief inducement was that this crusade was for but forty days; and the distance was not very great to be traversed from any one of the countries of western Europe. "Paradise, surely, could not be gained on easier terms; and the preachers did not fail to point out that the labor was small and the reward illimitable. The flame which had been so long kindling burst forth at last."

94. "Many great nobles assumed the cross -- the duke of Burgundy and the counts of Nevers, St. Pol, Auxerre, Montfort, Geneva, Poitiers, Forez, and others, with numerous bishops. With time there came large contingents from Germany, under the dukes of Austria and Saxony, the counts of Bar, of Juliers, and of Berg. Recruits were drawn from distant Bremen on the one hand, and Lombardy on the other; and we even hear of Slavonian barons leaving the original home of Catharism to combat it in its seat of latest development. There was salvation to be had for the pious, knightly fame for the warrior, and spoil for the worldly; and the army of the cross, recruited from the chivalry and the scum of Europe, promised to be strong enough to settle decisively the

question which had now for three generations defied all the efforts of the faithful."

95. Count Raymond, seeing that utter destruction was coming, sought to make peace with Rome. "Innocent demanded that as security for his good faith he should place in the hands of the Church his seven most important strongholds, after which he should be heard, and, if he could prove his innocence, be absolved. Raymond gladly ratified the conditions, and earnestly welcomed Milo and Theodisius, the new representatives of the Church, who treated him with such apparent friendliness that, when Milo subsequently died at Arles, he mourned greatly, believing that he had lost a protector who would have saved him from his misfortunes. He did not know that the legates had secret instructions from Innocent to amuse him with fair promises, to detach him from the heretics, and when they should be disposed of by the crusaders, to deal with him as they should see fit. He was played with accordingly, skillfully, cruelly, and remorselessly. The seven castles were duly delivered to Master Theodisius, thus fatally crippling him' for resistance; the consuls of Avignon, Nimes, and St. Gilles were sworn to renounce their allegiance to him if he did not obey implicitly the future commands of the pope, and he was reconciled to the Church by the most humiliating of ceremonies.

96. "The new legate, Milo, with some twenty archbishops and bishops, went to St. Gilles, the scene of his alleged crime, and there, June 18, 1209, arrayed themselves before the portal of the church of St. Gilles. Stripped to the waist, Raymond was brought before them as a penitent, and swore on the relics of St. Gilles to obey the Church in all matters whereof he was accused. Then the legate placed a stole around his neck, in the fashion of a halter, and led him into the church, while he was industriously scourged on his naked back and shoulders, up to the alter, where he was absolved. The curious crowd assembled to witness the degradation of their lord was so great that return through the entrance was impossible, and Raymond was carried down to the crypt where the martyred Pierre de Castelnau lay buried, whose spirit was granted the satisfaction of seeing his humbled enemy led past his tomb with shoulders dropping blood. From a churchman's point of view the conditions of absolution laid upon him were not excessive, though well known to be impossible of fulfillment."

97. "All that Raymond had gained by these sacrifices was the privilege of joining the crusade and assisting in the subjugation of his country. Four days after the absolution he solemnly assumed the cross at the hands of the legate Milo, and took the oath: --

"In the name of God, I, Raymond, duke of Narbonne, count of Toulouse, and marquis of Provence, swear with hand upon the Holy Gospels of God, that when the crusading princes shall reach my territories, I will obey their commands in all things, as well as regards security as whatever they may see fit to enjoin for their benefit and that of the whole army."

98. "It is true that in July, Innocent, faithful to his prearranged duplicity, wrote to Raymond benignantly congratulating him on his purgation and submission, and promising him that it should redound to his worldly as well as spiritual benefit; but the same courier carried a letter to Milo, urging him to continue as he had begun; and Milo, on whom Raymond was basing his hopes, soon after, hearing a report that the count had gone to Rome, warned his master, with superabundant caution, not to spoil the game. `As for the count of Toulouse,' writes the legate, `that enemy of truth and justice, if he has sought your presence to recover the castles in my hands, as he boasts that he can easily do, be not moved by his tongue, skillful only in his slanders, but let him, as he deserves, feel the hand of the Church heavier day by day.'"

99. This hand of the Church heavier day by day Count Raymond had already begun to feel. For "already the absolution which had cost so much, was withdrawn, and Raymond was again excommunicated, and his dominions laid under a fresh interdict, because he had not, within sixty days, during which he was with the crusaders, performed the impossible task of expelling all heretics; and the city of Toulouse lay under a special anathema, because it had not delivered to the crusaders all the heretics among its citizens. It is true that subsequently a delay until All-Saints' (November 1) was mercifully granted to Raymond to perform all the duties imposed on him; but he was evidently prejudged and foredoomed, and nothing but his destruction would satisfy the implacable legates.

100. "Meanwhile the crusaders had assembled in numbers such as

never before, according to the delighted abbot of Citeaux, had been gathered together in Christendom; and it is quite possible that there is but slight exaggeration in the enumeration of twenty thousand cavaliers, and more than two hundred thousand foot, including villeins and peasants, besides two subsidiary contingents which advanced from the West. The legates had been empowered to levy what sums they saw fit from all the ecclesiastics in the kingdom, and to enforce the payment by excommunication. As for the laity, their revenues were likewise subjected to be coerced into payment without the consent of their seigneurs. With all the wealth of the realm thus under contribution, backed by the exhaustless treasures of salvation, it was not difficult to provide for the motley host whose campaign opened under the spirit-stirring adjuration of the vicegerent of God: --

"Forward, then, most valiant soldiers of Christ! Go to meet the forerunners of antichrist, and strike down the ministers of the old serpent! Perhaps you have hitherto fought for transitory glory, fight now for everlasting glory! You have fought for the world; fight now for God! We do not exhort you to perform this great service to God for any earthly reward; but for the kingdom of Christ, which we most confidently promise you!"

101. "Under this inspiration the crusaders assembled at Lyons about St. John's day (June 24, 1209), and Raymond hastened from the scene of his humiliation at St. Gilles, to complete his infamy by leading them against his countrymen, offering them his son as a hostage in pledge of his good faith. He was welcomed by them at Valence, and, under the supreme command of Legate Arnaud, guided them against his nephew of Beziers." The Catholics of the devoted cities and provinces, seeing that they were to be overwhelmed, and their native country subjected, by strangers, and probably their native nobles removed, put themselves on the

defensive, equally with the others. "The position taken by Raymond, and the rejected submission of the viscount of Beziers, in fact, deprived the Church of all colorable excuse for further action; but the men of the North were eager to complete the conquest commenced seven centuries before by Clovis, and the men of the South, Catholics as well as heretics, were virtually unanimous in resisting the invasion, notwithstanding the many pledges given by nobles and cities

502

at the commencement. We hear nothing of religious dissensions among them, and comparatively little of assistance rendered to the invaders by the orthodox, who might be presumed to welcome the crusaders as liberators from the domination or the presence of a hated antagonistic faith. Toleration had become habitual, and race instinct was too strong for religious feeling, presenting almost the solitary example of the kind during the Middle Ages, when nationality had not yet been developed out of feudalism and religious interests were universally regarded as dominant. This explains the remarkable fact that the pusillanimous course of Raymond was distasteful to his own subjects, who were constantly urging him to resistance, and who clung to him and his son with a fidelity that no misfortune or selfishness could shake, until the extinction of the house of Toulouse left them without a leader.

102. "Raymond Roger of Beziers had fortified and garrisoned his capital, and then, to the great discouragement of his people, had withdrawn to the safer stronghold of Carcassonne. Reginald bishop ofBeziers, was with the crusading forces, and when they arrived before the city, humanely desiring to save it from destruction, he obtained from the legate authority to offer it full exemption if the heretics, of whom he had a list, were delivered up or expelled. Nothing could be more moderate, from the crusading standpoint, but when he entered the town and called the chief inhabitants together, the offer was unanimously spurned. Catholic and Catharan were too firmly united in the bonds of common citizenship for one to betray the other. They would, as they magnanimously declared, although abandoned by their lord, rather defend themselves to such extremity that they should be reduced to eat their own children.

103. "This unexpected answer stirred the legate to such wrath that he swore to destroy the place with fire and sword -- to spare neither age nor sex, and not to leave one stone upon another. While the chiefs of the army were debating as to the next step, suddenly the camp followers, a vile and unarmed folk, as the legates reported, inspired by God, made a rush for the walls and carried them, without orders from the leaders and without their knowledge. The army followed, and the legate's oath was fulfilled by a massacre almost without parallel in European history. From infancy in arms, to tottering age,

503

not one was spared -- seven thousand, it is said, were slaughtered in the church of Mary Magdalene, to which they had fled for asylum -- and the total number slain is set down by the legates at nearly twenty thousand, which is more probable than the sixty thousand, or one hundred thousand, reported by less trustworthy chroniclers. A fervent Cistercian contemporary informs us that when Arnaud was asked whether the Catholics should be spared, he feared the heretics would escape by feigning orthodoxy, and fiercely replied, `Kill them all, for God knows His own!' In the mad carnage and pillage the town was set on fire, and the sun of that awful July day closed on a mass of smoldering ruins and blackened corpses."

104. "The terrible fate which had overtaken Beziers -- in one day converted into a mound of ruins dreary and silent as any on the plain of Chaldea -- told the other towns and villages the destiny that awaited them. The inhabitants, terror-stricken, fled to the woods and caves. Even the strong castles were left tenantless, their defenders deeming it vain to think of opposing so furious and overwhelming a host. Pillaging, burning, and massacring as they had a mind, the crusaders advanced to Carcassonne, where they arrived on the first of August. The city stood on the right bank of the Aude; its fortifications were strong, its garrison numerous and brave, and the young count, Raymond Roger, was at their head. The assailants advanced to the walls, but met a stout resistance. The defenders poured upon them streams of boiling water and oil, and crushed them with great

stones and projectiles. The attack was again and again renewed, but was as often repulsed. Meanwhile the forty-days' service was drawing to an end, and bands of crusaders, having fulfilled their term, and earned heaven, were departing to their homes. The papal legate, seeing the host melting away, judged it perfectly right to call wiles to the aid of his arms. Holding out to Raymond Roger the hope of an honorable capitulation, and swearing to respect his liberty, Arnold induced the viscount, with three hundred of his knights, to present himself at his tent. `The latter,' says Sismondi, `profoundly penetrated with the maxim Innocent III, that "to keep faith with those that have it not is an offense against the faith," caused the young viscount to be arrested, with all the knights who had followed him.'

504

105. "When the garrison saw that their leader had been imprisoned, they resolved, along with the inhabitants, to make their escape overnight by a secret passage known only to themselves -- a cavern three leagues in length, extending from Carcassonne to the towers of Cabardes. The crusaders were astonished on the morrow, when not a man could be seen upon the walls; and still more mortified was the papal legate to find that his prey had escaped him, for his purpose was to make a bonfire of the city, with every man, woman, and child within it. But if this greater revenge was now out of his reach, he did not disdain a smaller one still in his power. He collected a body of some four hundred and fifty persons, partly fugitives from Carcassonne whom he had captured, and partly the three hundred knights who had accompanied the viscount, and of these he burned four hundred alive, and the remaining fifty he hanged." -- Wylie.60

106. The wasted land was put under the governorship of Simon de Montfort, who was the commander-in-chief of the crusade. "All tithes and first fruits were to be rigorously paid to the churches; any one remaining under excommunication for forty days was to be heavily fined according to his station; Rome, in return for the treasures of salvation so lavishly expended, was to receive from a devastated land an annual tax of three deniers on every hearth, while a yearly tribute from the count himself was vaguely promised." When all was thus settled, Innocent III expressed himself as "full of joy at the wonderful success which had wrested five hundred cities and castles from the grasp of heretics." And then the curse of papal possession and domination rested upon the land. "The song of the troubadour was hushed forever, the gay people sunk into melancholy under the monkish rule, their very language was proscribed, and a terrible inquisition was established to crush more perfectly the lingering seeds of heresy. Every priest and every lord was appointed an inquisitor, and whoever harbored a heretic was made a slave. Even the house in which a heretic was found was to be razed to the ground; no layman was permitted, to possess a Bible; a reward a mark was set for the head of a heretic; and all caves and hiding-places where the Albigenses might take refuge were to be carefully closed up by the lord of the estate." -- Lawrence.61

505

107. Count Raymond was robbed of all his dominion, and was set aside by the papacy; and by Honorius III, the successor of Innocent III, a new crusade was preached, which, in 1217, overran the territories that had fallen to his son, Raymond VII. "The pitiless cruelty and brutal licentiousness habitual among the crusaders, who spared no man in their wrath and no woman in their lust, aided no little in inflaming the resistance to foreign domination;" but neither young Raymond nor the land was allowed peace until 1229. Then, on Holy Thursday, April 12, "before the portal of Notre-Dame de Paris, Raymond humbly approached the legate, and begged for reconciliation to the Church; barefooted and in his shirt, he was conducted to the altar as a penitent, received absolution in the presence of the dignitaries of Church and State, and his followers were relieved from excommunication. . . . In the royal proclamation of the treaty, he is represented as acting at the command of the legate, and humbly praying Church and king for mercy and not for justice. He swore to persecute heresy with his whole strength, including heretics and believers, their protectors and receivers, and not sparing his nearest kindred, friends, and vassals. On all these speedy punishment was to be inflicted; and an inquisition for their detection was to be instituted in such form as the legate might dictate, while in its aid Raymond agreed to offer the large reward of two marks per head for every manifest ("perfected") heretic captured during two years, and one mark forever thereafter. As for other heretics, believers, receivers, and defenders, he agreed to do whatever

the legate or pope should command. His baillis, or local officers, moreover, were to be good Catholics, free of all suspicion. He was to defend the Church and all its members and privileges; to enforce its censures by seizing the property of all who should remain for a year under excommunication. . . . An oath was further to be administered to his people, renewable every five years, binding them to make active war upon all heretics, their believers, receivers, and fautors [patrons], and to help the Church and king in subduing heresy."

108. And, in the face of all this, the Church had the brazen hypocrisy to profess that she had ever "kept her hands free from blood." But "whatever scruples the Church had during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as to its duty toward heresy, it had none as to that of the secular power, though it kept its own hands free from blood.

506

A decent usage from early times forbade any ecclesiastic from being concerned in judgments involving death or mutilation, and even from being present in the torture-chamber where criminals were being placed on the rack. This sensitiveness continued, and even was exaggerated in the time of the bloodiest persecution. While thousands were being slaughtered in Languedoc, the Council of Lateran, in 1215, revived the ancient canons prohibiting clerks from uttering a judgment of blood, or being present at an execution. In 1255, the Council of Bordeaux added to this a prohibition of dictating or writing letters connected with such judgments; and that of Buda, in 1279, in repeating this canon, appended to it a clause forbidding clerks to practice any surgery requiring burning or cutting. The pollution of blood was so seriously felt, that a church or cemetery in which blood chanced to be shed, could not be used until it had been reconciled, and this was carried so far that priests were forbidden to allow judges to administer justice in churches, because cases involving corporal punishment might be tried before them.

109. "Had this shrinking from participation in the infliction of human suffering been genuine, it would have been worthy of all respect; but it was merely a device to avoid responsibility for its own acts In prosecutions for heresy, the ecclesiastical tribunal passed no judgments of blood. It merely found the defendant to be a heretic, and `relaxed' him, or relinquished him to the secular authorities, with the hypocritical adjuration to be merciful to him, to spare his life, and not to spill his blood. What was the real import of this plea for mercy, is easily seen from the theory of the Church as to the duty of the temporal power, when inquisitors enforced as a legal rule, that the mere belief that persecution for conscience' sake was sinful, was in itself a heresy, to be visited with the full penalties of that unpardonable crime."

110. "The Church thus undertook to coerce the sovereign to persecution. It would not listen to mercy, it would not hear of expediency. The monarch held his crown by the tenure of extirpating heresy, of seeing that the laws were sharp and were pitilessly enforced. Any hesitation was visited with excommunication, and if this proved inefficacious, his dominions were thrown open to the first hardy adventurer

507

whom the Church would supply with an army, for his overthrow. Whether this new feature in the public law of Europe could establish itself, was the question at issue in the Albigensian crusades. Raymond's lands were forfeited simply because he would not punish heretics, and those which his son retained, were treated as a fresh gift from the crown. The triumph of the new principle was complete, and it never was subsequently questioned.

111. "It was applied from the highest to the lowest, and the Church made every dignitary feel that his station was an office in a universal theocracy, wherein all interests were subordinate to the great duty of maintaining the purity of the faith. The hegemony of Europe was vested in the holy Roman Empire, and its coronation was a strangely solemn religious ceremony, in which the emperor was admitted to the lower orders of the priesthood, and was made to anathematize all heresy raising itself against the holy Catholic Church. In handing him the ring, the pope told him that it was a symbol that he was to destroy heresy: and in girding him with the sword, that with it he was to strike down the enemies of the Church. . . . In fact, according to the high

churchmen, the only reason of the transfer of the empire from the Greeks to the Germans, was that the Church might have an efficient agent. The principles applied to Raymond of Toulouse were embodied in the canon law, and every prince and noble was made to understand that his lands would be exposed to the spoiler, if, after due notice, he hesitated in trampling out heresy. Minor officials were subjected to the same discipline. . . . From the emperor to the meanest peasant, the duty of persecution was enforced with all the sanctions, spiritual and temporal, which the Church could command. Not only must the ruler enact rigorous laws to punish heretics, but he and his subjects must see them strenuously executed; for any slackness of persecution was, in the canon law, construed as fautorship of heresy, putting a man on his purgation."

112. "It is altogether a modern perversion of history to assume, as apologists do, that the request for mercy was sincere, and that the secular magistrate, and not the Inquisition, was responsible for the death of the heretic. We can imagine the smile of amused surprise with which Gregory IX or Gregory XI would have listened to the dialectics with which the Comte Joseph de Maistre proves that it is an error to

suppose, and much more to assert, that Catholic priests can in any manner be instrumental in compassing the death of a fellow-creature.

113. "Not only were all Christians thus made to feel that it was their highest duty to aid in the extermination of heretics, but they were taught that they must denounce them to the authorities regardless of all considerations, human or divine. No tie of kindred served as an excuse for concealing heresy. The son must denounce the father, and the husband was guilty if he did not deliver his wife to a frightful death. Every human bond was severed by the guilt of heresy; children were taught to desert their parents, and even the sacrament of matrimony could not unite an orthodox wife to a misbelieving husband. No pledge was to remain unbroken. It was an old rule that faith was not to be kept with heretics -- as Innocent III emphatically phrased it, 'According to the canons, faith is not to be kept with him who keeps not faith with God.'"

---

1 [Page 456] Rev. 2:20.

2 [Page 456] Kings 21:23.

3 [Page 456] Kings 21:7-11.

4 [Page 457] Kings 18:3-10.

5 [Page 457] Chap. 1, para. 17, 18.

6 [Page 457] Ex. 4:15, 16; 7:1; Deut. 18:18.

7 [Page 458] Rev. 17:1, 2; 18:3-9.

8 [Page 458] Rev. 17:18.

9 [Page 459] Chap. 1, par. 17.

10 [Page 459] Rev. 6, 7, 8, R. V.

11 [Page 460] "Great Empire of Prophecy, "chap. XXXiii, par. 4; chap. XXXV, pars. 51-55.

12 [Page 460] "History of the Inquisition," Vol. 1, p. 215.

13 [Page 460] Chap. Xiii. par. 15.

14 [Page 461] "History of Protestantism," book 1, chap. v. pars. 8, 9, 11.

15 [Page 462] Id., note.

16 [Page 462] Chap. xiii, par. 35, this book.

17 [Page 463] "History of Protestantism," book 1, chap. vi, pars. 2, 3.

18 [Page 463] "Historical Studies," pp. 200, 201.

19 [Page 464] "History of Protestantism," book 1, chap. viii, par. 2.

20 [Page 464] John 8:48.

21 [Page 464] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. liv, par. 2.

22 [Page 466] "History of Protestantism," book 1, chap. viii, para. 4-6.

23 [Page 466] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. liv, par. 4. vol 3. to 323.

24 [Page 467] Id., pars. 7, 8.

25 [Page 467] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. liv, par. 7.

26 [Page 468] Rev. 2:13.

27 [Page 468] Wylie's "History of Protestantism," book 1. chap. xi, par 6..

28 [Page 468] Id.

29 [Page 469] "History of the Inquisition," p. 73.

30 [Page 469] Wylie's "History of Protestantism," book 1, chap. xi, par. 11.

31 [Page 470] "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. lxix, par. 6.

32 [Page 470] Id.

33 [Page 471] "History of the Inquisition," vol. 1, pp. 74, 75.

34 [Page 471] "History of the Inquisition," p. 75.

35 [Page 472] "History of Protestantism," book i, chap. vii, par. 3.

36 [Page 472] "History of the Inquisition," pp. 76, 77.

37 [Page 474] "History of Protestantism," book i, chap. vii, pars. 5-8.

38 [Page 474] "History of the Inquisition," p. 102.

39 [Page 474] "History of the Inquisition," pp. 101, 102.

40 [Page 478] Id., pp. 117-119.

41 [Page 479] Id., pp. 113, 114.

42 [Page 479] Id., p. 120.

43 [Page 480] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," Alexander III, par. 10 from end.

44 [Page 480] Id., p. 124.

45 [Page 481] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," Lucius III, pars. 9-12.

46 [Page 483] Id., pp. 78-81.

47 [Page 485] Id., pp. 126-128.

48 [Page 485] Id., p. 128

49 [Page 486] Id., p. 186

50 [Page 487] Id., p. 81

51 [Page 488] Id., p. 101

52 [Page 488] Id., p. 98

53 [Page 489] Id., pp. 85-87.

54 [Page 489] Id., p. 125

55 [Page 489] Id., p. 87

56 [Page 489] Id., p. 98, note.

57 [Page 491] Id., pp. 116, 117.

58 [Page 492] Id., pp. 135, 136

59 [Page 493] Id., p. 141. From here to the end of this chapter, all quotations not otherwise directly credited are from "History of the Inquisition." Vol. 1. pp. 138-230.

60 [Page 504] "History of Protestantism," book 1, chap. ix, last two paragraphs.

61 [Page 504] "Historical Studies," P. 49.

20. THE ANARCHY OF THE PAPACY

IN Boniface VIII the papacy had reached the pinnacle of worldly power and glory. All the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them were hers. And now she entered diligently upon the enjoyment of it all And the conduct of the popes in the enjoyment of this power and glory, was exactly after the order of that of the emperors of ancient Rome in the enjoyment of the power and glory to which Rome had attained in the reign of Augustus. With but little more change than the insertion of the names of the popes in the place of the names of the Caesars -- Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, -- Suetonius's account ofthe lives of the Caesars would very easily fit the lives of the popes in thefourteenth century.

2. The immediate successor of Boniface VIII reigned less than a year, Oct. 27, 1303, to July 6, 1304. It seems that he really made honest efforts at a reform of the ecclesiastics, which excited such a violent opposition and hatred toward him as to cause his term to end as soon as it did, by poison. At his death there were two rival parties which aimed at the possession of the papacy. These two parties were the Guelphs and the Ghibellines. The influence of these two parties amongst the cardinals was so evenly balanced that the cardinals were obliged to break up their conclave without an election. But by the interference of King Philip the Handsome, of France, an election was reached in the choice of the archbishop of Bordeaux. He was installed at Lyons. "The ceremonies took place in the church of St. Just on the 14th of November, 1305, in the presence of an immense concourse of bishops, archbishops, kings, princes, and lords." He took the name of --

CLEMENT V, NOV, 14, 1305 TO APRIL 20, 1314.

"After mass he returned to his palace, followed by cardinals, nobles, and monks, and an immense escort of people: the kings of France and

Aragon led by the bridle a white horse, on which the pope, clothed in his pontifical ornaments and wearing his tiara, was mounted.

3. "The procession having arrived at the foot of the hill on which the church of Saint Just is built, the kings yielded their place, by the side of Clement, to Charles of Valois and Louis d'Evreux, the two brothers of Philip. Scarcely had this change been made, when a horrible crash was heard; an old wall, on which a scaffolding had been erected [for the crowd of sight-seers], fell on the train and drew down in its fall all who were on it. The count de Valois and the king of France were badly wounded; the pontiff himself was thrown from his horse, and in the tumult a large diamond of considerable value was stolen from his tiara. His brother, Gaillard de Got, was instantly killed, with the duke of Brittany and a large number of lords and priests. Several cardinals, already discontented with Clement took occasion of this accident to proclaim openly their intention of returning to Italy; but the pope promptly informed them that he knew how to constrain them to obey his will, and to inhabit the city in which he pleased to dwell.

4. "Some days afterward, Clement celebrated his first pontifical mass, and gave a grand entertainment to all his court. As we might suppose, the most delicious meats and wines of France were lavished at it; so that toward the end of the banquet, their heads being exhilarated, they laid aside reserve. An imprudent word brought on a quarrel between the cardinals and the holy father; from words they came to blows, daggers leaped from their sheaths, and one of the brothers of the pope was slain before his eyes." -- De Cormenin.1

5. "During his sojourn at Lyons, the pontiff, though much grieved by the death of his brothers, did not forget the interests of his see. He extorted enormous sums from the bishops and abbots of France who came to his court; and when he perceived that a fear of being mulcted prevented the clergy from visiting him, he determined to make a tour through the dioceses. He passed through a great number of cities, and everywhere carried off treasures from the churches and monasteries. It is related that he took five whole days to carry away from the rich abbey of Cluny the gold and silver that he found in the

cellars of the monks. He compelled Giles, the archbishop of Bourges, to pay so large a fine for not having visited him, that the unfortunate prelate was compelled forever after to live on alms. Not content with his own extortions, on his return to Bordeaux, he sent three legates -- Gentil de Montesiore, Nicholas de Freauville, and Thomas de Jorz, to squeeze the lower clergy of the Gallic Church. They imposed such onerous contributions on the priests, and exacted the payment so rigorously, that the latter, in their despair, complained to the monarch.

6. "Philip instructed Milon de Noyers, the marshal of France, to complain to the holy father against his extortioners, and to obtain their recall. But this embassy, instead of arresting the evil, increased it. The pope, fearing lest energetic measures would be taken to shackle his financiering expedition, urged the receipt of the money, and ordered his legates to increase their severity and set all ecclesiastical dignities up at auction. He also resolved to use the tribunals of the Inquisition, with which Blanche of Castlle and St. Louis had endowed France, so as to avail himself of the decrees of the fourth council of the Lateran, which provided that the property of heretics and their accomplices belonged to the holy see, without the children or relatives of the condemned being able to claim the least part. As Philip alone could offer any serious opposition, he determined to associate him with him in its benefits, and offered to divide with him the immense wealth of the templars and hospitalers, whom he proposed to attack as heretics."

7. This scheme was carried to successful issue; and the pope and the king "divided between themselves the riches of the Templars. Philip kept the land, and Clement took all the ornaments of gold and silver, and the coined money."2 The pope established his residence at the city of Avignon, which for seventy-four years -- 1304-1378 -- continued to be the residence of the popes. Clement held a general council at Vienna. Henry VII was to be crowned emperor. The imperial crown could be received only in Rome. The pope "commissioned five cardinals to proceed, in his place, to the coronation of the emperor, and sent a bull in which all the pontifical audacity was exhibited to the light of day." In the bull Clement V said to Henry VII: --

"Know, prince, that Jesus Christ, the King of kings, having given to His Church all the kingdoms upon earth, emperors and kings should

serve on their knees, us, who are the representatives and vicars of God."

8. When Clement died "his treasures were pillaged. The cardinals seized on enormous sums of coined money. Bernard, Count de Lomagne, nephew and minion of the dead pope, carried off chalices and ornaments worth more than a hundred thousand florins. The Countess de Foix stole as her share all the jewels of the holy father. And there were no minions nor mistresses of the cardinals who were not enriched by the spoils of the sovereign pontiff. . . . When there was nothing more left in the treasury of the Church, the cardinals, twenty-three in number, went to Carpentras, and shut themselves up in the episcopal palace, to proceed to the election of a new pope. Scarcely had they done so, when a dreadful tumult broke out in the city; the priests of the court of Clement, and the domestics of the cardinals who had not formed a part of the cortege of the pope, and who consequently had not had part of the plunder, arrived at Carpentras, furious at having been deprived of such rich booty. As they knew the impossibility of their masters opposing their designs, they traversed the streets with lighted torches, and set fire to the houses, that they might more easily rob the inhabitants in the general alarm. Fortunately, these soon gained the ascendence, and laid strong hands on the stranger priests. In consequence of this outbreak, a panic seized the cardinals; they left Carpentras furtively, to escape the popular vengeance, and retired to their magnificent palaces at Avignon, or to their country houses, without caring otherwise for Christianity than to spend with their mistresses the money which the faithful had given to Clement the Fifth, and which they had divided amongst themselves."3

9. Two full years passed without any election of a pope. At last the king of France "went to the city of Lyons, from whence he wrote to the cardinals to come to him secretly, promising the tiara to each one of them. On the appointed day they all arrived, mysteriously, in the city, and went to the monastery of Preaching Brothers, where Philip was. As soon as they appeared at the convent, they were arrested and confined in a large hall. Philip then informed them that he should keep them prisoners until they had named a pontiff." The king commanded that they be fed only on bread and water. At the end of

forty days, having not yet come to an agreement in the choice of a pope, they did agree "to commission the cardinal James d'Ossa to choose the worthiest among them as sovereign pontiff." The worthy cardinal "placed the tiara on his own head." And since it was the unanimous choice of the cardinals that James d'Ossa choose the pope, and he had chosen himself, his election was counted unanimous, and he was proclaimed Pope --

JOHN XXII, SEPT. 21, 1316, TO DEC. 4, 1334.

10. John was seventy years old. From the fact that the cardinals could unite in trusting him to choose the worthiest amongst them to be pope, it is evident that he had some claims to their confidence. But if this be so, and whatever claims to worthiness he might have had, after he became pope "he became prouder, more deceitful, and greedier than his predecessors. He was not content with the ordinary revenues of the Church, and with the enormous sums the inquisitors paid him as his share of the confiscations, but he increased them by speculating in human corruption, and publicly sold absolution for parricide, murder, robbery, incest, adultery, sodomy, and bestiality. He himself reduced to writing this tax of the apostolic chancery, that Pactolus which flowed over all the vices of humanity changed into livres tournois or handsome golden pennies -- and which rolled into the pontifical treasury, the true ocean in which the wealth of nations was engulfed. It was he also who first added a third crown to the tiara, as a symbol of the triple power of the popes over heaven, earth, and hell, and which they have made the emblem of their pride, their avarice, and their lubricity."

11. The list of taxes drawn up by John XXII, as levied upon the licentious practices of ecclesiastics, priests, nuns, and the laity; on murder and other enormities, as well as on lesser crimes and breaches of monastic rules and Church requirements; is sufficient to cover almost every sin that mankind could commit. Yet, all these sins were regularly taxed at a certain rate, to the single "sou" (cent), and even to the "denier." So that it is literally true that no inconsiderable portion of the revenues of the papacy were derived from a regularly assessed tax upon the sins of men. Well did the abbot of Usperg exclaim: "O Vatican, rejoice now, all treasuries are open to thee, -- thou canst draw

in with full hands! Rejoice in the crimes of the children of men, since thy wealth depends on their abandonment and iniquity! Urge on to debauchery, excite to rape, incest, even parricide; for, the greater the crime, the more gold will it bring thee. Rejoice thou! Shout forth songs of gladness! Now the human race is subjected to thy laws! Now thou reignest through depravity of morals and the inundation of ignoble thoughts. The children of men can now commit with impunity every crime, since they know that thou wilt absolve them for a little gold. Provided he brings thee gold, let him be soiled with blood and lust; thou wilt open the kingdom of heaven to debauchees, Sodomites, assassins, parricides. What do I say? Thou wilt sell God himself for gold!"4

12. In 1319 Pope John discovered that Clement V, "before his death, had deposited a vast amount in money, in gold and silver vessels, robes, books, precious stones, and other ornaments, with important instruments and muniments in the castle of Mouteil," in the care of the lord of the castle. The pope demanded that the lord of the castle should deliver all this wealth to him. It amounted to nearly four and a half million dollars' worth. The lord in whose charge it had been deposited, pleaded that it had been all spent, and chiefly by others than himself. He allowed himself to be put upon trial rather than to pay; and in the trial secured an

acquittal. But the transaction gives indisputable testimony as to what the popes did with the vast treasures that were pouring into their hands from all Europe.

13. The emperor Louis of Bavaria was under the displeasure of John. The city of Rome was exceedingly jealous of the city of Avignon because Avignon had the glory, the pomp, and the expenditures of the papal court. Rome called upon Pope John to come with his court to Rome. John still remained in Avignon. Rome notified him that if he did not respond to their call, they would receive his enemy, Louis of Bavaria; for "a court they would have: if not the pope's, that of the emperor." There was more than this in their threat. For, if the emperor came to Rome to be crowned, being at war with Pope John, and it being essential that he should have a pope to crown him, he could do as many emperors had

done before, -- create a pope, -- then they would have both an emperor's and a pope's court. By ambiguous sentences, implying halfpromises or not, John replied to the Romans as to his going to Rome with his court; but as to their receiving the emperor, he sought to dissuade them from joining with the enemy of the Church. But, since John did not comply with their call, Rome did welcome the emperor, and fought for him against his opponents in Italy.

14. Sunday, Jan. 17, 1328, was the day chosen by the emperor for his coronation. Two bishops supplied the place of pope and cardinals, in his crowning. Then, being emperor, the next day he ascended a lofty stage in front of St. Peter's, and "took his seat on a gorgeous throne. He wore the purple robes, the imperial crown; in his right hand he bore the golden scepter, in his left the golden apple. Around him were prelates, barons, and armed knights; the populace filled the vast space. A brother of the Order of Eremites advanced on the stage, and cried aloud: `Is there any procurator who will defend the priest, James of Cahors, who calls himself Pope John XXII?' Thrice he uttered the summons; no answer was made. A learned abbot of Germany mounted the stage, and made a long sermon in eloquent Latin, on the text: `This is the day of good tidings.' The topics were skillfully chosen to work upon a turbulent audience. `The holy emperor beholding Rome, the head of the world and of the Christian faith, deprived both of her temporal and her spiritual throne, had left his own realm and his young children to restore her dignity. At Rome he had heard that James of Cahors, called Pope John, had determined to change the titles of the cardinals, and transfer them also to Avignon; that he had proclaimed a crusade against the Roman people; therefore the Syndics of the Roman clergy, and the representatives of the Roman people, had entreated him to proceed against the said James of Cahors as a heretic, and to provide the Church and people of Rome, as the emperor Otto had done, with a holy and faithful pastor." -- Milman.5

15. The preacher next arraigned Pope John on charges of heresy. He charged that, when Pope John had been urged to war against the Saracens, he replied; "We have Saracens enough at home." He charged that Pope John XXII had said that Christ, "whose poverty

was among His perfections, held property in common with His disciples." He charged that Pope John had asserted that "to the pope belongs all power, temporal as well as spiritual;" "contrary to the gospel which maintains the rights of Caesar, and asserts the pope's kingdom to be purely spiritual. For these crimes therefore, of heresy and treason, the emperor, by the new law, and by other laws, canon and civil, removes, deprives, and cashiers the same James of Cahors from his papal office, leaving to any one who has temporal jurisdiction, to execute upon him the penalties of heresy and treason. Henceforth no prince, baron, or commonalty is to own him as pope, under pain of condemnation as fautor of his treason and heresy: half the penalty to go to the imperial treasury, half to the Roman people." He then announced that the emperor, Louis of Bavaria, promised that in a few days "he would provide a good pope and a good pastor for the great consolation of Rome and of all Christendom."

16. April 23, in the presence of senators and people, the emperor published a law "that the pope about to be named, and all future popes, should be bound to reside, except for three months in the year, in Rome; that he should not depart, unless with the permission of the Roman people, above two days' journey from the city; and, if summoned to return, and disobedient to the summons, he might be deposed and another chosen in his place." May 12, the emperor again took his place upon the throne, with a certain friar, Peter di Corvara, at his side. A sermon was preached from the text: "And Peter, turning, said, The angel of the Lord hath appeared and delivered me out of the hand of Herod." Pope John was Herod, and the emperor was the angelic deliverer. Then a bishop called three times to the populace, whether they would have "the brother Peter for the pope of Rome." The answer was loud and unanimous, in the affirmative. The decree was then read, "the emperor rose, put on the finger of the friar the ring of St. Peter, arrayed him in the pall, and saluted him by the name of --

NICHOLAS V, MAY 12, 1328, TO AUG. 24, 1329.

17. The emperor had himself crowned again by the new pope. The new pope immediately created seven cardinals, and thus formed a papal court; and he who had been proclaimed as the representative of apostolic

517

poverty, began immediately to display all the style of a court. His cardinals rode forth "on stately steeds, the gift of the emperor, with servants, even knights and squires;" they enjoyed splendid and costly banquets. And the new pope, like the popes at Avignon, maintained these extravagances of his court by the sale of ecclesiastical privileges, and benefices, and confiscating the wealth, even the lamps, of churches. The contest between the two popes "divided all Christendom. In the remotest parts were wandering friars who denounced the heresy of Pope John," and advocated the cause of the emperor and Pope Nicholas. "In the University of Paris were men of profound thought who held the same views, and whom the ruling powers of the University were constrained to tolerate." The whole of Europe seemed about to be divided. Two men were burned in Rome for denying that Nicholas V was lawful pope; and Pope John was burned in effigy. Pope Nicholas "threatened all who should adhere to his adversary, not merely with excommunication, but with the stake."6

18. In October, the emperor and Nicholas went first to Viterbo, and then to Pisa, Nicholas on every occasion issuing edicts anathematizing the "so-called pope," John XXII. The emperor retired to Trent, in the Tyrol. Pisa repudiated Pope Nicholas V. He fled; then stole back and took refuge in the palace of a nobleman who was his friend. To the nobleman Pope John XXII wrote a letter, urging him to "surrender the child of hell, the pupil of malediction." Pope Nicholas V surrendered, and threw himself upon the mercy of Pope John XXII. To Pope John he wrote thus :--

"I heard brought against you and your court accusations of heresy, exactions, simony, debaucheries, and murders, which rendered you, in my eyes, the most execrable of pontiffs. I then thought it my duty not to refuse the tiara, in order to deliver the Church from a pope who was drawing the faithful into an abyss. I have since learned, from my own experience, how difficult it is to live a holy life in the chair of the apostle, and I avow that no one is more worthy of the papacy than yourself. I thus renounce this dignity, and I will abdicate solemnly in your presence, in such place as you shall please to designate."7

518

19. The nobleman under whose protection Nicholas was, required of John XXII that the life of Nicholas V should be spared, and that he should be absolved of the crime of having been pope. Pope John XXII commissioned the archbishop of Pisa to receive the submission of Pope Nicholas V. In the great cathedral of Pisa, Pope Nicholas V renounced the popedom, and condemned as heretical and impious all his acts of pope. He was then conveyed to Avignon, to Pope John XXII. "The day after his arrival at Avignon he was introduced into the full consistory with a halter round his neck. He threw himself at the pope's feet; imploring mercy and execrating his own impiety." A few days afterward he appeared again before the pope and cardinals, read a long confession, renounced and condemned the emperor Louis as heretical and schismatical. He was allowed to live

in the papal palace; but "closely watched and secluded from intercourse with the world, yet allowed the use of books and all services of the Church."

20. A section of the Franciscan monks were wandering everywhere, preaching absolute poverty as the perfection of Christianity. They denounced the luxury of the popes; and even denounced the papacy itself as "the great harlot of Revelation." Clement V had persecuted many of them to death; and John XXII followed it up. "Wherever they were, John pursued them with his persecuting edicts. The Inquisition was instructed to search them out in their remotest sanctuaries; the clergy were directed to denounce them on every Sunday and on every festival."

21. The claims of the papacy were by no means slackened. Pope John XXII, in one of his edicts, declared that --

"He [the pope] alone promulgates law; he alone is absolved from all law. He alone sits in the chair of St. Peter, not as mere man, but as man and God. . . . His will is law; what he pleases has the force of law."8

22. He published a treatise, in which he set forth the claims of the papacy as follows: --

"As Jesus Christ is recognized as the Pontiff, King and Lord of the universe, so His vicar upon earth can have no equal. And since the whole world belongs to God, it should equally appertain to the pope. Emperors, kings, and princes can not then be recognized as lawful

unless they have received their States as fiefs from the chief of the Church, who possesses this immense power, not by the right of the sword, but by divine right. For Jesus gave to St. Peter the keys, not the key of the kingdom of heaven only, that is one for spiritual and another for temporal things. The faithful should obey only God and the pope. And when kings refuse obedience to the holy see they place themselves without the bosom of the Church; they condemn themselves with their own mouths as heretics; and should consequently be handed over to the inquisitors to be burned for the edification of the faithful."9

23. Pope John XXII died in 1334, at nearly the age of ninety years. "After his death they found in his treasury eighteen millions of florins [about forty-three and a half millions of dollars] in coined money, besides his vessels, crosses, miters, and precious stones, which were valued at seven millions of florins [about seventeen millions of dollars]. I can render certain testimony to this, because my brother, a man worthy of belief, who was one of the purveyors of the pontifical court, was at Avignon when the treasurers made their report to the cardinals. This immense wealth, and the still greater which the holy father had expended, were the proceeds of his industry, that is, of the sale of indulgences, benefices, dispensations, reserves, expectatives, and annates. But what contributed the most to increase his treasures was the tax from the apostolic chancellors for the absolution of all crimes."10 This same writer well remarks: "The good man had forgotten that saying, `Lay not up your treasures upon earth.'" And this vast sum that was found in the coffers of John XXII after his death, was that which was left over "beyond and above the lavish expenditure on the Italian wars; the maintenance of his martial son or nephew, the cardinal legate, at the head of a great army; his profuse provision for other relatives;" and the enormous expenditures of the papal court of Avignon. From all of this it may be conjectured as to what was the immensity of the papal revenues.

24. "One large source of his wealth was notorious to Christendom. Under the pretext of discouraging simony, he seized into his own power all the collegiate benefices throughout Christendom. Besides this, by the system of papal reserves, he never confirmed the direct promotion

of any prelate; but by his skillful promotion of each bishop to a richer bishopric or archbishop, and so on to a patriarchate, as on each vacancy the annates or first fruits were paid, six or more fines would accrue to the treasury. Yet this pope -- though besides his great rapacity, he was harsh, relentless, a cruel persecutor, and betrayed his joy not only at the discomfiture, but at the slaughter of his enemies -- had great fame for piety as well as learning, arose every night to pray and to study, and every morning attended mass." -- Milman.11

25. When the cardinals, after the death of John, entered into conclave for the election of a new pope, there were the same difficulties as formerly in reaching an election; for they would not, if they could avoid it, elect as pope a man who would not remain in Avignon. There was quite a general agreement in favor of one of their number; but they required a promise that he would continue to reign in Avignon, to which he replied: "I would sooner yield up the cardinalate than accept the popedom on such conditions." This destroyed all his chances; and, in playing against time, each thought to throw away his vote by casting it for one whom no one would ever expect could be chosen pope. But, as it happened, in thus seeking to throw away their votes, enough of them threw their votes to the same man to elect one who, when to the surprise of all it was discovered, exclaimed: "You have chosen an ass!" He toke the name of Pope --

BENEDICT XII, DEC. 20, 1334, TO APRIL 25, 1342.

He immediately dismissed a vast number of hangers-on at the papal palace, and declared that he found great difficulty in finding ecclesiastics who were worthy to be appointed to vacancies. He bestowed upon the cardinals one hundred thousand florins ($242,000) of the many millions left in the treasury by John XXII. Also from these treasures he began the building of a magnificent palace.

26. The king of France, and the emperor Louis, were under excommunication, from Benedict's predecessors; and not only the sovereigns, but the imperial diet, sought earnestly, by humiliating concessions, to have Benedict XII to release them. But the pope delayed so long that the sovereigns and the nobles grew weary. The emperor appeared before

a diet at Frankfort, and complained of the obduracy of the pope. The diet declared that he had done enough to satisfy the pope, and, since it was all in vain, they pronounced null and void the excommunication and all the other papal proceedings in the case. And, at a diet at Rhense, July 16, 1337, at which all but one of the electors were present, the imperial office was declared independent of the papacy.

27. "They solemnly agreed that the holy Roman Empire, and they, the prince-electors, had been assailed, limited, and aggrieved in their honors, rights, customs, and liberties; that they would maintain, guard, assert those rights against all and every one without exception; that no one would obtain dispensation, absolution, relaxation, abolition of his own vow; that he should be, and was declared to be, faithless and traitorous before God and man, who should not maintain all this against any opponent whatsoever." August 8 following, a diet, held again at Frankfort, "passed as a fundamental law of the empire, a declaration that the imperial dignity and power are from God alone; that an emperor elected by the concordant suffrage, or a majority of the electoral suffrages, has plenary imperial power, and does not need the approbation, confirmation, or authority of the pope, or the apostolic see, or any other."

28. In response to this Benedict declared the throne vacant, and named himself protector of the empire. But death prevented him from any further aggression. An epitaph describes him as "a Nero, death to the laity, a viper to the clergy, without truth, a mere cup of wine." To the customary vices of the popes of the time, he added that of drunkenness to such a degree that his example gave rise to the proverb, "As drunk as a pope." He was succeeded by --

CLEMENT VI, MAY 7, 1342, TO DEC. 6, 1352.

29. What little check had been put upon the hangers-on at the palace by Benedict XII, was more than swept away by Clement VI. He actually published a letter giving notice that "all poor clergy who would present themselves at Avignon within two months, should partake of his bounty." An eye-witness declares that a hundred thousand greedy applicants crowded the streets of Avignon. "If Clement acted up to his maxim, that no one ought to depart unsatisfied from the palace of a

prince, how vast and inexhaustible must have been the wealth and preferment at the disposal of the pope!" Where Benedict XII hesitated to fill ecclesiastical vacancies, because of the dearth of those worthy to fill them, Clement VI not only filled all the vacancies that could be found, but a great number of bishoprics and abbacies he declared vacant, in order that he might fill them. This was for revenue, because every appointment to a vacancy brought a considerable sum of money, according to the dignity and wealth of the position. When it was objected that no former pope had assumed this power, he merely answered: "They knew not how to act as pope."

30. "If Clement was indulgent to others, he was not less so to himself. The court at Avignon became the most splendid, perhaps the gayest, in Christendom. The Provencals might almost think their brilliant and chivalrous counts restored to power and enjoyment. The papal palace spread out in extent and magnificence. The young art of painting was fostered by the encouragement of Italian artists. The pope was more than royal in the number and attire of his retainers. The papal stud of horses commanded general admiration. The life of Clement was a constant succession of ecclesiastical pomps and gorgeous receptions and luxurious banquets. Ladies were admitted freely to the court, the pope mingled with ease in the gallant intercourse. If John XXII and even the more rigid Benedict, did not escape the imputation of unclerical license, Clement VI, who affected no disguise in his social hours, would hardly be supposed superior to the common freedom of the ecclesiastics of his day. The countess of Turenne, if not, as general report averred, actually so, had at least many of the advantages of the pope's mistress -- the distribution of preferments and benefices to any extent, which this woman, as rapacious as she was handsome and imperious, sold with shameless publicity."12 Petrarch declared that Avignon was one vast brothel.

31. Pope Clement VI took yet another turn to increase the revenues of the papacy. It will be remembered that Boniface VIII established the jubilee, to be celebrated each hundredth year, with complete indulgence to all who would make the pilgrimage to Rome. The result of the jubilee appointed by Boniface was such that a writer who was present,

said: "I can bear witness to it, since I dwelt in that city: by day and by night, there were two clerks at the altar of St. Paul, with rakes in their hands to rake up the gold which the faithful unceasingly threw down there. Boniface amassed an immense treasure from these donations, and the Romans were enriched by selling their wares, at excessive prices, to the simple people who came to obtain indulgences and empty their purses."13

32. And now the people of Rome were more urgently than ever pressing the pope to remove his court to that city. They sent an embassy "to offer the pope, in the name of their fellow-citizens, the posts of first senator and captain of the city, provided he would return to Rome, and reduce the interval of the jubilees, from one hundred to fifty years, in order to multiply the causes of the prosperity of Italy, and increase the imposts of the holy city. Clement accepted the dignities and magistracies which were offered to him, and assured the ambassadors that he had the re-establishing of the holy see much at heart, and that he would engage to do it as soon as possible. As a proof of the sincerity of his word, he fixed the period of the new jubilee for the year 1350. The following was the bull published on the occasion: --

"The Son of God, by expiring on the cross, my brethren, has acquired for us a treasure of indulgences, which is increased by the infinite merits of the holy Virgin, the martyrs, and the saints; for you know that the dispensation of these riches belongs to the successors of St. Peter. Boniface the Eighth has already ordered the

faithful to make a pilgrimage to the churches of Saint Peter and Saint Paul, and his bull grants entire absolution of sin to those who make this journey at the commencement of each century. We, however, consider that in the Mosaic law, which Jesus Christ came to accomplish spiritually, the fiftieth year is that of jubilee or the remission of debts. For this reason, then, on account of the short duration of human life, and that the greatest number of Christians may participate in this indulgence, we grant full and entire absolution to those who shall visit the churches of the two apostles, and that of St. John of the Lateran, in the year 1350, during thirty days, if Romans, and during five months, if strangers."14

33. Clement lived to see this jubilee that he had appointed, and to enjoy the rich returns that came to the papal treasury. "Annibal Cecano placed his soldiers around the church of St. John of the Lateran;

524

and at the end of the year he left Rome followed by fifty wagons loaded with gold and silver, which he conducted to the holy father under the charge of a good escort. Clement himself had not remained inactive: he had sold a goodly number of dispensations to kings, princes, and lords who could not go to Rome; and they counted that the jubilee produced incalculable wealth to the court of Avignon."15

34. Benedict XII had failed to raise the excommunication from the emperor Louis. The emperor besought Clement VI so earnestly to release him, and the pope held him off so long, that, at last, he offered to allow the pope himself to dictate the terms of his release. This, of course, the pope willingly did; and, amongst the terms, he stipulated that the emperor should never issue any ordinance "as emperor or king of the Romans, without special permission of the Roman see; and that he would supplicate the pope, after absolution, to grant him the administration of the empire; and that he would make the States of the empire swear by word and by writing to stand by the Church." Even to these terms the emperor agreed. But the nobles of the empire denounced him for it. They also protested to the pope, and began to say that an emperor who had so debased the imperial office, ought to be compelled to abdicate.

35. Yet even after the emperor had done all this, under the plea that the emperor had not fulfilled the treaty with becoming promptness Clement VI issued the following bull, "which in the vigor and fury of its curses transcended all that had yet, in the wildest times, issued from the Roman see:" --

"We humbly implore the divine power to confute the madness and crush the pride of the aforesaid Louis, to cast him down by the might of the Lord's right hand, to deliver him into the hands of his enemies, and those that persecute him. Let the unforeseen snare fall upon him! Be he accursed in his going out and his coming in! The Lord strike him with madness, and blindness, and fury! May the heavens rain lightning upon him! May the wrath of Almighty God, and of the blessed apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, turn against him in this world and in the world to come! May the whole world war upon him! May the earth open and swallow him up quick. May his name be blotted out in his own generation; his memory perish from the earth! May the elements be against him; his dwelling be desolate! The merits of all the saints at rest confound him and execute vengeance on him in

525

this life! Be his sons cast forth from their homes and be delivered before his eyes into the hands of his enemies!"16

36. In 1347 Rienzi roused Rome to the establishment of a new republic, with Rienzi himself as great tribune. Clement VI condemned Rienzi and his whole proceedings, denounced him "under all those terrific appellations, perpetually thundered out by the popes against their enemies. He was `a Belshazzar, the wild ass in Job, a Lucifer, a forerunner of antichrist, a man of sin, son of perdition, a son of the devil, full of fraud and falsehood, and like the beast in the Revelation over whose head was written, Blasphemy.' He had insulted the holy Catholic Church by declaring that the Church and State of Rome were one." -- Milman.17

37. In the year 1348 the black plague swept over Europe, and caused multitudes to perish. The clergy had neglected the attentions due to the suffering, the dying, and the dead; and the friars everywhere had administered those offices. This everywhere turned the gratitude of the people to the friars, and brought to the friars vast numbers of gifts in wills and offerings. "Cardinals, many bishops, a multitude of the secular clergy, thronged to Avignon. They demanded the suppression of the mendicants. By what authority did they preach, hear confessions, intercept the alms of the faithful, even the burial dues of their flocks? The consistory sat, not one was present who dared to lift his voice in favor of the friars. The pope arose. . . He defended them with imposing eloquence against their adversaries. At the close of his speech he turned to the prelates," and thus addressed them: --

"And if the friars were not to preach to the people, what would ye preach? Humility? you, the proudest, the most disdainful, the most magnificent among all the estates of men, who ride abroad in procession on your stately palfreys! Poverty? ye who are so greedy, so obstinate in the pursuit of gain, that all the prebends and benefices of the world will not satiate your avidity! Chastity? of this I say nothing! God knows your lives, how your bodies are pampered with pleasures. If you hate the begging friars, and close your doors against them, it is that they may not see your lives; you had rather waste your wealth on panders and ruffians than on mendicants. Be not surprised that the friars receive bequests made in the time of the fatal mortality, they who took the charge of parishes deserted by their pastors, out of which they drew converts

to their houses of prayer, houses of prayer and of honor to the Church, not seats of voluptuousness and luxury."18

38. At the death of Clement the cardinals met in their solemn conclave. They first unanimously enacted a law for themselves, ordaining that the pope should create no cardinal till the number of the cardinals was as low as sixteen, and then could not increase the number beyond twenty: that he must not nominate cardinals without the consent of the whole college of the cardinals, or, in extremity, at least two thirds: that likewise, without their consent, he could neither depose a cardinal, nor put one under arrest, nor seize nor confiscate their property; and that the college of cardinals were to have one half of the total revenues of the papacy. All solemnly swore to obey the law which they had made to bind themselves: some with the reservation "if it be according to law."

39. A proposal was made to elect a certain one of their number; but another of the number warned them that if that man were made pope, the "noble horses of the cardinals" would "in a few days be reduced to draw wagons, or to toil before the plow." This dire consideration put an end to that cardinal's candidacy. The choice finally fell upon the bishop of Clermont, who took the name of Pope --

INNOCENT VI, DEC. 18, 1352, TO SEPT. 12, 1357.

His very first act as pope was to release himself from his oath to observe the statute that he with the other cardinals had framed, and then to declare that statute void and illegal from the beginning.

40. He tried to stir up a crusade to help the emperor of the east to defend Constantinople against the Turks. But the only monarch who received his call with any favor, was Charles of Germany; but even he was prevented from rendering any aid by the protest of his chancellor, Conrad of Alezia, who called upon him to "recollect that the popes have always regarded Germany as an inexhaustible mine of gold; and that they have their hands constantly extended toward us to despoil us. Do we not send enough money to Avignon for the instruction of our children and the purchase of benefices? Do we not furnish every year sufficiently large sums for the confirmation of bishops, the impetration of benefices, the pursuit of processes and appeals; for dispensations, absolutions,

indulgences, privileges; and, finally, for all the simoniacal inventions of the holy see? Lo, the pope demands still a new subsidy. What does he offer us in exchange for our gold? -- Inefficacious blessings, anathemas, wars, and a disgraceful servitude. Arrest, prince, the course of this evil, and do not permit pontifical despotism to make a second Italy out of Germany."19

41. When Innocent died, and the cardinals met in a conclave to elect a successor, a whole month was spent without their coming to agreement. Believing that they could not agree upon any one of their number, it was proposed that they choose for pope some one who was not of the college of cardinals. This was agreed to; and William Grimoardi, abbot of St. Victor at Marseilles, was chosen, who took the name of Pope --

URBAN V, OCT. 28, 1362, TO DEC. 19, 1370.

He had been sent as legate to the kingdom of Naples, by Innocent VI, and so was absent from Avignon when chosen. When he heard of the death of Innocent, he had remarked: "Could I but see a pope who would return to his own Church at Rome, and quash the petty tyrants of Italy, I should die with great satisfaction the next day."

42. And now, finding himself to be pope, he carried out this, his wish, and removed from Avignon to Rome in 1367, arriving in that city October 16. "He was greeted by the clergy and the people with a tumult of joy. He celebrated mass at the altar of St. Peter: the first pope since the days of Boniface VIII." In August, 1368, the emperor Charles IV came to Rome, and was crowned the pope. The emperor led the pope's horse from the castle of St. Angelo to St. Peter's Church, and performed the office of deacon to the pope, in the service at St. Peter's. But Urban did not remain long in Rome; for September, 1370, he went to Avignon. He arrived at Avignon September 24; he was taken sick on that very day, and died December 19.

43. Through a regular election by the cardinals, Urban V was succeeded by Peter Roger, a nephew of Clement VI, who took the papal name of --

GREGORY XI, DEC. 30, 1371, TO MARCH 27, 1378.

Since the desolation poured upon the country of the Albigenses by Innocent

III, Christianity had permeated France, and was specially prevalent in the Province of Dauphine. The local officials would not execute the decrees of the Church against them. Therefore Gregory addressed to King Charles V of France the following letter: --

"Prince, we have been informed that there is in Dauphiny, and the neighboring provinces, a multitude of heretics, called Vaudois, Turlupins, or Bulgarians, who are possessed of great riches. Our holy solicitude is turned toward that poor kingdom, which God has confided to you, to extirpate the schism. But your officers, corrupted by the gold of these reprobates, instead of assisting our dear sons, the inquisitors, in their holy ministry, have themselves fallen into the snare, or rather have found death. And all this is done before the eyes of the most powerful lords of Dauphiny. We order you, then, by virtue of the oath you have taken to the holy see, to exterminate these heretics; and we enjoin you to march, if necessary, at the head of your armies, to excite the zeal of your soldiers, and reanimate the courage of the inquisitors."

44. "Charles the Fifth, called the Wise, seconded well the pope in his sanguinary plans. Soon a general massacre of the unfortunate Turlupins took place throughout all France. The dungeons of the Inquisition were encumbered with victims, and they had even to build new prisons at Embrun, Vienne, Avignon, and a great number of other cities, to hold the accused. . . . At Toulouse and Avignon the flames devoured several thousands of these unfortunates, who were gangrened and poisoned by heresy, as the holy father expressed it. These terrible executions brought in magnificent recompenses to the persecutors, as a letter of Charles the Fifth, addressed `to Pierre Jacques de More, grand inquisitor of the Bulgarians, in the province of France,' attests. The sect of the

Turlupins was finally entirely annihilated, and the coffers of the apostolic chancellery were gorged with riches." -- De Cormenin.20

45. There were urgent calls for the papal court to come again to Rome. One day, in Avignon, Gregory had demanded of an ecclesiastic: "Why do you not betake yourself to your diocese?" He received the pointed reply: "Why do you not betake yourself to yours?" In response to these calls, Gregory set out with his court (with the exception of six cardinals who remained at Avignon), in the month of October, 1376, and arrived at St. Peter's in Rome, April 17, 1377. But, early in

the year 1378, he had resolved to go again to Avignon, but was prevented by his death, March 27.

46. As soon as it was known in Rome that Gregory XI was dead, the whole city rose in a riotous tumult, demanding that a Roman pope should be elected. Sixteen of the college of cardinals were in Rome. In regular course they assembled in conclave. The populace surrounded the place, demanding "a Roman pope! We will have a Roman pope!" They demanded to be allowed to speak to the cardinals. The cardinals consented, not daring to refuse. The spokesman of the people related how that, for seventy years, the people of holy Rome had no pastor: said that there were many wise and noble ecclesiastics in Rome who were able to govern the Church: and if not in Rome such could be found in Italy. They told the cardinals that the people were so determined in that matter that, if the conclave did not comply with their demand, there was danger of a general massacre, in which the cardinals would certainly perish.

47. All the time of this audience the crowd was clamoring about the building, crying: "A Roman pope! If not a Roman, an Italian!" To the spokesman of the crowd the cardinals very piously replied that "no election of a pope could be by requisition, favor, fear, or tumult; but only by the interposition of the Holy Ghost. `We are in your power; you may kill us, but we must act according to God's ordinance. To-morrow we celebrate the mass for the descent of the Holy Ghost: as the Holy Ghost directs, so shall we do.' The people responded: `If ye persist to do despite to Christ, if we have not a Roman pope, we will hew these cardinals and Frenchmen in pieces.'"

48. The intruders were persuaded at length to leave the hall, and the cardinals began their deliberation. All night the crowd kept up their cries: "A Roman pope! A Roman pope!" In the early morning some men had climbed to the belfry of St. Peter's, and were clanging the bells as though the city were on fire; and the vast crowd were still demanding "A Roman pope!" The day passed with no election. All night again the crowd continued their cries, and the clanging of the bells, and the beating upon the doors of the building where the cardinals were. Morning came with the tumult increasing. The cardinals tried to speak to the crowd from the windows; but all their efforts were answered

only with the shout: "A Roman! A Roman!" By this time not even an Italian would be accepted. By this time also the crowd had succeeded in breaking open the pope's cellar, and gaining access to the abundance and variety of rich wines there stored. Thus drunkenness was added to their fury.

49. Eleven of the sixteen cardinals were French, and, of course, would, if possible have a pope who would sit at Avignon. But, now the crowd had become so violent that the whole conclave were in danger of being massacred; and they finally agreed, and chose the archbishop of Bari, Bartholomew Prignani, as pope. But as he was not a Roman, the cardinals feared to let it be known, until they had made good their escape. They therefore had the cardinal of St. Peters to appear at the window "with what either was or seemed to be the papal stole and miter." Instantly the multitude triumphantly shouted the joyful acclaim, "We have a Roman pope! The cardinal of St. Peter's. Long live Rome! Long live St. Peter! The crowd now actually broke into the hall of conclave, pressed around the aged cardinal of St. Peter's, and, in their wild congratulations, almost smothered

him, in spite of his protest that he was not the pope. One portion of the multitude hurried to his palace, broke it open, threw the furniture into the streets, and sacked it from cellar to garret.

50. When the crowd broke into the hall, the cardinals succeeded in making their escape through secret passages. The real pope-elect hid himself, fearing that he should be massacred because he was not a Roman, but only an Italian. The next day, however, the Roman cardinals found him, and sent notice to the Roman officials of his election. And, since the crowd had in great measure spent its fury, they were allowed to proceed with the ceremonies of the installation. The installation seremon was from the text: "Such ought he to be, an undefiled High Priest." He was proclaimed Pope --

URBAN VI,21 APRIL 9, 1378, TO OCT. 15. 138.

51. On the same day that Urban VI was ordained to the papacy, "the cardinals at Rome wrote to the six who had remained at Avignon, to acquaint them with the election of the archbishop of Bari," as follows: --

"Our late Father Gregory of holy memory, having left us to our unspeakable concern on the 27th of March, we entered into the conclave on the 7th of April to deliberate about the election of a new pontiff. The next day being enlightened by the rays of that Sun that never sets, about the hour when the Holy Ghost descended upon the apostles, we all freely and unanimously elected for high pontiff our reverent father and lord in Christ, Bartholomew, archbishop of Bari, a man endowed, in an eminent degree, with every virtue becoming so high a station. The news of his election was received with loud acclamation by an innumerable multitude of people. On the 9th he was placed in the apostolic throne, taking on that occasion the name of Urban VI. On the day of the resurrection of our Lord he was solemnly crowned, according to custom, in the basilic of St. Peter. We have thought it necessary to transmit to you this account, containing the truth, and nothing but the truth, of what has passed within these few days in the Roman Church. You may safely rely upon what we write; and it is incumbent upon you to contradict, as absolutely false, all reports to the contrary."22

52. Of Urban it was written by a papal historian, that he was "a prelate who would have been regarded as most worthy of the papacy, if he had never been pope." And a writer of the times who was favorable to him as pope, said: "In Urban VI was verified the proverb: None is so insolent as a low man suddenly raised to power." He preached a sermon from the text: "I am the good Shepherd," in which he rebuked the cardinals for their indulgence of wealth and luxury, and their grand banquets; and threatened to cut them down to only one dish each at the table. For these reasons it was but a few days before the cardinals began to repent that they had elected him pope, and to seek for a way by which they might repudiate him. The wild and dangerous attack of the people gave them ground to claim that his election was forced, and, therefore, was not valid. He himself, while in the conclave, in the presence of the tumult of the populace, had said to the other cardinals: "You see what methods are used. He who shall be thus elected will not be pope. For my own part I would not obey him, nor ought he to be obeyed by any good Catholic."

53. The French cardinals were, of course, opposed to a pope who would not sit in Avignon; and the other cardinals were galling under the new pope's rule. The cardinals fixed their residence at Anagni. The pope went to Tivoli, and summoned the cardinals to that city. They

replied that they had been put to large expense in establishing their residence at Anigni, and they had not the means to do the same thing a second time, in addition to the expense of removing to Tivoli. There were at Anagni twelve cardinals. Four cardinals were with the pope at Tivoli. Aug. 9, 1378, the twelve cardinals "publicly declared in encyclic letters addressed to the faithful in all Christendom," as follows: --

"We have already informed you of the fury of the Roman people and their leaders, as well as of the violence done to us by forcing us to choose an Italian pope whom the Holy Spirit had not chosen. A multitude, carried away by fanatacism, wrested from us the temporary appointment of an apostate, a murderer, a heretic soiled with every crime; he himself had recognized that his election was to be only provisional. In contempt of his oath, he, however, compelled us by threats of death to elevate him to the chair of the apostle, and to cover his proud forehead with the triple crown. Now that we are beyond the reach of his anger, we declare him to be an intruder, usurper, and antichrist; we pronounce an anathema against him, and those who shall submit to his authority."23

54. And now that the papacy had attained and steadily held the pinnacle of absolute and irresponsible worldly power, she proceeded to take the next logical step -- to gnaw her own vitals and tear herself to pieces. The chamberlain of Pope Urban left the castle of St. Angelo and the cause of Urban, and came to the cardinals at Anagni, bringing the jewels and ornaments of the pope. One of the cardinals that stood by Urban, died, leaving only three; while at Anagni there were thirteen against him, and at Avignon, six. Urban had announced that he was going to create nine new cardinals; but, all at once, he created twenty-six: which was more than there were already, all put together. This action estranged those who had stood by him, and united against him the whole number -- twenty-two -- of the original cardinals; and now this college of the twenty-two original cardinals proceeded without delay to elect another pope, Robert of Geneva, who took the papal name of --

CLEMENT VII, SEPT. 20, 1378, TO SEPT. 16, 1394.

"The qualifications which, according to his partial biographer, recommended
the cardinal of Geneva, were rather those of a successor to John Hawkwood or to a duke of Milan, than of the apostles. Extraordinary

activity of body and endurance of fatigue, courage which would hazard his life to put down the intrusive pope, sagacity, and experience in the temporal affairs of the Church; high birth, through which he was allied with most of the royal and princely houses of Europe: of austerity, devotion, learning, holiness, charity, not a word." -- Milman.24

55. It thus came about that there were two popes elected by the same identical cardinals. There was therefore spread through Christendom the question as to which pope was really at the head of the Church. Consequently the whole of Christendom was divided. Urban was recognized as lawful pope by Germany, Hungary, England, Poland, Bohemia, Denmark, Sweden, Prussia, Norway, Holland, Tuscany, Lombardy, and the duchy of Milan. The king of France assembled a council, and asked that they decide in favor of the one whose election was the least scandalous. On that issue the council unanimously voted in favor of Clement. Then France formally recognized Clement, in which she was joined by Lorraine, Savoy, Scotland, Navarre, Aragon and Castile, Sicily, and the islands of Rhodes and Cyprus.

56. Thus at the heads of the two parts of divided Christendom stood these two rabid and determined popes. They were both men "from whom profound devotional feeling could not but turn away abashed and confused. . . . Acts of most revolting cruelty to his own partisans showed Urban to be a type of that craft, treachery, and utter inhumanity which were hereafter to attaint the bad Italian popes. He might almost seem to confirm the charge of madness. On the other hand, the highest praise of Clement was that he was a sagacious and experienced politician, a valiant captain of a free company." -- Milman.25 Each promptly issued a bull denouncing the other as "antichrist."

57. As the natural consequence "a bitter war then commenced between the two popes. Anathemas, interdicts, depositions, and maledictions were the prelude to the bloody strife which was soon to overwhelm the Western nations. Urban launched a bull against his competitor, and cited him to appear before the court of Rome to be judged and condemned as antipope. Clement, on his side, fulminated a terrible decree

against his enemy, and cited him before the consistory of Avignon to be judged for his usurpation of the apostolic chair. Finally, both having refused to appear, they anathematized each other by the ringing of bells and the light of torches, declaring each other apostates, schismatics, and heretics. They preached crusades against each other, and called to their aid all the banditti and malefactors of Italy and France, and let them loose like wild beasts on the unfortunate inhabitants who recognized Clement or preferred Urban.

58. "In the States of the Church the Clementists made horrible havoc, ruined castles, burned villages, and even several cities; they penetrated as far as Rome, under the leading of Budes, a Breton captain, seized on the fortress of St. Angelo, and committed atrocities in all parts of the city. In Naples and Romagna the Urbanists, commanded by an Englishman named Hawkwood, a former leader of free companions, took their revenge and committed reprisal. Everywhere pillage, rape, incendiarism, and murder were committed in the name of Clement, or in the honor of Urban. The unhappy cultivators fled with their wives and children, to escape the satellites of the Roman pontiff, and were massacred by the soldiery of the pope of Avignon.

59. "Everywhere hamlets and villages exhibited only ruins blackened by the flames; the dead bodies of thousands of men and women lay unburied in the fields; the flocks wandered without resting places; the crops were trampled under feet for want of reapers to harvest them; and these magnificent provinces were threatened to be converted into immense deserts, had not Captain Hawkwood taken prisoner the leader of the Clementists and thus arrested the devastations for a time." -- De Cormenin.26

60. "Urban's great difficulty was the disorder and poverty of his finances. The usual wealth which flowed to the papal court was interrupted by the confusion of the times. The papal estates were wasted by war, occupied by his enemies, or by independent princes. Not only did he seize to his own use the revenues of all vacant benefices, and sell to the citizens of Rome property and rights of the churches and monasteries (from this traffic he got 40,000 florins27); not only did he barter

away the treasures of the churches, the gold and silver statues, crosses, images of saints, and all the splendid furniture, he had recourse to the extraordinary measure of issuing a commission to two of his new cardinals to sell, impawn, and alienate the estates and property of the Church, even without the consent of the bishops, beneficed clergy, or monasteries."

61. "Everywhere might be found divisions, spoliations, even bloodshed; ejected and usurping clergy, dispossessed and intrusive abbots and bishops; feuds, battles for churches and monasteries. Among all other causes of discord, arose this the most discordant: to the demoralizing and unchristianizing tendencies of the times was added a question on which the best might differ, which to the bad would be an excuse for every act of violence, fraud, or rapacity. Clement and his cardinals are charged with great atrocities against the adherents of Urban. The Italian partisans of Clement, who escaped the cruelty of Urban, crowded to the court of Clement, but that court, at first extremely poor, gave but cold entertainment to these faithful strangers: they had to suffer the martyrdom of want for their loyalty. When this became known, others suppressed their opinions, showed outward obedience to the dominant power, and so preserved their benefices.

62. "France at times bitterly lamented her indulgence of her pride and extravagance, in adhering to her separate pontiff. If France would have her own pope, she must be at the expense of maintaining that pope and his conclave. While the Transalpine kingdoms in the obedience of Urban rendered but barren allegiance, paid no tenths to the papal see, took quiet possession of the appointment to vacant benefices; in France the liberties of the Church were perpetually invaded. The clergy were crushed with demands of tenths or subsidies; their estates were loaded with debts to enrich the apostolic chamber.

63. "The six-and-thirty cardinals had proctors in ambush in all parts of the realm, armed with papal bulls, to give notice if any large benefice fell vacant in cathedral or collegiate churches, or the priories of wealthy abbeys. They were immediately grasped as papal reserves, to reward or to secure the fidelity of the hungry cardinals. They handed these down in succession to each other, sometimes condescending to disguise the accumulation of pluralities by only charging

the benefices with large payments to themselves. `So,' says an ecclesiastic of the day, `the generous intentions of kings and royal families were frustrated, the service of God was neglected, the devotion of the faithful grew cold, the realm was drained; many ecclesiastics were in the lowest state of penury; the flourishing schools of the realm were reduced to nothing; the University of Paris mourned for want of scholars." -- Milman.28

64. Having thus a general view of the misery of the world under this horrible anarchy of the papacy, it will not be necessary to follow in detail any more than the course of the individual popes who, on their respective sides, not only kept up but increased this anarchy, for a period of fifty years. Urban VI discovered that some of his cardinals had spoken of appointing guardians for him, because of his extreme and desperate conduct. The six who seemed to have thought of it were arrested by him, and, loaded with chains, and were "cast into a close and fetid dungeon, an old tank or cistern." The inquisitors whom he sent to question them were so affected by their sufferings that when they returned to report to the pope "two of them burst into tears. Urban sternly taunted their womanly weekness. Theodoric by his own account ventured to urge the pope to mercy. Urban became only more furious; his face reddened like a lamp, his voice was choked with passion."

65. After having kept the cardinals some time in the dungeon, causing them to "suffer from hunger, thirst, cold, and reptiles," Urban next caused them all to be horribly tortured. This occurred in Nocera. Urban was besieged in Nocera; but, by a sally, he escaped. "He dragged with him the wretched cardinals. During the flight to the galleys, the bishop of Aquila, enfeebled by torture, could not keep his sorry horse to his speed. Urban, suspecting that he sought to escape, in his fury ordered him to be killed; his body was left unburied on the road. With the rest he started across to Sicily; thence to Genoa. The cardinals, if they reached Genoa alive, survived not long. By some accounts they were tied in sacks and cast into the sea, or secretly dispatched in their prisons." Only one of the six was spared. Pope Urban's madness was simply the intoxication of absolute power, and jealousy

of rivalry in that power; precisely as was that of Caligula, Tiberius, or Nero.

66. In April, 1389, Urban VI, the more to fill his coffers, resorted to the scheme of reducing yet further the term at which the papal jubilee should recur: he made it each thirty-third year beginning with a jubilee the following year. "Christendom was summoned to avail itself of the incalculable blessings of a pilgrimage to Rome, with all the benefits of indulgencies. The treasury of the holy see was prepared to receive the tribute of the world." -- Milman.29 However, Urban did not live to reap the coming harvest of gold.

67. At the death of Urban VI, Oct. 15, 1389, the remaining cardinals, seventeen in number, whom he had appointed proceeded to the election of a successor, meeting in conclave at Rome, or near by; and chose Peter Tomacelli, who took the name of --

BONIFACE IX, NOV. 2, 1389, TO OCT. 1, 1404.

He immediately created four new cardinals. When the jubilee expired, he sent his collectors into all the countries that were partisans of this side of the schism, "with full power to grant the indulgences of the jubilee to such as had been prevented by sickness or any other lawful impediment, from going to Rome. Thus were immense sums collected." Further to gather money, he reduced to a thorough system the sale of Church offices, from

cardinalates to the lowest that was within his reach. "To indulge, palliate, and establish this simony," he established "as a permanent tax the annates, or first fruits, of every bishopric and rich abbey, calculated on a new scale, triple that in which they stood before in the papal books. This was to be paid in advance by the candidates for promotion, some of whom never got possession of the benefice. That was a matter of supreme indifference to Boniface, as he could sell it again. But as these candidates rarely came to court with money equal to the demand, usurers, with whom the pope was in unholy league, advanced the sum on exorbitant interest. The debt was sometimes sued for in the pope's court."

68. "The smaller benefices were sold from the day of his appointment with shameless and scandalous notoriety. Men wandered

538

about Lombardy and other parts of Italy, searching out the age of hoary incumbents, and watching their diseases and infirmities. For this service they were well paid by the greedy aspirants at Rome. On their report the tariff rose or fell. Benefices were sold over and over again. Graces were granted to the last purchaser, with the magic word `Preference,' which cost twenty-five florins. That was superseded by a more authoritative phrase (at fifty florins), a prerogative of precedence. Petitions already granted were sometimes canceled in favor of a higher bidder: the pope treated the lower offer as an attempt to defraud him.

69. "In the same year the secretary Theodoric a Niem had known the same benefice sold in the course of one week to several successive claimants. The benefices were so openly sold that if money was not at hand, the pope would receive the price in kind, in swine, sheep, oxen, horses, or grain. The officers were as skillful in these arts as himself. His auditors would hold twenty expectatives, and receive the first fruits. The argus-eyed pope, however, watched the deathbed of all his officers. Their books, robes, furniture, money, escheated to the pope. No grace of any kind, even to the poorest, was signed without its florin fee. The pope, even during mass, was seen to be consulting with his secretaries on these worldly affairs. The accumulation of pluralities on unworthy men was scandalous even in those times."30

70. Of course, "on his side, Clement, in point of exactions, was not behind his competitor. He ruined the clergy of France and Spain by enormous impositions, and extorted incredible sums from the faithful. . . . Whilst Italy was thus squeezed by an avaricious pontiff, France was groaning beneath the weight of imposts, which had accumulated in that country, to support the prodigalities of the pope at Avignon, his thirty-six cardinals, mistresses, and minions. At last the prelates of the kingdom, tired of paying to Clement, now a tenth, now a twentieth of their revenues, assembled at the university, and appointed fifty-four doctors to decide upon the steps to be taken to re-establish union in the Church, and in order, as they said, `to have but one pope to fatten.'" -- De Cormenin.31

539

71. The doctors of the university, after faithfully considering the situation, issued the following letter:-

"The Church has fallen into contempt, servitude, and poverty. Two popes elevate to prelacies only unworthy and corrupt ministers, who have no sentiments of equity or shame, and who think only of satiating their passions. They rob the property of the widow and the orphan, at the same time that they are despoiling churches and monasteries. Sacred or profane, nothing comes amiss to them, provided they can extract money from it. Religion is for them a mine of gold, which they work to the last vein. They sell everything from baptism to burial. They traffic in pyxes, crosses, chalices, sacred vases, and the shrines of the saints. One can obtain no grace, no favor without paying for it. It is not the worthiest, but the richest, who obtain ecclesiastical dignities. He who gives money to the pope can sleep in safety, though he may have murdered his own father; for he is assured of the protection of the Church. Simony is publicly exercised, and they sell with effrontery to the highest and last bidder dioceses, prebends, or benefices. Thus do the princes of the Church. What shall we say of the lower clergy, who no longer administer the sacraments but for gold? What shall we say of the monks, whose morals are more corrupt than those of the inhabitants of ancient Sodom? It is time, illustrious prince, that you

should put an end to this deplorable schism, proclaim the freedom of the Gallican Church, and limit the power of the pontiffs."32

72. This letter was sent by ambassadors to Pope Clement at Avignon. The ambassadors secured a full conclave of the cardinals, with the pope present, to whom they read the letter in full. After the reading, the ambassadors presented the request of the king and the university to Clement, to renounce the pontificate. At this, Clement sprang from his seat, grabbed the document, tore it to pieces, and trampled it under his feet. He appealed to the cardinals, to know what punishment was fitting for those who had used such language as that in the letter. The cardinals surprised him by saying that the counsel offered by the university was worthy of serious consideration: that all the resources for gathering means had been exhausted, and their supply of money was falling off. This only increased his rage. He reproached them with traitorous cowardice, and, in his rage, left the council, retired to his chamber, where his excessive anger threw him into apoplexy, from which he died the third day afterward.

73. As soon as the death of Clement was known in Paris, the university addressed the king, begging him to prohibit the cardinals at Avignon from electing another pope. The king sent a message to this effect to the cardinals at Avignon. The king of Aragon also addressed them to the same purpose. The archbishops of Treves, Mayence, and Cologne made the same request. And Pope Boniface, of course, did the same. But the cardinals had taken precaution, and forestalled all these things: being in solemn conclave, they refused to receive any communications of any kind whatever until their deliberations might be ended. They agreed, however, amongst themselves, and took a solemn oath, that "whoever was chosen should at once resign the papacy at the request of the cardinals, provided Boniface also would resign."

74. The conclave chose the cardinal of Luna, who had repeatedly lamented the schism, and had openly declared that if he were pope, he would put an end to it at once. And when he sent to the king of France the notice of his election, he informed the king that it was only the importunity of the cardinals that had compelled him to accept the unwelcome office of pope; but that he was fully prepared to do whatever was advisable to bring peace to the Church. The University of Paris received this word with joy, and sent to him an address, in which they recognized him as pope, and highly commended his noble sentiments. To this he replied anew, suiting his action to the word: "I am as ready to resign the office as to take off this cap." Before the death of Clement VII, Boniface IX had made proclamation to the world that he was anxious to end the schism. But each pope was willing to end the schism only by having the other one resign. The two popes were now --

BENEDICT XIII (AT AVIGNON), SEPT. 28, 1394, TO NOV. 29, 1424,

BONIFACE IX (AT ROME), NOV. 2, 1389, TO OCT. 1, 1404.

75. The miseries of this papal anarchy had now become so great that the king of France took the lead in having the great powers of Christendom unite to save the papacy from itself. He sent representatives to Germany and to England, to further this purpose. The University of Paris entered a standing appeal from all the acts of Benedict XIII to a future one who should be true and universal pope. Benedict issued a bull denouncing this as defamatory libel. A national

assembly of the State and Church of France met in Paris, approved the king's plan, and sent ambassadors to Benedict beseeching him to comply. He made answer as follows: --

"Know all of you, princes of the State and Church, that you are my subjects, since God has submitted all men to my authority! Know that the cardinals have no other power than that of choosing as pope the most worthy of their number, and as soon as they have declared him supreme chief of the Church, the Holy Spirit

suddenly illuminates him. He becomes infallible, and his power equals that of God: he can be no longer subjected to any sway. He is placed above the powers of the earth, and he can not be deposed from the apostolic throne, even by his own desire. The dignity of the pontiff is finally, so redoubtable that the world should listen to our decrees, bend in the dust, and tremble at our word!"33

76. Two years passed, and the efforts of the king of France were so well received by powers of Europe that, in 1398, at an assembly of the States and clergy of France, it was announced that not only the king and Church of France had determined to demand the renunciation of the papacy by both popes, but that in this were united the kings of Hungary, Bohemia, England, Aragon, Castile, Navarre, and Sicily. This same assembly unconditionally withdrew allegiance from Benedict XIII, and this act was published by letters throughout the kingdom of France. When these letters reached Avignon, even the cardinals there withdrew from Pope Benedict. A representative of the emperor, of the king of France, and of the clergy of both Germany and France, was sent to Rome, to present to Boniface IX their request for his renunciation. When the pope's attendants began to show some fear that he might concede the request, he said to them: "My good children, pope I am, pope will I remain; despite all entreaty of the kings of France and Germany!"

77. The representative returned to France, and was sent on a like errand to Pope Benedict XIII, at Avignon. The only answer he could get from Benedict was: "Let the king of France issue what ordinances he will, I will hold my title and my popedom till I die!" The ambassador begged of him to consult his cardinals. He consented, and the cardinals assembled in full consistory. He made to them a speech,

and withdrew. The cardinals consulted, and advised him to submit to the request of the kings. But he declared: "I have been invested by God in the papacy. I will not renounce it for count, nor duke, nor king!" The cardinals then sent again to Benedict -- this time the king's ambassador. But Benedict again replied : --

"Pope I have written myself; pope I have been acknowledged by all my subjects; pope I will remain to the end of my days. And tell my son, the king of France, that I thought him till now a good Catholic: he will repent of his errors. Warn him in my name not to bring trouble on his conscience."

78. Next a marshal of France, with troops, was sent to remove Benedict and to compel him to resign. Even the citizens of Avignon were in favor of compelling him to resign. But to this he replied: "I will summon the gonfalonier of the Church, the king of Aragon, to my aid. I will raise troops along the Riviera as far as Genoa. What fear ye? Guard ye your city, I'll guard my palace!" But Benedict's "gonfalonier of the Church" would not respond, except with the words: "Does the priest think that for him I will plunge into a war with the king of France?"

79. The people of Avignon and the cardinals surrendered to the marshal at the first summons. Benedict endured a short siege, but surrendered. He was not really taken a prisoner. He was allowed to remain in his palace and grounds, but was held thus a prisoner for five years, 1398-1403. In this time divisions had arisen amongst the nobles. The king of Sicily forced his way into the presence of Benedict, and assured Benedict of his full and loyal allegiance. March 12, 1403, Benedict escaped in disguise from his palace, took a boat, dropped down the River Rhone, and took refuge in the strong fortress held by 500 soldiers of the king of Sicily. There he summoned to him his cardinals. They went; and he was complete pope again.

80. Before an assembly of the clergy in Paris two cardinals appeared, to plead the cause of Benedict. The University of Paris itself was divided. The king of France changed his attitude, and restored to Benedict the allegiance of the realm, declaring: "So long as I live, I will acknowledge him alone as the vicar of Christ." To the king and the whole kingdom Benedict still made his loud professions of his

eagerness to quench the schism. He sent an embassy to Boniface in Rome. Boniface refused to receive them unless they would come before him, recognizing him as pope. Some of them did so, and pleaded with him to appoint a place to meet with representatives of Benedict, and discuss their rival claims, with a view to quenching the schism. Boniface answered: "I alone am pope, Peter de Luna is an antipope." The ambassadors remarked: "At least our master is guiltless of simony." This struck Pope Boniface IX so straight as to rouse his anger to such a pitch that he fell into a fit, and had to be carried to his bed, upon which, three days afterward, he died, Oct. 2, 1404.

81. The cardinals in Rome immediately assembled to elect a pope. First of all, they pledged one another in a solemn oath that whosoever of them should be chosen to the papacy, he would abdicate just as soon as Benedict XIII would do the same. Cosmo Megliorotto was elected, and took the name of --

INNOCENT VII, OCT. 12, 1404, TO NOV. 13,1406.

The anarchy grew so great in Rome that the pope and his cardinals were compelled to flee for their lives. They took refuge in Viterbo. Ladislaus, the king of Naples, undertook to take possession of the city of Rome. "The whole city was a great battlefield. The soldiers of Ladislaus set fire to it in four quarters." However, he was compelled to withdraw, and the people begged the pope to return. This he did March 13, 1406, where he remained until his death, November 13 of the same year.

82. Immediately the cardinals, fifteen in number, again entered into conclave, took the usual solemn oath that whosoever of them might be elected would renounce his office, when the rival pope at Avignon would do the same. The one of their number who had most constantly, and seemingly most earnestly, deplored the schism -- Angelo Corario -- was elected, at the age of nearly eighty years, taking the papal name --

GREGORY XII. NOV. 19, 1406, TO OCT. 18, 1417.

After his election, as well as before, he proclaimed his profound interest in quenching the schism of the Church. He declared that "his only fear was lest he should not live to accomplish the holy work." At his coronation he renewed, with tears, this affirmation. And, in private,

after his coronation, he declared that "for the union of the Church, if I had not a galley, I would embark in the smallest boat; if without a horse, I would set out on foot with my staff." But his very first act betrayed the hypocrisy of all these professions: he wrote a letter to Benedict XIII, addressed: "To Peter de Luna, whom some nations, during this miserable schism, call Benedict XIII." Benedict answered in a letter addressed: "To Angelo Corario, whom some, in this pernicious schism, name Gregory XII." Benedict exhorted Gregory: "Haste! Delay not! Consider our age, the shortness of life, embrace at once the way of salvation and peace, that we may appear with our united flock before the Great Shepherd."

83. Each of them pledged himself to make no new cardinals -- except to keep their numbers equal. Gregory wrote to the king of France such beautiful letters on the evils of schism and his heart's deep longing to heal this schism, that the king was persuaded that he was fairly an angel of light. Progress was made to the point at which a meeting was actually arranged for the two popes, at Savona, in 1407. Pope Gregory set out from Rome, in great state, traveled to Viterbo, where he remained two months. Next he traveled to Sienna. The meeting of the rival popes was appointed for September 29. Partisans of Gregory -- monks and friars -- began to preach against his going to the meeting. Gregory himself drew up a statement containing twenty-two objections to Savona as the place of meeting. He demanded that the place of meeting be some town in the possession of a neutral power -- Carrara, Lucca, Pisa, or Leghorn. Benedict XIII, on his part, advanced at about the same rate as did Gregory; and so came finally to Spezzia. Gregory advanced to Lucca.

84. They were now about forty-five miles apart. One was on the seashore, and the other was inland. There they stood. As related by one who was present, and an eyewitness to the whole procedure, "being now at

no great distance, letters and embassies passed daily between them. Both pretended to have nothing so much at heart as the unity of the Church, but both were equally averse to the means of procuring it. They pretended to be desirous of conferring in person, but no place could be found to which the one or the other did not object. Gregory excepted against all maritime places, and Benedict against all at a

545

distance from the sea. You would have thought the one a terrestial animal that hated the water, and the other an aquatic that dreaded the dry land. This conduct gave great offense to all sensible and well-meaning men, who could not but see that their fears were affected, and dangers were pretended where there was nothing to fear. All loudly complained of so palpable and criminal a collusion: and how shocking it was to see two men, both at the age of seventy and upward, sacrificing their reputation, their conscience, and the peace of the Church to their ambition, to the desire of reigning but a few days." -- Leonardo of Arezzio.34

85. Gregory XII first showed his hand through these pretensions. He broke the agreement to appoint no new cardinals, by appointing four at once. The former cardinals were summoned before him. He informed them that he had determined to resume the full exercise of the papal power. They fled to Pisa, and appealed to a general council. Benedict XIII on his part, resumed full papal functions by issuing two bulls at once, each one excommunicating the king of France. He sent the bulls by messengers instructed to deliver them into the king's own hands, and to return with all speed. They delivered the bulls, as instructed; but, instead of returning, they were captured, and put in prison.

86. The king assembled some members of his parliament, and the deputies of the University of Paris, with nobles and prelates. One of the prelates preached a sermon from the text: "His iniquity shall fall on his own head," and presented thirteen charges against "Peter de Luna, called Benedict XIII." Amongst these were charges of perjury and of heresy. The bulls were declared, by the council, "illegal, treasonable, and injurious to the king's majesty." The king told his chancellor to "do what is right." The chancellor tore each of the bulls in two. One half he gave to the nobles, the other half to the prelates and the delegates of the university. These tore the bulls into shreds. A proclamation was published in Italy, announcing the neutrality of France in the contest between the popes; "asserting the perjury, treachery, and heresy of both popes;" and calling upon all churches to abandon both.

546

87. "Christendom had beheld with indignation this miserable game of chicanery, stratagem, falsehood, perjury, played by two hoary men, each above seventy years old. . . The mutual fear and mistrust of the rival popes was their severest self-condemnation. These gray-headed prelates, each claiming to be the representative of Christ upon earth, did not attempt to disguise from the world that neither had the least reliance on the truth, honor, justice, religion of his adversary. Neither would scruple to take any advantage of the other; neither would hesitate at any fraud, or violence, or crime; neither would venture within the grasp of the other, from the avowed apprehension for his liberty or his life. The forces at the command of each must be exactly balanced; the cities or sovereigns in whose territories they were to meet must guarantee to give hostages for their personal security. They deliberately charged each other with the most nefarious secret designs, as well as with equivocation, evasion, tampering with sacred oaths, perjury." -- Milman.35

88. Both colleges of cardinals now united against both popes. The two colleges of cardinals met in one, at Leghorn. There they agreed, and decided to set their authority above that of the popes; and, on that authority, to call a general council to assemble at Pisa, March 25, 1409. Each company of cardinals sent a summons to its respective pope, and circular letters throughout the realms of Europe that recognized the respective popes.

89. Benedict's cardinals charged him with being "the author and maintainer of the schism," and as "wicked as the Jews and the heathen soldiers who would rend the seamless robe of Christ." They charged him with insincerity, artifice, obstinacy, and contempt of his oaths. Gregory's cardinals charged him with being "a

man of blood, without honor, the slave of his carnal affections, a drunkard, a madman, a proclaimed heretic, a subverter of the Church of God, an accursed hypocrite." They charged him and Benedict XIII with all the evils that accompanied the schism. They declared that they had chosen Gregory XII "as the best and most holy of their Order; he had sworn deeply, repeatedly, solemnly, to extinguish the schism by renunciation. He had afterward declared such renunciation diabolic and damnable; as

though he had taken the keys of St. Peter only to acquire the power of perjuring himself, and of giving free license of perjury to others."36

90. The two popes, seeing that a general council was to be assembled, each himself called a general council! But the general council called by the cardinals became the real one. In the general council of Pisa thus called, there were twenty-six cardinals; four patriarchs; twelve archbishops, eighty bishops, in person; and fourteen archbishops and a hundred and two bishops by their representatives. There were eighty-seven abbots in person, and two hundred by representatives. The generals of the four great Orders of the Church were present; delegates from thirteen of the great universities of all Europe were there -- Paris, Toulouse, Orleans, Angers, Montpellier, Bologna, Florence, Cracow, Vienna, Prague, Cologne, Oxford, Cambridge -- and the chapters of a hundred metropolitan and collegiate churches. There were three hundred doctors of theology and of canon law. There were ambassadors of the kings of France, of England, of Portugal, Bohemia, Sicily, Poland, and Cyprus; of the dukes of Burgundy, Brabant, Pomerania; of the margrave of Brandenburg; and the landgrave of Thuringia, with many other German princes.

91. After the formal opening of the council, proclamation was made at the doors of the cathedral, "demanding whether Peter de Luna or Angelo Corario were present, either by themselves, their cardinals, or their procurators." Three days in succession this proclamation was made. Then, as there was no answer from either of the popes, they were pronounced "in contumacy." Then resolutions were adopted "that the holy council was canonically called and constituted, by the two colleges of the cardinals now blended into one; that to them it belonged to take cognizance of the two competitors for the papacy." Then there was read a full account of the origin and progress of the schism up to that time, the account concluding as follows: --

"Seeing that the contending prelates have been duly cited, and, not appearing, declared contumacious, they are deprived of their pontifical dignity, and their partisans of their honors, offices, and benefices. If they contravene this sentence of deposition, they may be punished and chastised by secular judges. All kings, princes, and persons of every

rank or quality are absolved from their oaths, and released from all allegiance to the two rival claimants of the popedom."

92. Following this several days were devoted to the hearing of the testimony of witnesses. But it was soon found that witnesses who could be easily found, were innumerable; and so, not to prolong the council to unnecessary length, they declared that the main facts were "matters of public notoriety," and, in the next session, proceeded to definite sentence. The session was opened with a sermon from the bishop of Sisteron, who had been a strong partisan of Benedict XIII. He preached from the text: "Purge away your old leaven," and in his sermon declared that Benedict XIII and Gregory XII were "no more popes than my old shoes." He pronounced them "worse than Annas and Caiaphas," and compared them even to "the devils in hell." Then the sentence of the council was pronounced as follows: --

"The holy universal council, representing the Catholic Church of God, to whom belongs the judgment in this cause, assembled by the grace of the Holy Ghost in the Cathedral of Pisa, having duly heard the promoters of the cause for the extirpation of the detestable and inveterate schism, the union and re-establishment of our

holy mother Church, against Peter de Luna and Angelo Corario, called by some Benedict XIII and Gregory XII declares the crimes and excesses, adduced before the council, to be true, and of public fame. The two competitors, Peter de Luna and Angelo Corario, have been and are notorious schismatics, obstinate partisans, abetters, defenders, approvers of this long schism; notorious heretics as having departed from the faith; involved in the crimes of perjury and breach of their oaths; openly scandalizing the Church of their manifest obstinacy, and utterly incorrigible. By their enormous iniquities and excesses they have made themselves unworthy of all honor and dignity, especially of the supreme pontificate; and though by the canons they are actually rejected of God, deprived and cut off from the Church, the council nevertheless excommunicates, rejects, and deposes them, and pronounces them excommunicated, rejected, and deposed by the present definitive sentence; forbids them henceforth to assume the name of high pontiffs, and all Christians, on pain of excommunication, to obey them, or lend them any assistance whatever: annuls all the judgments they have hitherto given, or may henceforth give, as well as the promotion of cardinals made latterly by either -- by Angelus Corarius since the 3d of May of the preceding year, and by Peter de Luna since the 15the of June of the same year; and lastly declares upon the whole for further security, the apostolic see to be

549

at present vacant, and the cardinals at liberty to proceed to a new election."37

93. The next thing was the election of a new pope. This could not be by the council, but only by the cardinals. The twenty-six cardinals spent eleven days in conclave, and then announced the election of friar Peter Chilargi, more than seventy years old, who was proclaimed pope under the name of --

ALEXANDER V, JUNE 26, 1409, TO MAY 3, 1410.

It was very soon discovered that, instead of Christendom's having now one pope, it had three: that the efforts of the council and the cardinals in setting up a new pope, instead of having brought peace to the world, had only increased the confusion; for Alexander V immediately bestowed papal honors upon the members of his Order. He issued a bull by which he "invested the Friar Preachers, the Friar Minors, the Augustinians, and the Carmelites, in the full, uncontrolled power of hearing confession and granting absolution in every part of Christendom. It rescinded, and declared null, if not heretical, seven propositions advanced or sanctioned by other popes, chiefly John XXII. . . . This bull was not only the absolute annihilation of the exclusive prerogatives and pretensions of the clergy, but it was ordered to be read by the clergy themselves in all the churches in Christendom. They were to publish before their own flocks the triumph of their enemies, the complete independence of their parishioners of their authority, their own condemnation for insufficiency, their disfranchisement from their ancient immemorial rights.

94. "Henceforth there was a divided dominion in every diocese, in every parish there were two or more conflicting claimants on the obedience, the love, and the liberality of the flock. Still further, all who dared to maintain the propositions annulled by the bull were to be proceeded against as contumacious and obstinate heretics. Thus the pope, who was to reconcile and command or win distracted Christendom to peace and unity, -- a narrow-minded friar, thinking only of his own Order, -- had flung a more fatal apple of discord into the world, and stirred up a new civil war among the more immediate adherents of the

550

papacy, among those who ought to have been knit together in more close and intimate confederacy."38

95. The effect of this act of Alexander V was to throw back to Benedict XIII and Gregory XII the sympathy of many; and also to cast discredit upon the Council of Pisa that had chosen a pope who could act only in a way to make confusion worse confounded. "Murmurs were heard in many quarters that the council instead of extinguishing the schism, had but added a third pope." This increased confusion also encouraged the other two popes; and it very shortly appeared that now there were indeed three popes instead of one. Gregory XII was

acknowledged as pope by the king of Sicily, by some of the cities of Italy, and by Rupert, king of the Romans. Benedict XIII was acknowledged as lawful pope by the kings of Aragon, Castile, and Scotland, and the earl of Armagnac. Alexander V was acknowledged to be pope by the remaining princes of Europe.

96. Benedict XIII was now under the protection of the king of Aragon; and he issued his anathemas against the Council of Pisa and the other two popes. Gregory XII was in the territories of Venice. He by his general council published sentences of excommunication and anathema against the other two popes, declaring that "the election of the one and the other was uncanonical and sacrilegious; both were pronounced schismatics and heretics; their acts were all annulled, and all were forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to obey the one or the other." Gregory also published again his many times repeated and broken profession that he was ready to resign immediately, provided the other two popes would do "the same, at the same time, and in the same place." He further declared that "if the two intruders did not agree to these terms, he granted them leave to assemble a general council of the three obediences, at which he said he was ready to assist in person, and to acquiesce in their decrees, provided his two competitors engaged to assist at it in person as well as he, and to stand to the determination of that assembly." -- Bower.39

97. Instead of following the example of his immediate predecessors, in hoarding vast treasures, Alexander V plunged to the other extreme, and gave everything away. He declared that as a bishop

he had been rich, as a cardinal he had been poor, and as pope he would be a beggar. "On the very day of his enthronement his grants were so lavish as to justify, if not to give rise to, the rumor, that the cardinals, on entering into the conclave, had made a vow that whosoever should be elected would grant to the households of his brother cardinals the utmost of their demands." Alexander V put himself under the care of his favorite, Balthasar Cossa, cardinal legate of Bologna. He went with the cardinal to the city of Bologna; and there he died May 3, 1410. The cardinals had gone to Bologna with Pope Alexander. The twenty-four cardinals unanimously elected as the successor of Alexander V Balthasar Cossa, who took the papal name of --

JOHN XXIII, MAY 25, 1410, TO JUNE 14, 1410.

98. John XXIII is the last of the Johns, and also the worst. "John XXIII is another of those popes, the record of whose life, by its contradictions, moral anomalies, almost impossibilities, perplexes and baffles the just and candid historian. That such, even in those times, should be the life even of an Italian churchman, and that after such a life he should ascend to the papacy, shocks belief. Yet the record of that life rests not merely on the concurrent testimony of all the historians of the time, two of them secretaries to the Roman court; but is avouched by the deliberate sanction of the Council of Constance." -- Milman.40 While only a plain cleric, Balthasar Cossa had been a pirate; and his piratical disposition as well as "the pirate's habit of sleeping by day and waking by night," remained with him after he had ceased the actual practice of a professional pirate and had become successively archdeacon, pope's chamberlain, pope's cardinal legate, and pope.

99. It was Pope Boniface IX who had appointed Balthasar Cossa his legate "to wrest the city of Bologna from the domination of the Visconti. The legate fulfilled his mission; the poor student of law, the archdeacon of Bologna, became the lord of that city with as absolute and unlimited dominion as the tyrant of any other of the Lombard or Romagnese commonwealths. Balthasar Cossa, if hardly surpassed in extortion and cruelty by the famous Ecceline, by his debaucheries might

have put to shame the most shameless of the Viscontis. Under his iron rule day after day such multitudes of persons of both sexes, strangers as well as Bolognese, were put to death on charges of treason, sedition, or other crimes, that the population of Bologna seemed dwindling down to that of a small city. He used to send to the executioners to dispatch their victims with greater celerity.

100. "Neither person nor possession was exempt from his remorseless taxation. Grain could not be ground, nor bread made, nor wine sold without his license. From all ranks, from the noble to the peasant, he exacted the most laborious services. He laid taxes on prostitutes, gaming-houses, usurers. His licentiousness was even more wide and promiscuous. Two hundred maids, wives, and widows, with many nuns, are set down as victims of his lust. Many were put to death by their jealous and indignant husbands and kindred. The historian wonders that in so rich and populous a city no husband's, or father's, or brother's dagger found its way to the heart of the tyrant.

101. "So is Balthasar Cossa described by Theodoric a Niem, his secretary. Leonardo Aretino, another secretary, in pregnant and significant words, represents him as a great man, of consummate ability in worldly affairs, nothing or worse than nothing in spiritual. . . . The conclave refused to remember the enormities of the life of Balthasar Cossa. The pirate, tyrant, adulterer, violater of nuns, became the successor of St. Peter, the vicegerent of Christ upon earth!"41 The three-headed monstrosity of the papacy now stood --

BENEDICT XIII,

GREGORY XII,

JOHN XXIII.

102. Eight days after his accession to the papacy, John XXIII made his grand entry into the city of Rome, where his rule, while he stayed, was akin to what it had been in Bologna. There was deadly enmity between John and the king of Sicily; and their wars desolated vast regions of Italy. As a consequence of his wars, John was obliged to leave Rome, and he came again to Bologna. There was enmity also between Pope John and the emperor Sigismund. But, to strengthen

himself in his contest with the king of Sicily, John sought an alliance with the emperor. But the only terms upon which the emperor would accept John's proposal of an alliance, were that the pope should agree to the assembling of a general council to quench the schism in the Church, and to heal the miseries of Christendom. These terms could not well be refused by John on also another ground: The Council of Pisa whose action was the sole basis of John's position as pope, had decreed that either that council or another general council should meet in three years. John consented to the terms demanded by the emperor, and Constance was fixed upon as the place where the coming council should be held. An imperial letter and a papal bull were sent throughout Christendom "to summon the general council of Christendom to meet at Constance toward the close of the ensuing year" -- 1414.

103. The Council of Constance met Nov. 1, 1414, and continued till April 22, 1418. The total number of the clergy alone present at the council, though perhaps not all of them all the time, was four patriarchs, twenty-nine cardinals, thirty-three archbishops, one hundred and fifty bishops, one hundred and thirty-four abbots, two hundred and fifty doctors, and lesser clergy, amounting to eighteen thousand. With the emperor and his train, kings, dukes, lords, and other nobles, the numbers were ordinarily fifty thousand. At certain periods of the conference there were as many as one hundred thousand present. Thirty thousand horses were fed, and thirty thousand beds were provided by the city.

104. The council was opened with John XXIII presiding. Deputies were present from both Gregory XII and Benedict XIII. Gregory's deputies promptly declared, in behalf of their master, that he was ready to resign, upon condition that both the other popes should resign at the same time. They also presented to the emperor a petition asking that John XXIII should not be allowed to preside at the council. To consider this subject there was appointed, apart from the council, a general assembly of the heads of the nations who were present. They reported a recommendation that the three popes should voluntarily resign. Pope John instantly agreed, and

himself drew up a form of resignation. But, as the assembly was not satisfied with it, he left it with them to frame.

554

105. To this assembly of the nations there was presented a memorial containing a long list of the crimes of the life of John XXIII, stating that these crimes could be proved by unexceptionable witnesses, if the council chose to hear them. As the crimes were notorious already, and undeniable, even by John, he proposed to the assembly that he should plead guilty before the council, reminding them of the generally received maxim that "a pope could not be deposed for any crime except that of heresy." But this proposition was refused by the assembly, on the ground that they could not think it decent that such heinous crimes should be laid publicly before the council, to be narrowly inquired into. They therefore advised the memorial be suppressed, provided John would consent to the resignation which they would frame. To this John agreed. The assembly therefore drew up the form of the proposed resignation as follows: --

"I, Pope John XXIII, for the peace of the whole Christian world, declare, promise, vow, and swear to God, to His holy Church, and to this holy council, to give peace to the Church by the way of cession, or resignation of the pontificate, and to execute freely and spontaneously what I now promise, in case Peter de Luna, and Angelus Corarius, called in their obediences, Benedict XIII and Gregory XII, in like manner resign their pretended dignity; and also in case either of resignation, of death, or in any other, when my resignation may give peace to the Church of God, and extirpate the present schism."42

106. This form of resignation Pope John read the next day to the full council; and when, in the reading, he reached the words: "I vow, and swear," he rose from his throne and knelt before the altar, and, laying his hand upon his breast, said: `I promise thus to observe it.'" Then he resumed his seat upon the throne. The emperor laid off his crown, prostrated himself before John XXIII, "kissed his foot, and thanked him in the name of the whole council, for his good resolution. At the same time the council, the princes who were present, and the ambassadors of those who were absent, engaged to support him, to the utmost of their power, against his two competitors, if they followed not his example."

107. But it was very soon made plain to all that John had no intention whatever of resigning the papacy. For, when the emperor

555

and the assembly of the nations requested him to carry out the agreement, he asked that it be put off a while. When they insisted, then, by means of the duke of Austria, who was his ally, he fled to Schaffhausen. From there he wrote, the evening of the same day, and sent to the emperor, a letter, asking him to excuse his flight, in which he addressed the emperor, saying : --

"My dear son, by the grace of Almighty God, I am arrived at Schaffhausen, where I enjoy my liberty, and air that agrees with my constitution. I came hither, unknown to my son, the duke of Austria, not to be exempted from keeping the promise I have made to abdicate for the peace of the holy Church of God; but, on the contrary, to do it freely, and without endangering my health."

108. John's purpose in all this was to break up the council, because he supposed that, in the absence of the pope, the council would dissolve. But in this his calculations failed. The emperor Sigismund, attended by the marshal of the empire, rode through the city, with trumpets sounding before him, proclaiming that the council was not dissolved by the flight of the pope, but that he would defend the council to the last drop of his blood. The chancellor of the University of Paris presented an argument before the emperor and the assembly of the nations, to prove "that a general council is superior to the pope, and that its determinations hold good whether the pope be present or absent, whether he approve or disapprove of them.

109. Accordingly, the council met in regular session, and adopted the following articles: --

"I. That the council had been lawfully assembled in the city of Constance.

"II. That it was not dissolved by the withdrawing of the pope and the cardinals.

"III. That it was not be dissolved till the schism was removed and the Church reformed in its head and members.

"IV. That the bishops should not depart, without a just cause approved by the deputies of the nations, till the council was ended; and if they obtained leave of the council to depart, they should appoint others to vote for them as their deputies or proxies."

110. The cardinals who were with John now returned to the council. The emperor discovered that the duke of Austria had aided John

in his flight, and therefore put the duke under the ban of the empire, and sent troops to invade his dominions. Upon learning of this, John forsook Schaffhausen and fled to Lauffenberg. In his note to the emperor, John had declared that it was not from fear that he had left Constance. At Lauffenberg he secured a notary, and, in the presence of witnesses, certified that everything he had agreed to at Constance was because of his fear; and that his pledges there being made under duress, he was not obliged to keep his oath.

111. The council met again in regular session, and made the following declaration: --

"The present council lawfully assembled in the city of Constance, and representing the whole Church militant, holds its power immediately of Jesus Christ, and all persons of whatever state or dignity (the papal not excepted) are bound to obey it in what concerns the faith, the extirpation of the schism, and the reformation of the Church in its head and members."

112. The council sent messengers to John, notifying him that there was no violence intended him, and giving the emperor's assurance that none should be offered him. Therefore, if he refused to return, or to appoint deputies to effect in due form his resignation for him, then the council would proceed against him as guilty of perjury and the author of the schism. The messengers found John at Brisac. He promised them an audience the next day. But, in the interval thus gained, he fled again. The messengers followed, and overtook him at Friburg. They made sure that he should not again have a chance to escape by putting them off: they invaded his bedchamber, and delivered their message to him as they found him in his bed.

113. To the messengers John replied that he was ready to perform his promise to resign the papacy "upon the following conditions, and no other: --

"I. That the emperor should grant him a safe conduct in due form, such as he himself should dictate.

"II. That a decree should be issued by the council, granting him entire freedom and security, and exempting him from being molested upon any account whatever.

"III. That a stop should be put to the war against the duke of Austria.

"IV. That after his resignation, he should be appointed perpetual legate over all Italy, or enjoy, during life, the Bolognese and the county of Avignon, with a yearly pension of thirty thousand florins of gold; and that

he should hold of no person whatever, nor be obliged to give an account to any person of what he had done or might thenceforth do."

114. Meanwhile the council met in its fifth regular session, in which it confirmed all the transactions of the previous sessions, especially that which related to the superiority of the council to the pope. In this session it was further decided that the pope was obliged to obey the decrees of the council, and to stand to its decisions: that if he refused to resign, the faithful should all withdraw their obedience from him, and he should be held as actually deposed: that his flight from Constance was unlawful, and prejudicial to the unity of the Church: that if he would return, a most ample safe conduct should be granted to him: and if he fulfilled his promise to resign, he should be provided for during life in such manner as should be arranged by four persons named by him and four by the council.

115. At the next session the council adopted the form of renunciation of the papacy which the assembly of the nations had framed, which John had read to the council, and to which he had agreed. At the next session the pope was officially summoned to appear at the council, to justify his flight from Constance, and to clear himself of the crimes of heresy, schism, simony, etc., laid to his charge. Other matters occupied the council at the next two sessions, except that John was officially summoned again. But as John paid no attention to any of the overtures of the council, and the emperor's forces were raiding the dominions of the duke of Austria, the duke made his peace with the emperor, and two archbishops, with three hundred troops, arrested Pope John at Friburg, and confined him in a castle about ten miles from Constance.

116. At the tenth session of the council, May 14, 1414, there was read the list of accusations against Pope John, consisting of seventy articles, twenty of which were too shockingly scandalous to be publicly read, even in that rough and scandalous age. At the next session, May 25, all the articles against John, which had been read in the previous session, were read again. As they were read, one by one, there were also

read the deposition of the witnesses, and the characters of the witnesses, without their names. When all had been read, the council declared fully proved the whole list -- those which had been read, and those not fit to read; and then unanimously declared that "the said lord pope John ought to be suspended from all administration, in spirituals as well as in temporals, belonging to him as pope; and we declare him accordingly actually suspended for his notorious simony and wicked life." Notification of this sentence was sent to Pope John; to which he replied that he "entirely acquiesced in the sentence which they had already pronounced, and was ready, to submit to any sentence that they should pronounce, as he knew that the council could not err."

117. The messengers returned with John's answer, and, in the twelfth session of the council, May 29, the following sentence of deposition was pronounced: --

"The general Council of Constance, having invoked the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and examined, in the fear of God, the articles exhibited and proved against John XXIII, and his voluntary submission to the proceedings of the council, does pronounce, decree, and declare by the present sentence, that the nocturnal escape of the said John XXIII, in disguise and in an indecent habit, was scandalous; that it was prejudicial to the unity of the Church, and contrary to his vows and oaths; that the same John XXIII is a notorious simonist; that he has wasted and squandered away the revenues of the Roman Church and other churches; that he has been guilty in the highest degree of maladministration both in spirituals and temporals; that by his detestable behavior he has given offense to the whole Christian people; that by persevering in so scandalous a conduct to the last in spite of repeated admonitions, he has shown himself incorrigible; that as such, and for other crimes set forth in his process, the council does declare him deposed and absolutely deprived of the pontificate, absolves all Christians from their oath of allegiance to him, and forbids them for the future to own him for pope, or to name him as such. And that this sentence may be irrevocable, the council does from this time, with their full power, supply all the defects that may afterward be found in the process; and does further condemn the said John XXIII to be committed, in the name of the council, to some place where he may be kept in the custody of the emperor, as

protector of the Catholic Church, so long as the council shall judge necessary for the unity of the Church, the said council reserving a power to themselves to punish him for his crimes and irregularities according to the canons, and as the law of justice or mercy shall require."

559

118. While the council had been disposing of John, ambassadors from Gregory XII had arrived. They were sent by Gregory "to resign the pontificate in his name, and all right and title to that dignity. But they came not to the council: Pope Gregory XII would not recognize the legitimacy of a council convened by Pope John XXIII. Therefore, these messengers were commissioned to the emperor, and were empowered to treat with him. They were directed to inform the emperor that if he and the heads of the nations would allow the council to be convoked anew by Pope Gregory XII, then Pope Gregory XII would recognize it as lawful council, but not otherwise. To this the emperor and the heads of the nations agreed.

119. Accordingly, at the fourteenth session, July 4, 1415, one of Gregory's nuncios took the chair, and from Gregory read two bulls: the one convoking the Council of Constance, and, when thus convoked, owning it as a lawful council: the other empowering this nuncio to act as Pope Gregory's proxy, and, in that character, to submit to the decisions of the council when lawfully convoked as Gregory's council. When the bulls had been thus read, the council was declared convoked in the name of Pope Gregory XII. Then the proxy announced to the council that Gregory XII was ready to sacrifice his dignity to the peace of the Church, and to submit to their disposal of him as they should see fit.

120. Then the regular president of the council took the chair, and the emperor his throne. A third bull from Gregory was then read, giving his proxy full power to resign the papal dignity in his name. Then the renunciation of Gregory was made by the proxy, in the following words : --

"I, Charles Malatesta, vicar of Rimini, governor of Romagna for our most holy father in Christ Lord Pope, Gregory XII, and general of the holy Roman Church, being authorized by the full power that has just now been read, and has been received by me from our said Lord Pope Gregory, compelled by no violence, but only animated with an ardent desire of procuring the peace and union of the Church, do, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, effectually and really renounce for my master Pope Gregory XII the possession of, and all right and title to, the papacy, which he legally enjoys, and do actually resign it in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of this general council, which represents the Roman Church and the Church Universal."

560

121. This act of resignation of Pope Gregory XII was received with thunderous applause by the council. The Te Deum was sung, and mighty commendations were bestowed upon Gregory. Then the council decreed that Benedict XIII should be required in like manner to resign within ten days after he received the notice of the council; and that if he did not resign within that time, he should be declared "a notorious schismatic, and an obstinate and incorrigible heretic; and as such be deprived of all honor and dignity, and cast out of the Church."

122. The council next decreed that Gregory "should retain the dignity of cardinal bishop so long as he lived; that he should be first in rank after the pope, unless some alteration should be judged expedient, with respect to this article, upon the resignation of Peter de Luna; and that he should be perpetual legate of the Marches of Ancona, and enjoy undisturbed all the honors, privileges, and emoluments annexed to that dignity. The council granted him besides a full and unlimited absolution from all the irregularities he might have been guilty of during his pontificate, exempted him from giving an account of his past conduct, or any part of it, to any person whatever, and forbade any to be raised to the pontificate till they had promised upon oath to observe this decree, notwithstanding all the canons, constitutions, and decrees of general councils to the contrary."

123. Benedict XIII insisted that now that the other two popes had resigned, this left him sole and indisputably lawful pope. The emperor and a large number of attendants made a journey of nearly five hundred

miles to Perpignan, in France, on the Gulf of Lyons, near the Spanish border, where they met the king of Aragon and all the princes who recognized Benedict as pope. They held a congress and sought by every possible means to persuade Benedict to resign; but all in vain. At one of the sessions he argued for seven hours at a stretch, although he was seventy-seven years old, that he alone was lawful pope; and that, if the good of the Church required him to resign, he alone had the right to elect a new pope, being the only undoubted cardinal then alive, as having been created before the schism, and, consequently, by an undoubted pope. He declared that he "never would abandon the Church which it had pleased the Almighty to commit to his care; and at the same time declared excommunicated all who did not acknowledge him, whether

emperors, kings, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, or bishops; and declared them to be rebels to St. Peter and his Church."

124. His adherents all, except four cardinals, deserted him, and recognized the Council of Constance. Then the Council of Constance deposed him, July 26, 1417. But Benedict excommunicated and anathematized "the schismatic assembly at Constance, and all the princes and bishops who assisted at it or received its definitions or decrees calculated to foment and perpetuate so dangerous a schism in the one holy Catholic and apostolic Church; so that the only holy Catholic and apostolic Church was now to be found only at Peniscola," where Benedict then was. He persisted unto the moment of his death, that he was the only pope. As long as he could speak he maintained it; and "when he could no longer speak, he wrote down, with great difficulty, the following injunction addressed, as his last will, to his cardinals: --

"I enjoin you, upon pain of an eternal curse, to choose another pope after my death."

125. The three cardinals did elect another pope after the death of Benedict, who took the title of --

CLEMENT VIII, NOV. 29, 1424;

but he abdicated in favor of the pope who had been elected by the Council of Constance, --

MARTIN V, NOV. 8, 1417, TO FEB. 20, 1431.

126. Martin V left Constance for Rome, May 16, 1418. He remained a season in Geneva; then passed to Florence, where he arrived Feb. 27, 1419. While at Florence John XIII, in June, 1419, "throwing himself at his feet, without any previous stipulations or conditions whatever, acknowledged him for the lawful successor of St. Peter and Christ's vicar upon earth." On the fourteenth of June, Balthasar Cossa "ratified and confirmed all the decisions of the Council of Constance relating to himself, and relating to the election of Martin V; renounced in a solemn manner all right and title to the popedom; was thereupon created by the pope cardinal bishop of Tusculum, was made dean of the sacred college; and it was ordained that he should always sit next to the

pope, and his seat should be somewhat raised above the seats of the other cardinals." He died December 20 following.

127. Thus by the efforts and authority of the nations, the anarchy of the papacy was ended; and the papacy was saved from herself. As the nations had now resumed their legitimate place and power as superior to the papacy, the absolutism, as well as the anarchy, of the papacy was ended. In complete and horrible measure there had been demonstrated to all the world that the essence of the papacy and the ultimate of her rule, is only anarchy. The fearful iniquities of the popes continued; but after the thorough demonstration of the essential anarchy of the papacy that had been presented to the world, in the further career of the papacy there could be

nothing new except the official crowning of the whole arrogant, deceitful, licentious, bloody, and anarchistic record, by Pope --

PIUS IX, JUNE 16, 1846, TO FEB. 8, 1878,

with the attribute of divinity, in his proclamation of papal infallibility, as an article of faith because of divine revelation.

128. And even this is but the logic of the theocratical theory upon which the foundation of the papacy was laid in the days of Constantine. For, the papacy being professedly the government of God, he who sits at the head of it, sits there as the representative of God. He represents the divine authority; and when he speaks or acts officially, his speech or act is that of God. But to make a man thus the representative of God, is only to clothe human passions with divine power and authority. And being human, he is bound always to act unlike God; and being clothed with irresponsible power, he will often act only like Satan. Consequently, in order to make all his actions consistent with his profession, he is compelled to cover them all with the divine attributes, and make everything that he does in his official capacity the act of God.

129. This is precisely the logic and the profession of papal infallibility. It is not claimed that all the pope speaks is infallible; it is only what he speaks officially -- what he speaks ex cathedra, that is, from the throne. The decree of infallibility is as follows: --

"We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed, that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his

supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrines regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiffs are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church.

"But if any one -- which may God avert -- presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema.

"Given at Rome in public session solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our pontificate."43

130. Under this theory, the pope sits upon his throne as the head of the government of God, and as God indeed. For the same pope who published the dogma of infallibility, consistently published a book of his speeches, in the preface to which, in the official and approved edition, he is declared to be "the living Christ;" "the voice of God;" and further of him it is declared: "He is nature, that protests; he is God, that condemns."44 And fully up to the measure of these declarations, Pope --

LEO XIII, FEB. 20, 1878 --

published, June 21, 1894, a communication addressed " to the princes and peoples of the universe," in which he said to them: "We hold the regency of God on earth." A regency is the office and administration of a regent. A "regent is an administrator of a realm during the minority or incapacity of a king;" "one who rules or reigns, hence one invested with vicarious authority; one who governs a kingdom in the minority, absence, or disability of the sovereign." A regency of God on earth, therefore, can exist only upon the assumption of the "minority, absence, or disability" of God as to the affairs of the earth, which assumption can not possibly be anything short of supremely blasphemous.

131. Thus in the papacy there is fulfilled to the letter, in completest meaning, the prophecy -- 2 Thess. 2:1-9 - of " the falling away" and the revealing of " that man of sin, " " the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped;

so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

132. This is the inevitable logic of the false theocratical theory. And if it be denied that the theory is false, there is logically no escape from accepting the whole papal system. Thus so certainly and so infallibly is it true that the false and grossly conceived view of the Old Testament theocracy, contains within it the germ of THE ENTIRE PAPACY.45

---

1 [Page 510] "History of the Popes," Clement V.

2 [Page 511] Id.

3 [Page 512] Id.

4 [Page 514] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," John XXII, where a considerable portion of the list is given.

5 [Page 515] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vii, book xii, chap. vii, par. 36.

6 [Page 517] Id. pars. 43-45.

7 [Page 517] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," under Nicholas V. antipope.

8 [Page 518] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vii, book xii, chap. vi, par. 5 from end.

9 [Page 519] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," under Nicholas V, antipope.

10 [Page 519] Id. Cardinal Villani, under John XXII, sole pope.

11 [Page 520] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vii, book xii, chap. vii, last paragraph.

12 [Page 522] Id., chap, ix, pars, 1, 2.

13 [Page 523] De Cormenin, Boniface VIII.

14 [Page 523] Id., Clement VI.

15 [Page 524] Id., Clement VI.

16 [Page 525] Id., par. 15.

17 [Page 525] Id., under Rienzi, par. 19 from end.

18 [Page 526] Id., chap. xi, par. 1.

19 [Page 527] Id.

20 [Page 528] "History of the Popes," Gregory XI.

21 [Page 530] Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vii, book xiii, chap, i.

22 [Page 531] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," Urban VI.

23 [Page 532] De Cormenin, under A. D. 1378.

24 [Page 533] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vii, book xiii, chap. 1, last paragraph but one.

25 [Page 533] Id. chap. ii, par. 1.

26 [Page 534] "History of the Popes," under Urban VI and Clement VII.

27 [Page 534] A florin was equal to ?$2.421/2.

28 [Page 536] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vii, book xiii, chap. ii.

29 [Page 537] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vii, book xiii, chap. ii, par. 4 from end.

30 [Page 538] Id., chap. iii, pars.2.3.

31 [Page 538] "History of the Popes," under A. D. 1389.

32 [Page 539] Id.

33 [Page 541] De Cormenin's "History of the Popes," under year 1389.

34 [Page 545] Bower under Gregory XII.

35 [Page 546] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vii, book xiii, book xiii, chap. iv, par. 13.

36 [Page 547] Id., pars. 14, 15.

37 [Page 549] "Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vii, book xiii, chap. v; with Bower's "Lives of the Popes," under Gregory XII.

38 [Page 550] Id.

39 [Page 550] "Lives of the Popes," Alexander V.

40 [Page 551] "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vii, book xiii, chap. v, under John XXIII.

41 [Page 552] Id.

42 [Page 554] Bower's "Lives of the Popes," John XXIII. The whole account of the Council of Constance is drawn from Bower's record.

43 [Page 563] Schaff's "History of the Vatican Council," Decrees, chap. iv. The pontificate" is that of Plus IX.

44 [Page 563] Speeches of Pope Plus IX, pp. 9, 17; Gladstone's Review, p. 6.

45 [Page 564] Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. ii,sec. ii, part i, div. ii, par. 29.

21. THE SPIRIT OF THE PAPACY

THERE can not possibly be any fair denying that the whole course of the papacy is the display of sheer selfishness -- selfishness supreme, and self-exaltation absolute. But Christianity is the direct and extreme opposite of selfishness. It is the complete emptying of self. It is self-renunciation absolute.

2. To all people in the world it is spoken by the Word of God: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but emptied himself, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."1

3. The idea conveyed in the term translated "robbery" may be more clearly discerned by noting the different translations. The "Emphatic Diaglott" remarks that the original -- "harpagmon" -- being a word of very rare occurrence, a great variety of translations have been given," and cites as examples: "Did not think it a matter to be earnestly desired." -- Clarke. "Did not earnestly affect." -- Cyprian. "Did not think of eagerly retaining." -- Wakefield. "Did not regard -- as an object of solicitous desire." -- Stuart. "Thought it not a thing to be seized." -- Sharpe. "Did not earnestly grasp." -- Kneeland. "Did not violently strive." -- Dickinson. "Did not meditate a usurpation." -- Trumbull. To these may be added: "Counted it not a prize." -- R. V., with margin, "or a thing to be grasped." "Deemed it no trespass." -- Murdock's Syriac. In the "Emphatic Diaglott" itself the translation is the same as Trumbull's: "Who [Christ Jesus] being in God's form, yet did not meditate a usurpation to be like God." And

this, it will be seen, more nearly expresses the intended thought of the Scripture than any other; as where the idea of government is involved a robber of government is a usurper.

4. The thought, therefore, which is conveyed in the text is this: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God thought it NOT a thing to be seized upon, to be violently striven for, and eagerly retained, -- thought it not a usurpation to be meditated, -- to be equal with God." This is Christianity. But it is not in any sense the papacy. From the inception of the papacy even in the days of the apostles ("The mystery of iniquity doth already work;" 2 Thess. 2:7) until the proclamation of the essential divinity of the papacy by Pope Pius IX, every step of the way is but a manifestation of the mind that has thought it a thing to be earnestly desired, a prize to be seized upon, to be violently striven for, and eagerly retained, a usurpation to be meditated, to be equal with God. If that word and thought expressing the mind that was NOT in Christ, had been written since 1870, instead of before A. D. 70, it could not have more fitly defined the essential spirit of the papacy than it does. And that for eighteen hundred years, throughout the blackest record in the whole world, there should be a succession of men perpetually actuated by this one spirit of violently striving for, seizing, and eagerly retaining, equality with God, is a matter of sufficient interest to demand inquiry as to its origin.

5. The key to this inquiry, the key that unlocks this mystery, is the word of God in the text here cited: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who,being in the form of God, thought it NOT a thing to be seized upon, to be violently striven for, and eagerly retained, -- thought it not a usurpation to be meditated, -- to be equal with God; but emptied himself and took upon himself the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

6. Jesus Christ is the Word of God. Words express thoughts. Jesus Christ, the Word of God, is therefore the expression of the thought of God. God's thought is manifested in "the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."2 Jesus Christ is the revelation of

that eternal purpose of the Eternal God. Jesus Christ is the brightness of His Father's glory, and the express image of His person.3 From the Father He spoke all things into existence.4 "By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by Him, and for Him."5 He upholds all things by the word of His power.6 By Him all things hold together.7 "It pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell."8 He is the One whom the Lord possessed "in the beginning of His way;" who was "set up from everlasting;" who "was by Him as one brought up with Him."9 He is the one "whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of Eternity."10 He is the only begotten of the Father, and is therefore in very substance of the nature of God; in Him "dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily;" He, therefore, by divine right of "inheritance," bears from the Father the name of "God."11 Thus Christ Jesus was indeed by divine and eternal right one of God -- "equal with God."

7. Yet, being this, "He thought it not a thing to be violently striven for, and held fast, to be equal with God." What then should ever raise this question? What could have caused His mind to run in the channel of thinking that this mighty and glorious dignity of equality with God, was not a thing to be striven for and eagerly retained? What should cause Him not to think of holding fast to, and striving for, that which by eternal and inalienable right was truly His, and which He truly was?

8. From the nature of the case as stated in the text, it is evident that on the part of some one there was a mind willing to raise a strife as to who should be equal with God. It is plain that in some one there was manifested a mind, a disposition, earnestly to desire, and to seize upon, equality with God. By some one there was meditated a usurpation of equality with God. Who was this? Can we find him? If we can find such a one, it is certain that we shall have found the key to the whole situation, the secret of the thought contained in the scripture under consideration, and the secret of the papacy.

9. We can find him. He is named, and fully described. His attempted usurpation, its origin, and its awful results are fully explained. Here is the description of an "anointed cherub" who sinned: --

"Thus saith the Lord God; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, the topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created. Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire.12 Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee. By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned: therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God; and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire."13

10. It will not be a repetition, but rather an addition, to insert here the Jews' translation of this passage. It runs as follows: --

"Thus hath said the Lord Eternal, Thou wast complete in outline, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. In Eden the garden of God didst thou abide; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, the topaz, and the diamond, the chrysolite, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold; thy tabrets and thy flutes of artificial workmanship were prepared in thee on the day that thou wast created. Thou wast a cherub with outspread covering (wings); and I had set thee upon the holy mountain of God (as) thou wast;

in the midst of the stones of fire didst thou wander. Perfect wast thou in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till wickedness was found in thee. By the abundance of thy commerce thou wast filled to thy center with violence, and thou didst sin: therefore I degraded thee out of the mountain of God; and I destroyed thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire."

11. It is important just here to study what the cherubim are, and what their place is: In the tabernacle made and pitched by the children of Israel in the wilderness there were two apartments, the holy place and the most holy place. The inner curtain that formed the top of the whole tabernacle was curiously and elegantly interwoven with

569

figures of cherubim.14 The veil which separated between the holy place and the most holy place was likewise wrought in figures of cherubim. In the most holy place was the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein were the tables of the testimony, the tables of the covenant, the Ten Commandments; and over the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat. The top of this ark of the testimony was the mercy-seat. On each end of this mercy-seat was placed a golden cherub. These two cherubim faced each other and the mercy-seat, with outstretched wings shadowing the mercy-seat. Above the mercy-seat dwelt the Shekinah -- the bright shining glory of the presence of the Lord. And said he, "There I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel."15

12. When the temple in Jerusalem was built to take the place of the tabernacle, all the inner wall and the inner face of the doors were carved in figures of cherubim and palm-trees and open flowers; and then all this carving and the whole inner surface of the house were overlaid with gold fitted upon the carved work, and "garnished with precious stones for beauty." In addition to all this there were made two cherubim each ten cubits high, with wings ten cubits from tip to tip. The ark of the testimony that had been in the tabernacle was brought into the temple, and put in the most holy place with the tables of the testimony in it and the mercy-seat and the golden cherubim upon the top of it. And these two large cherubim which were made with the temple, were place also in the most holy placed, "and they stretched forth the wings of the cherubim, so that the wing of the one touched the one wall, and the wing of the other cherub touched the other wall; and their wings touched one another in the midst of the house."16

13. Now this earthly tabernacle, or this temple, with all its appointments was but a shadow of things in heaven. The tabernacle when it was made was according to the pattern, or original, which the Lord himself showed to Moses in the mount.17 And when the temple was to

570

be built to take the place of the tabernacle, a view of the pattern, or original, was given to David by the Spirit of God, and the plans were committed by him to Solomon for his guidance in the building and furnishing of the temple.18 Thus, the tabernacle, or temple, on earth, with its priesthood, its ministry, and all its appointments, was a shadow, a representation, of the tabernacle, or temple in heaven, and of the heavenly priesthood, the heavenly ministry, and the heavenly appointments.19 Therefore the figures of cherubim about the mercy-seat, and the ark of the testimony, and over all the inner surface of the tabernacle and the temple, were but shadows or representations of the real cherubim in heaven itself.

14. There is a temple of God in heaven.20 In that temple Jesus Christ, our High Priest, ministers.21 In it is an altar of incense at which the merit of Jesus Christ is offered with the prayers of the saints.22 In it also is the ark of God's testimony; upon which is the mercy-seat where God himself dwells; and about it are the bright cherubim with outstretched, shadowing wings. In the first and tenth chapters of Ezekiel there are recorded visions in which the prophet saw the glory of the heavenly throne and of Him who sits upon it, and the cherubim about it. Four of the cherubim he describes particularly. These four had each four faces and four wings, and two

of the wings of each one were stretched upward, joining one to another, and with the other two each one covered his body.23 By the sides of the cherubim, and apparently inseparably connected with them ("for the spirit of the living creature was in the wheels," chap. 1:20, 21), were four living wheels "so high that they were dreadful."24

15. "And the likeness of the firmament upon the heads of the living creature was as the color of the terrible crystal, stretched forth over their heads above. And under the firmament were their wings straight, the one toward the other: every one had two, which covered on this side, and every one had two, which covered on that side, their bodies. And when they went, I heard the noise of their wings, like the noise of great waters, as the voice of the Almighty, the voice of speech, as the noise of a host: when they stood, they let down their wings. And there

was a voice from the firmament that was over their heads, when they stood, and had let down their wings. And above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone: and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it. And I saw as the color of amber, as the appearance of fire round about within it, from the appearance of his loins even upward, and from the appearance of his loins even downward, I saw as it were the appearance of fire, and it had brightness round about. As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of one that spake."25 "This is the living creature that I saw under the God of Israel by the river of Chebar; and I knew that they were the cherubim."26

16. By comparing these scriptures with Dan. 7:9; Rev. 4:2-8; and Isa. 6:1-3, it is clearly seen that Ezekiel had a vision of the living throne of the living God. As the cherubim are inseparably connected with that throne; and as the cherubim were also inseparably connected with the ark of the testimony in the earthly temple where the presence of the Lord dwelt between the cherubim; it is evident that the ark of God's testimony in the temple of heaven has the same relative place, and is therefore the base, or foundation, of the throne of the living God.

17. In the earthly temple the ark of the testimony took its name from the testimony -- the Ten Commandments -- which was put within it. These commandments the Lord himself wrote with His own hand, and gave to Moses to deposit beneath the mercy-seat above which the presence of the glory of God dwelt, between the cherubim. It is therefore evident that the ark of His testament in the heavenly temple takes its title also from the fact that therein, beneath the mercy-seat and the cherubim upon it, there is the original of the testimony of God -- the Ten Commandments -- of which that on earth was a copy. And as this holy law -- the Ten Commandments -- is but the expression in writing, a transcript, of the character of Him who sits upon the throne, therefore it is written: --

"The Lord reigneth, let the people tremble, He sitteth upon [above] the cherubim, let the earth be moved."

"Clouds and darkness are round about Him: Righteousness and judgment are the foundation of His throne."

"Righteousness and judgment are the foundation of thy throne: Mercy and truth go before thy face."27

18. Now it was one of these glorious creatures, who sinned. It was one of these bright cherubim, "full of wisdom and perfect in beauty," who stood close to the throne of God with outstretched, covering wings covering the mercy-seat, upon whom rested "the ceaseless beams of glory enshrouding the eternal God," -- it was one of these exalted ones who forgot his place as creature, and aspired to be equal with God the Creator.28 For, again

we quote, "Thou art the anointed cherub ["a cherub with outspread covering wings"] that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee."

19. But what caused iniquity to appear in one of these? What was the origin of his ambition to be equal with God? Here is the answer: "Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness."29 Being "perfect in beauty" he looked at himself instead of to Him who gave him this perfect beauty; and began to contemplate himself, and to admire himself. Then, as the consequence, he grew proud of himself, and began to think that the place which he occupied was too narrow for the proper, profitable, and full display of the ability which he now gave himself

the credit of possessing. He concluded that the place which he occupied was not fully worthy of the dignity which now in his own estimation merged in him.

20. True, he did have the perfection of beauty, fullness of wisdom, and height of dignity. But he had received it all from God through Jesus Christ who had created him. He had nothing, to his very existence itself, which he had not received. And when he would boast of it as if he had not received it; when he grew proud of his beauty, and gave himself credit for it as if it were inherently of himself; this, in itself, was but to ignore his Creator, and put himself in His place. Yea more, when he boasted of that which he had received as if he had not received it; when he exalted himself because of that which he was, as if it were inherently of himself; this was only to argue for himself, self-existence. And this was, in itself, only to make himself, in his own estimation EQUAL WITH GOD

21. When he had thus "corrupted his wisdom," it is not strange that he should follow, and even be charmed with, a line of false reasoning. Being only a creature, he could not fathom at once "the eternal purpose" which God had "purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord: " and he now began to measure all things by his own perverted conceptions, and to reason only from what he could see. And, having separated from God, all that he could see was only in the perverted light, through the gloom, of his own corrupted wisdom. Thus again, in the nature of things as they now were, all his reasonings were altogether from himself; and so, measuring all things by his own confused conceptions, beginning and ending all things in himself, this was still to put himself in the place of God, and to make himself equal with God.

22. But he saw no token that the Lord thought of him as he thought of himself. He could see nothing to indicate any purpose on the part of the Lord to exalt him to the dignity and the place which alone he now considered worthy of himself. He could see nothing to indicate any purpose on the part of the Lord to exalt him to the dignity and the place which alone he now considered worthy of himself. He therefore concluded that this failure was only because of a set purpose on the part of Christ, who was equal with God (which set purpose was shared by the Father), to keep him down, and not to allow, in the

presence of the heavenly hosts, the full display of his powers lest He himself should be eclipsed. Then it was that he conceived the idea and formed the purpose to supplant Him who was equal with God, and to make himself indeed, and in place, equal with God. Then it was, and thus it was, that he thought it a thing to be seized upon, a usurpation to be meditated, a prize to be contended for, to be equal with God. And therefore it is written, "O Lucifer, son of the morning! . . . thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High."30

23. This expression, "I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north" or "the farthest end of the north," is worthy of notice. In Ps. 48:1-3 it is written, "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be

praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of His holiness. Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is Mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great King. God is known in her palaces for a refuge." It is not the purpose here to try to tell just what is the meaning of this expression, "the sides of the north;" but it is evident that it refers in some way to that particular place where the Majesty of heaven sits in the mountain of His holiness. And therefore when Lucifer declared, "I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north," it was only another way of expressing his determination to be "equal to the Most High." The other expressions in the passage when analyzed, all signify the same thing.

24. Thus have we found in the completest sense the one in whom was the mind that thought it robbery -- a thing to be seized upon, a prize to be violently striven for, a usurpation to be meditated -- to be equal with God. We have found his name, and what he was, and what caused his mind to run in this channel.

25. But let us follow this farther. A greater problem than many

575

think it to be, was thus presented. When Lucifer began thus to admire himself, and so to exalt himself in his own estimation to such a pitch that nothing but to be equal with God would satisfy his ambition, and nothing but to be in the very place of God could furnish a theater sufficient for a proper display of the abilities which resided in him, it again followed in the nature of things as they now were that the old order of things would not any longer satisfy. New conditions would demand a new order of things, and therefore there must necessarily be a change. As certainly as his purposes and propositions should be complied with and carried out, so certainly there would have to be a change in the order and government of God. And he did specifically demand that his views should be adopted, that he should be exalted to the place of dominion and power, and that his plans and purposes should be adopted and carried out. And just so certainly, therefore, he did demand that there should be a change in the order of things. And all, of course, in the interest of "progress," of "freedom," and of "moral and intellectual advancement." In short, he proposed to "reform" the government of God.

26. But in order to change the order of things in the government of God there would of necessity have to be a change of the law of God. But the law of God is only the transcript of the character of God; it is but the reflection of himself. To call for a change of His law is to call upon God himself to change. And for God to consent to any conceivable change in His law, would be only Himself to change. And further, it is written, and we have read it that the justice and judgment -- the righteousness -- that is expressed in the law of God which abides in the throne of God, are the habitation, the prop, the stay, the foundation of that throne; and therefore are the foundation of the government of God. Consequently, to propose a change in the law of God, which in itself was proposed in the proposition to change the government of God, was only to propose to remove the foundation of the government of God. But this would be only to destroy the government of God, and set up another, independent of God, and founded, NOT upon righteousness, justice, and judgment, mercy, and truth; but upon self and selfish ambition only.

27. As only righteousness and justice are the foundation of the

576

throne and government of God; as only mercy and truth go before the face of Him who sits upon that throne and administers the government; it is evident that this throne and government exist only for the highest good, the chiefest blessing, and the most perfect happiness of all in the universe of God -- all expressed in the one word, LOVE.

28. Then if this order of government must go, to give place to one whose foundation abides only in self and selfish ambition, -- every one for himself, and that self supreme; pride and love of supremacy characterizing all who are in any place of power of influence, and envious aspiration all who are not; begetting universal suspicion and distrust, -- this would be but to establish an order of government that could be maintained only by

a system of everlasting suppression, and oppression, -- in short, a universal and unmitigated tyranny, all expressed in the one word, FORCE.

29. Upon the premises from which Lucifer was proceeding, between the government founded in righteousness and judgment, mercy and truth, and administered in love, and a government centering in self and administered through a spying, meddling, tyrannical force, there could be no possible alternative but universal anarchy and even chaos; for the very idea of government is a system of laws maintained. If the laws are not maintained, but the very fundamental principles of the government must be changed at the selfishly ambitious demand of the first discontented subject, then there can be no such thing as government: everything must go to pieces. It is evident, therefore, that in the controversy thus originated there was involved not only the happiness and highest good of every inhabitant of the universe, but the very existence of the throne and government of God -- yea, even the existence of God himself. If this new order of things must be recognized, the throne and government of God must go. If the throne and government of God are to stand, this other enterprise must cease.

30. This is not to say that Lucifer saw, or intended, all this at the start. He was only a creature. He was, therefore, unable, short of eternity, to fathom God's eternal purpose which He has purposed in Christ; and which was manifested alone through Christ. But now he had turned against Christ, and against God, and it was impossible for him to understand the purpose of God in anything. He

had corrupted His wisdom, and so could see things only in the perverted light of his own obscured vision. He saw things not as they really were, but as they appeared to him in his perverted understanding of things. And, reasoning only from what he could thus see, it really appeared to him that he was working for the best interests of all. He could see no farther than to suppose that the order of things proposed by him was better than that which had been established in the eternal counsels, and which was being carried out according to the eternal purpose of the eternal God.

31. But God saw it all. And Christ saw it all. And both had seen it from the days of eternity. They knew all that was involved in the step which Lucifer had taken. They saw from the beginning all the fearful results which would flow from the course upon which Lucifer had now entered, and from that which he had proposed. They knew full well that the life and joy, or the misery and death of every creature in the universe was involved -- life and joy in the order of God and of Love; misery and death in the order of Self and of Force. Therefore, the Lord could not recognize nor sanction in any possible degree the propositions of this self-exalted one. He could not change His law. He could not change His own character. He could not cease to be God. He could not abdicate. The throne of God, the righteous government of the universe, must stand.

32. As certainly as God and His law could not change nor, cease to be, so certainly Lucifer and his course must be changed or else he cease to be. The mind, the will, the purpose, of God could not change nor cease to be; therefore the mind, the will, and the purpose of Lucifer must be changed, or else he cease to be. And God did invite him to change his mind, to yield his will, and to abandon his purpose. The Lord did plead with him to forsake self, and turn again to God.

33. This we knew because the eternal purpose of God is "that in the dispensation of the fullness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth."31 It is "by Him to reconcile all things unto himself, . . . whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven."32 Here, then, was one, and through him there were others, in heaven who had turned against

Christ and had separated from God. And as it is God's eternal purpose to gather together in one all things in Christ which are in heaven, it follows that God did certainly invite Lucifer to turn again to oneness with the purpose of God in Christ.

34. Further: it is God's eternal purpose to gather together in one all things in Christ which are in heaven and which are in earth. And as, when man in earth had separated from God, he was called to return; so in the very nature of that eternal purpose, when angels in heaven had sinned, God did invite them to return.

35. Again: we know that God did invite Lucifer and the other angels that sinned to return, because it is written, "There is no respect of persons with God." When man sinned, God did invite him to return. Therefore, as there is no respect of persons with God; and as God did invite man to return when he had sinned; it follows, of necessity, that He did invite Lucifer and the other angels to return when they had sinned.

36. Yet further: God's purpose concerning man and angels, earth and heaven, is but one purpose. In the offer of salvation to man, and the work of salvation in man, in the gospel, by means of the Church on earth, God is working out a problem which is of interest to the good angels now (1 Peter 1:12); and by means of which they are caused to know the manifold wisdom of this eternal purpose. For thus it is written: "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ . . . to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church [by means of the Church] the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."33 But this problem of sin in man on earth, is but the continuation of the original problem raised by sin in Lucifer in heaven.

37. Therefore as the purpose of God concerning earth and heaven, man and angels, is one eternal purpose; as God invited man to return when he had sinned; as the working out of this problem raised by sin in man, is only the continuance of the original problem raised by sin in Lucifer; and as in the working out of this problem through man

on earth, the angels are interested, and by it are learning of the manifold wisdom of God in His eternal purpose; it follows that this call of God to man to return to God through Christ, is but the continuance of the call of God to Lucifer and the angels that sinned to return to God through Christ.

38. The conclusion of the whole matter then is this: As certainly as God's purpose concerning man and angels, earth and heaven, is one purpose; as certainly as there is no respect of persons with God; as certainly as the problem of sin in man on earth is but the continuance of the original problem raised by sin in Lucifer in heaven; and as certainly as God called man to return; so certainly Lucifer and the angels that sinned did God call to return.

39. But even this blessed call Lucifer misunderstood and perverted. Instead of seeing in it the mercy and loving-kindness of God that would save him from ruin, his own self-importance mistook it for a willingness and even a desire on the part of God to treat with him on even terms. He thought himself so far a necessity to the completeness of the universe that it was for that reason the Lord was so anxious to have him return; and that therefore in this treaty he could secure the recognition of at least some of his demands.

40. But, as we have seen, God could not in any conceivable degree recognize or sanction any single idea or wish proposed by him. And as God could not do so, Lucifer soon discovered that He would not do so. He found that the only thing that would be received or recognized by the Lord was the unconditional surrender of himself to God, and the abandonment of all his purposes. This, however,he determined not to do. And then, when he had determined that he would not, because he would not, he cast upon God his own character of willfulness, and decided that the reason that God would not come to terms with him was not because he could not, but only arbitrarily because he would not.

41. This only confirmed him the more in his determined course; and he resolved to draw with him the heavenly host, and so accomplish his purpose anyhow, of usurping the dominion of God. He insisted everywhere

and to all, that God was harsh, stern, and unyielding; that He would make no concessions at all; would deny himself nothing;

580

would make no sacrifices on behalf of any; but demanded sheer, blind, unreasoning submission; that to submit to such a government, and accede to such demands was most unbecoming in such glorious and exalted beings as they were; that it was to consent to be forever kept down, and confined to a narrow circle arbitrarily prescribed, with no liberty, and no opportunities for development. And all this sacrifice and subjection on their part, he declared, was demanded on the part of God merely to satisfy His partiality toward His Son whom He was determined should have the place of honor and dominion -- not because of any merit or right on His own part, but only because His Father would have it so at the expense of the freedom and dignity of all the rest. Thus he actually succeeded in deceiving and drawing after him one third of the heavenly host.34

42. And yet at that very moment, and from the moment when Lucifer took his first false step, God was offering to give His only begotten Son and himself in Him; and the Son himself was freely offering himself to die a sacrifice; to save him who had sinned -- to save this very one who was here making the charge and insisting upon it that God would deny himself nothing, and would make no sacrifices for anybody.

43. The sacrifice of Christ was in the invitation to Lucifer to return to God as certainly as it was in the invitation of man to return to God. For Lucifer had sinned, and from that moment he was a sinner as certainly as ever man was a sinner. And we have before found that God's eternal purpose in Christ is the same toward all: that purpose to "gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth." Lucifer had sinned and was a sinner when God invited him to return to God. But God did not invite him to return and take his place as of old as a sinner. Sin can not abide in the presence of God. Therefore the invitation of God to sinful Lucifer to return was in itself the offer to him of salvation from sin, that he might return and take his place in righteousness. But "the wages of sin is death." Therefore to save Lucifer from sin was to save him from death, and to save him from death was to die for him. Consequently, the sacrifice of the Son of God to save Lucifer from sin, was

581

in the invitation of God to him to return, as certainly as the sacrifice of Christ to save man from sin, was in the invitation to man to return from sin to God. For whether sin be in man or in cherub, it is sin; and without the offering of life there is "no remission," -- and that the offering of the life of the Son of God.35

44. Again: it was not the mind that was in Christ that was manifested in Lucifer, and that led him to take this course. It was self and self alone -- the mind and the minding of self. And when God invited him to return to God, it was not that he should return with this mind and the minding of self, which thought it a thing to be seized upon to be equal with God; but to return to the mind of God that was in Christ, who thought it not a thing to be held fast, or contended for, to be equal with God.

45. This mind that was in Lucifer had exalted himself even above God, and the image of God was no more reflected in him; but only self. And when invited to return, it was that he should turn from self, to forsake self, and have the image of God once more impressed upon his heart, and reflected in his life. But he was only a creature, and therefore of himself could not empty himself of himself that he might forsake self, and receive the native impress of God. Self was all there was of him, and self can not save itself from itself.

46. The sinner, whether cherub, angel, or man, must be saved from himself. Lucifer had disconnected himself from God's eternal purpose; he had separated from Christ. But that eternal purpose is to gather together all in Christ. Therefore for Lucifer to be saved from himself, to receive again the mind that was in Christ that restores the image of God, he would have to receive Christ in whom God is revealed. And in receiving Christ --

the mind, the Spirit of Christ -- there would again be restored and reflected in him the image of God who is revealed alone in Christ.

47. But in order for Lucifer to receive Christ, and thus be saved from himself, and restored to righteousness and holiness before God, Christ must be offered. Therefore so certainly as it was necessary in order for Lucifer to return in righteousness, that he should have another mind, another heart; so certainly it is true that in the invitation

582

of God for Lucifer to return, there was the offering of Jesus Christ to die for him. And thus to him, as certainly as ever to man, there was given the exhortation, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who thought it not a thing to be seized upon and contended for to be equal with God; but emptied himself and became obedient unto death."

48. And all that was done for Lucifer was done for the angels who were deceived by him or who went with him, "for there is no respect of persons with God." But neither he nor they would receive the wondrous gracious gift. On the part of all it was still "all of self, and none of Christ."

49. What more, then, could possibly be done for them? When that anointed cherub had chosen his own way instead of God's way; when he had put his own purpose in the place of God's purpose; when he had set up for independence of God; when he had not only rejected the Lord's gracious invitation to return, but had presumed to judge Him who gave the invitation; he doubly rejected the gift of salvation by Jesus Christ. When he had thus chosen himself and his own way, and had confirmed himself in that way; and when all those who followed him had deliberately chosen him instead of God in Christ as their head and leader, and so had rejected the gift of Christ to save them; then what more could possibly have been done for them? -- Absolutely nothing.

50. They had deliberately made their own choice, and had confirmed themselves in that choice. They had "kept not their first estate" (Jude 6), and had chosen not to receive it again. They had "left their own habitation" (id.), and had refused to return. They had "sinned" and had rejected salvation. As they had so determinedly made their own choice, all that the Lord could do was to let them have their own choice. Only, as evil can not dwell with Him, as sin can not abide in His presence, as they in heart, in character, and by deliberate and confirmed choice has abandoned their first estate and left their own habitation, they must now leave it in fact; for neither in itself nor to them could heaven be heaven with them in it. They must be cast out that they and all might realize and know for a certainly the difference between the service of self and the service of God.

583

51. But, behold! when they found that their choice and the course which they had taken involved their leaving heaven, involved really and indeed their leaving their own habitation, they were not willing to go. They were willing to make their choice, and were willing to confirm themselves in that choice; but they were not willing to accept the consequences of their choice. They resisted. "And there was war in heaven: Michael [Christ] and His angels fought against the dragon [the devil]; and the dragon [Satan] fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven."36

52. Than this, nothing could possibly show more plainly the essentially selfish nature of Lucifer and those who chose to go with him. Nothing could show more plainly that the complete usurpation of the place and government of God was involved in the controversy that had been thus raised. They were not only determined to have their own way, but they were determined to have their own way in their own way. They would have their own way, and have it in heaven, too. And they would even drive out Christ and God from heaven that they might have their own way in their own way, in the place of God. This demonstrates conclusively that the mind that was in Lucifer, -- the mind that was not in Christ, -- the mind that caused Lucifer to exalt himself, was a mind, that in

its very essence would be content with nothing less than "to be equal with God" in the place of God. It would exalt self above God, and put Him out of His place, that self alone might be supreme.

53. But he prevailed not. He was cast out of heaven, and his angels were cast out with him. They were "cast down to hell, and delivered into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment."37 "Into chains of darkness" -- into the bondage of darkness. The Greek word here translated "hell" is raprapwoas tartarosas, from raprapos Tarturus, and is defined as meaning "the hard, impenetrable darkness that surrounds the material universe." It seems, from the definition that the lexicographers give the word, that the Greek idea of "the material universe," whatever may have been included in their idea of the term, was that around it like a shell lay a solid mass of material darkness so perfectly

"hard" that it was impenetrable." Now the Lord adopts the
Greek word, but not the Greek idea, to convey to us the idea of the condition of "the angels that sinned." As the Greek word is expressive of a material darkness that is impenetrable, so by this word the Lord would convey to us the idea and the truth that the spiritual darkness into which were cast, or given over, the angels that sinned, is absolutely impenetrable ever to a single ray of light or hope from God.

54. They have persistently chosen their own way, which is only the way of darkness. They have rejected every offer of light and hope that God could possibly make. He has consequently given them up to their own way. And as they have rejected every possible offer that the Lord could make, they have put themselves completely beyond recovery. And therefore they have also decided their own cases, and have fixed upon themselves the judgment of destruction, which now only awaits them. So it is written: "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, He hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."38

WHY WERE THEY NOT DESTROYED?

55. There are some questions that may arise, that it would perhaps be well to notice before proceeding farther. First, it may be asked: Why did not the Lord destroy the wicked angels all at once? The answer is: Because He desires to desired the thing and not simply the persons. He desires to blot out the thing that made them what they are, rather than simply to blot out the persons who have been made what they are by it. And to have lifted up His righteous hand, or spoken in justice the word that would have smitten into nothingness the whole company of them -- this would have gotten rid of the persons who had sinned, it is true; but it would not certainly have gotten rid of the sin, which was the difficulty that had brought things to the point where they now were.

56. It was the wisdom and the justice of God's eternal purpose which had been called in question by one of the principal creatures of his realm. Being an eternal purpose, it will take eternity to reveal it to persons whose existence is measured in times. Being a purpose of infinite

depth, it will take eternity to make it all plain to minds that are only finite. It was the misapprehension of this eternal purpose, on the part of this exalted and anointed cherub, that had sprung the problem, and raised the controversy. And although misunderstanding this eternal purpose himself, yet he had such eminence and ability, even in his mistaken course, that he was able to present his views of things in such a way as to excite sympathy, and cause a vast number of the angelic host also to question the wisdom and justice of the eternal purpose of God which He had purposed in Christ.

57. He had represented God as stern, harsh, arbitrary, partial, exacting, and unwilling to make any sacrifices for His creatures. From the situation of things as it now was, he had succeeded in making it appear to

many that this was so. And for the Lord to have smitten out of existence instantly the whole crew, while being altogether just in itself, would have still left room for the suspicion on the part of finite minds who did not understand the infinite purpose, that perhaps Lucifer and those who were with him did not really deserve such a fate; and from this suspicion the thought, "Such treatment looks somewhat as if there were truth in Lucifer's view that God is arbitrary;" and from this thought, sympathy for the course of the rebels, and doubts of the goodness and righteousness of God; then discontent in heaven, and a service of fear and bondage instead of love and freedom. But as this is the very thing that Lucifer had charged against God, -- that such was the nature of the divine government, -- this in itself would be only finally to develop a sinful rebellion again.

58. Nor is it to be thought that this result is imaginary. For when this highly exalted one, this anointed cherub, who was so glorious that his very name, expressive only of what he was, -- "light-bearer," -- signified that wherever he went, he bore the light of God, this one who if he had equals had no superiors;39 among the heavenly hosts -- when such a

586

one so far misapprehended the eternal purpose of God which He purposed in Christ, it is not by any means an imaginary thing that others who were less than he, might possibly also misapprehend this eternal purpose if these had been instantly stricken out of existence in the presence of all; and this especially when the minds of all had been stirred upon this very thing, and had had all manner of insinuations spread before them by this most artful one.

59. Therefore with the situation as it was, and with the eternal principles and purpose of the government of God involved, it was impossible in the nature of things for the Lord to put an end to the evil then, by putting out of existence the evil-doers. The only thing therefore that He could do was to let the whole matter go on and develop as it would, until such time as the whole problem should be thoroughly understood by all in heaven and earth, and even in hell. And then when all evil shall be swept away with the destruction of all evil-doers, every knee shall bow, of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth, and every tongue shall confess that in eternal justice and righteousness, Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.40 And therefore it is written that He hath "made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in Him."41 And then, and thus again, with all in the realm of God it will be ALL OF CHRIST AND NONE OF SELF.

60. It may be further asked: Could not God have prevented it all, by making Lucifer and all others so that they could not sin? It is right and perfectly safe to answer, He could not! To have made creatures so that they could not sin, would have been really to make them so that they could not choose. To have no power of choice is not only to be not free to think, but to be unable to think. It is to be not intelligent,

587

but only a mere machine. Such could not possibly be of any use to themselves or their kind, nor be of any honor, praise, or glory to Him who made them.

61. Freedom of choice is essential to intelligence. Freedom of thought is essential to freedom of choice. God has made angels and men intelligent. He has made them free to choose, and has left them perfectly free to choose. He made them free to think as they choose. God is the author of intelligence, of freedom of choice, and of freedom of thought. And He will forever respect that of which He is the author. He will never invade to a hair's breadth the freedom of angel or man to choose for himself, nor to think as he chooses. And God is infinitely more honored in making intelligences free to choose such a course, and to think in such a way as to make themselves devils, than He could possibly be in making them so that they could not think nor choose, so that they would be not intelligent, but mere machines.

62. It may be yet further queried: As God made angels and men free to sin if they should choose, did he not then have to provide against this possible choice before they were made -- did He not have to provide for the possibility of sin, before ever a single creature was made? -- Assuredly He had to make such provision. And He did so. And this provision is an essential part of that eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord, which we are now studying.

63. Let us go back to the time when there was no created thing; back to the eternal counsels of the Father and the Son. The existence of God is not a self-satisfied existence. His love is not self-love. His joy is not fulfilled in wrapping himself within himself, and sitting solitary and self-centered. His love is satisfied only in flowing out to those who will receive and enjoy it to the full. His joy is fulfilled only in carrying to an infinite universe full of blessed intelligences, the very fullness of eternal joy.

64. Standing then, in thought, with Him before there was a single intelligent creature created, He desires that the universe shall be full of joyful intelligences enjoying His love to the full. In order to do this they must be free to choose not to serve Him, to choose not to enjoy His love. They must be free to choose Him or themselves, life or death. But this involves the possibility of the entrance of sin, the possibility

that some will choose not to serve. Him, will choose the way of sin. Shall He then refuse to create because, if He does, it must be with the possibility that sin may enter? -- This would be but eternally to remain self-centered and solitary. More than this, such a shrinking would in itself cause Him to cease to be God. For what is a god, or what is he worth, who can not do what he desires? who can not fulfill his own will? Such a god would be worthless.

65. Thank the Lord, such is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He made all intelligences free to choose, and to think as they choose; and therefore free to sin if they choose. And at the same time, in His infinite love and eternal righteousness, He purposed to give Himself a sacrifice to redeem all who should sin; and give them even a second freedom to choose Him or themselves, to choose life or death. And those who the second time would choose death, let them have what they have chosen. And those who would choose life, -- the universe full of them, -- let them enjoy to the full that which they have chosen, -- even eternal life the fullness of perfect love, and the dear delights of unalloyed joy forever.

66. This is God, the living God, the God of love, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is fully able to do whatsoever He will, and yet leave all His creatures free. This is He who from the days of eternity "worketh all things after the counsel of His own will."42 And this is "the mystery of His will, . . . which He hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him."43 This is "the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."44

67. The choice of self is sin, bondage, and death. the choice of Christ is righteousness, freedom, and life eternal in the realm and purpose of the eternal God.

THE LOSS OF MAN AND THE WORLD.

68. Lucifer and all his adherents, the angels that sinned, were cast, out, and their place was found no more in heaven. They were delivered up to the confirmed impenetrable darkness which they had doubly

chosen. Having left their own habitation, and being obliged to accept the result of their choice, being cast out, they had no place of their own. They were homeless wanderers in space.

69. Still, however, their leader, Satan, pursued his original mistake of thinking that he was self-sufficient for all things, and of following his blind reasoning upon his misjudgings of the Lord. His ambitious determination was still to be equal with God. And now he conceived the idea that he would lead the inhabited worlds astray. He had succeeded in leading angels away from allegiance to God, why could he not also lead other creatures away? Here, too, his former mistake in judging the Lord, followed him up, and laid the foundation for farther error and more false reasoning.

70. He had charged upon God that He was hard, arbitrary, unyielding, and unwilling to make any sacrifices for His creatures. And when the Lord asked him to yield himself, and return to God, and he had refused, and was thus given his own choice with its consequences, and was cost out of heaven, in his blindness he made this result only confirm his charge that the Lord was stern, arbitrary, and unforgiving. And now he reasoned from this that if he could get the inhabitants of some of the worlds to turn from God, and accept and follow him, this stern and arbitrary disposition of the Lord would cause him to cast off that world as the Lord had cast out him, and to give up to irretrievable darkness its inhabitants, as He had given up him and his adherents. This then would give him a habitation and undisputed sway therein. And when this plan should thus succeed with one world, why not then with another and another, and so on, till should be accomplished his original purpose to be equal with God?

71. With this purpose he set out on his mischievous journey. And he found this world in which we now dwell. Whether he tried other worlds first, or whether this was the first, is immaterial; as we know full well that he succeeded in getting into his toils this world and its inhabitants.

72. God in His wise purpose had created man, the holy pair, upright, only a little lower than the angels. He had given him paradise for his home. He had given him dominion over the earth and over every living thing that moveth upon it. He had made to grow from the

ground "every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food," and "the tree of Life which is in the midst of the paradise." He had put before him everything that could please the eye, and delight the mind, and charm the senses.

73. In this delightful state and place God put the blessed pair whom he had formed. He gave it all to them to enjoy forever. He made them free to enjoy it or to refuse it; and therefore he put also in the midst of the garden the forbidden tree, "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."45

74. Into this happy place came Satan with his deceptive purposes. He came here to fill, if possible, these with his own evil ambition. "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."

75. The Hebrew, the Revised Version, and the Jews' translation, all give to this latter point the reading: "God doth know, that, on the day ye eat thereof, your eyes will be opened and ye will be as God, knowing good and evil." This is not only the literal reading, but the true meaning, of the original words. This gives the very thought that was put before the woman. It was not that you shall be as gods, in the common acceptation of the plural term "gods." It was literally the very thought and ambition of Lucifer himself which he now put before her -- ye shall be as God. He would lead her away, and inspire her with this mind which was in him, to be equal with God.

76. But note the expression with which he opens the conversation. It is an expression which insinuates into her mind a whole world of suspicion.

591

The common version translates it, "Yea, hath God said," etc. The Revised Version gives it the same. The Jews' English version translates it, "Hath God indeed said," etc. But no translation can give it exactly. It can not be exactly expressed in letters so as to form a word that would give it truly. Yet everybody in the world is familiar with the expression. It is that sneering grunt (expressed only through the nose) -- c-ugh! -- which conveys query, doubt, suspicion, and contempt, all at once. "C-ugh! hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" And everybody knows that to this day among men there is nothing equal to this sneering grunt, to create doubt and suspicion; and no other expression is used so much by mankind for that purpose. And this is the origin of it.

77. Having thus suggested to Eve query, doubt, and suspicion of the Lord's word as to shutting them away from a certain tree of the garden, and having drawn her into conversation, he followed it up with further implication and insinuation that the Lord had some ulterior purpose in thus keeping this tree from them. Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, ye shall be like God. Thus he set up his own word directly against the word of the Lord, and then declared that God knew that it was not true that they should die, but that instead of that they would be like God; and that because He knew this, He had, under cover of this other word, thought to shut them away from that tree which would make them like Him. All this, too, solely because He wanted to keep them down and in ignorance; for fear that they should rise and advance; for fear that they would be like Him.

78. Thus it is clearly seen that from beginning to end, Satan was employing all his cunning to cast upon the Lord all the dark traits of his own evil character, and so to get the woman to think that God did not desire good for her nor mean good toward her. It was the same evil intent with which he started on his sinful course in heaven, to get himself in the place of God in the estimation of intelligent creatures, as well as in fact. He was determined so to misrepresent God that he himself should be accepted instead of God; that thus he might succeed in usurping the place of God, and seize upon equality with God. And the woman was taken with the prospect and caught by the deception.

592

She believed Satan instead of God. She accepted the word of Satan instead of the word of God. And so it is written: "When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat."

79. The tree was not in any sense good for food. It was not in any sense a tree to be desired to make one wise. Yet the woman, deceived by the glamour cast over her mind, over her eyes, over the tree, and even over her, loving Creator himself, by the deceptions of the enemy, "saw that the tree was good for food, and a tree to be desired to make one wise." As the tree was not good for food, and therefore was not really to be desired for that purpose, the words "to make one wise" contain the key of the whole matter. That which caused her to see that it was good for food, and a tree to be desired, was only the idea that thus she could attain to wisdom which God was withholding. She saw that it was good for food, and a tree to be desired, only because she supposed she could thus attain to the wisdom of God, and thus be like God.

80. And thus it was ambition to be equal with God that caused sin to enter the world, even as it had caused sin to enter heaven. Lucifer had said in heaven, "I will be like the Most High." Here he had placed before the woman the same prize, the same ambition, to be obtained by disobedience to God. "Ye shall be like God." In heaven Lucifer had aspired "to be equal with God," and here he set before the woman the aspiration, "Ye shall be as God." And that herself might be exalted to equality with God, she turned away from God to accomplish to through the ways of sin! O, it is the desire to please self instead of God that is the origin of every sin!

81. And she "gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat." "Adam was not deceived,"46 however. He accepted the situation, and went with his wife, even though he knew she was deceived. "And the eyes of both were opened, and they knew that they were naked." The glory of God which had rested upon them, and its holy light which had clothed them as with a garment, departed from them; and they knew they were naked, and they "hid themselves from the presence of the Lord." Guilty, they were afraid of the presence of the Lord. Innocent,

593

they had loved His gracious and holy presence. Sin separates the soul from God, and fills it with a dread of His approach. Righteousness binds the soul to God, delights in the fullness of His presence, and basks in the sunlight of His divine glory.

ANOTHER MIND IN MAN.

82. "God made man in His own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them," and He intended that they should ever and forever reflect the image and glory of Him who created them. And if our eyes could have looked upon that divinely formed pair, as they stood in the garden of Eden before they sinned, crowned with glory and honor, we should have been irresistibly reminded of Another than themselves. There was that about them which would have suggested some one other than themselves, yet inseparably connected with themselves. In fact, themselves, as themselves, we should not have seen at all; because they fully reflected the image and glory of God.

83. And so long as they had harkened to the words of God, and had walked in the counsel of God, they would have ever reflected in every characteristic, and to all beholders, the image and glory of their divine Head and Creator. But they sinned. The glory departed. The image of God was gone. They no longer reflected the image and glory of God, but the image and shame of another.

84. God had given them His word clearly spoken. The word of God is the expression of the thought of the mind of God. If they had remained faithful to that word, if they had fully put their trust upon that word, if they had depended upon it for their sole counsel, and to guide them in the way they should go, then this word -- the thought and mind -- of God would have lived in them, and would have been manifested in them. But when the enemy came speaking his words, laying before them the thoughts and suggestions of his evil mind; and when they accepted his word instead of the word of God, and the thoughts and suggestions of his mind in place of those of the mind of the Lord; then the evil mind of the enemy, instead of the mind of God, was in them and lived in them. This mind is enmity against God, and is not, and can not be, subject to the law of God.47

594

85. And now, being filled with the evil mind of the enemy, with its desires and ambitions, they reflected the image and shame of him who had led them into sin, instead of reflecting the image and glory of Him who had created them in righteousness and true holiness. So that it is literally true that just as certainly as before man sinned he reflected the image and glory of his Maker unto righteousness, so certainly after he sinned he reflected the image and shame of his seducer unto sin.

86. The truth of this is seen in every line of man's conduct after he had sinned. The glory had no sooner departed because of their sin than they were ashamed before Him in whose presence they had formerly only delighted. Now, when they heard the voice of God, instead of being thrilled with delight and holy confidence, they were afraid, and sought to hide from Him, and even supposed they could hide, and had hidden, themselves from Him. This is the mind that was in Lucifer in heaven. Not understanding the Lord's purpose, he thought he could hide from the Lord his own purposes.

87. When the Lord asked the man, "Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat?" he answered: "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat." Instead of answering openly and honestly and frankly the truth, "I have," he did not answer directly at all; but indirectly, evasively, and by involving both the Lord and the woman in the guilt, before himself; and thus sought to shelter himself behind them, and to clear himself by involving them. This is the very disposition that Lucifer had developed in heaven. And now it is clearly reflected in the man.

88. Next the asked Lord the woman, "What is this that thou hast done?" Instead of answering plainly and frankly, "I have disobeyed thy word; I have eaten of the forbidden tree," she also involves another before herself, and shields herself behind him. She answered, "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat."

89. No such disposition as that was ever put into mankind by the Lord. Yet everybody knows that this very disposition is in all mankind, even at this present day. Everybody knows that it is not in human nature openly, frankly, and at once to confess a fault. But that the first

595

and spontaneous impulse in every human soul is to dodge and shelter himself behind anything or anybody in the world,and seek to clear himself by involving another. And if through all he can not fully escape, yet when he does come into it, it is with the least possible degree of blame upon himself. It is the spirit that holds tenaciously that ourself is the last one that can possibly be wrong or do wrong; and even when we have done wrong, argues, "We would never have done it had it not been for somebody or something else," and are therefore not really to blame, and so are right anyhow. Or it will excuse self from wrong, because somebody else does or has done the same thing or worse. It is the very essence of the claim of infallibility.

90. Such disposition was not put into mankind by the Lord. Yet it is there. It is the disposition, it is the very mind, of Lucifer who originally led in the way of sin. And as the man and woman whom God made upon the earth, followed this wicked one in the way of sin; as they accepted his word and his suggestions, and adopted his thoughts and his way of thinking; so they yielded themselves to him and to his mastery, and thus were made to reflect his evil image, which is self and self alone -- self above all and through all and in all. This was all of self, and none of God.

THE MYSTERY OF GOD.

91. In a certain sense -- a bad sense -- that which Satan told the woman -- they should " be as God" -- was fulfilled. As the disposition that had been confirmed in him was that in his own estimation he was equal with God; and as that mind had been received by them, and that disposition was now reflected in them; so in their own estimation they would now count themselves as God in that they could do no wrong, and would involve the Lord in wrong rather that they admit they they had done wrong. Thus the same evil mind that in Lucifer would exalt self to equality with God, was now in the man and the woman, and caused them to exalt self to the same point. This is not only the philosophy of the case, but it is the fact; for after this talk of the Lord with them, "The Lord God said, Behold, the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil.48 Not indeed become as one of them in truth and righteousness;

596

but in this evil way, in their own mind, and in their own estimation, self was exalted to equality with God.

92. This is further shown by another scripture: "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to humble thyself to walk with God."49 That is to say, in his own mind and estimation man considers himself above God, and capable of walking there alone. But God wants man to walk with Him. Yet in order to do this, man must humble himself -- he must step down from where he is. The scripture thus shows in itself that in man's own estimation as he naturally is, he is

above God, and would walk alone rather than with God. And the Lord simply invites him: "Humble yourself, be content to step down and take a lower place, -- even the place where I am, -- and come, walk with me."

93. Again this is shown in the text which is the study of all this chapter: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who thought it not a prize to be seized and held fast, to be equal with God, but humbled himself." This in itself shows that in mankind as they are, there is a mind that is not the mind of God, but another mind. And the Lord invites all to let this mind of His return to them, and abide in them, that they may walk with him. And as Christ humbled Himself, "therefore God also hath highly exalted Him." And forever and to all people it is written, "He that exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." Therefore, "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to humble thyself to walk with God?" "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who humbled Himself."

94. But as man was when he had sinned, as he was when he yielded himself a servant to Satan, he had no power to humble himself. He had no power to confess his fault. He had no means of knowing anything else than that he was right, when he was wholly wrong. He was a captive, and no longer free. He was a slave, and could no longer do as he would. His very mind itself was enslaved to the evil one to whom he had yielded himself; and he had no power even to think otherwise than as dictated by the master mind to whom he had yielded.

597

95. The man was now overwhelmed with that darkness of sin of which the evil one was the author, which he had brought with him, and into which he had succeeded in drawing the inhabitants of this world. Then it was, as well as ever since, that "darkness covered the earth and gross darkness the people." That darkness was complete. In it was no element of light. No suggestion of good could possibly reach him from that realm where the ruler of the darkness of this world reigneth alone.

96. Yet as with the angels that sinned, God would not give man up to that darkness, without giving him another opportunity to choose the Light and the Life. And then if he should persist in refusing all offers of the Light and Life and joy of the Lord of all, he would be allowed to have his own choice, and could only, like the others, be given up to the impenetrable darkness which they had chosen, and which by their persistent refusal of light they themselves had made impenetrable.

97. And God did not leave mankind in this abject slavery and total darkness. Although they had freely chosen it, the Lord of love and mercy would give them another chance. And therefore it is written, "And the Lord God said unto the serpent, . . . I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed."50 In this declaration God broke up the pall of total darkness which through sin enshrouded mankind. By this He opened the way for light to shine once more to the enslaved captive sitting helpless in the darkness. In this blessed word, God again gave to mankind freedom of choice.

98. Yet God did not bind man to Himself even now, in an irresistible, absolute, and irresponsible bondage, as Satan had bound him. No, no. God is ever the Author of intelligence, of freedom of choice, and of freedom of thought. He would not compel man, even now, to take the way of righteousness and keep it. He simply made man free again to choose for himself, whom he will serve. And mankind is now perfectly free to make the choice for himself as to whether he will serve God or Satan, whether he will have the mind of God or the mind of Satan, whether he will choose Christ or self.

598

99. Man's will is now, and by this word, freed, and abides free, to choose and serve whom he will -- to choose deliverance from the bondage of sin, or to remain in the bondage of sin. God will deliver no man from

bondage against his will. But whoever will submit his will to God, there is no power in the universe that can hold him in sin.

100. And just here Satan was again surprised in his misreading of the character of God. Again he discovered his reasoning to be at fault. He had reasoned that if he could succeed in drawing the inhabitants of the world into the darkness where he himself was, that character of sternness and arbitrary dealing which he had attributed to the Lord would cut them off at once; and this would assure him a foothold and a vantage ground forever. He had succeeded in drawing these inhabitants into sin and into darkness with himself. He had succeeded in getting them to adopt his word and thoughts, his mind and will, instead of the word and mind and will of God. He had succeeded in drawing them into full union with himself, where there was complete friendship between them and himself.

101. But lo, just as he was congratulating himself upon the success of his plan, he was surprised by a turn that had never entered his thoughts. He was more than surprised, he was alarmed when he heard the word of God, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed." With enmity forever at work between him and mankind, he could not help but know that his dominion would ever be in dispute, and that as a result some might escape his yoke. And when these new and startling words were followed with the still new and also ominous sentence, "It [the seed of the woman] shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel," he knew that his cause was endangered.

102. Thus, just at the point when Satan had felt surest of his triumph, he was caused to fear most for his success. That which had appeared as his certain, complete, and assured conquest, was suddenly made to take an aspect of doubtfulness, defeat, and utter loss. Here was opening up a phase of the subject that had never occurred to him, raising questions that were to him as baffling as they were new. It was all a mystery.

103. It was indeed a mystery, even "the mystery of God." For this

enmity against Satan, this hatred of evil, which God, by his word, puts in every person that comes into the world, causes each soul to hate the evil and desire the good, and to long for deliverance from the bondage of evil into the rest and satisfaction of the good. And as this deliverance is found alone in Christ,51 that promise to put enmity between Satan and mankind, is the promise of Christ, "the Desire of all nations."52

104. This word of God which plants in each soul, enmity against Satan; this hatred of evil that calls for deliverance which is found alone in Christ; this is the gift of faith to man. The object of this faith is Christ, and the authorof it is Christ; and so he is "the author and finisher of faith."53 By faith Christ dwells in the heart;54 and Christ in men the hope of glory is the mystery of God.55

105. And so the planting of enmity between Satan and the woman, and between the seed of each, was the beginning of the revelation of the mystery of God which had been "kept in silence through times eternal."56 Then "when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."57 Then were seen and heard things which many prophets and righteous men had desired to see and had not seen, and had desired to hear and had not heard; 58 then, in the words of Him who spake as never man spake, there were uttered things which had "been kept secret from the foundation of the world."59

106. To Christ was offered all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them. But He could have these only by falling down and worshiping Satan, the God of this world. Besides, Christianity is not rulership or overlordship, but service. "The princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of Man came

not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."60 The liberty wherewith Christ makes men free, the liberty in which Christian

600

stand fast, is the liberty by love to serve one another. For all the law of God is fulfilled in this one word, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.61

107. Christ emptied himself to take upon Him the form of a servant and to be made in the likeness of men. "He voluntarily assumed human nature. It was His own act, and by His own consent. He clothed His divinity with humanity. He was all the while as God, but He did not appear as God. He veiled the demonstrations of Deity, which had commanded the homage, and called forth the admiration of the universe of God. He was God while upon earth, but He divested himself of the form of God, and in its stead took the form and fashion of a man. He walked the earth as a man. For our sakes He became poor, that we through His poverty might be made rich. He laid aside His glory and His majesty. He was God, but the glories of the form of God he for a while relinquished. Though He walked among men in poverty, scattering His blessings wherever He went, at His word legions of angels would surround their Redeemer and do Him homage. But He walked the earth unrecognized, unconfessed, with but few exceptions, by His creatures. The atmosphere was polluted with sin and curses, in place of the anthem of praise. His lot was poverty and humiliation. As He passed to and fro upon His mission of mercy to relieve the sick, to lift up the depressed, scarce a solitary voice called Him blessed, and the very greatest of the nation passed Him by with disdain.

108. "Contrast this with the riches of glory, the wealth of praise pouring forth from immortal tongues, the millions of rich voices in the universe of God in anthems of adoration. But he humbled himself, and took mortality upon Him. As a member of the human family, he was mortal; but as a God, He was the fountain of life to the world. He could, in His divine person, ever have withstood the advances of death, and refused to come under its dominion; but He voluntarily laid down His life, that in so doing He might give life and bring immortality to light. He bore the sins of the world, and endured the penalty, which rolled like a mountain upon His divine soul. He yielded up his life a sacrifice, that man should not eternally die. He died, not through being compelled to die, but by his own free will. This was humility. The

601

whole treasure of heaven was poured out in one gift to save fallen man. He brought into His human nature all the life-giving energies that human beings will need and must receive.

109. "Wondrous combination of man and God! He might have helped His human nature to withstand the inroads of disease by pouring from his divine nature vitality and undecaying vigor to the human. But He humbled himself to man's nature. He did this that the Scripture might be fulfilled; and the plan was entered into by the Son of God, knowing all the steps in His humiliation, that He must descend to make an expiation for the sins of a condemned, groaning world. What humility was this! It amazed angels. The tongue can never describe it; the imagination can not take it in. The eternal Word consented to be made flesh! God became man! It was a wonderful humility.

110. "But he stepped still lower; the Man must humble himself as a man to bear insult, reproach, shameful accusations, and abuse. There seemed to be no safe place for Him in His own territory. He had to flee from place to place for His life. He was betrayed by one of His own disciples. He was denied by one of His most zealous followers. He was mocked. He was crowned with a crown of thorns. He was scourged. He was forced to bear the burden of the cross. He was not insensible to this contempt and ignomy. He submitted, but oh! He felt the bitterness as no other being could feel it. He was pure, holy, and undefiled, yet arraigned as a criminal! The adorable Redeemer stepped down from the highest exaltation.

111. "Step by step He humbled himself to die,-- but what a death! It was the most shameful, the most cruel, -- the death upon the cross as a malefactor. He did not die as a hero in the eyes of the world, loaded with honors, as men in battle. He died as a condemned criminal, suspended between the heavens and the earth, -- died a lingering death of shame, exposed to the tauntings and revilings of a debased, crime-laden, profligate multitude! "All they that see me laugh me to scorn; they shoot out the lip, they shake the head."62 He was numbered with transgressors, He expired amid derision, and His kinsmen according to the flesh disowned Him. His mother beheld His humiliation, and He was forced to see the sword pierce her heart. He endured

the cross, despising the shame. He made it of small account in consideration of the results that He was working out in behalf of, not in behalf of, not only the inhabitants of this speck of a world, but the whole universe, every world which God had created.

112. "Christ was to die as man's substitute. Man was a criminal under the sentence of death for transgression of the law of God, as a traitor, a rebel; hence a substitute for man must die as a malefactor, because He stood in the place of the traitors, with all their treasured sins upon His divine soul. It was not enough that Jesus should die in order to fully meet the demands of the broken law, but He died a shameful death. The prophet gives to the world his words, `I hid not my face from shame and spitting.'" And when the great enemy -- the greatself-exalted one -- had thus accomplished the death of the great Friend -- the self-emptying One -- it was demonstrated to the wide universe that this was what was involved in his self-exalting course from its inception in heaven, and so demonstrated to the universe that he was only "a murderer from the beginning."

113. But God "raised Him from the dead, and set Him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all."63 And He, being thus at "the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost," shed forth this Holy Spirit, by whom He came to His disciples and dwelt in their hearts by faith, so that they knew that He was in the Father, and they in Him, and He in them.64

114. Thus, with Christ in them the hope of glory, having thus received the knowledge of the mystery of God, "which in other ages was not made know unto the sons of men," as it was then "revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." they went forth preaching this mystery of God, which had been "hid from ages and from generations, but was now made manifest to His saints, to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the

Gentiles; which is Christ in you the hope of glory." In preaching the riches of the glory of this mystery, they preached "the unsearchable riches of Christ," so as to "make all see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world had been hid in god, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."65

115. In order that this might be, they preached, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God thought it not a thing to be seized upon, to be violently striven for and eagerly retained, to be equal with God." They preached that by this mind of Christ, each one should empty self, take upon him the form of a servant, obedient unto death, being made conformable unto His death. But there came a "falling away." Instead of an emptying of self, there was an exalting of self in those who professed the name of Him who emptied himself: grievous wolves entered in, not sparing the flock; men arose, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.66 And in this exalting of self there was developed the man of sin, the son of perdition, the mystery of iniquity; which again hid from ages and generations the mystery of God. Thus

this mystery of iniquity is the papacy; the mystery of God is Christianity. Christianity is self-renunciation; the papacy is self-exaltation. The spirit of Christianity is the spirit of humility and self-renunciation; the spirit of the papacy is pride and self-exaltation. Christianity is the incarnation of Christ; the papacy is the incarnation of Satan.

116. Thus by Satan there is continued on the earth the same controversy that was begun in heaven. By the great apostate, through the great apostasy there is continued here, the same opposition to Christ, to God, and to the law and government of God, that was begun in heaven. And indeed through the great apostasy here, the great apostate accomplished in his measure that which he could not in any degree accomplish in heaven -- the change of the law of God.67 For, to accommodate the image worship which she would have, the papacy

leaves out the Second Commandment; and to accommodate sun worship, she set aside the Sabbath of the Lord and set up Sunday in its place.68 Then in order to fill out the number ten of the Ten Commandments, she has divided the Tenth into two: thus forcing upon God "tautology in the only document ever written with. His own hand." She has deliberately changed the law and government of God into one wholly her own; she has excluded God from the world, and in herself has set up a "regency of God:" and so in fullest measure and intent has counted it a usurpation to be meditated to be equal with God.

117. Thus fully and so certainly is the papacy only the incarnation of the spirit of Satan.

---

1 [Page 565] Phil. 2; 5-8, R. V.

2 [Page 566] Eph. 3:11.

3 [Page 567] Heb 1:3

4 [Page 567] Ps. 33:6,9; Heb 1:2.

5 [Page 567] Col 1:16

6 [Page 567] Heb 1:3.

7 [Page 567] Col 1:17.

8 [Page 567] Col 1:19.

9 [Page 567] Prove 8:22,23,30.

10 [Page 567] Micah 5:2, with margin.

11 [Page 567] II John 3:16; Col, 2:9; Heb. 1:4-8.

12 [Page 568] Compare Rev. 21:10-23; 22:1-4.

13 [Page 568] Eze 28:12-16.

14 [Page 569] Ex. 26:1.

15 [Page 569] Ex 25:10,11,16-22; Heb 9:2-5; Num 7:89

16 [Page 569] I Kings 6:21-35:8:1-11; 2 Chron 3:3-14; 5:1-10.

17 [Page 569] Ex 25:9,40; Heb 8:4,5.

18 [Page 570] 2 Chron 28:11, 12,19.

19 [Page 570] Heb 8:1-6; 9:1-14, 22-26.

20 [Page 570] Rev 14:15,17; 15:5; 16:1, 17

21 [Page 570] Heb 8:1,2

22 [Page 570] Rev 8:3,4

23 [Page 570] Eze 1:11.

24 [Page 570] Chap 1:18.

25 [Page 571] Eze 1:22-28.

26 [Page 571] Chap 10:20. compare also Ex. 24:10; Rev 4:2-6

27 [Page 572] Ps. 99:1; 97:2; 89:14, R. V. The Jews' translation or these passages is worthy of a place here also: --
"The Lord reigneth; people tremble; He sitteth enthroned over the cherubim; the earth is moved."
"Clouds and thick darkness are round about Him: righteousness and justice are the support of His throne."
"Righteousness and justice are the prop of thy throne: kindness and truth precede thy presence."

28 [Page 572] This is not to say that it was one of the four-faced ones: for as the references given show, there are many other cherubim besides those four. But it was one who stood in the company with these about the throne, the ark of testimony and the mercy-seat, shadowing the mercy-seat with his outstretched glorious wings.

29 [Page 572] Eze. 28:17

30 [Page 574] Isa 14:12-14 The Jews' translation of this passage runs thus: morning star, son of the dawn, thou hast said in thy heart, Into heaven will I ascend, above the stars of God will I exalt my throne: and i will sit also upon the mount of the assembly, in the farthest end of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be equal to the Most High." This expresses in words the very thought of our study.

31 [Page 577] Eph 1:10

32 [Page 577] Col. 1:20

33 [Page 578] Eph 3:8-11.

34 [Page 580] Rev 12:4.

35 [Page 581] John 3:16; 10:15-18.

36 [Page 583] Rev 12:7,8,(9)

37 [Page 583] 2 Peter 2:4

38 [Page 584] Jude 6.

39 [Page 585] The expression in Eze 28:12, "Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty," as rendered in the different versions, shows that there was no created being that stood higher than he.
R. V. Margin: "Thou sealest up the measure, or pattern." Young: "Thou art sealing up the measurement."
French (Segond): "Thou puttest the seal to perfection." Danish:"You impress(stamp) the seal upon the fit (proper)adjustment (ordinance.)"
Norwegian: "Thou, the seal of the well-arranged building."
In the Hebrew the word that in our version is rendered "sealest" is a participle, so that more strictly it would be rendered, "Thou sealer of perfection," or, "Thou who sealest perfection."
The word rendered "sum" occurs but in one other place (Eze. 43:10), where it is very striking as suggesting the Norwegian rendering. The masculine form of the word occurs in Ex. 5:18, rendered, "tale".
Rev. 7:2, 3 read in this connection, is wonderfully suggestive.

40 [Page 586] "Phil. 2:10; Rom. 14:11; Isa, 45:23.

41 [Page 586] Eph. 1:9, 10.

42 [Page 588] Eph. 1:11.

43 [Page 588] Eph. 1:9, 10.

44 [Page 588] Eph. 3:11.

45 [Page 590] Gen. 8, 9, 16, 17.

46 [Page 592] Tim. 2:14.

47 [Page 593] Rom. 8:7.

48 [Page 595] Gen. 3:22.

49 [Page 596] Micah 6:8, margin, Hebrew.

50 [Page 597] Gen. 3:14, 15.

51 [Page 599] Rom. 7:14-25.

52 [Page 599] Haggai 2:7.

53 [Page 599] Heb. 12:2.

54 [Page 599] Eph. 3:17.

55 [Page 599] Col. 1:26, 27.

56 [Page 599] Rom. 16:26, R. V.

57 [Page 599] Gal. 4:4.

58 [Page 599] Matt. 13:16, 17.

59 [Page 599] Matt. 13:36.

60 [Page 599] Matt. 20:25-28.

61 [Page 600] Gal. 5:13, 14.

62 [Page 601] Ps. 22:7.

63 [Page 602] Eph. 1: 20-23.

64 [Page 602] Acts 2:33; John 14: 18-20; Eph. 3:16, 17.

65 [Page 603] Eph. 3:3-5; Col. 1:26, 27; Eph. 3:8-11.

66 [Page 603] Acts 20:29, 30.

67 [Page 603] Dan. 7:25.

68 [Page 604] For the full history of this change of the Sabbath for Sunday, see "Great Empires of Prophecy," chap. xxxii.

22. THE REFORMATION -- ENGLAND

WE have seen how widespread was Christianity amongst the common people, the poor, and the despised. The time had now come when it must receive the attention of the nobles, princes, and heads of the nations. This movement began in England.

2. In 1365 Pope Urban V demanded that England should pay the one thousand marks tribute which Innocent III had exacted of King John of England, which had not been paid for the last thirty-five years. The demand was accompanied with the intimation that if the kings, Edward III, did not make the regular payment of the one thousand marks each year, and all that was due for the thirty-five years back, he would be summoned to Rome "to answer before his liege lord for contumacy." King Edward assembled the Parliament in 1366, and laid before it Pope Urban's letter, and asked that they take counsel and decide what answer should be given. The Parliament asked for a day, "to think over the matter." This was granted; and the next day Parliament assembled to give its answer.

3. The first to speak said: "The kingdom of England was won by the sword, and by that sword has been defended. Julius Caesar exacted tribute by force; force gives no perpetual right. Let the pope then gird on his sword, and come and try to exact his tribute by force. I, for one, am ready to resist him."

4. The second said: "He only is entitled to secular tribute who legitimately exercises secular rule, and is able to give secular protection. The pope can not legitimately do either: he is a minister of the gospel, not a temporal ruler. His duty is to give ghostly counsel, not corporal protection. He should follow the example of Christ, who refused all civil dominion: The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air their nests, He had not where to lay His head. Let us see that the

pope abide within the limits of his spiritual office, where we shall obey him. But if he shall choose to transgress these limits, he must take the consequences. Let us boldly oppose all his claims to civil power."

5. The third said: "The pope calls himself the servant of the servants of God. Very well, he can claim recompense only for service done. But where are the services which he renders to this land? Does he minister to us in spirituals? Does he help us in temporals? Does he not rather greedily drain our treasures, and often for the benefit of our enemies? I give my voice against this tribute."

6. The next one said: "The pope claims to be the suzerain of all estates held by the Church. These estates held in Mortmain amount to one third of the realm. There can not be two suzerains. The pope, therefore, for these estates, is the king's vassal. He has not done homage for them; he may have incurred forfeiture."

7. The next: "On what grounds was this tribute originally demanded? Was it not for absolving King John, and relieving the kingdom from interdict? But to bestow spiritual benefits for money is sheer simony: it is a piece of ecclesiastical swindling. Let the lords, spiritual and temporal, wash their hands of a transaction so disgraceful. But if it is as feudal superior of the kingdom that the pope demands this tribute, why ask a thousand marks? Why not ask the throne, the soil, the people, of England? If his title be good for these thousand marks,it is good for a great deal more. The pope, on the same principle, may declare the throne vacant, and fill it with whomsoever he pleases."

8. The next: "Pope Urban tells us that all kingdoms are Christ's, and that he, as His vicar, holds England for Christ. But as the pope is peccable, and may abuse his trust, it appears to me that it were better that we should hold our land directly and alone of Christ."

9. The last: "Let us go at once to the root of this matter: King John had no right to gift away the kingdom of England without the consent of the nation. That consent was never given. The golden seal of the king, and the seals of the few nobles whom John persuaded or coerced to join him in this transaction, do not constitute the national consent. If John gifted his subjects to Innocent like so many chattels, Innocent may come and take his property if he can. We, the people

of England, had no voice in the matter. We hold the whole bargain, charter, signature, seal, an absolute nullity from the beginning."

10. The unanimous decision of the Parliament declared: "Forasmuch as neither King John, nor any other king, could bring his realm and kingdom into such thraldom and subjection, but by common assent of Parliament, the which was not given, therefore, that which he did was against his oath at his coronation, besides many other causes. If, therefore, the pope should attempt anything against the king by process, or other matters indeed, the king, with all his subjects, should, with all their force and power resist the same."1

11. It will be seen that in these speeches there is a general agreement in the repudiation of the temporal power of the pope; also of his infallibility; and, in that, of his being vicar of Christ. There is also a clear idea of the separation of the spiritual and the secular powers. Now the papacy knew exactly where to lay the blame for all this. Though there was in Parliament no defender of the pope's claim, a monk stood forth to defend his cause. This monk set forth as a fundamental proposition that "as vicar of Christ, the pope is the feudal superior of monarchs, and the lord paramount of their kingdoms." From this he drew the conclusion that "all sovereigns owe to the pope obedience and tribute; that vassalage was specially due from the English monarch in consequence of the surrender of the kingdom to the pope by John; that Edward had clearly forfeited his throne by the nonpayment of the annual tribute; and finally, that all ecclesiastics, regulars, and seculars, were exempt from the civil jurisdiction, and under no obligation to obey the citation or answer before the tribunal of the magistrate." Then the monk singled out by name JOHN WICKLIF, and challenged him to disprove these propositions.

12. From this it is perfectly plain that the papacy traced directly to Wicklif the responsibility for the arguments made, and the positions taken, by the king and the Parliament. And this was entirely correct. Wicklif, at this particular time, was royal chaplain -- "the king's peculiar clerk." Six years before this time he had been appointed to the mastership of Balliol College. "This preferment he owed to

608

the fame he had acquired as a scholastic." About that time also he acquired the degree of Bachelor of Theology, and, as such, gave public lectures in the University of Oxford, on the books of Scripture. As he studied the Scriptures, he saw, in their light, what the papacy really is; and he hesitated not to teach the Word of God as he found it, which, in the very nature of things, exposed to public view the vast difference between Christianity and the papacy. And the abuses and oppressions of the papacy upon the realm of England were then so great, that the nobles, and even the king, were glad to know that in breaking loose from the papal thraldom, they could find support in the Word of God.

13. This was the secret of the clear and bold statement of principles, manifestly drawn from the Scriptures, made by the successive speakers in Parliament. For the one great aim of Wicklif, to the day of his death, was to have all people as fully as possible acquainted with the Scriptures. More than this, it is only Wicklif who reported these proceedings of Parliament, which shows that he was present there. And this is how the papacy knew so well who should be challenged to defend against the pope the position of the king and Parliament. The papists knew that these principles were to be traced to Wicklif; that it was his preaching that was responsible for the prevalence of these principles in the Parliament; and therefore, that when they would challenge a defender of the principles, they must call out Wicklif by name.

14. Nor did Wicklif in any sense evade the issue. He accepted the challenge, although at that very time there was before the pope an appeal in which he was involved, and he knew that his action here would decide his case there. He said: "Inasmuch as I am the king's peculiar clerk, I the more willingly undertake the office of defending and counseling that the king exerciseth his just rule in the realm of England when he refuses tribute to the Roman pontiff." As the grounds of his argument in this defense, he named "the natural rights of men, the laws of the realm of England, and the precepts of Holy Writ." He declared: "Already a third and more of England is in the hands of the pope. There can not be two temporal sovereigns in one

609

country: either Edward is king or Urban is king. We make our choice. We accept Edward of England and refuse Urban of Rome."

15. Wicklif "made the sacred Scriptures the ultimate standard of all law." He declared it to be the great problem of Church evolution, to reform everything according to the principles therein contained. "His endeavors to do this procured for him the title of doctor evangelicus." In the year 1372 he was made doctor of theology; and both by his lectures and his writings, greatly enlarged his evangelical influence. As his knowledge of the Scriptures grew, stronger became the ground which he took against the corruptions of the papacy. In this always his point of special attack was the mendicant monks. In his defense of the kingdom of England against the invasions of the papacy, he objected not only to the extortions practiced by the Roman court, but just as strongly against the practice of having the high offices in the Church of England held by Italians, who were not only unfit for their spiritual calling, but especially because they were ignorant of the language and customs of the country.

16. In 1374 Wicklif was one of seven ambassadors who were sent to meet the papacy in a mutual consideration of the matters that had been raised in England with respect to the papacy. Happily for Wicklif this embassy was not obliged to go to Rome: they met the papal representatives at Bruges. This commission was a great benefit to Wicklif, for " he was thus enabled to obtain a more intimate knowledge of the spirit of the Roman chancery, of the corruptions springing from that quarter, and of the intrigues prevailing there; and was led to examine more closely into the rights of the papacy, and to come out more vehemently in opposition to it as

the principal cause of corruption in the Church. He came to the conviction that the papacy had not its origin in divine right: that the Church stood in no need of a visible head.

17. "He spoke and wrote against the worldly spirit of the papacy, and its hurtful influence. He was wont to call the pope antichrist, `the proud worldly priest of Rome,' `the most cursed of clippers and pursekervers [purse-carvers].' He says in one of his papers, `the pope and his collectors draw from our country what should serve for the support of the poor, and many thousand marks from the king's treasury for sacraments

610

and spiritual things. And certainly though our realm had a huge hill of gold, and no man took therefrom but this proud worldly priest's collector, in process of time the hill would be spent; for he is ever taking money out of our land, and sends nothing back but God's curse for his simony, and some accursed clerk of antichrist to rob the land still more for wrongful privileges, or else leave to do God's will, that [which] men should do without his leave, and buying and selling.'"3

18. "It is thus that the wretched beings of this world are estranged from faith, and hope, and charity, and become corrupt in heresy and blasphemy, even worse than heathens. Thus it is that a clerk, a mere collector of pence, who can neither read nor understand a verse in his psalter, nor repeat the commandments of God, bringeth forth a bull of lead, testifying in opposition to the doom of God, and of manifest experience, that he is able to govern many souls. And to act upon this false bull, he will incur costs and labor, and often fight,and get fees, and give much gold out of our land to aliens and enemies; and many are thereby slaughtered by our enemies, to their comfort and our confusion. As much, therefore, as God's word and the bliss of heaven in the souls of men, are better than earthly goods, so much are these worldly prelates, who withdraw the great debt of holy teaching, worse than thieves; more accursedly sacrilegious than ordinary plunderers, who break into churches, and steal thence chalices, and vestments, and never so much gold."4 At that time the revenues of the papacy, taken out of England, were five times the total revenues of the king of England himself.

19. Wicklif insisted that the care of the clergy should be only for the good of their flocks; and therefore they should be content to receive from their flocks what might be necessary for the supply of their bodily wants, and no more. He counted it part of the calling of the clergy to stand up for the rights of the poor. He held that whatever was given to the clergy merely for the purpose of ministering to their luxury, was just so much taken from the poor. Thus he was the declared enemy of the begging monks, as they on their part "were the most zealous and the most influential organ of the Roman hierarchy which he attacked. They

611

appeared to him the chief promoters of superstition, of the externalization of religion into forms and ceremonies, of the immoral tendencies made safe and secure by false reliances."

20. In one of his writings entitled: "A Short Rule of Life," he speaks thus of the minister of religion: "If thou art a priest, and by name a curate, live thou a holy life. Pass other men in holy prayer, holy desire, and holy speaking, in counseling, and teaching the truth. Ever keep the commandments of God, and let His gospel and His praises be ever in thy mouth. Let thy open life thus be a true book, in which the soldier and the layman may learn how to serve God and keep His commandments. For the example of a good life, if it be open and continued, striketh rude men much more than open preaching with the word alone. Have both meat and drink, and clothing; but the remnant give truly to the poor: to those who have freely wrought, but who now may not labor, from feebleness or sickness; and thus thou shalt be a true priest, both to God and to man."

21. Then to the people he said: "Thy second father is thy spiritual father who has special care for thy soul, and thus thou shalt revere him. Thou shalt love him especially before other men; and obey his teaching as far as he teaches God's will. And thou shalt help, according to thy power, that he may have a reasonable sustenance when he doth well his office. If thy spiritual father fail in his office, by giving evil example, and in

ceasing to teach God's law, thou art bound to have great sorrow on that account, and to tell, meekly and charitably, his fault to him, between thee and him alone."

22. Further of the clergy he said: "Neither prelates nor doctors, priests nor deacons, should hold secular offices; that is, those of chancery, treasury, privy seal, and other such secular offices in the exchequer -- more especially while secular men are sufficient to do such offices. Prelates and great religious possessioners are so occupied in heart about worldly lordships and with plans of business, that no habit of devotion, of praying, of thoughtfulness on heavenly things, on the sins of their own heart, or on those of other men, may be preserved; neither may they be found studying and preaching of the gospel, nor visiting or comforting of poor men. They resemble baliffs rather than bishops."

23. The center of all Wicklif's teaching was the keeping of the commandments

612

of God and the faith of Jesus. We have already found in his words the instruction to let the life be a true book in which the soldier and the layman may learn how to serve God and keep His commandments. We have read his word: "Ever keep the commandments of God, and let His gospel and His praises be ever in thy mouth." And by the expression, "the commandments," he meant specifically the Ten Commandments. One of his very first works as a reformer "was a detailed exposition of the Ten Commandments, in which he contrasted the immoral life prevalent among all ranks, in his time, with what these commandments require." He himself says that he was "led to do this by the ignorance which most people betrayed of the decalogue; and that it was his design to counteract a tendency which showed greater concern for the opinions of men than for the law of God." His spiritual insight was so clear that he correctly saw that the whole body of Christian morality is derived from the Ten Commandments.

24. He says: "Many think if they give a penny to a pardoner, they shall be forgiven the breaking of all the commandments of God, and therefore they take no heed how they keep them. But I say thee, for certain, though thou have priests and friars to sing for thee, and though thou each day hear many masses, and found chauntries and colleges, and go on pilgrimages all thy life, and give all thy goods to pardoners, all this shall not bring thy soul to heaven. While, if the commandments of God are revered to the end, though neither penny nor half-penny be possessed, there shall be everlasting pardon and the bliss of heaven." Nor in this keeping of the commandments did he mean in any sense the outward endeavor of a justification by works; for "he ever presupposes the connection of all this with trust on Jesus as the only Saviour, and with the practical imitation of him which such trust implies." He said: "Before all we are bound to follow Christ. For Christ ever lives near the Father, and is the most ready to intercede for us, imparting Himself to the soul of every wayfaring pilgrim who loves Him. Therefore should no man seek first the mediation of other saints, for He is more ready to help than any one of them. So long as Christ is in heaven the Church hath in Him the best pope. Preachers should set an example to all of walking after Christ; they should be nearest to Christ, and nearest to heaven, and fullest of charity."

613

25. On the friars he said: "The friars drive the youth from the religion of Christ, in their several Orders, by hypocrisy, falsehood, and theft. For they say, before them [before the youth], that their particular Order is holier than any other, and that they shall take a higher place in the bliss of heaven than others who are not members of it; and that people of their Order will never come to perdition, but will, on the day of judgment, with Christ judge others. And thus they steal away children from fathers and mothers, sometimes such as are incapable of ordination, and sometimes such as, by the commandment of God, are bound to support their elders. Hence they are blasphemers of God, who confidently advise things of a doubtful character, which are, in the Holy Scriptures, neither expressly commanded nor forbidden." What a moral pestilence these mendicants were may be estimated from the asseveration of the archbishop of Armagh and primate of Ireland, that "I have in my diocese of Armagh about two thousand persons, who stand condemned by the censures of the Church,

denounced every year against murderers, thieves, and such-like malefactors, of all which number scarce fourteen have applied to me or to my clergy for absolution: yet they all receive the sacraments, as others do, because they are absolved, or pretend to be absolved, by friars."5

26. Wicklif proclaimed: "There cometh no pardon but of God. The worst abuses of these friars consist in their pretended confessions, by means of which they affect, with numberless artifices of blasphemy, to purify those whom they confess, and make them clear from all pollution in the eyes of God, setting aside the commandments and satisfaction of our Lord. There is no greater heresy than for a man to believe that he is absolved from his sins if he give money, or if a priest lay his hand on this head, and say that he absolveth thee. Thou must be sorrowful in thy heart, and make amends to God, else God absolveth thee not. May God of His endless mercy destroy the pride, covetousness, hypocrisy, and heresy of this feigned pardoning; and make men busy to keep His commandments, and to set fully their trust in Jesus Christ.

27. "I confess that the indulgences of the pope, if they are what they are said to be, are a manifest blasphemy. The friars give a color to this blasphemy by saying that Christ is omnipotent,and that the pope

614

is His plenary vicar, and so possesses in everything the same power as Christ in His humanity. Against this rude blasphemy I have elsewhere inveighed. Neither the pope nor the Lord Jesus Christ can grant dispensations or give indulgences to any man, except as the Deity has eternally determined by His just counsel."

28. He declared that the way of living followed by the friars was not the most perfect imitation of the life of Christ; for Christ by no means bred himself to such kind of poverty. Christ had not asked everybody without distinction to give Him alms, but received from Mary Magdalene and other pious women and men what was necessary for His subsistence. Christ bade His disciples not to take scrip or purse; but both scrip and purse were used by the begging monks for the purposes of conveying home to their monasteries whatever they had begged. Christ directed His disciples rather to consider who were prepared to receive the message of the gospel; and with such they were to eat and drink, and not go about from house to house. He cited the example of Paul, who supported himself and his companions with the labor of his own hands; and sought not to obtain gold nor silver nor apparel from those whom he instructed: thus instructing other teachers by his example, that in times of distress they should do likewise. To these beggars he quoted the Scripture: "If any will not work, neither shall he eat."

29. In 1375 Wicklif became parish priest of Lutterworth, and "labored alternately as teacher of theology at Oxford, and as preacher and curate at Lutterworth." He held fast the mighty truth that "the highest service that man can arrive at on earth is to preach the Word of God. This service falls peculiarly to priests, and therefore God more straightly demands it of them. Hereby should they produce children to God, and that is the end for which God has wedded the Church. Lovely it might be to have a son that were lord of this world, but fairer much it were to have a son in God, who, as a member of holy Church, shall ascend to heaven! And for this cause Jesus Christ left other works, and occupied himself mostly in preaching; and thus did His apostles, and for this God loved them. As saith the Scripture, `Blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.' Luke 11:28. Hence he made the sermon a principal thing in the improvements introduced into public worship, and endeavored to lead the way in this reform by his own example,

615

as well as to encourage the clergy who followed him in their course of training to do the same. And this because the office of preaching "Christ enjoined on His disciples more than any other; by this He conquered the world out of the fiend's hand. Men who love not the souls, have little love for the bodies, of their neighbors; therefore the work of Christian instruction is the best service that man may do for his brother."

30. Yet his work for mankind was not confined to Christian instruction by preaching only. He took special pains to get the hearts of Christians interested in the works of charity, in bestowing sympathy and relief on the suffering, whether from age, from sickness or from poverty; in providing for all their bodily wants. In his "Exposition of the Ten Commandments" the Christian is instructed "to visit those who are sick, or who are in trouble, especially those whom God hath made needy by age, or by other sickness, as the feeble, the blind, and the lame, who are in poverty. These thou shalt relieve with thy goods, after thy power, and after their need, for thus biddeth the gospel."

31. Against monks excluding themselves in what they called the contemplative life, he declared it a temptation of the great adversary, saying: "Before all we are bound to follow Christ; yet Christ preached the gospel and charged His disciples to do the same. All the prophets and John the Baptist were constrained by love to forsake the desert, renounce the contemplative life, and to preach. Ah, Lord, what cursed spirit of falsehood moveth priests to close themselves within stone walls for all their life, since Christ commanded all His apostles and priests to go into all the world, and to preach the gospel! Certainly they are open fools, and do plainly against the gospel: and if they continue in this error, are accursed of God as perilous deceivers and heretics."

32. The monks cited against him the example of Mary Magdalene, who, by sitting at the feet of Jesus, chose the better part than did Martha, who spent the time in serving. Wicklif answered: "The example might be pertinent if the priests were women, and if no command opposed to a life to solitude could be found in Scripture. From what is usually said respecting the value of the contemplative life, it might be gathered that Christ, when in this world, chose the life least suited to it, and that He has obliged all His priests to forsake the better and take the worse. Prayer is good; but not so good as preaching; and, accordingly, in

preaching, and also in praying, in the giving of sacraments, the learning of the law of God, and the rendering of a good example by purity of life -- in these should stand the life of a priest."

33. Consistently with this high but truly Christian view of the office of the Christian preacher, Wicklif held that to have preachers only of particular churches was not enough. He therefore sent forth everywhere through the land traveling preachers, because, as he said, "the gospel relates how Jesus went about in the places of the country, both great and small, as in cities and castles, or small towns, and this to teach us to profit generally unto men, and not to forbear to teach to a people because they are few, and our name may not, as a consequence, be great." These traveling preachers called themselves "poor priests" -- the word poor used not as boasting of poverty, but in the sense of "deficient in desirable or essential qualities;" but they soon acquired from the people the name of "Lollards" because of their singing: from lollen or lullen, to sing with a low voice, from lull, and lullaby, to sing to sleep. They were also called by the people, "Bible men," because of their large use of the Bible. Said Wicklif to these preachers, as they went forth: "If begging friars stroll over the country, preaching the legends of saints and the history of the Trojan War, we must do for God's glory what they do to fill their wallets, and form a vast itinerant evangelization to convert souls to Jesus Christ. Go and preach: it is the sublimest work; but imitate not the priests whom we see, after the sermon, sitting in the ale-houses, or at the gaming table, or wasting their time in hunting. After your sermon is ended, do you visit the sick, the aged, the poor, the blind, and the lame, and succor them according to your ability."6

34. Another reason for this was the corrupt system that then prevailed in the Church, by which no true Christian preacher could find a place where he could be regularly settled and a teacher of the people. Wicklif wrote on the question, "Why Poor Priests Have No Benefices," saying: "If there be any simple man who desires to live well, and to teach truly the law of God, and despise pride and other sins, both of prelates and other men, he shall be deemed a hypocrite, a new teacher, a heretic, and not suffered to come to any benefice. If in any little poor

place he shall live a poor life, he shall be so persecuted and slandered, that he shall be put out by wiles, and imprisoned or burnt."

35. He says that many of the lords who held the power of appointment to benefices, in order to disguise the simony by which the most worthless men obtained high Church livings, pretended that they did not want any money as the price for the place, but simply a present, as for example, "a kerchief for the lady, or a palfrey, or a tun of wine. And when some lords would present a good man, then some ladies are the means of having a dancer presented, or a tripper on tapits, or a hunter, or a hawker, or a wild player of summer gambols." He declared that the prelates and lords who practiced this collusion were the allies of antichrist; they would not suffer Christ's disciples to teach His children the law of Christ so as to save their souls. And thus they labor to banish Christ and His law out of His heritage: that is, those souls whom He redeemed, not with corruptible gold and silver, but with the precious blood of His own heart, which He shed on the cross from glowing love.

36. "Now it is to escape such sins that some poor priests take no benefices. The poor priests are afraid that if they receive such particular appointments, they shall be withdrawn thereby from better employments, from such as would bring more benefit to the Church. That is what they have to fear more than anything else; for it concerns directly their own persons; for they have received their whole calling from God to help their brethren, that they may get to heaven, by their teaching, their prayers, and their example. And it seems to them that they can most easily fulfill this vocation by a general curacy of Christian love, after the example of Christ and the apostles. By this means also they can easily deliver themselves from danger, and are enabled to give most assistance to their brethren. So now, the poor priests, when persecuted by the clerks of antichrist, can flee without let or hindrance from one city to another, as Christ commanded in the gospel. So also they can best be present at once and lend their aid, according to the promptings of the Holy Spirit, at any spot where they are needed. In this way priests and laymen, free from all strife, will be joined together in love. Thus some poor priests have associated themselves together, for the purpose of following to the utmost the example of Christ and the apostles: of laboring where there is the most need, as long as they still retain

the vigor of youth, without condemning other priests who faithfully do their duty."

37. Wicklif realized the danger which he incurred by this faithful conformity to the Christian model of Christ and the apostles. He said that it was "an invention of hypocrisy to hold that martyrdom is no longer possible, because all are Christians. He who declares the truth, which is opposed to their corruption, to satraps [for thus he designated the prelates] shall not escape their deadly hatred, and may therefore die as martyrs. And so we Christians need not visit the heathen for the purpose of converting them and dying as martyrs: but let us but steadfastly preach the law of Christ, even to the imperial satraps, and straightway there shall be a blooming martyrdom, if we hold on in faith and patience. But I know from the evangelical faith, that antichrist with his blows can destroy only the body; but Christ, for whose cause I fight, can destroy both soul and body in hell, and I know that he will suffer nothing to be wanting of that which is most needful for His servants, when he has freely surrendered himself to a terrible death, and permitted all the disciples who were dearest to him to endure severe torments for their own benefit."

38. As to the Church, Wicklif said: "Holy Church is the congregation of just men for whom Christ shed His blood; and not mere stones, and timber, and earthly dross, which the priests of antichrist magnify more than the righteousness of God and the souls of men." At that time when men spoke of "holy Church," it was generally held that by this was to be understood the prelates and priests, with the monks, canons, and friars. But of this Wicklif said: "Those people would not reckon as belonging to the Church the secular men of holy Church, though they live never so truly according to God's law, and die in perfect charity. Nevertheless, all who shall be saved in the bliss of heaven are members of holy Church, and no more.

39. "Prelates make many new points of belief, and say it is not enough to believe in Jesus Christ and to be baptized -- as Christ says in the Gospel by St. Mark -- except a man also believe that the bishop of Rome is

the head of holy Church. But certainly no apostle of Jesus Christ ever constrained any man to believe this of himself. And yet they were certain of their salvation in heaven. How, then, should any

619

sinful wretch constrain men to believe that he is head of holy Church, while he knows not whether he shall be saved or lost. The pope is he chief antichrist, for he himself falsely pretends that he is the immediate vicar of Christ, and most resembling Him in life; and consequently, the most humble pilgrim, the poorest man, and the farthest removed from worldly men and worldly things; when, however, the fact generally is, that he stands first in the opposite sin. So long as Christ is in heaven, the Church hath in Him the best pope, and that distance hindereth Him not in doing His deeds; as He promiseth that He is with His always to the end of the world. We dare not put two heads, lest the Church be monstrous. The Head above is therefore alone worthy of confidence."

40. In 1376 the monks gathered from Wicklif's teaching nineteen propositions which they denounced as heretical, and sent them to the pope to have them condemned. Gregory XI was the pope. However, his enemies did not wait for an answer from the pope before beginning proceedings against him. Feb. 19, 1377, the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London set up their court at Lambeth and summoned Wicklif to appear. This created such excitement that a great crowd assembled at the place set for the trial. Wicklif was allowed to go alone. John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, and Lord Henry Percy, earl marshal of England, accompanied him. When they came to the place, the crowd was so dense at the doors that they were compelled to press their way through to the tribunal of the prelates, in "the Chapel of Our Lady" in St. Paul's Cathedral. The crowd was composed of those who had zealously espoused Wicklif's cause "as that of a martyr for the truth."

41. Earl Percy was the first to succeed in making his way through the crowd into the presence of the judges. The prelates were offended at his coming before them with so little ceremony, and the bishop of London addressed him: "Percy, if I had known what masteries you would have kept in the Church, I would have stopped you from coming in hither." The duke of Lancaster answered for Percy: "He shall keep such masteries, though you say nay." Earl Percy, addressing Wicklif, said: "Sit down, Wicklif, sit down; you have many things to answer to, and have need to response yourself on a soft seat." The bishop of London interposed: "He must and shall stand. It is unreasonable that one on his trial

620

before his ordinary should sit." The duke of Lancaster again spoke: "Lord Percy's proposal is but reasonable: and as for you, who have grown so arrogant and proud. I will bring down the pride not of you alone, but of all the prelacy in England." The bishop replied: "My trust is in no friend on earth, but in God." As this was a direct slur upon the friendship of the duke and the earl to Wicklif, it stirred the anger of the duke. But, by this time, there was considerable confusion, and the only words that could be heard were those of the duke: "Rather than take such words from you, I'll drag you out of the court by the hair of your head."

42. And now the crowd at the door having caught an idea of what was really occurring at the court,broke down the barriers, and burst into the chapel where the court was held. Further colloquy between the duke and the bishop was thus broken off, and all further procedure as well, was broken up by the clamors and uproar of the crowd that had rushed in and taken possession. Wicklif, all this time, was waiting meekly and quietly for his trial to begin. But now the situation had grown so dangerous to the bishops that they did not dare to attempt to carry proceedings any further against Wicklif. "It was their turn to tremble. Their citation, like a dangerous spell which recoils upon the man who uses it, had evoked a tempest which all their art and authority were not able to allay. To proceed with the trial was out of question. The bishops hastily retreated; Wicklif returned home, `and so,' says one `that council, being broken up with scolding and brawling, was dissolved before nine o'clock.'"7

43. May 22, 1377, Gregory wrote a letter to the chancellor and the University of Oxford, in which he reprimanded them for suffering the "pestilential errors" of Wicklif to take root in England "to the disgrace of the Catholic faith;" and commanded them to seize Wicklif and deliver him up to the archbishop of Canterbury and

the bishop of London, or to either of them. On the same date he wrote a letter to each of these prelates to examine carefully, but privately, into the doctrine of Wicklif, and if they found it to be as was reported to him, to keep Wicklif carefully and closely confined until further orders. He also instructed them that in case they failed to capture Wicklif, then they

621

should publish an edict summoning him to appear in three months in Rome, at the "tribunal of the apostolic see." He further instructed them that they should inform the king, the royal family, and the nobles of the kingdom, of the errors taught by Wicklif, and exhort them to the "extirpation of his errors."

44. To the prelates in England the pope inclosed a list of sixteen propositions upon which Wicklif had been accused to him of holding and publicly preaching. Four of these relate to the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, and are more scholastic distinctions than expressions of truth, except perhaps the first one: "That the eucharist is not the real body of Christ, but only the figure or representation of it." Others of the charges are altogether false, having been drawn by Wicklif's bitter enemies. Others are entirely true, exactly as stated; but as they attacked the supremacy of the pope, they were considered as amongst the chiefest errors that could possibly be expressed. These were: "That the pope has no more authority than any other priest; that the gospel alone is sufficient to direct every Christian; that no ecclesiastic ought to have prisons for punishing delinquents; that excommunications, interdicts, and other ecclesiastical censures, when employed for the temporalities of the Church, are in themselves null; that the sacraments administered by bad priests are null; that those who forbear to preach the Word of God, to perform divine service, or assist at it, on account of any excommunication or interdict, incur thereby excommunication; that the institution of the Mendicant Order is repugnant to the gospel; and that it is encouraging idleness, and therefore sinful to relieve them." 45. These letters of Gregory were not very favorably received in England, except by the prelates to whom they were addressed. The authorities of the University of Oxford really hesitated a long while as to whether they should receive them at all, or whether they should not reject them with scorn. June 21, 1377, King Edward III died, and was succeeded by his grandson, Richard II, who was but eleven years old. During his minority his uncles, the duke of Lancaster and the duke of Gloucester, the two principal men of the kingdom, were his guardians; and these two nobles, with the earl marshal of the kingdom, Henry Percy, were firm friends to Wicklif and his cause. This was so well known to the prelates, that no one dared to attempt to carry out the pope's instruction

622

as to exhorting the king to arrest Wicklif and to extirpate his "pestilential errors."

46. Yet the archbishop of Canterbury issued his citation to Wicklif, to appear before his court. "On the appointed day, Wicklif, unaccompanied by either Lancaster or Percy, proceeded to the archiepiscopal chapel at Lambeth. `Men expected he should be devoured, being brought into the lions' den.'" But, though the princes were not with Wicklif, the burgesses took their place. "The assault of Rome had aroused the friends of liberty and truth" in all England. Yet more than this, a higher authority than burgesses or even princes intervened: "The archbishop had scarcely opened the sitting, when Sir Louis Clifford entered the chapel, and forbade the court, on the part of the queen mother, to proceed against the reformer. The bishops were struck with panic fear: `They bent their heads,' says a Roman Catholic historian, `like a reed before the wind.'" Before he retired, however, Wicklif handed in a protest in which he said: "In the first place. I resolve with my whole heart, and by the grace of God, to be a sincere Christian; and, while life shall last, to profess and demand the law of Christ so far as I have power." In attacking Wicklif's protest, one of the papists said, "Whatever the pope orders should be looked upon as right." Wicklif answered: "What! The pope may then exclude from the canon of the Scriptures any book that displeases him, and alter the Bible at pleasure."8

47. In June, 1378, the court sat again, and Wicklif was summoned. Again his friends went with him: and the crowd was there, too. This time, however, a hearing was obtained, and Wicklif had an opportunity to give his own explanation of the points upon which the monks had sent to the pope charges against him. He declared

himself submissive to the correction of the church in all cases of detected error. He stated all the points in his own way, with his own intended meaning, the meaning in which they had always been stated, and recanted not a single item. His concluding words were: "Far be it from the Church of Christ that the truth should be condemned because it sounds harshly to sinners or to the ignorant; for then the entire faith of Scripture would be deserving of condemnation." Wicklif was allowed to go in peace, and "the zealots for the hierarchical party were much dissatisfied with the issue of the

623

cause, and saw in it nothing but a yielding up of their cause on the part of the court, from motives of fear."

48. In 1379 Wicklif fell dangerously sick. His enemies, thinking he was going to die, a deputation of four doctors of theology from the Mendicant Orders, and four senators of the city of Oxford, visited him, "to wish him a restoration to health." But, since he might die, they considered it proper to "remind him of the many calumnies which the Mendicant Friars had suffered from him; and to admonish him, in view of death, to retract what he had said against them." Wicklif was too weak even to raise himself up in his bed; but he caused his attendant to lift him to a sitting posture; and then, summoning his remaining strength, he answered the monks: "I shall not die; but live, and ever continue to expose the bad practices of the begging monks." The monks gathering from this that their ministrations in view of his death were no more needed, retired more uneasy than ever at the prospect before them.

49. Wicklif recovered, and the next year was enabled to accomplish the one cherished purpose of his life: to publish the Bible in the English language (1380). For "he felt it to be his duty to make the Bible, which to the laity was an altogether sealed book, and to the clergy of that age one but little known, accessible to all as the common source of faith, by translating it into the vernacular tongue." But this publication of the Scriptures in the language of the common people, brought upon him fiercer attacks than had anything that he had ever before done. He was attacked from various quarters, because he was "introducing among the multitude a book reserved exclusively for the use of priests. But he steadfastly defended his undertaking and so expressed himself concerning the right and the duty of laymen to draw directly, themselves, from the Word of God, as could not fail to provoke against him still more violent attacks."

50. A certain Henry Knighton who lived at the time, and wrote a history of the period, said: "Master John Wicklif has translated out of Latin into English the gospel which Christ delivered to the clergy and doctors of the Church, that they might administer to the laity and to weaker persons, according to the state of the times and the wants of men, in proportion to the hunger of their souls, and in the way which

624

would be most attractive to them. Thus was the gospel by him laid more open to the laity, and to women who could read, than it had formerly been to the most learned of the clergy; and in this way the gospel pearl is cast abroad, and trodden underfoot of swine." The monks said: "It is heresy to speak of Holy Scripture in English. Since the Church has approved of the four Gospels, she would have been just as able to reject them and admit others. The Church sanctions and condemns what she pleases. . . . Learn to believe in the Church rather than in the gospel."9

51. Wicklif answered: "When so many versions of the Bible have been made, since the beginning of the faith, for the advantage of the Latins, it might surely be allowed to one poor creature of God to convert it into English, for the benefit of Englishmen." He cited the fact that the venerable Bede and King Alfred had translated the Scriptures into English. He cited the French, the Bohemians, and the Britons who had translated the Bible into their languages; and said: "I can not see why Englishmen should not have the same in their language, unless it be through the unfaithfulness and negligence of the clergy, or because our people are not worthy of so great a blessing and gift of God, in punishment for their ancient sins." Of those who held it heretical that the Bible should be translated into English, he said: "They would condemn the Holy Ghost, who taught the apostles to

speak in divers tongues. The clergy are withholding from the laity those keys of knowledge which have been given to them. They are heretics who affirm that people of the world, and lords, have no need of knowing the law of Christ, but that it is sufficient for them to know only what the priests impart to them orally. Holy Scripture is the faith of the Church, and the more familiar they become with them, in a right believing sense, the better." His work in thus issuing the Scriptures was so abundantly successful in reaching the people, that a writer of the time declared that "you could not meet two persons on the highway, but one of them was Wicklif's disciple."10

52. He censured the clergy for having taken "the liberty to withhold from the laity many things contained in the Scriptures, which are

625

against their own interest: as for example, whatever relates to the obligation of the clergy to follow Christ in poverty and humility. But all laws and doctrines of the prelates are to be received only so far as they are founded on the sacred Scriptures. As all believers must stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, to give account of the talents committed to them, so all should rightly know these talents and their use, in order that they may know how to render an account of them: for then [in the Judgment] no answer which must be given through a prelate or a steward can be of any avail, but each must answer in his own person. The New Testament is intelligible to all laymen who only do what in them lies to attain to the understanding of it. There is no peculiar sort of preparation, which is possible only to the order of priests, requisite for the understanding of the New Testament. The hungering and thirsting after righteousness is the most important qualification; but, whoever observes gentleness and love, he possesses the true understanding of the Holy Scriptures. It is heresy to affirm that the gospel, with its truth and freedom, does not suffice for the salvation of a Christian, without the ordinances and ceremonies of sinful and ignorant men. Indeed, there is no subtlety in grammar, neither in logic, nor in any other science that can be named, but that it is found in a more excellent degree in the Scriptures."

53. In 1381 Wicklif openly attacked transubstantiation -- that one point in which , more than any other, the papacy has supplanted the daily sacrifice and intercession of Christ, with "the daily sacrifice of the mass." The doctrine of the papacy on this is that the bread and the wine, at the word of the priest, is turned into the very flesh and blood of Christ, so that it is no longer bread nor wine, but flesh and blood. And, since this be so, either is complete flesh and blood: therefore, in administering the wafer only, the flesh and blood of Christ is administered just as really as though both the wafer and the wine were administered. Accordingly to the laity, only the wafer is administered as the eucharist; while the wine is withheld from them.

54. But all this system Wicklif declared to be falsehoods, and said: "The author of these falsehoods is not He who spoke, and it stood fast; but rather that lying spirit who spake, and it ceased to be." The decree of the Lateran Council held by Innocent III was cited against him. But,

626

to this he boldly replied: "Although Innocent may have taught such an insane fiction as the monks affirm, still this can make out nothing against the truth, which is founded on the gospel; for it is from this source that all truth must be derived, and especially that truth which relates to our faith." He did not presume to undertake to enter into any precise definition of the divine mystery of the Lord's supper, as a positive doctrine, but left it on its surest ground to the soul of the believer: to be comprehended by the faith of the believer himself. He said: " The right faith of a Christian is this: that this commendable sacrament is bread and body of Christ as true God and true man; and this faith is founded on Christ's own words in the Gospels. I am certain of the negatives,viz., that the doctrine of transubstantiation , and the doctrine of the accidentibus sine subjecto [accident without a subject], can not be true. I am not certain of the positive side: how it is necessary to conceive the relation of the consecrated bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ."

55. Next Wicklif "presented to the English Parliament a paper, in which he proposed that the king and the realm should obey prelates only so far as, according to the teaching of Scripture, such obedience belonged to the obedience of Christ; because, otherwise, Christ must obey antichrist. For there is no neutral ground between Christ and antichrist. All obedience should be paid solely to Christ; and any act of obedience not paid to him, must therefore be paid to antichrist. `He that is not for me is against me.'" This was in the time when one pope reigned at Avignon and another at Rome. Wicklif in his paper proposed that the money of the kingdom of England should not be sent either to the court of Rome or to Avignon; nor yet to any other foreign power, unless it be "proved that men are bound to do so from Holy Scripture."

56. He declared that "neither a cardinal nor any other man had a right to enjoy the fruits of an English Church, unless he duly resided there, or was lawfully employed in prosecuting some affair of the realm, which had been approved by the nobles." For "he would else not enter in through Christ, but as a disciple of antichrist; and by human ordinances he would plunder the kingdom, like a robber, among the poor under his power, without returning any equivalent for the money obtained. The common weal of the realm should not be burdened with inordinate taxes, until the patrimony with which the clergy was endowed,

627

was exhausted; for that was all property of the poor, to be used for their benefit in the spirit of charity, as it would be, if the clergy lived in the perfection of primitive poverty. The king should employ no bishop or priest in secular affairs: as well king as clergyman would otherwise be Christ's betrayer. The king should cause no person to be arrested because he remained under excommunication, till it should be proved by the law of God, that he remained justly under excommunication; for many have been excommunicated through haste and imprudence, in cases where, according to the laws of God and the Church, they ought not to have suffered excommunication. To arrest a man when he does his whole duty, is a work of the devil."

57. In November, 1382, Wicklif's inveterate enemy, former bishop of London, now archbishop of Canterbury, visited Oxford. "Having gathered round him a number of bishops, doctors, priests, students, and laymen, he summoned Wicklif before him. . . . Weakened by labors, by trials, by that ardent soul which preyed upon his feeble body, he might have refused to appear. But Wicklif, who never feared the face of man, came before them with a good conscience. We may conjecture that there were among the crowd some disciples who felt their hearts burn at the sight of their master; but no outward sign indicated their emotion. The solemn silence of a court of justice had succeeded the shouts of enthusiastic youths. Yet Wicklif did not despair: he raised his venerable hand, and turned to Courtenay with that confident look which had made the regents of Oxford shrink away. Growing wroth against `the priests of Baal,' he reproached them with disseminating error in order to sell their masses. Then he stopped, and uttered these simple and energetic words: `The truth shall prevail!' Having thus spoken, he prepared to leave the court: his enemies dared not say a word; and, like his Divine Master at Nazareth, he passed through the midst of them, and no man ventured to stop him." -- D'Aubigne.11

58. On the papal schism he published a paper in 1382, in which he said: "Trust we in the help of Christ on this point; for He hath begun already to help us graciously, in that He hath clove the head of antichrist and made the two parts fight the one against the other. For it is not doubtful that the sin of the popes, which hath been so long continued,

628

hath brought in this division. Let the rival pontiffs continue to launch their anathemas against each other, or should one of them prevail, in either case a severe wound has been inflicted. Let the emperor and kings lend their assistance in this cause, to maintain God's law, to recover the heritage of the Church, and to destroy the foul sins of clerks, saving their persons. Thus will peace be established and simony destroyed. And so God would no longer suffer the fiend to reign in only one such priest, but for the sin which they had done, made division among two, so that men, in Christ's name, may the more easily overcome them both. The pope is not on Christ's side, who put his soul for the sheep; but on the side of antichrist who putteth many souls for his pride. This man

feedeth not the sheep of Christ, as Christ commanded Peter; but spoileth them and slayeth them, and leadeth them many wrong ways."

59. When Popes Urban VI and Clement VII were excommunicating one another, each declaring the other to be antichrist, Wicklif agreed with them both in this. And, of the crusades which each preached against the other, Wicklif reproached them "for using the banner of the cross, that symbol of peace, of grace, and of charity, to lead men on to the destruction of Christians, from love to two false priests, open antichrists, in order to maintain their worldly state, and oppress Christendom. Why is not the proud priest in Rome willing to grant full pardon to all men when they live in peace, charity, and patience, as he grants it to all who will engage in the work of destroying Christians?"

60. Urban VI had renewed the summons of Gregory XI, that Wicklif should appear before the tribunal of the pope in Rome. Wicklif published a letter in reply, in which he said: "Believing the gospel as I do, to be the supreme rule, higher than all other laws, I consider the pope as bound above all men to keep this law [he] being the highest representative of Christ on earth. For the greatness of Christ's representative is not to be measured by the standard of worldly greatness, but by the degree in which a person represents Christ by a virtuous life. I suppose that Christ, during His life on earth, was the poorest of men. No Christian should follow the pope, nor any saint in heaven, except so far as such an one follows Christ. For James and John were in error, and Peter and Paul sinned. Let the pope surrender his secular rule to secular lords, and he will soon induce all his clergy to do the same; for so Christ

did and taught His disciples to do, till the evil fiend blinded this world.

61. "So far as it depends on me I am ready to go to Rome; but Christ has bidden me do the contrary, and has taught me to obey God rather than man. And I hope of our pope, that he will be no antichrist, nor act in direct contradiction to the will of Christ; for if he cites me against reason, and this unreasonable citation is followed up, then he is an open antichrist. An honest intention did not suffice to excuse Peter, nor prevent Christ from calling him Satan. So, in the present case, a blind intention and bad counsel, will not serve to excuse the pope. But when he requires poor priests to undertake a journey which is beyond their means, this can not be excused by the pious intention, nor so as to prevent his being called antichrist. God takes no man beyond what he is able to bear; why should a man require such a service from another? Therefore, we pray God in behalf of our Pope Urban VI, that His holy purpose of old may not be hindered and frustrated by the fiend. And Christ, who can not lie, says that the fiend of man is in his own house."

62. In 1382 Wicklif had suffered a stroke of paralysis. And Dec. 29, 1384, while conducting service in his church at Lutterworth, he was again stricken and died forty-eight hours afterward, December 31, in his sixty-first year. Under God he began a work, proclaimed truth, and set an example in behalf of Christianity against the papacy, which shall never fade. "Wicklif is the greatest English Reformer: he was in truth the first reformer of Christendom; and to him under God, Britain is indebted for the honor of being the foremost in the attack upon the theocratic system of Gregory VII. . . . `The rising sun of the Reformation,' for so has Wicklif been called, had appeared above the horizon, and its beams were no more to be extinguished. In vain will thick clouds veil it at times; the distant hilltops of eastern Europe will soon reflect its rays; and its piercing light, increasing in brightness, will pour over all the world, at the hour of the Church's renovation, floods of knowledge and of light."12

---

1 [Page 607] Wylie's "History of Protestantism," book ii, chap.iii, pars. 2-7; Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," Vol. vii, book xiii, chap. vi. par. 19.

3 [Page 610] All quotations in this chapter not otherwise credited are from Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. v, sec. ii, part i.

4 [Page 610] Wylie's "History of Protestantism," book ii, chap.ix, pars. 17, 18.

5 [Page 613] Wylie's "History of Protestantism," book ii, chap. v, par. 3, note.

6 [Page 616] D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," book xvii, chap. vii, par. 6 from end.

7 [Page 620] Wylie's "History of Protestantism," book ii, chap. vii, pars. 7-13.

8 [Page 622] D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," book xvii, chap. vii, par. 14-16.

9 [Page 624] Id., chap. vii, par.5.

10 [Page 624] Id., chap. vii, par.4.

11 [Page 627] Id., chap. viii, par.11.

12 [Page 629] Id., par. 18 and last.

23. THE REFORMATION -- BOHEMIA.

IN Wicklif's lifetime the principles of truth which he proclaimed had permeated not only all England, but had spread far and wide through Europe. The center of the lodgment of these principles on the continent of Europe, was in the country of Bohemia, in the city of Prague. The wife of young King Richard II of England, was Anne, the daughter of the king of Bohemia, who was the emperor Charles IV. She read the Wicklif Bible, and recommended it to the high ones of the kingdom about her. The University of Oxford, the University of Prague, and the University of Paris, were at that time the three great universities of Europe. Anne of Bohemia, being English queen, formed a connecting link between Oxford and Prague: Bohemian youth came to Oxford to study, "and were there seized with enthusiasm for the doctrines of Wicklif;" and young English theologians went from Oxford to Prague, where they spread the truths which they had learned from Wicklif. It is certain that as early as 1381 the writings of Wicklif were owned and studied by professors in the University of Prague.

2. In Bohemia, moreover, the soil for the reception of the seeds of truth sown by Wicklif, was better prepared than in any other country in Europe. This preparation is worthy and important to be studied. A man of the name of Militz was archdeacon of the cathedral church in Prague, and also secretary and chancellor of the emperor Charles. IV. "He was distinguished for his untiring, pious zeal for the salvation of souls, for his self-sacrificing, disinterested charity." In 1364 he began to preach to the people in the Bohemian language. "His novel and simple way of preaching met, at first, with but little favor. He was derided on account of his pronunciation, and his want of readiness in repeating certain liturgical forms and in announcing festivals. He had but a small number of hearers. His friends advised him to give up

preaching, as he could accomplish nothing in that way. How many devout and learned men have failed as preachers! Why should he expend his energies to no purpose? But Militz replied: `If I can save but a single soul,

it will satisfy me. The example of my Saviour teaches me this, who did not disdain to accept the one Canaanite woman.'

3. "As nothing could divert him from his purpose, so his fervent zeal was soon crowned with the happiest results. His sermons produced more effect every day. Many men and women were awakened to repentance under them, confessed their sins to him, and commenced a new Christian life. Usurers and others pursuing unlawful gains, renounced their old wicked courses. Many filled with disgust at the life of the world, withdrew from it into a rigid ascetic tendency. The results of his labors stimulated him to still greater activity. He preached twice every Sunday and holiday, and occasionally three, four, and even five times daily, in different churches; and his sermons, which were listened to with constantly increasing attention, lasted several hours. He had but little time, therefore, to prepare for them. He endeavored to gain strength for this duty in prayer. Other learned clergymen had to complain, that with their utmost exertion, they could not accomplish what Militz was enabled to do after an hour's preparation. On finishing the labors of the day, when he returned home, weary and exhausted with so much preaching, he was surrounded and followed by multitudes, seeking spiritual consolation and advice, which he imparted to all with kindness and affection."

4. "At an advanced period of his life he learned German, for the purpose of extending his labors also to the German population, and he now preached in this language as well as his own. To the students of the University of Prague, and to the learned, he preached in the Latin language; and was listened to by eager crowds. He had to lend his sermons for the students to copy; and thus they became multiplied. Matthias of Janow, his enthusiastic disciple, of whom we shall speak more particularly hereafter, says of him: `Having been a simple priest and secretary at the prince's court, before his experience of this visitation by the spirit of Christ, he grew so rich in wisdom and all utterance of doctrine, that it was a light matter to him to preach five times in a day; namely, once in Latin, once in German, and then again in the

Bohemian tongue, and this publicly, with mighty fervor and a powerful voice, and he constantly brought forth from his treasures things new and old.' Great was the effect produced by the preaching of Militz, on the female sex in particular; many were induced by his sermons to lay aside their ornaments of pride. Through all Bohemia were to be found young maidens who owed to him their conversion, and presented patterns of true piety in their womanly virtues.

5. "Prague was then a seat of extreme depravation of manners. There was one quarter of the city devoted wholly to pleasure full of brothels, -- `Little Venice,' as it was called, and, in Bohemian, Benatky. Militz proposed to transform this seat of sin into a seat of Christian virtues. He commenced with little beginnings, and ended with great results. He succeeded at first in converting twenty licentious women. He got them to dwell in one house. He found devout women in good circumstances who were willing to look after them. He took unwearied pains himself in promoting their moral improvement. Some of them were married to husbands, others taken into the service of pious ladies. At length he succeeded in extending his labors to several hundreds. The houses of licentiousness were emptied. The place which they had occupied was partly given up by the emperor and the magistrates of the city to Militz for the promotion of his pious object, and other houses were purchased with money supplied by charitable contributions. He founded here a Magdalene hospital, with a chapel, in which there was preaching every day for the benefit of the new converts. `Little Venice,' now converted into a seat of piety, obtained the name of `Little Jerusalem.'

6. "We see, in Militz, one of the leaders and founders of domestic missions, -- an institution much needed in such an age. Matthias of Janow thus describes these labors of Melitz, by which Prague underwent so complete a change: `O, how many vices, conquered by him, had to give up the field! And if Militz had not come, and so much had not been accomplished by his voice thundering to the skies, we should, of a truth, have been as Sodom, and perished like Gomorrah. But now, by the grace of Christ, through the energy and pains of Militz, Sodom has been restored to her ancient worth; from being a Babylon, Prague is spiritually transformed, full of the word of Christ, and of the doctrine

633

of salvation; for now, that the abominable, the open and public vices have been conquered, the Christian virtues find room to bud and blossom in many souls, and increase daily both in number and vigor.' The same Matthias of Janow remarks of this extraordinary man: `I confess that I can not enumerate even the tenth part of what my own eyes saw, my own ears heard, and my hands handled, though I lived with him but a short time.'

7. "Militz sought to interpret the signs of the present, by comparing them with the prophecies of the Old Testament [Daniel especially], the last discourses of Christ [Matthew 24], and the prophetical intimations in the epistles of St. Paul [2 Thessalonians 2]. He saw the way preparing for a divine judgment on the corrupt Church; he foresaw a renovation of the Church, by which it was to be prepared for the second advent of Christ. The prophetic images which presented themselves in his visions, appeared to him as revelations of the Divine Spirit. From him as the source proceeded those prophetic ideas, which further developed afterward by his disciple Matthias of Janow, extended their influence also to John Huss. . . . Under the `abomination of desolation' [Matthew 24] he finds signified corruption in all parts of the Church. The apostasy of the Jewish nation from divine truth appears to him an antitype of the fall of the secularized Church from evangelical truth. Antichrist, he supposes, is not still to come, but has already come." -- Neander.13

8. In 1367 Militz made a journey to Rome, especially to see Pope Urban V. There he nailed to the door of St. Peter's the words: "Antichrist is now come, and sitteth in the Church." He also published a notice that, on a certain day, he would stand at the entrance of St. Peter's and address the people: "That he would announce the coming of antichrist, and would exhort the people to pray for the pope and the emperor, that they might be enabled so to order the affairs of the Church, in things spiritual and temporal, that the faithful might securely serve their Creator." However, he was arrested by the Inquisition, was loaded with chains, and was given to the Franciscans to be kept in close confinement. But he took it all with such perfect meekness as to disarm his persecutors.

634

9. After he had been kept in prison some time, the inquisitors asked him what it was that he intended to preach at the entrance of St. Peter's. He asked them to give him his Bible, which had been taken from him when he was arrested, with paper, pen, and ink, and he would write it all down. They granted his request, he wrote it out, and was allowed to read it "before a large assembly of prelates and learned men, in the church of St. Peter." It made such an impression, even upon his keepers, that when he was taken back to prison, he was treated with less severity than he had formerly been. While thus in prison, after his discourse in St. Peter's, he wrote a book, "On the Antichrist," of which he says: "The author writes this, a prisoner and in chains, troubled in spirit, longing for the freedom of Christ's Church, longing that Christ would speak the word, Let it be, and it shall be; and protesting that he has not kept that which was in his heart, but has spoken it out to the Church; and that he is prepared to hold fast to whatever the pope or the Church may lay on him."

10. While Militz was thus in prison Pope Urban V arrived in Rome, from Avignon; and, most strange to tell, Militz was set free from prison, was received into the palace of a cardinal, had a favorable audience with the pope, and was allowed to return to Prague, to the exceeding joy of the people, whose exultation was the greater "because his enemies, the mendicants, had foretold the people from the pulpit, that he would perish at the stake." Upon his arrival at Prague he immediately took up his work of preaching; and, to spread his message as widely as possible, "he set up a school for preachers: often being heard to say, `Would that all were prophets!' When he had trained up an able young priest, he took pains himself to draw upon him the attention of the communities, pointing him out as one who would surpass his master, as one whom they should listen to with care.

11. "He founded an association composed of two or three hundred young men, all of whom resided under the same roof with himself, were trained under his influence and by his society. He copied the books which they were to study, and gave them devotional books to copy themselves, for the sake of multiplying them.

All here was to be free; to flow spontaneously from the one animating spirit by which all were to be governed. An internal tie was all that held them together; no outward

635

ward discipline or rule, no vow, no uniformity of dress. The disciples of Militz soon distinguished themselves by their serious, spiritual lives, and by their style of preaching. Hence they, too, like himself, were made butts of ridicule and persecution by the worldly minded clergy, whom the lives of these exemplary young men stung with shame and reproach.

12. "The beneficence of Militz was without bounds. Crowds of the poor were always to be seen collected before his doors. He gave all he had to help them; reserving nothing at all for himself; so that when everything else was gone, he sold his books, the very books which he used himself, and which he kept ready to lend to any that needed. When he had nothing more, he ran round among other clergymen and the rich, and collected contributions, never allowing himself to lose heart by any rude rebuff he might chance to receive from those whose charities he asked. Nothing was left him but the most indispensable articles of clothing; not even what was needful to protect him, in midwinter, from the inclemency of the season. A rich man had said: `Militz suffers so much from the cold, I would be glad to present him with a set of furs if I could only be sure that he would keep it.' On hearing of it, Militz observed: `I am far from wishing to keep anything for myself alone; on that condition I could not accept the furs.' He was often persecuted and stigmatized as a heretic; but his patience and gentleness never failed him for a moment; and he used to say: `Let me suffer ever so much persecution, when I bethink me of the fervent penitence of that poor woman -- referring to one who had been converted by his means from a life of licentiousness and crime -- the bitterest cup becomes sweet to me, for all I suffer is as nothing compared to the grief of that one woman.'"

13. Finally, his enemies, the mendicants, managed to gather from his sermons twelve articles which they claimed to be heretical, and sent them to the papacy at Avignon, to have them condemned as heresy by the pope, who, then, was Gregory XI. The pope sent a letter to the emperor Charles IV, saying: --

"We have recently learned from the report of several creditable persons, that a certain priest, Militz, formerly a canonical at Prague, under the garb of sanctity, but in the spirit of temerity and self-conceit,

636

has taken upon himself the calling to preach, which does not belong to him, and has dared to teach openly in your dominions many errors, which are not only bad and rash, but also heretical and schismatic, extremely mischievous and dangerous to the faithful, especially the simple."

14. "When the pope's bull arrived at Prague, the archbishop was confounded. He caused Militz to be cited, and complained to him of his perplexity. Militz, however, remained perfectly tranquil in the consciousness of his innocence, and bid the archbishop take courage, as his conscience was clear. He placed his trust in God and the power of the truth; these would triumph over every assault. He went to Avignon in the year 1374; but died there while his cause was still pending." In these same years of the great labors of Militz, his work was grandly seconded by Conrad of Waldhausen, who was charged by the papacy that "he set the people in commotion, beginning from Rome, the seat of the apostolic chair, in the year of the jubilee, and teaching through all Austria even to this city of Prague."

15. As already indicated, Matthias of Janow was the disciple of Militz. He was not so thorough an evangelist as was Militz, but more of a scholar and a writer; though he also traveled much. He was confessor to the emperor Charles IV. Of his experience and conversion, he says: "Once my mind was encompassed by a thick wall; I thought of nothing but what delighted the eye and the ear, till it pleased the Lord Jesus to draw me as a brand from the burning. And while I, worst slave to my passions, was resisting Him in every way, he delivered me from the flames of Sodom, and brought me into the place of sorrow, of great adversities, and of much

contempt. Then first I became poor and contrite; and searched with trembling the Word of God. I began to admire the truth in the Holy Scriptures, to see how, in all things, it must be exactly fulfilled; then first I began to wonder at the deep wiles of Satan, to see how he darkened the minds of all, even those who seemed to think themselves wisest. And the most pious Jesus elevated my mind, that I might understand men absorbed by vanity; and then, reading, I understood clearly the abomination of desolation, standing wide, high beyond measure, and firmly, in the holy place. And there entered me, that is, into my heart, a certain unusual, new, and

637

powerful fire, but a very blessed fire, and which still continues to burn within me, and is kindled the more in proportion as I lift my soul in prayer to God and to our Lord Jesus Christ the Crucified; and it never abates nor leaves me, except when I forget the Lord Jesus Christ, and fail to observe the right discipline in eating and drinking; then I am enveloped in clouds, and unfitted for all good works, till, with my whole heart and with deep sorrow I return to Christ, the true Physician, the severe Judge, He who punishes all sin, even to idle words and foolish thoughts."

16. Following the lead of Militz, Matthias was a thorough student of the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation, and those of Jesus and Paul. His chief work is one in which is given his reflections on the history of his own times, with hints concerning the future, all "based on the rules of the Old and New Testaments, and on the prophetical elements which they contained." "He portrays the utter corruption of the Church in all its parts, and explains the causes of it. Of this his work he says: "The Lord Jesus instructed me how to write all this which relates to the present condition of priests, that is, the carnal ones, and which throws light on the character of these times; but what the end is in which all this is to result, He only knows who set me to work. And He sent me His spirit who shoots the fire into my bones and into my heart, leaving me no rest, till I reveal the son of iniquity and of perdition, till I expose the hidden shame of the mother of harlots (the corrupt Church as symbolized in Revelation)."

17. Of the clergy he says: "They neglect Spiritual things: the least of all their concerns is the study of the Bible and the old Church teachers. They are men who know nothing of the spirit of Jesus the Crucified; who have never meditated day and night on the law of the Lord -- carnal-minded priests. They are men who are not wholly devoted to the study of the Holy Scriptures, who have not been instructed in them from their youth; yet, for all this, they boldly stand forth as teachers, because perhaps they possess a certain gift of elocution; and they provide themselves with collections of sermons, postills for every day in the year, and so, without any further search into the Holy Scriptures, they hold forth those current homilies, preaching with great ostentation. They are people who know nothing about

638

the Bible. Such persons do not preach from devotion, and from joy in the Divine Word, nor from zeal to edify the people; but because this is the business assigned to them, or because they are fond of making a display of their skill in speaking, or because they are hunting after popularity, and find gratification in being favored and honored by the people. So they have recourse to their collections of sermons, or put together fine words, and furnish out their discourses with stories, and with promises of large indulgences."

18. He declares it to be "one of the cunning tricks of the archenemy to persuade men that antichrist is still to come, when, in truth, he is now present and so has been for a long time; but men are less on their guard against him, when they look for him as yet to come. Lest the abomination of desolation [Matt. 24:15] should be plainly manifest to men, he has invented the fiction of another abomination still to come, that the Church, plunged still deeper in error, may pay homage to the fearful abomination which is present, while she pictures to herself another which is still in the future. It is a common, everyday fact, that antichrists go forth in endless numbers, and still they are looking forward for some other and future antichrist. As to the person of antichrist, it is neither to be a Jew, nor a pagan; neither a Saracen, nor a worldly tyrant persecuting Christendom. All these

have been already; hence they could not so easily deceive. Satan must invent some new method of attacking Christianity."

19. Then he gives the following clear, plain, and direct description of antichrist, which no one can mistake: "He is and will be a man who opposes Christian truth and the Christian life in the way of deception. He is and will be the most wicked Christian, falsely styling himself by that name, assuming the highest station in the Church, and possessing the highest consideration, arrogating dominion over all ecclesiastics and laymen: one who, by the working of Satan, knows how to make subservient to his own ends and to his own will the corporations of the rich and wise in the entire Church: one who has the preponderance in honors and in riches, but who especially misappropriates the goods of Christ, the Holy Scriptures, the sacraments, and all that belongs to the hopes of religion, to his own aggrandizement and to the gratification of his own passions; deceitfully perverting spiritual things

639

to carnal ends, and in a crafty and subtle manner employing what was designed for the salvation of a Christian people, as means to lead them astray from the truth and power of Christ.

20. "It is not to be imagined that antichrist will form a particular sect, or particular disciples and apostles. Nor will he come upon the Church preaching his own name, in the open and obvious manner with which Mohammed spread abroad his doctrines: that would be a tyranny too strikingly apparent, not at all fitted to deceive mankind. Antichrist must be more cunning than all that. His organs must stand forth in the name of Christ, and profess to be his ministers. He is thus to deceive men under the mask of Christianity. The multitude of carnal men, led on by the most subtle artifices of wicked spirits, have been brought to think that, in following fables, they are pursuing the right way; to believe that in persecuting Christ's believers, or Christ and His power, they are persecuting antichrist and the false doctrines of his agents, just as it happened with those Jews and pagans who called Christ a deceiver, and put Him and His apostles to death, supposing that by so doing they did God service. Thus, too, the actual antichrists will dream of another antichrist to come."

21. Having thus defined the actual antichrist in his own person, Matthias carries the thought outward from that, to the spirit of antichrist, as manifested in individuals. Writing on 1 John 4:3, which, according to the Latin Version that Matthias used, reads: "And every spirit that dissolves Jesus, is not from God. And this one is antichrist, concerning whom thou hast heard, because he cometh, and even now is already in the world," Matthias says: "Every spirit who dissolves Christ, is antichrist. Jesus is all power, all wisdom, and all love. Every Christian, therefore, who from design, either in great or in small, in a part or in the whole, dissolves this, dissolves Jesus; for he destroys and dissolves God's power, God's wisdom and love; and so, in the mystical sense, he is antichrist. An antichrist is every evil spirit, who in any way, directly or indirectly, opposes himself to the Christian faith and Christian manners among Christians. Although Christ is eternal, and therefore all opposition to the divine being may be regarded as in a certain sense opposition to Christ, still, in the proper sense, there was no antichrist before the incarnation."

640

22. On the falling away predicted in 2 Thess. 2:3, he said that it had already been accomplished. And, further: "Faith is styled fides formata because it is made up of all the virtues. For it requires all other virtues in connection with itself, and is kept fresh and sound by every virtue. Hence it follows, that a falling away from the faith consists especially in the admission of every kind of sin, and the omission of every kind of virtue; and we see, on the whole, at the present day, in the time of antichrist, all the virtues neglected among Christian people. The destruction of antichrist and the multiplication of the true witnesses of Jesus Christ, are to take place in a gradual manner, beginning from the present time, till all shall be carried into fulfillment. The time has begun. Satan has been gradually working through antichrist as his instrument, for a long period of time, introducing evil under the appearance of good among the people of God, turning good customs into abuse, diffusing more widely, every day, his principal errors. While Satan has thus gradually introduced into the Church the mysteries

of his antichrist, keeping his toils concealed; so, on the other hand, the Lord Christ, gradually manifesting himself in His beloved disciples, will at length, before the final judgment, reveal himself in a great multitude of preachers. The spiritual revelation of Christ, through his genuine organs; the spiritual annihilation of antichrist by the same, and a new illumination of the Church, are to prepare it for the last personal appearance of Christ, and are to precede that event."

23. One reason of the corruption of the Church he declared to be "the overloading it with human ordinances, the excessive multiplication of ecclesiastical laws. No man can possibly invent laws suited to every contingency and relation. The Spirit of God alone can do this, who knows all things and holds them together. And inasmuch as this Spirit is present everywhere and to all men, the spirit of man also which is in himself, with the Spirit of Christ, alone knows what is in man." In illustration of this, Matthias cites "The Ten Commandments, which are plain to every one, even the dullest of understanding, so that no man can pretend that he is embarrassed by them; and Jesus the Crucified, who is the power of God and the wisdom of God, has in a certain manner briefly summed them up in a single precept, requiring love to God and

641

our neighbor: for love is the fulfillment of the law, and love is the perfect law of liberty.

24. "All other and multiplied laws of men are superfluous and inadequate. They ought not to be called traditions, but superstitions. No man can frame a law adapted to all times, and places, and circumstances, which is not contained in that one precept of love of God and our neighbor. Thus human laws are to be recognized only as such, and the commandments of God to remain in their dignity, and as such to be reverenced and obeyed. This the faithful apostle of Christ, who may well serve as an example to all disciples, has wonderfully illustrated in himself: for Paul (in 1 Corinthians 7) distinguishes what he says in his own name from what he makes known as a precept of the Lord. Mark with what discrimination and moderation he speaks to his flock, so as nowhere to impose a necessity and nowhere to inspire fear, except for the precepts and words of the Lord Jesus Christ. All rules are one. They proceed from one principle and aim at one end. They do not obtain their authority from themselves, nor are they observed in the Church of God on their own account; but they are inseparably included in the same holy law of Christ, which is inscribed by the Holy Spirit on the hearts of believers, which binds many widely separated nations in union with one another, and makes all dwell with one set of manners in the house of Jesus the Crucified.

25. "While the one commandment of Christ, and His one sacrifice, preserved in the Church, greatly promote unity; so, on the other hand, the multitudinous prescriptions of men burden and disturb the collective body of the Church of Christ. Unity among men can come only from the Word of God. A forced uniformity will of necessity produce nothing but divisions. The Holy Spirit and the Word are the only true rule for all that relates to man. Hence, therefore, the Father is the shaping principle from which all things proceed; the Son is the shaping principle toward which all things aim: the Holy Ghost is the principle in which all things repose: and yet there are not three rules or forms, but one. Hence, the highest rule, by which everything is to be tried, is Christ, that single rule, which is alone necessary and alone sufficient for all apostles and every man that cometh into the world, in all matters, in every place, and at all times: not only for men, but also for angels,

642

because He is himself that truth and wisdom which work mightily from one end of being to the other. That which forms the unity of the Church, is the one God, one Lord, one Master, one religion, one law, one commandment. All Christians who possess the Spirit of Jesus the Crucified, and who are impelled by the same Spirit, and who alone have not departed from their God, are the one Church of Christ, His beautiful bride, His body: and they are not of this world, as Christ is not of this world, and therefore the world hates them.

26. "Men would attain to justification, and believe that they can obtain it by many labors, with much expense, in the performance even to satiety, of all the newly appointed ceremonies; and yet Christ is become to

their hearts as one dead; they have nothing of His Spirit, they see and know Him not. Hence they perform all their isolated works according to the letter, and in a spirit of fear according to the law: but they know nothing of the true liberty, of the freedom, which is in the Spirit of Jesus Christ. Hence they appear to be little, if at all, different from the scribes and Pharisees among the ancient people of the Jews, on whom our Lord Jesus Christ often denounced woe: and the apostle Paul has often reproached such persons with apostatizing from the Christian faith.

27. "All Holy Scripture, all Christian faith, proclaims, preaches, and confesses, that Jesus Christ the Crucified alone is the one Saviour, and the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth: that He alone is all power, all wisdom for every Christian; He himself the Alpha, the beginning and the end; and that every one who is longing and striving to be a just and virtuous man, must first of all, and immediately, put on Christ himself and His Spirit, because He is himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life. After Him alone, first of all, and with the whole heart, we should seek: begin to glorify Him, and to carry Him in our souls, who alone hath redeemed us at that great price, His precious blood. Those who, in their mistaken search after self-righteousness, separate faith from works, substitute in place of the genuine Christian morality, a morality which they have learned in the schools of ancient philosophy. And because they did not like to retain Christ crucified in their knowledge, the Son of God gave them over to a reprobate mind (Rom. 1:28), to expend their efforts in building

643

up their own righteousness. And they think they shall be able to attain to a virtuous life after the methods of Aristotle, of Plato, and the other philosophers, by their own efforts and virtuous habits."

28. Of the great schism and anarchy of the papacy, Matthias of Janow said that it was but "a symptom of the distempered condition of the Church, and an admonition from God, designed to bring men to the consciousness of her corruption, and to awaken the longing for her regeneration. It never arose from any love which the cardinals had for Christ and His Church; but from their love of themselves and their love of the world. Nor does this schism tend ultimately to the injury of the Church, but rather a benefit; inasmuch as the kingdom of antichrist will thereby be more easily and more speedily destroyed. It is only the external appearance of the Church that can be affected by this schism: her essential being is raised above its influence. The body of the Omnipotent and altogether indivisible Jesus Christ, the community of saints, is not divided, neither indeed can be divided. It is self-love that is the cause of all the divisions of the Church, and of all her corruptions; and the restoration of Church unity and the reformation of the Church, can proceed only from the overcoming of that selfish element. The blissful unity of the Church can never be truly restored until men, governed by self-love, are removed entirely out of the way, and their places filled by those in vastly multiplied numbers, who overflow with zeal for the true unity of the Church: men who seek not their own, but the things of Jesus Christ.

29. "They who are apostles and preachers of antichrist, oppress the apostles, the wise men, and prophets of Christ: persecuting them in various ways, and boldly asserting that these ministers of Christ are heretics, hypocrites, and antichrists. And since many and mighty members of antichrist go forth in a countless variety of ways, they persecute the members of Christ who are few and weak, compelling them to go from one city to another, but driving them from the synagogues. Whenever one of the society of such Christians ventures to be somewhat more free of speech, to live more worthily of Christ than is common, he is directly called a Beghard, or by some other heretical name, or merely set down as a hypocrite or fool. If he do but in a small degree imitate his crucified Master, and confess His truth, he will experience

644

at once a fierce persecution from some side of the thick body of antichrist. If thou dost not live just as they do, thou wilt be judged to be nothing else but a poor, superstitious creature or a false guide. How then can that man who sees that the truth stands thus, and judges correctly of individual facts, say or believe otherwise than that

those times of antichrist are at hand? All that now remains for us is to desire and pray for reform by the destruction of antichrist himself; and to lift up our heads, for our redemption draweth nigh."

30. Matthias of Janow died Nov. 29, 1394. As he was dying, he said to his sorrowing friends: "The rage of the enemies of the truth now prevails against us; but it will not be forever: there shall arise one from among the common people, without sword or authority, and against him they shall not be able to prevail."14

31. Thus in the work of Militz, of Conrad of Waldhausen, and of Matthias of Janow, and their disciples, which had spread evangelical truth throughout Bohemia, was the soil prepared for the writings of Wicklif, which, as we have seen, from the year 1381 had been studied by professors in the University of Prague. And, in the University of Prague, in these same years of the work of Matthias of Janow, John Huss was a student, and also a student of the writings of Wicklif. In the year 1396 Huss received his master's degree, and two years afterward, in 1398, began to lecture in the university; and he himself says that he began the reading of Wicklif's writings before the year 1391.

32. Of his reading of the writings of Wicklif, Huss says: "I am drawn to him by the reputation he enjoys with the good, not the bad priests at the University of Oxford; and generally with the people, though not with the bad, covetous, pomp-loving, dissipated prelates and priests. I am attracted by his writings, in which he expends every effort to conduct all men back to the law of Christ, and especially the clergy, inviting them to let go the pomp and dominion of the world, and live with the apostles according to the life of Christ. I am attracted by the love which he had for the law of Christ, maintaining its truth and holding that not one jot or tittle of it could fail." By the "law of Christ," Huss ever means the Ten Commandments in the Spirit of Christ.

33. In 1398 a young knight of Bohemia, Jerome of Prague, returned from Oxford to Prague, bringing with him many of the writings of Wicklif not before known in Bohemia. These writings Jerome did his utmost "to circulate through the whole country, and among all ranks and conditions of people." He himself not only devoutly believed but powerfully preached, the principles set forth in the writings of Wicklif; and, a few years later the abbot of Dola, in Bohemia, complained that "important men in Bohemia openly and secretly disseminate the Wicklifite doctrines;" and that "the writings of Wicklif are scattered over the whole world."

34. There was in the city of Prague a chapel, "devoted particularly to the preaching of the gospel in the vulgar tongue, for the benefit of the people." This chapel had been founded in 1391 by John of Milheim, a member of the royal council of Bohemia, and a merchant whose name was Crentz. The title deed of this foundation reads: "Had not Christ bequeathed to us the seed of God's word and of holy preaching, we should have been like unto Sodom and Gomorrah. Christ moreover gave commission to His disciples, when He appeared to them, after His resurrection, to preach the Word, so as to preserve constantly in the world the living memory of himself. But since all Christ's actions are doctrines to them that truly believe on Him, the founder has carefully considered that the city of Prague, though possessing many places consecrated to the worship of God and used for a variety of purposes connected with that worship, is still destitute of a place devoted especially to preaching. Preachers, particularly in the Bohemian tongue, are under the disagreeable necessity of strolling about for this purpose, to houses and corners. Therefore, the founder endows a chapel consecrated to the Innocents, and named `Bethlehem, or the House of Bread,' for the use of the common people, that they may be refreshed with the bread of holy preaching. Over this church a preacher is to be placed as rector, whose special duty it shall be to hold forth on every Sunday and festival day, the Word of God, in the Bohemian tongue."

35. In 1401 John Huss was appointed as rector of this chapel of "Bethlehem, or the House of Bread," "to hold forth the word of God in the Bohemian tongue." "His sermons, glowing with all that fervor of love from which they proceeded, and backed up by a pious, exemplary

life, coupled with gentle and amiable manners, made a powerful impression." Great crowds of people, including even the nobility, were drawn to the chapel by Huss's preaching of the gospel. Queen Sophia chose Huss as her confessor. "A little community gathered around him, of warm and devoted friends; and a new Christian life started forth, from him, among the people. As a curer of souls to the lower class of the people, he became more intimately acquainted with the corrupting influence of a religion reduced entirely to a round of outward ceremonies, and of the superstition which gave countenance and support to immorality; and he was thus led to attack the sources of so much mischief; to dwell with increasing earnestness upon the essence of a practical Christianity, bringing forth its fruits from a principle seated in the heart; and to rebuke with emphatic severity the prevailing vices."

36. "So long as he chiefly attacked the corruption among the laity, he was left unmolested." But he could not confine himself to rebuking corruption amongst the laity, without greatly crippling his ministry; for to his admonitions they were wont to reply: "The priests preach against our unchastity and our other vices, and say nothing of their own unchastity and their own vices. Either this is no sin, or they are for monopolizing it for themselves. The priests behold the mote in our eyes, but not the beam in their own. Let them first cast out the beam in their own eyes; and then tell us that we should cast out the mote from ours. Why dost thou reprove us? The priests do the same. Why dost thou not reprove them? Is it, perchance, no sin in their case?"

37. To the faithful, Christian spirit of Huss, sin was sin, whether in layman or in priest; and he could recognize no distinction on account of position. But he no sooner called the priests to amendment of life, than he found himself seriously attacked. The corrupt clergy themselves had, with pleasure, listened to and approved Huss's sermons when he had called the nobility, as well as the common people, to amendment of life; but when his preaching touched them, they resented it, and actually made complaint to the king against Huss. The king told them: "When Huss preached sharp discourses against the princes and lords, you complacently looked on; now your turn has come, and you must make the best of it." Then they resorted to the charge that Huss was injuring the good name of the clergy, and was stirring up the laity to rebellion

against the clergy, by openly attacking "before the people, in the Bohemian tongue, the vices of the clergy."

38. To all this Huss answered: "I hope that, by the grace of God, I have never preached in an unbecoming manner. Against the vices of the clergy I have undoubtedly preached; and I hope that I shall preach against them before the council [the coming Council of Constance], not in any extravagant and irregular way, nor so as to show any disposition to injure their good name; but so as to restore their good name, and to give them occasion for correcting their faults. For he who from good motives, seeks to remove the vices from his neighbors, seeks most effectually to restore their good name. O, how much would it conduce to the good name of every one, if, whenever he heard his vices rebuked in a sermon, he would renounce them, and afterward, by a good life, secure to himself the praise of God and all holy men!"

39. May 28, 1403, a university meeting was held, before which there were laid, for examination and judgment, forty-five propositions ascribed to Wicklif. The propositions had been drawn forth by an opponent of the writings; and those who were best acquainted with the writings of Wicklif, declared in the meeting, that in these propositions Wicklif's writings had been falsified. In the meeting Huss declared that he could not agree to the "unconditional condemnation of the propositions, though neither was he disposed to defend them all; for many of them had been interpolated by that master Hubner." Further, "he could not join in any such condemnation, lest he should bring on himself the woes denounced on such as call evil good, and good evil." Yet the professor who had been Huss's teacher, actually stood forth as a defender of the whole forty-five of the propositions, even as they stood. The propositions were condemned by a large majority of the votes of the assembly.

40. Next, the Bohemian prelates laid before the pope in Rome complaints against the writings of Wicklif and those who used them. In 1405 Pope Innocent VII, in return, issued a bull addressed to the archbishop of

Prague, directing him "to suppress and punish the Wicklifite heresies that were spreading in Bohemia." The archbishop, in obedience to the pope, held a synod in Prague, in 1406, by which he published an ordinance threatening "ecclesiastical penalties against those who

presumed to preach, assert, or discuss the Wicklifite errors." Yet in the year 1407 Huss was chosen by the archbishop "to deliver the exhortatory discourse before his clergy, assembled at a synod of the diocese." He chose for his text Eph. 6:14: "Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness." In his sermon he said: "The clergy ought to take the lead of all others in following Christ under the form of a servant, in meekness, humility, purity, and poverty. They ought literally to realize what Christ has said in the Sermon on the Mount, on loving our enemies, on bearing wrong. The thriving of Christian life in all others, must be conditioned on the fact that the clergy let their light shine before others, in the literal copying after Christ. It is in the falling away of the clergy from this, their true destination, that I find the cause of the corruptions in the rest of Christendom, the contemplation of which fills my soul more and more every day with heart sorrow.

41. "The clergy, as soldiers of Christ, should lead the order of battle in the spiritual conflict. But if they are unfit for the contest, the victory is seldom or never won; since they, betaking themselves to flight, or struck down and put into confusion, fill the next ranks of the army with despair or irresolution. If the clergy are struck down or slain, this will hinder the rest of the army from conquering the enemy; but if they treacherously enter into a league with the enemy, they will prepare the way for the enemy to vanquish, more easily and treacherously, the army of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is the reason why, in our days, the Christian army is overcome by the flesh, the world, the devil, and pagans. Since it is essentially the clerical calling to set the example of following Christ, so when they exhibit the opposite of this in their lives, they are antichrists; and the true antichrist is already present in the corrupt clergy, whose life and doctrine stand in mutual contradiction. Many stand waiting for gifts by letters of fraternities, by far-sought indulgences, by fictitious relics, by painted images of saints." These letters of fraternities were documents issued by certain spiritual societies, by which the recipients of the letters were adopted into the community of the merits of those societies. The attacking of these epistles was one of the special features of what was denounced as Wicklifism.

42. In 1408, at a great convocation of the university, the forty-five

propositions extracted from Wicklif's writings were again brought forth for unconditional condemnation. But on account of the opposition of Huss and other friends of the writings of Wicklif, this unconditional condemnation could not be carried through; and, therefore, it was decreed "that no one should presume to maintain any one of the forty-five propositions in their heretical, erroneous, or scandalous sense." Until this time, every graduate of the University of Prague had been at liberty to lecture in the University of Prague, on any book of a teacher of the University of Prague, of Paris, or of Oxford. As Wicklif had been a teacher in Oxford, this liberty had been used by graduates of Prague, in lecturing upon Wicklif's writings, in the university. But now, by this convocation "an ordinance was passed that for the future, no bachelor should hold public lectures on any one of the three tracts of Wicklif, entitled `The Dialogue,' `The Trialogue,' and the `De Eucharistia,' and that no person should make any proposition relating to Wicklif's books and doctrines, a subject of public disputation."

43. In the same year several clergymen, accused of Wicklifite errors, were called for judicial examination before a consistory presided over by the archbishop's assistant. At the trial the accused refused to take any oath "by the crucifix, the gospels, or the saints, because on oath could be taken on things created." They did not refuse to take oath before God. But, because they would not take the Catholic oath upon the crucifix, the gospels, or the saints, this was held against them as an offense not less than that of the Wicklifite heresy. Huss, being present, defended the man, whose refusal to take this oath had raised the issue, because, without special reference to any right or wrong of the refusal in itself, he considered it proper to "honor the conscientiousness

which refused to transfer to any created thing the honor due to God alone." Huss's plea was of no avail, however: the man was imprisoned for several days, and then banished from the diocese. This aroused Huss to address to the archbishop a letter of protest, in which he said: "What is this! That men stained with innocent blood, men guilty of every crime, shall be found walking abroad almost with impunity; while humble priests, who spend all their efforts to destroy sin, who fulfill their duties under your Church guidance in a good temper, never follow avarice, but give themselves for nothing to God's service and

650

the proclamation of His Word, are cast into dungeons as heretics, and must suffer banishment for preaching the gospel!"

44. It was now the time of the Council of Pisa. The archbishop of Prague, with his clergy, and the German party in the university, held to the obedience of Gregory XII, whom the council had declared deposed. Huss favored the council, because he believed in the principle of a council being superior to a pope. The king of Bohemia also stood with the council, in its efforts to correct the popes. This difference of view on the part of the king and his nobles, and the archbishop and his clergy, brought on controversy between the two parties. On the part of the clergy, fierce resistance was made to the king's efforts to aid the Council of Pisa in correcting the papacy. Many of the clergy refused to continue Church services. From the party of the king, violent attacks were made on the archbishop and the clergy "partly as the king's instruments, partly from private grudges eagerly sought to humble the prelates."

45. In his sermons Huss declared himself in favor of the Council of Pisa, because "there was far more reason to expect something might be done for the reform of the Church" by the council than by either of the popes. The archbishop then published a notice, by which "all masters of the university who sided with the college of cardinals, and particularly Huss, were forbidden to exercise any priestly functions within the diocese." Huss was charged with sowing discord and schism between the spiritual and secular powers, from which had arisen the persecution" of "the bishop and the clergy, and the plundering of their goods." He was also charged with "stirring up the people against the clergy, the Bohemians against the Germans;" with "preaching disrespect to the Church and disregard to her power of punishing:" with having "styled Rome the seat of antichrist, and declaring every clergyman a heretic who demanded a fee for distributing the sacrament;" with having "openly praised Wicklif, and having expressed the wish that his soul might finally arrive where Wicklif's soul was." In response to this complaint the archbishop directed his inquisitor to inquire into the charges, and "at the same time, examine by virtue of what authority it is that sermons and divine worship are held in Bethlehem chapel."

651

46. When the Council of Pisa had finished its labors by declaring Alexander V to be pope, the archbishop of Prague discontinued his resistance, and accepted the new pope; and immediately laid before him complaints of the spread of the Wicklifite heresy in his jurisdiction. In December, 1409, Pope Alexander V issued a bull, in which it was declared that he had "heard that the heresies of Wicklif, and especially his denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation, was spreading far and wide in Bohemia." He called upon the archbishop to "employ vigorous measures for the suppression of these heresies. He should cause all the writings of Wicklif to be delivered up into his hands, appoint a committee of four doctors of theology and two doctors of canon law to examine the same, and proceed in conformity with the judgment they should give. All clergymen who refused to deliver up those writings, or who should defend Wicklifite heresy, the archbishop should cause to be arrested and deprived of their benefices, and in case of necessity the aid of the secular power should be called in. And as private chapels serve to spread errors among the people, sermons for the future should be preached, in Bohemia, only in cathedrals, parish and conventual churches, and prohibited in all private churches."

47. To all in Prague it was evident that this bull in itself was more the writing of the archbishop of Prague than it was of Pope Alexander V; and it produced a great excitement in opposition to the archbishop. The king and the nobles stood with Huss. "The bull was declared to be in many ways a garbled and interpolated one,

and therefore, of no force. Huss suggested suspicious against it, on this ground, and employed at first every lawful means in his power, under the circumstances of those times, to withhold obedience, while he showed all respect to the Roman Church." He appealed from the pope "ill informed" to the pope "well informed." The archbishop issued his prohibition of preaching in private chapels, which, from the beginning, was intended to stop Huss's preaching in Bethlehem Chapel. But, since this was contrary to the legal provisions of the foundation of Bethlehem Chapel, Huss refused to obey it. At the same time the archbishop commanded that all the writings of Wicklif should be delivered up to him for examination within six days. Huss obeyed this command, saying that he was ready to condemn them himself whenever any error

could be pointed out in them. The committee appointed to examine them condemned "The Dialogue," "The Trialogue," and some of his other writings, and ordered that they be all "committed to the flames, and thus be put out of the way of doing harm."

48. "The very announcement of this sentence produced disturbances. At a convocation of the university, it was resolved to send in a petition to the king, that he would prevent the execution of such a sentence, on account of the extreme peril to which it would expose the peace of the university and of all Bohemia. The king promised the delegates of the university that he would comply with their request. The archbishop on hearing of this, hastened to get the start of the king; and on the next day, the sixteenth of June, 1410, repeated the proclamation of the above sentence on the writings of Wicklif. When the king learned of this, he caused the archbishop to be asked whether it was really his intention to burn the books. Zbynek [the archbishop] promised that he would do nothing against Wicklif's writings without the king's consent; and for this reason put off the execution of the sentence.

49. "But he was far from intending really to give up the execution of the sentence, in spite of all the remonstrances against such a proceeding: alleging in excuse of his conduct that the king had not expressly forbidden him to burn the books. On the sixteenth of July, 1410, having surrounded his palace with a watch, he actually caused two hundred volumes, among which were not only the writings of Wicklif, but also some of Militz's and others, to be burned, without the slightest regard to rights of private property, as was afterwards remembered to his reproach. This step of the archbishop was the signal for great disturbances and violent controversies in Prague. Even blood was spilt. So great a movement in the minds of men could not be put down with force. The attempt to put it down by an act of arbitrary power, would have only led to still greater violence. The burning of the books had no other effect than to expose the archbishop to contempt and ridicule; and it was a great shock to his authority. Ribald and satirical songs, of which he was made the subject, were openly sung in the streets of Prague, to the purport: `The archbishop has yet to learn his A, B, C; he has caused books to be burned, without knowing what was in them.'

50. "Two contemporaries, belonging to the opposite parties, are

agreed in stating that by this burning of his books the enthusiasm for Wicklif was increased rather than diminished. One was Huss's zealous opponent, the abbot Stephen of Dola, who at the same time was blind enough to trace the origin of all the troubles to the disobedience of Huss. This writer cites, from the lips of one of Wicklif's adherents, the following words: `The archbishop has burnt many famous writings of Wicklif; yet he has not been able to burn them all. For we have still quite a number left; and we are continually searching in all quarters for others to add to this number, and to supply the place of those lost. Let the archbishop again bid us deliver them up to him, and let him see whether we will obey him!' The second is Huss himself, who says: `I call the burning of books a poor business. Such burning never yet removed a single sin from the hearts of men (if he who condemned could not prove anything), but has only destroyed many truths, many beautiful and fine thoughts, and multiplied among the people disturbances, enmities, suspicious, and murders.'"

51. When John XXIII succeeded Alexander V in the papacy, Huss renewed his appeal, addressing it to the new pope. In it he cited the Scripture rule that "in things necessary to salvation, one should obey God rather than man." In his appeal Huss was joined by "many other masters and preachers." But the high spiritual language employed in it "was little suited indeed to be understood or appreciated by the monster, John XXIII, and the court which he had gathered."

52. About this time Huss received the conviction that he should die a martyr. Accordingly, from this time, all that he said or did was in conscious view of the stake. In this conviction, and as an answer to all that might be charged against him in time to come, he wrote: "From the earliest period of my studies until now, have I laid it down as a rule that whenever I heard a more correct opinion on any subject whatever advanced, I would, with joy and humility, give up my earlier opinion: being well aware that what we know is vastly less than what we do not know. In order that I may not make myself guilty, then, by my silence, forsaking the truth for a piece of bread or through fear of man, I avow it to be my purpose to defend the truth which God has enabled me to know, and especially the truth of the Holy Scriptures, even to death; since I know that the truth stands, and is forever mighty, and abides

eternally; and with her there is no respect of persons. And if the fear of death should terrify me, still I hope in my God and in the assistance of the Holy Spirit, that the Lord himself will give me firmness. And if I have found favor in His sight, He will crown me with martyrdom. But what more glorious triumph is there than this? In citing His faithful to this victory, our Lord says: `Fear not them that kill the body.' As it is necessary for men gifted with reason to hear, to speak, and to love the truth, and to guard carefully against everything that might thwart it; as the truth itself triumphs over everything and is mighty forever; who, but a fool, would venture to condemn or to affirm any article, especially in what pertains to faith and manners, until he has informed himself about the truth of it?"

53. Huss's appeal to the pope was referred by the pope to a cardinal, for investigation. This cardinal confirmed the sentence which the archbishop of Prague had already pronounced against Huss; and cited Huss to appear at Bologna, where Pope John XXIII was then staying. But this aroused the earnest protests of all Huss's friends, including even the king and the queen. The king himself, in behalf of Huss, wrote to the pope and the college of cardinals, praying them to put a stop to the whole process; to impose silence on the enemies of Huss; and to suppress the dispute concerning the books of Wicklif: since it was "evident that in Bohemia no man had fallen into error or heresy because of these writings." As to Bethlehem chapel the king said: "It is our will, too, that Bethlehem chapel, which, for the glory of God and the saving good of the people, we have endowed with franchises for the preaching of the gospel, should stand, and should be confirmed in its privileges: so that its patrons may not be deprived of their rights of patronage, and that the loyal, devout, and beloved Master Huss may be established over this chapel and preach the Word of God in peace." He further demanded of the pope that the citation of Huss to Bologna should be revoked; and that if anyone had anything to object to him, he should present his objections within the realm of Bohemia, and before the University of Prague or some other competent tribunal.

54. This communication the king sent to John XXIII by Doctor Nass and John Cardinalis, two prominent men of his kingdom. Cardinalis was a friend of Huss, Doctor Nass was a personal friend of John

XXIII. They were commissioned by the king "to request the pope to send a legate to Bohemia at the king's expense." The king also wrote to the cardinal to whom had been committed Huss's appeal, asking him to come to Prague and inform himself of the actual state of things by personal observation. He instructed Doctor Nass to inform the pope that nothing but his respect for the pope prevented him from bringing to condign punishment the archbishop of Prague, whom the king considered as the author of all these disturbances in his kingdom. With

these two ambassadors of the king, Huss sent three procurators as his representatives and advocates in the case. When these ambassadors arrived at the court of the pope they found that the cardinal had already pronounced against Huss a sentence of excommunication, for "contumacy in not obeying the citation to appear at Bologna. Yet the ambassadors were heard with such respect that the pope took the case out of the hands of the cardinal to whom he had committed it, and appointed a new commission composed of several officials.

55. All this time the archbishop of Prague had been exerting himself to the utmost, through delegates at the court of the pope, to prevent any turn of the case in favor of Huss. He presented to the pope and the cardinals, horses, vases, costly rings, and other gifts in most lavish expenditure. By this or some other dark influence, Huss's case was removed from the second commission to which it had been referred, and was committed again to a single cardinal "who, in spite of all remonstrances made by the procurators of Huss, kept the whole affair in suspense for a year and a half." And, since the excommunication of Huss had not been revoked, the archbishop of Prague, taking advantage of this delay, without regard to Huss's appeal or any of the accompanying proceedings, published as valid the excommunication that had been pronounced from the court of the pope. The rectors of two churches, however, refused to publish it to their congregation. Also, at the court of the pope, because they so diligently pressed their case, some of Huss's procurators were imprisoned, and the others succeeded in reaching Prague.

56. Finally the cardinal to whom the case had been committed the last time, gave his decision, in which he confirmed the previous sentence; added to it a public declaration that Huss was a heresiarch; and put under interdict "the city where he resided." Huss was in Prague; but

656

the city of Prague was not named in the interdict. The interdict was upon "the city where he resided," so as to apply to any city where he might be. The archbishop of Prague immediately placed the city of Prague under interdict. The king, on behalf of Huss, resisted the interdict. He punished the clergy that observed it, confiscated their property: "many of them fled the country." By this time John XXIII, by his terrible life as pope, had so weakened his standing that the archbishop of Prague could not feel himself strong enough to carry on this war against Huss in the face of the attitude of the king. "The archbishop was forced, therefore, to the conviction, that, if he pushed matters to the extreme, he would only run the risk of losing all his authority in Bohemia: a result which would be inevitable, if sharper spiritual measures were continually resorted to, while yet every one of them was trifled with. Hence he was rather inclined, for the sake of saving his authority, and finally to give way to the efforts of the king and of the university for the restoration of peace, to offer his hand for reconciliation."

57. For more than a year negotiations had been going on, to secure "peace" in Bohemia. The heads of the respective parties were the king and the archbishop of Prague. A committee of ten had been appointed to consider the best means of securing peace; and both sides had pledged themselves to submit to the decision of this committee. It was finally agreed that both the king and the archbishop should write to the pope, and that the archbishop should say to the pope that "no heresies existed in Bohemia." Then a new inquiry was to be instituted; and if anything heretical were found, it should be severely punished. The archbishop, on his part, was to secure the pope's consent that if any person belonging to the realm of Bohemia were under the ban, the pope should remove it. Both parties were to recall their representatives from the court of the pope, and accept the decision of the king. The archbishop was to dismiss the ban and raise the interdict: the king was to release such of the clergy as he had arrested for enforcing the interdict, and restore their salaries. The archbishop did actually write a letter to be sent to the pope "reporting that no heresies were propagated in Bohemia;" and requesting him to remove the excommunication which had been pronounced on Huss, and to revoke the citation which had been served on him.

657

58. Huss, on his part, presented a confession of faith, which was to be sent to the pope. In this confession he said: "To show due obedience to the Church of Jesus Christ and to its supreme head, I am ready to give to

every man an account of the faith that is in me, and to confess with my whole heart that Jesus Christ is true God and true man, that His whole law is of such stable truth, that not one jot or tittle thereof can fail; next, that His Church is so firmly established on the firm rock, that the gates of hell can never prevail against it: and I am ready, trusting on my Lord Jesus Christ, to endure the punishment of a terrible death, sooner than consciously to say anything which would be contrary to the will of Christ and of His Church."

59. The archbishop, however, failed to fulfill his part of the agreement. Although, as stated, he wrote a letter to the pope stating that no heresies were propagated in Bohemia, it seems that the letter was never sent. He informed the king that he must complain that what he called heresy was preached by many clergymen, and that he was not permitted to apply his ecclesiastical power of punishing to those who set forth erroneous doctrines; and that since "under these circumstances it would be impossible for him to maintain his authority in Bohemia, or to carry out his measures by force, he resolved, instead of fulfilling the terms of the agreement, to quit Bohemia, for the present, and to seek assistance from Wenzel's brother, King Sigismund in Ofen." But he died, September, 1411, before he could execute this purpose.

60. And now Pope John XXIII took a step which, in its results, vitiated all the results of the hard labor that had been performed to establish peace in Bohemia. In sending the insignia of office to the new archbishop of Prague, Pope John sent also, by his legate, a bull denouncing the king of Naples, who was protector of Pope Gregory XII, and proclaiming a crusade against him. The pope's legate was to publish this bull in Prague. He did so "pronouncing in the most awful forms the curse of the ban on the pope's enemy, King Ladislaus, of Naples, adherent of Gregory XII, as on a heretic, a schismatic, a man guilty of high treason against the majesty of God; and proclaiming a crusade for the destruction of his party, together with a bull granting full indulgence to all who took part in this crusade. All who personally bore arms in this crusade were promised, if they truly repented and confessed

themselves (which, in this connection, surely could mean nothing but a mere form), the forgiveness of their sins, as fully as in partaking in any other crusade. Following the example of cupidity set up by Boniface IX, this bull offered the like indulgence to those also who would contribute as much in money as, in proportion to their means, they would have expended by actively engaging in this crusade for the space of a month."

61. The legate, suspecting that Huss would oppose this bull, had the archbishop to summon Huss before him. Huss came, and the legate "demanded of him whether he would obey the apostolical mandates. Huss declared that he was ready, with all his heart, to obey the apostolical mandates. Then said the legate to the archbishop: `Do you see? The master is quite ready to obey the apostolical mandates.' But Huss rejoined: `My lord, understand me well. I said I am ready, with all my heart, to fulfill the apostolical mandates; but I call apostolical mandates the doctrines of the apostles of Christ: and so far as the papal mandates agree with these, so far I will obey them willingly. But if I see anything in them at variance with these, I shall not obey, even though the stake were staring me in the face.' "

62. Hitherto, on the subject of indulgences, Huss had opposed simply the abuses of them, which were practiced by those who vended them. But now he entered into the principles underlying indulgences. The forms of absolution which accompanied this bull that had been just now published, were such that the dean of the theological faculty of the university, Stephen Paletz, hitherto a close friend to Huss and to the truth which he preached, "directed the attention of Huss to the objectionable features in them, and declared to him that such things ought not to be approved," because they contained "palpable errors." Yet, when it came to the test, Paletz himself maintained the pope's authority, against Huss, who attacked these indulgences. In the name of the theological faculty, Paletz offered the following resolution: "We do not take it upon us to raise objections against the lord apostolical or his letters; to pass any judgment whatever upon them; or to determine anything with regard to them: as we have no authority for it."

63. "But Huss, in accordance with his principles, could not believe in any such blind obedience. Obedience to his Master, Christ, the observance

659

of His doctrine, and the copying of His example, stood first in importance with him. This was the rule by which everything was to be examined, by which the limit of all obedience was determined; and this principle it was by occasion of which it was laid to his charge that, by making the commands of the superior dependent on the criticising judgment of his subjects, he relaxed the bonds of all civil and ecclesiastical order. Accordingly it was remarked, that by the course he pursued he would introduce the dangerous error that obedience might be refused to letters patent of popes, emperors, kings, and lords, if the truth and reasonableness of such letters could not be made clear to the understanding of the subjects. And who could calculate what disorders would spring up, all over the world, from this opinion! So he was called a revolutionist.

64. "His opponents believed, it is true, that men were bound to unconditional obedience to those in power only in that which was not absolutely wicked, or that which is in itself indifferent. But, to what extent was the phrase `that which is in itself indifferent' to be stretched? As for Huss, he could not look upon that which the bull required as a thing indifferent; but only as a thing directly opposed to the law of Christ, and sinful. To obey, in this case, would be the same as to abandon his principle of obeying God rather than man. He then spoke for the last time, with his old friend Paletz, whom he next met as his fiercest enemy, preparing destruction for him at Constance. His last words to him, the words with which he must sunder the tie of friendship that had so long united them, were . . . : `Paletz is my friend, truth is my friend: and both being my friends, it is my sacred duty to give the first honor to truth.'

65. "Neither his friend [Paletz] nor his teacher [Stanislaus of Znaim] could ever forgive Huss for presuming to stand forth against their authority, as well as the authority of the whole theological faculty, composed of eight doctors: for presuming to be more bold and more free-minded than themselves. Huss himself marks the critical moment which separated him forever from his former associates: `The sale of indulgences and the lifting of the standard of the cross against Christians, first cut me off from my old friends.' Compelled to stand forth as an opponent to his old teacher Stanislaus of Znaim, he still never

660

forgot his obligations to him as an instructor; as he says in the paper he wrote against him: `Though Stanislaus was my teacher, from whom in the discipline of the school, I learnt a great deal that is valuable, still I must answer him as the truth impels me to do, that the truth may be more apparent.'"

66. Huss now resolved publicly to discuss the subject of indulgences "before a numerous convocation of the university, where also his friend Jerome intended to appear." Announcements were posted throughout the city of Prague, that this discussion should occur June 7, 1412. The day came, the convocation was held, Huss spoke. He himself left an account of what he said, the salient points of which shall here be given. He said: "I was moved to engage in this affair by a threefold interest: the glory of God, the advancement of holy Church, and my own conscience. Therefore, in relation to all that is now to be said, I call God, Almighty and Omniscient, to witness that I seek first of all things God's glory and the good of the Church. To these objects every mature Christian is strictly bound by the command of the Lord; and for the good reason that every one should love Christ and His Church infinitely more than his bodily parents, temporal goods, his own honor, or himself. It is moreover my opinion that the glory of Christ and of His bride, the Church, consists particularly in the practical imitation of the life of Christ himself in this, that a man lay aside all inordinate affections and all human ordinances that would hinder or obstruct him in the pursuit of his object.

67. "I will never affirm anything contrary to the Holy Scriptures that contain Christ's law, or against His will. And when I am taught by any member of the Church, or by any other creature whatsoever, that I have erred in my speech, I will openly and humbly retract it. Therefore, in order that I may proceed more safely I will place

myself on the immovable foundation, the corner stone, which is the truth, the way, and the life, our Lord Jesus Christ. And I hold it fast, as the faith of the Church, that he who observes not the ordinance and the law which Christ established, and which He also taught and observed by himself and His apostles, does not follow the Lord Jesus Christ in the narrow way that leadeth to life; but goes in the broad way which leads the members of the devil to perdition.

661

68. "On this principle it is not permitted the faithful to approve these bulls. Nothing but what proceeds from love, can be approved by Christ; but assuredly neither the shedding of blood among Christians, nor the laying waste and impoverishing of countries, can have proceeded from love to Christ; nor can such an enterprise afford any opportunity for martyrdom. Indulgence denotes the pardon of sin; which is the work of God alone. Priestly absolution consists in this, that the priest in the sacrament declares the person confessing to him to be in such a state of contrition as fits him, if he were to die immediately, to enter, without passing through the fires of purgatory, into the heavenly mansions. And, the power of the priest, in the last extremity, is not so restricted that he may not promise, so far as God who reveals it to him permits, the pardon of sin. But, it would be too great a presumption to suppose that any vicar of Christ could rightfully attribute to himself such power of absolution, if God had never given him a special revelation on the subject: for otherwise he would be guilty of the sin of blasphemy.

69. "The sacrament of penance can avail nothing except on the presupposition of contrition. It is a foolish thing, therefore, for a priest not informed by divine revelation that penance or some other sacrament avails for the salvation of the individual, to whom it is administered, to bestow on him unconditional absolution. Hence the wise priests of Christ give only a conditional absolution: conditioned namely on the fact that the person confessing feels remorse for having sinned, is resolved to sin no more, trusts in God's mercy, and is determined for the future to obey God's commandments. Hence, every one who receives such indulgence, will actually enjoy it, just so far as he is fitted to do so by his relation to God. It is the duty of prelates to instruct the people in this truth, so that the laity may not spend their time and labor on that which can not profit them.

70. "It is neither permissible nor advantageous for a pope, or for any bishop or clerk whatsoever, to fight for worldly dominion or worldly wealth. This may be understood from the example of Christ, whose vicar the pope is; for Christ did not fight, nor did he command his disciples to fight: but forbade them. The pope ought not to contend for secular things. The safer way is to contend spiritually, not with the

662

secular sword, but with prayer to Almighty God, to persuade the enemy to concord by negotiations, even though by such a course, which to men might seem like madness, one should in case of need suffer death. This rule St. Paul gives in Rom. 12:19: would that the pope might humbly adopt this rule of St. Paul.

71. "The pope's conduct is contrary to the example of Christ, who reprimanded His disciples for desiring to call down fire from heaven upon His enemies. Luke 9:54. O that the pope, then, would, like the apostles, who desired to avenge their Lord, have addressed himself to the Lord, and, with the cardinals, said to Him: `Lord, if it be thy will, we would call upon all, of both sexes, to combine for the destruction of Ladislaus and Gregory and their companions in guilt;' and perhaps the Lord would have answered: `Ye know not what spirit ye are of, when ye seek to ruin so many souls of men by ban, sentence of condemnation, and destruction of life. Why do ye thus set at naught my example, I who forbade my disciples to be so cruelly zealous against those who crucified me, who prayed: "Father! Forgive them, they know not what they do"?' If the pope, then, would subdue his enemies, let him follow the example of Christ, whose vicar he styles himself; let him pray for his enemies and the Church; let him say, `My kingdom is not of this world;' let him show them kindness; let him bless those that curse him; for then will the Lord, according to His promise, give him a power of utterance and wisdom, which they will never be able to gainsay.

72. "But, it is objected in these days, that, `such literal imitation of Christ is confined to the evangelical counsels, designed for those who strive after Christian perfection -- to the monks.' All priests should aim at the highest perfection, because they are representatives of the apostles; and particularly so should the pope, who should exhibit in his conduct the highest degree of perfection, after the example of Christ and of Peter. All priests are bound to the same rule of perfection: certainly the priesthood is the summit of perfection in the militant Church. The precepts, therefore, that forbid contention for earthly things, concern all priests in general. The clergy should literally observe the precepts of the sermon on the mount; as for example, Matt. 5:40.

73. "Ignorance in these matters is no excuse for a priest; because

663

they are commanded as persons ordained to act as presidents, judges, and teachers, to have knowledge of the law, and to explain it to those under them in all its several parts. This ignorance of Holy Scripture, being a guilty ignorance, renders the priests the more condemnable, as it is the mother of all other errors and vices among themselves and the people. Even the laity, if they follow the invitation of the bull, and by their contributions uphold the pope in things at variance with his calling, can not wholly excuse themselves by pleading ignorance, since it is ignorance which they might have avoided. In fact there is no such ignorance: on the contrary, they have knowledge enough, only it is asleep. For when they see priests attending spectacles, putting themselves on a par with the world, meddling in secular business, they directly murmur against them, in accordance with Catholic tradition; though these are trifles when compared with carrying on war and legal suits for earthly ends.

74. "Yet it is not even ignorance, but absolute indifference, which leads many to obey this bull, who say: `What matters it to us, whether the bull is a good or a bad one? We can eat and drink without disturbance if we are left to our peace; others may do what they please.' Then there is a third class who obey from cowardice: men conversant with the Scriptures, who obey in opposition to their own consciences; who think of the bull in one way and speak openly of it in another. They tremble, who should yield to no fear of the world: tremble lest they should lose their temporal goods, the honor of the world, or their lives."

75. The bull had put upon King Ladislaus and his adherents the curse of destruction to the third generation. To this Huss objected that it was "in contradiction to Ezek. 18:20, wherein it calls Ladislaus and his adherents blasphemers and heretics, although this is not manifest from any trial to which he has been subjected; and although his subjects are included, poor weak people, men and women, acting under constraint."

76. It will be remembered that the bull granted "full indulgence" to all who took part in the pope's crusade; and that this indulgence was extended to those who, not going on the crusade, should contribute the amount of money that would have been spent if they had gone. This

664

was cited by Huss. Then he repeated his definition of indulgence, that it "denotes the pardon of sin," and concluded: "On this point he who is blind may judge whether pardon of sin is not bestowed for a consideration in money. Is not this true simony?"

77. Huss next quoted bodily from the bull the following passage:-

"By the apostolical power entrusted to me, I absolve thee from all the sins which, to God and to me thou hast truly confessed, and for which thou hast done penance. If, as thou art not able personally to take part in this enterprise, thou wilt act according to my direction and that of the other commissioners, in furnishing means and helps for this cause, and if thou hast done all according to thy ability, I bestow on thee the most perfect forgiveness of all thy sins, both from the guilt and the punishment of them, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

78. Upon this he said: "It is one and the same thing to bestow the forgiveness of all sins, and to impart the Holy Ghost; both presuppose divine power. And for a sinful man to pretend to impart the Holy Ghost, is too enormous a presumption. Christ alone on whom the heavenly dove descended as a symbol of the Holy Ghost, can bestow the baptism of the Spirit. God grants the pardon of sin to none but those whom He has first rendered fit to receive it. Since then a Christian can render another person fit, no otherwise than by laboring for it by prayer or preaching, or by contributing to it through his own merits, it is evident that the being rendered fit for it by God, must precede forgiveness. It may be said that this is `but a conditional indulgence, given truly to the contrite, and therefore, to the elect.' This is sophistical. In such case there would be no need of indulgence. So it might be said of any one, that `on the supposition that he were of the divine essence, he would be very God."

79. He next noticed another "sophistical pretense: that `the pope's real object is neither more nor less than this, to rule the Church of Christ in peace and tranquillity; but to secure this object, he must resist his adversaries.'" To which Huss answered: "The pope can not deceive God. God knows perfectly on what the pope's heart is intent: his ruling aim, implicit or explicit. If he who should imitate the poverty of Christ, fights for worldly rule, he commits a grievous sin of which every man is an abettor who upholds him in so doing. If the pope really possesses a plenitude of power to bestow indulgence upon

all, Christian charity requires no less of him than that he should show this kindness to all alike."

80. Next Huss attacked the injurious effects produced by these indulgences: "The foolish man of wealth is betrayed into a false hope; the law of God is set at naught; the rude people give themselves up more freely to sin; grievous sins are thought lightly of; and, in general, the people are robbed of their property. Far be it, therefore, from the faithful to have anything to do with such indulgences! As to the common fund of all the good works in the Church, to be distributed by the pope, individuals share in this common fund only in proportion as they are qualified to share in it by their charity. But it is not in the power of the pope: it belongs to God alone, to determine the greater or less degree of charity in individuals; for to do this presupposes infinite power: it depends on the good pleasure of God. Therefore, it is not in the power of the pope to give any one a share in intercession by the community of holy Church; and consequently it is absurd for him to attribute any such power to himself, since the pope himself should, with David, humbly say, `Make me, O God, a companion of all them that fear thee, and of them that keep thy precepts.' In place of such an imparting of spiritual fellowship with all the good in the Church, let the Christian live a righteous life, following Christ his head in all virtue, and especially in humility and patience; and then let him rely on partaking of His merits, so far as God may grant it; and assuredly, if he thus perseveres unto the end, he will attain to the most complete forgiveness of his sins; and, as his life grows conformed to the example of Christ, in the same proportion will he share of His mercy and of the glory of the blessed.

81. "From the proclamations of the commissioners for granting indulgences, it is evident that their sole object is to extort money from the people. Not an instance is to be found in Scripture, of a holy man saying to any one: `I have forgiven thee thy sins; I absolve thee.' Nor are any to be found who have absolved from punishment or guilt for a certain number of days. The theological faculty who say that `hundreds of years ago' the holy fathers instituted indulgences, have taken good care not to express themselves more definitely, and to say: `a thousand years' `two or three hundred,' or any other particular number of centuries ago. Nor have they ventured to name any of these holy

fathers. I will not allow that the sentence of the pope is an ultimate and definite one. Christ is the highest expounder of His own law, as well by His words as by His deeds; and He is ever with His faithful, according to His promise that He will be with them even unto the end of the world.

82. "I dispute the position that when the great mass of the clergy, monks, and the laity have approved of the papal bulls, it would be `foolish to contradict so large a majority.' By the same sort of reasoning, anything might be justified, however wicked and vile, provided only that it were approved by the majority! and anything condemned, however true and good, only if sanctioned by a majority! In Jer. 8:10 it is written that every one, from the least even unto the greatest, was given to covetousness; from the prophet even unto the priest every one dealt falsely. According to this principle,it was folly in the prophet to contradict so vast a multitude! Therefore, it is the custom of wise men, whenever difficulties occur with regard to any truth, laying it open for discussion, to consider, first of all, what the faith of Holy Scripture teaches on the point in question; and, whatever can be so determined, that they hold fast as a matter of faith. But if Holy Scripture decides neither on one side nor the other, they let the subject alone, as one which does not concern them, and cease to dispute whether the truth lies on this side or that."

83. After Huss had finished his discourse, "his friend Jerome came forward and delivered a glowing discourse, which kindled the greatest enthusiasm in the hearts of the youth. In the evening he was escorted home, in triumph, by large bodies of students. The excitement produced by the transactions of this day, spread further; and, as it usually happens when the impulse has been given to some great movement, however pure and unobjectionable at the outset, that it no longer stands in the power of those who began it, to control and keep it within bounds, but violent passions soon enter in and with their fierce burnings, vitiate the purity of the beginning; so it turned out on the present occasion." Under the leadership of one of the king's courtiers, "a mock procession was got up; the papal bulls, suspended from the necks of certain indecent women, were carried in the midst of a vast concourse of people, through the principal quarters of the city. The chariot conveying the

women was surrounded by armed men of the party, vociferating, `To the stake with the letters of a heretic and rogue.' In this way the bulls were finally conveyed to the Pranger, where a pile of fagots had been erected, upon which they were laid and burned.

84. "This was intended only as a parody on the burning of Wicklif's books two years before." Still, Huss plainly expressed his disapproval of such a course on the part of any who professed to be of his party, but whose life did not correspond with the doctrines they supported. Of course he was charged with the chief responsibility of it. But he said: "I hope, by the grace of God, that I am a Christian, departing in no respect from the faith, and that I should prefer to suffer a horrible death rather than to affirm anything contrary to the faith, or to transgress the commandments of our Lord Jesus Christ. And the same I hope also of many of my adherents, though I observe with deep pain that some of them are blameworthy in their morals. I should be sorry if any one of my party should brand his opponent as a heretic, or style him a Mohammedan, or ridicule or attack him in any other way that implied a disregard to the law of love."

85. The king "summoned around him the lords of counsel and the elders of the communities of all the three towns, out of which the great capital had arisen, and directed them to forbid for the future all public insult of the pope, as well as all public resistance of the papal bulls, on pain of death; and to be vigilantly careful that all occasions of excitement on both sides should be avoided. This royal edict was proclaimed by a herald through the whole city, as a warning to all. It is probable, however, that the king, after all, was not so very solicitous that these measures should be rigorously executed in their whole extent; nor is it clear that he had power enough to enforce them. The getter-up of the mock procession against the bull,of which we have just spoken, still retained his relations with the king.

86. "Huss could not be prevented by any power on earth, from fulfilling his vocation as a preacher of the gospel; or from saying to his congregation whatever his duty as a preacher and curer of souls made it incumbent on him to say. He could not keep silent concerning the errors connected with the subject of indulgences: he must point out the great peril to which a reliance on indulgences, as he had already demonstrated

in his public disputation, exposed the souls of the people. As yet Queen Sophia did not cease her attendance at the chapel of Huss; and this new contest could only serve to increase the number of his hearers and their enthusiasm. The large concourse of noblemen, knights, men and women of all ranks and conditions, who assembled around Huss, is described by his opponents; especially the thousand of pious women who were denominated Beguines -- a nickname like the term Pietists in later times; and one which had been applied already to the followers of Militz. Now, when the hearts of the laity, of men who belonged to the class of industrious artisans, among whom Huss had many adherents, were seized by the power of truth in his sermons,and then going into the churches heard the sellers of indulgences preaching up with shameless effrontery the value of their spiritual merchandise, in direct outrage to the gospel truth they had listened to in Bethlehem chapel, nothing else was to be expected, especially in a state of so much excitement among the youth, than that violent scenes should ensue."

87.The king's courtier, the students, and the crowd whom they led, undoubtedly did foolishly, yet, to the utmost of all they did, harmlessly. But now the papal party took a step in which they did most wickedly. "A number of priests, distributed among the several parish churches, were engaged, on the 10th of July [1412], in publishing the papal bulls and inviting the people to purchase indulgences. On this occasion three young men belonging to the class of common artisans, by the name of John, Martin, and Stasek, stepping forward, cried out to one of these preachers, `Thou liest! Master Huss has taught us better than that. We know it is all false.' After a while they were seized, conducted to the council house, and, on the next day, in pursuance of the royal edict, condemned to death. Huss, on being informed of this, felt it to be his duty to interpose and endeavor to save these young men, doomed to fall victims to the gospel truth which they had heard from his lips, and which burned in their hearts.

88. "Accompanied by two thousand students he repaired to the council house. He demanded a hearing for himself and some of his attendants. At length he was permitted to appear before the senate. He declared that he looked upon the fault of those young men as his own, and that he, therefore, much more than they deserved to die. They

promised him that no blood should be shed, and bade him tranquilize the excited feelings of the others. Hoping that they would keep their word, he left the council house together with his followers. But some hours afterwards, when the multitude had, for the most part, dispersed, they ventured to proceed to the execution of the sentence. Resistance being apprehended from the Hussite party, the prisoners were conducted under a large escort of soldiers to the place of death, and, as in the meantime, the concourse of spectators running together in the highest state of excitement, increased every moment, they hurried the execution, and finished it even before arriving at the destined spot. But the adherents of Huss had no intention of resorting to violence. When the headsman, after his work was done, cried out, `Let him who does the like expect to suffer the same fate,' many among the multitude exclaimed at once. `We are all ready to do the like; and to suffer the same.'

89. "This execution could have no other effect than to increase the excitement of feeling and the enthusiasm of the people for the cause of Huss. Those three young men would of course be regarded by the party they belonged to, as martyrs for the truth. It would be impossible to devise anything better calculated to promote any cause, bad or good, than to give it martyrs. Several, and in particular the so-called Beguines of this party, of whom we have spoken above, dipped their handkerchiefs in the blood of the victims, and treasured them up as precious relics. A woman who witnessed the execution, offered white linen to enshroud the dead bodies; and another individual who was present, Master von Jitzin, attached to the party of Huss, hastened with a company of students to convey the bodies to Bethlehem chapel. Borne thither as saints, with chanted hymns and loud songs, they were buried amid great solemnities, under the direction of Huss. This event gave new importance to Bethlehem chapel in the eyes of the party of Huss. They named it the chapel of the Three Saints.

90. "It is certain that Huss took a lively interest in the death of these young men. He thought they might justly be called martyrs for Christian truth, like others whose memory is preserved in the history of the Church. Nor was there anything in this which could justly subject him to the slightest reproach. Certainly by his sermons he contributed to nourish the enthusiasm with which the memory of these witnesses for

670

the truth was cherished among the people. But as public rumor, in such times of commotion, is not wont to discriminate between the different agents, and the different shares taken by each in a transaction, but is inclined to lay the whole upon the shoulders of the one who happens to be the most important individual, so Huss soon came to be pointed out as the person who headed the procession at the burial of the three young men. This is reported by the abbot of Dola. Accordingly the blame of the whole affair is thrown upon Huss at the Council of Constance; but he could deny, with truth, that the procession had been got up at his instigation.

91. "But we may hear what Huss himself says concerning these witnesses of the truth, as his words are recorded in his book De Ecclesia, written at a somewhat later period. After citing the passage in Dan. 11:33 ["And they that understand among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days,"], he remarks: `Experience gives us the right interpretation of these words, -- since persons made learned by the grace of God, simple laymen and priests, many taught by the example of a good life, because they openly resisted the lying word of antichrist, have fallen under the edge of the sword; of which we have an example in those three laymen, John, Martin, and Stasek, who because they contradicted the lying disciples of antichrist, fell victims to the sword.' Then, in allusion to what afterwards transpired in consequence of these commotions, he adds: `But others who gave up their lives for the truth, died the death of martyrs, or were imprisoned, and still have not denied the truth of Christ, priests, and laymen, and even women.'

92. "This first blood having been shed, the persecuting party thought it inexpedient to venture immediately upon any thing further. They perceived the danger of attempting to put a stop to these commotions by force. They had learned by experience to what a height the enthusiasm of the people had already mounted by the death of those three young men. Accordingly the other prisoners, who were now looking for nothing but martyrdom, were set at large. The conflict between the two parties, which had divided the university, since the dispute about the papal bulls relating to indulgence and a crusade, still went on, and grew more violent; the smaller party consisting of those who now

671

declared themselves opposed to all Wicklifite doctrines and in favor of the whole system of papal absolutism, and the larger party, of those who espoused the cause of reform, at the head of whom stood Huss.

93. "The former had on their side all who were attached to the hierarchy; and they supposed they could reckon also on the help of King Wenceslaus, whom, in fact, they had joined on defending the bull, and who had issued the edict against its opponents. Those eight doctors, at whose head stood at that time, Paletz, as dean, believed they were entitled to represent themselves as constituting the theological faculty. They now united in condemning the forty-five articles of Wicklif, although some of them had before this defended those articles; and, hence, Huss calls them the cancrisantes. They declared to the prelates their agreement with them in the earlier resolutions against those articles; and, by a course which to Huss appeared retrograde, though to the advocates of hierarchy it could appear no otherwise than an advance, gave them the highest satisfaction. They next proceeded to condemn the forty-five articles in a solemn session.

94. "To these propositions they added six others," as follows: --

"1. `That he is a heretic who judges otherwise than the Roman Church concerning the sacraments and the spiritual power of the keys.'

"2. `That in these days, to suppose that great antichrist is present and rules, who, according to the faith of the Church, and according to Holy Scripture, and the holy teachers, shall appear at the end of the world, is shown by experience to be a manifest error.'

"3. `To say that the ordinances of the holy fathers, and the praiseworthy customs in the Church, are not to be observed, because they are not contained in Holy Scripture, is an error.'

"4. `That the relics, the bones of the saints, the clothes and robes of the faithful, are not to be reverenced, is an error.'

"5. `That priests can not absolve from sins and forgive sins, when, as ministers of the Church, they bestow and apply the sacraments of penance, but that they only announce that the penitent is absolved, is an error.'

"6. `That the pope may not, where it becomes necessary, call upon the faithful or demand contributions of them for the defense of the Apostolic See, of the Roman Church and city, and for the coercion and subjection of opponents and enemies among Christians, while he bestows on the faithful who loyally come to the rescue, show true penitence, have confessed and are mortified, the full forgiveness of all sins, in an error.'"

672

95. These eight doctors "as the theological faculty" asked the magistracy of Prague to obtain the king's consent that the "teaching and spreading abroad" of the forty-five articles of Wicklif, should be forbidden by a royal decree. They also declared that "certain preachers, on whose account violent insurrections, strifes, and divisions had sprung up among the people, ought to be silenced." They said that "this was the way to restore peace among the people. A cunningly devised means, to be sure, putting an end to all strife, to allow only one party to speak, and enjoin absolute silence on the other. Such an edict was now to be procured from the king. The king granted but a part of the demand. He actually issued an edict forbidding the preaching of those doctrines on penalty of banishment from the land; at the same time, however, he caused the faculty to be told, that they had better employ themselves in refuting those doctrines, than in trying to effect the suppression of them by an edict of prohibition. But an edict of prohibition against the preaching of this or that individual, was a thing he would never consent to."

96. In answer to the king the "theological faculty" said that it was impossible for them to refute those doctrines so long as Huss refused to lay before them in written form what he had to object to against the bulls. Then both Huss and his opponents of the faculty were summoned to appear before the king's privy council; and there Huss first quoted John 18:20 "Jesus answered him [the high priest] I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing." Then he said: "I have spoken openly, and taught in the schools, and in the temple in Bethlehem, where masters, bachelors, students, and multitudes of the common people congregate, and nothing have I spoken in secret, by which I could be seeking to draw men away from the truth. At the same time, I am ready to comply with the demand of these doctors; provided that as I bind myself to suffer at the stake, in case I can be convicted of holding any erroneous doctrine, the eight doctors will also, on their part, collectively bind themselves to suffer in the same way on the same conditions."

97. The doctors requested time for deliberation, and withdrew. Presently they returned and said that one of them would bind himself

673

by this pledge, for all. But this Huss would not accept, because, said he, "they are all combined together against me, and I stand opposed to them without associates; this would not be fair." But to this the doctors would not consent; and the privy council, seeing that there was no hope of agreement, as to arrangements for the

consideration of the disputed points, dismissed them all, after admonition that they should try to make up the matter between themselves -- "an admonition which in their present state of exasperated feelings, would pass unheeded; and which was intended, perhaps, simply to intimate that the council would have nothing more to do with the business."

98. During the time of these occurrences in Prague, the pope had again taken Huss's case out of the hands of the cardinal to whom it had last been committed, and had referred it to yet another cardinal, charging him to "employ the severest measures against the recusant." And now Huss's enemies in Prague, finding their power foiled there, sent away an agent to the pope, to report to the terrible John XXIII that Huss had opposed his bulls and indulgences, and was therefore, "a dangerous man, hostile to the papacy." "The cardinal now pronounced sentence of excommunication on Huss, in the most terrible formulas. If he persisted twenty days in his disobedience to the pope, the ban was to be proclaimed against him in all the churches, on Sundays and festival days, with the ringing of all the bells and the extinguishing of all the tapers, and the same punishment should be extended to all who kept company with him. The interdict should be laid on every place that harbored him. By a second ordinance of the pope, the people of Prague were called upon to seize the person of Huss, and deliver him up to the archbishop of Prague, or to the bishop of Leitomysl, or to condemn and burn him according to the laws. Bethlehem chapel was to be destroyed from its foundation, that the heretics might no longer nestle there."

99. The king now stood still, offering no prohibition to the publication of these ordinances against Huss; at the same time doing nothing to forward their execution. This, however was sufficient for the enemies of Huss. With the concurrence of the senators of the old city of Prague, they "assembled at the consecration festival of the church of Prague, October 2, under Bernhard Chotek, a Bohemian, as their leader, for the

purpose of dispersing the congregation in Bethlehem chapel and getting possession of the person of Huss. But the firm resolution with which they were met by the congregation who gathered around Huss, induced them to abandon their plan. They returned back to the senate house, where it was resolved at least to carry into execution the pope's command to destroy Bethlehem chapel. But when this resolution came to be known, such violent commotions arose, that it was found necessary to abandon this project also."

100. On the part of Huss, his procurator, who had presented his case before the pope, published an argument to demonstrate that everything that had been done in the process against Huss, was invalid. Huss himself "caused to be engraved on the walls of Bethlehem chapel a few words, showing the invalidity of such an excommunication. And finally, when no other earthly remedy was left him, he appealed from the venality of the court of Rome, to the one incorruptible, just and infallible Judge, Jesus Christ. After describing what pains he had taken to obtain justice at the Roman chancery, he says: `But the Roman court, which cares not for the sheep without the wool, would never cease asking for money, therefore have I finally appealed from it to the most just Judge and High Priest over all.' This appeal he published to his congregation from the pulpit of Bethlehem chapel."

101. Yet this appeal was counted by his enemies in Prague, and by the papacy itself, as the highest-handed offense of all. "It is characteristic of the times that this act should be objected to him as a contemptuous trifling with the jurisdiction of the Church, as an insolent act of disobedience to the pope, and an overleaping of the regular order of ecclesiastical tribunals. The abbot of Dola says, in his invective against Huss, `Tell me, then, who accepted your appeal? From whom did you obtain a release from the jurisdiction of the subordinate authorities? You would not say from the laity, and your daughters the Beguines.' " The clergy of Prague gave full obedience to the pope, and published the excommunication and interdict with all the awesome ceremony possible. "From all the pulpits that published the ban against Huss; they strictly observed the interdict; no sacraments were administered; no ecclesiastical burial was permitted. Such a state of things would, as ever, provoke the most violent disturbances among the people."

The archbishop of Prague, worn out with the scheming, contention, and confusion, resigned at the close of the year 1412. His successor was "a zealous advocate of the hierarchy and more inclined to severe measures in support of it than his predecessor" had been.

102. The king now urged Huss that, in the interests of peace, he would leave Prague for a time. Huss consented; but still there was no peace, because the opposition would not have peace. They persisted in constantly stirring up the matter, tracing it always back to "the erroneous doctrines of Wicklif." The king finding that the absence of Huss from Prague had not brought peace, approached the papal party, with the hope of obtaining it. There had already, before Christmas of 1412, assembled in Prague "the college of the ancient nobles of the land, for the purpose of advising about the restoration of peace and the rescue of the good name of the Bohemian people, in foreign lands." It was now decided to assemble " a national synod" for this same purpose, before which the leaders of the two parties should appear. It was first arranged to hold this synod at a small city outside of Prague, so that Huss might be present. But it was finally held in Prague, and Huss could not be present. But he was represented by his procurator, who read Huss's memorial. The theological faculty of the eight doctors was led by Stephen of Paletz and Stanislaus of Znaim, supported by Archbishop John the Iron of Leitomysl.

103. "The theological faculty traced all the schism to the defending of the forty-five erroneous doctrines of Wicklif, and insisted that the condemnation of them should be rigorously observed, and that the decision of the Church of Rome should be submitted to in every point. The Church in their view was the pope as head, and the college of cardinals as the body. Errors they found, especially in the widely spread doctrines about the power of the keys being vested in the Church; errors concerning the hierarchy; concerning the seven sacraments; concerning the veneration of relics: and concerning indulgence. They traced all these errors to one cause: that the party admitted no other authority than the sacred Scriptures, explained in their own sense and in contrariety with the doctrine of the Church and of entire Christendom. They regarded themselves, on the other hand, as the people, who alone were in possession of the truth, inasmuch as they agreed with the doctrine

of the Roman Church and of entire Christendom. They required in all matters in themselves indifferent, among which were to be reckoned the late ordinances of the pope and the process against Huss, unconditional submission to the Roman Church. The disobedience of Huss and his party to the commands of their superiors passed, with them, for the greatest crime. The interdict should be strictly observed; the order forbidding Huss to preach should remain in full force. They maintained that, since the proceedings against Huss had been accepted by the collective body of the clergy of Prague, and they had submitted to them, therefore all should do the same, especially as they related only to things in themselves indifferent, forbade nothing good, and commanded nothing wrong; and it was not the business of the clergy of Prague to judge whether the ban pronounced on John Huss was a just or an unjust one. Severe punishment for publicly holding forth any of those things which they from their particular point of view called heresy, was required by them. Thee proposals for peace, therefore, looked to nothing else than a total suppression of the other party and the triumph of their own.

104."Huss, on the other hand, began by laying down the principle, that the sacred Scriptures alone should pass as a final authority; no obedience could be required to that which was at variance with their teaching. He said, in answer to the challenge of obedience to the interdict and ban: `It were the same as to argue that, because the judgment pronouncing Christ a traitor, an evildoer, and worthy of death, was approved by the collective body of the priests in Jerusalem, therefore that judgment must be acquiesced in.' Looking at the matter from this point of view, he was conscious of no heresy himself, nor could he see any ground for asserting that heresies existed in Bohemia. He demanded, therefore, that they should return back to the earlier compact concluded under Archbishop Zbynek. He declared that he was ready to clear himself from the charge of heresy against any man, or else suffer at the stake; provided his accusers would also bind themselves under the same

conditions. Every man who took it upon himself to accuse another of heresy, should be required to come forward and take this pledge. But if none could be found that were able to do so, then it should be proclaimed anew that heresy did not exist in Bohemia."

677

105. To this committee, when they were assembled in regular session, "one of the most zealous friends of Huss, Master Jacobellus of Meis, submitted a resolution" to the effect that "if the matter now in question relates to the restoration of peace, it should first be settled what peace is meant, whether peace with the world, or with God. Peace with God depends on keeping the divine commandments. The origin of the strife is this: that the attempts of some to bring back that peace of God meet with such unholy and violent resistance on the part of others. Yet the peace of the world without Christian and divine peace, is as unstable as it is worthless. Let the king but give his thoughts to the peace of God first, and the other will follow of itself."

106. Archbishop John the Iron approved the propositions of the papal party, and declared strongly against those of the party of Huss. He advised that all writings in the vulgar language of Bohemia, relating to religious subjects, writings that had contributed in a special manner to the spread of heresy, should be condemned, and the reading of them forbidden. The purpose, therefore, of the assembling of this synod, was not by any means accomplished: peace was no nearer than before; and the assembly broke up.

107 The king made yet another effort. He appointed a committee of four, which he "empowered to take every measure necessary for the restoration of concord and tranquillity. They carried it so far as to oblige the two parties to bind themselves under the penalty of a pecuniary forfeit and of banishment from the country, to abide by the decision of this committee." But they no sooner attempted to formulate articles of agreement, than everything was confusion again. Their very first proposition was to be an expression of "the agreement of the two parties with the faith of the Church on the matter of the holy sacraments and the authority of the Church." But to this Paletz objected that the cause which he and the faculty were defending, was the cause of the Church itself, and not the cause of a party. He said that the opposition was the party, while they were the Church; and that he "never could concede that he and his should be called a mere party." Paletz then laid down his definition of the Church: " By the Church is to be understood the body of cardinals under the pope as their head."

108. Huss's representative yielded to the demand of the committee,

678

that the party of Huss would agree with the Church, and would accept the decisions of the Church, "as every faithful Christian ought to accept and understand them." Paletz and Znaim insisted that this was only a pretext under which to conceal discord and disobedience. For two days the question was debated. The third day Paletz and his company did not appear, and accused the committee of "weakness and partiality." The king now held those who had thus protested against and hindered the compromise, to be "the promoters of schism, being unfaithful to the pledge under which they had engaged to submit to the decision of the committee; and he deprived them of their places, and banished them from the country."

109. All this time Huss himself had peace, quietly spending his time in castles belonging to his friends, where he was ever gladly welcomed. There he spent his time in the study of the Scriptures, and reviewing the great questions that were in dispute. That question of, What is the Church, that had now been brought to a crisis by Paletz before this committee, was taken up and written upon by Huss in this period of retirement. This writing is entitled "Concerning the Church," and is "the most important of all his works," not only in itself, but from the further fact that it is "the one chiefly appealed to in conducting the process against him which brought him to the stake" at the Council of Constance. The principal points of this writing will be given.

110. "We must regard the clerical body as made up of two sects: the clergy of Christ, and those of antichrist. The Christian clergy lean on Christ as their leader, and on his law. The clergy of antichrist lean for the

most part, or wholly on human laws and the laws of antichrist; and yet pretend to be the clergy of Christ and of the Church, so as to seduce the people by a more cunning hypocrisy. And two sects which are so directly opposed, must necessarily be governed by two opposite heads with their corresponding laws.

111. Quoting the words of Christ: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, I am in the midst of them," he says: "There, then, would be a true particular Church; and accordingly, where three or four are assembled, up to the whole number of the elect; and in this sense the term Church is often used in the New Testament. Thus all the righteous who now, in the archbishopric of Prague, live under the reign

679

of Christ, and in particular the elect, are the true Church of Prague. We may well be amazed to see with what effrontery those who are most devoted to the world, who live most worldly and abominable lives, most distant from the walk with Christ, and who are most unfruitful in performing the counsels and commandments of Christ, with what fearless effrontery such persons assert, that they are heads, or eminent members of the Church, which is His bride."

112. "Christ alone is the all-sufficient Head of the Church. The Church needs no other, and therein consists its unity. If a Christian in connection with Christ were the head of the universal Church, we should have to concede, that such a Christian was Christ himself; or that Christ was subordinate to him, and only a member of the Church. Therefore, the apostles never thought of being aught else than servants of that Head, and humble ministers of the Church, His bride; but no one of them ever thought of excepting himself and asserting that he was the head or the bridegroom of the Church. Christ is the all-sufficient Head of the Church; as He proved during three hundred years of the existence of the Church, and still longer, in which time the Church was most prosperous and happy. The law of Christ is the most effectual to decide and determine ecclesiastical affairs, since God Himself has given it for this purpose. Christ himself is the Rock which Peter professed, and on which Christ founded the Church; which, therefore, will come forth triumphant out of all her conflicts.

113. "The pope and the cardinals may be the most eminent portion of the Church in respect of dignity, yet only in case they follow more carefully the pattern of Christ and, laying aside pomp and the ambition of the primacy, serve in a more active and humble manner their mother, the Church. But proceeding in the opposite way, they become the abomination of desolation: a college opposed to the humble college of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. Why should not Christ, who, in the holy supper, grants to believers the privilege of participating in a sacramental and spiritual manner of himself, -- why should not He be more present to the Church, than the pope, who, living at a distance of more than eight hundred miles from Bohemia, can not by himself act directly on the feelings and movements of the faithful in Bohemia, as it is incumbent on the head to do! It would be enough, then, to say that

680

the pope is a representative of Christ; and it would be well for him, if he were a faithful servant, predestined to a participation in the glory of his Head, -- Jesus Christ.

114. "The papacy, by which a visible head was given to the Church, derived its origin from the emperor Constantine; for, until the gift of Constantine, the pope was but a colleague of the other bishops. If the Almighty God could not give other true successors of the apostles than the pope and the cardinals, it would follow that the power of the emperor, a mere man, by whom the pope and the cardinals were instituted, had set limits to the power of God. Since, then, the Almighty God is able to take away the prerogatives of all those emperors, and to bring back His Church once more to the condition in which all the bishops shall be on the same level, as it was before the gift of Constantine, it is evident that he can give others besides the pope and the cardinals, to be true successors of the apostles, so as to serve the Church as the apostles served it.

115. "It is evident that the greatest errors and the greatest divisions have arisen by occasion of this [visible] head of the Church, and that they have gone on multiplying to this day. For, before such a head had been instituted by the emperor, the Church was constantly adding to her virtues; but after the appointing of such a head the evils have continually mounted higher. And there will be no end to all this, until this head, with its body, be brought back to the rule of the apostles. Christ can better govern His Church by His true disciples scattered through all the world, without such monsters of supreme heads. The theological faculty have called the pope `the secure, never-failing, and all-sufficient refuge for his Church.' No created being can hold this place. This language can be applied only to Christ. He alone is the secure, unfailing, and all-sufficient refuge for His Church, to guide and enlighten it. `Without me ye can do nothing.' John 15.5.

116. "It injures not the Church, but benefits it, that Christ is no longer present to it after a visible manner; since He himself says to His disciples, and, therefore, to all their successors (John 16:7): `It is good for you that I go away; for if I went not away, the Comforter would not come to you; but if I go, I will send Him unto you.' It is evident from this, as the truth itself testifies, that it is a salutary thing for

681

the Church militant that Christ should ascend from it to heaven, that so His longer protracted bodily and visible presence on earth might not be prejudicial to her. Therefore, the Church is sufficiently provided for in the invisible guidance, and should need no visible one by which she might be made dependent. Suppose, then, that the pope who walks visibly among men, were as good a teacher as that promised Spirit of Truth, for which one need not to run to Rome or Jerusalem, since he is everywhere present, in that He fills the world [even then such visible head would not be "good" for the Church]. Suppose also that the pope were as secure, unfailing, and all-sufficient a refuge for all the sons of the Church as that Holy Spirit; it would follow that you supposed a fourth person in the divine Trinity.

117. "This Spirit, in the absence of a visible pope, inspired prophets to predict the future bridegroom of the Church, strengthened the apostles to spread the gospel of Christ through all the world, led idolaters to the worship of one only God, and ceases not, even until now, to instruct the bride and all her sons, to make them certain of all things, and guide them in all things that are necessary for salvation. As the apostles and priests of Christ ably conducted the affairs of the Church in all things necessary to salvation, before the office of pope had yet been introduced, so they will do it again if it should happen, it is quite possible it may, that no pope should exist, until the day of judgment; for Christ is able to govern His Church, after the best manner, by His faithful presbyters, without a pope. The cardinals, occupied with worldly business, can not teach and guide, by sermons, in the articles of faith and the precepts of the Lord, the members of the universal Church and of our Lord Jesus Christ. But the poor and lowly priests of Christ, who have put away out of their hearts all ambition, and all ungodliness of the world, being themselves guided by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ,teach and guide the sons of the Church, quickened by the grace of the Holy Spirit, and give them certainty in the articles of faith and the precepts necessary to salvation. The Church has all that it needs in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and ought to require nothing else; nothing else can be a substitute for that."

118. Stanislaus of Znaim had asserted that the Church could not have been left by Christ without a visible head; for it would have

682

been leaving her in a condition of too great embarrassment. To this Huss answered: "Far be it from our hearts to utter a sentiment so heretical as this. For it directly contradicts the declarations of the gospel. How can the Church be embarrassed when she has the Bridegroom with her to the end of the world? when she has a sure consolation and an infallible promise, the promise of Christ's own words, that if we ask the Father anything in His name, He will give it us? And whatever ye ask of the Bridegroom, He will do. From no pope can she obtain this."

119. It is interesting to note that Militz, Matthias of Janow, and Huss all taught, that in the last days of antichrist and the Church, the power of working wonders to be seen with the eyes, would be manifested on the part of antichrist, rather than on the part of Christ. As stated by Huss, this view is as follows: "Antichrist will have the power of deceiving by wonders.2 In the last times, miracles are to be retrenched. She [the Church of Christ] is to go about only in the form of a servant: she is to be tried by patience.3 The lying wonders of the servants of antichrist are to serve for the trial of faith. 4 By its own intrinsic power faith shall preserve itself in the elect, superior to all arts of deception. Prophecy is wrapt in obscurity; the gift of healing removed; the power of long, protracted fasting diminished; the word of doctrine silent;5 miracles are withheld. Not that divine providence utterly suspends these things; but they are not to be seen openly and in great variety, as in earlier times.

120. "All this, however, is so ordered by a wonderful arrangement of divine providence, that God's mercy and justice may be revealed precisely in this way. For while the Church of Christ must, after the withdrawal of her miraculous gifts, appear in grater lowliness, and the righteous, who venerate her on account of the hope of heavenly good, not on account of visible signs, fail of their reward in this earthly life, there will on the other hand, be a more speedy manifestation of the temper of wicked, who, disdaining to follow after the invisible things which the Church promises, cling fast to visible signs.

121. "This servant form of the true Church, in which the power of

the invisible Godlike is all that attracts, as contrasted with the abundance of lying wonders in the worldly Church of antichrist, appearing in visible glory,6 serves as the means of separating the elect from the reprobate. The elect must pass through this trial in order to bring out their genuine character: the reprobate must be deceived according to the just judgment of God. Therefore, in these times, it is rather the servants of antichrist, than the servants of Christ, who will make themselves known by wonders. It is a greater miracle to confess the truth and practice righteousness, than to perform marvelous works to the outward senses. The priest or deacon who loves his enemies, despises riches, esteems as nothing the glory of this world, avoids entangling himself in worldly business, and patiently endures terrible threatenings, even persecutions for the gospel's sake -- such a priest or deacon performs miracles, and has the witness within him that he is a genuine disciple of Christ."

122. The Council of Constance was drawing near; and since the great object of that council was declared to be "the reformation of the Church in its head and members," Huss much desired to be there and to bear witness to the truth. But he knew that it was to risk his life. And now, on his own part, he wrote: "Relying on Christ, that Witness whom no multitude of witnesses can draw away from the truth, whom the Roman court can not terrify, whom no gift can corrupt and no power overcome, I will confess the gospel truth, so long as He himself gives me grace to do so. As to the advice of the faculty, with Christ's help, I would not receive it, if I stood before a stake, which was ready prepared for my execution. And I hope that death will sooner remove me or the two who have deserted the truth (Stephen Paletz and Stanislaus of Znaim), either to heaven or to hell, than I shall be induced to adopt their opinions. For I knew them both as men who, in earlier times, truly confessed the truth as it is in Christ; but, overcome by fear, they have turned to flattering the pope, and to lies.

123. "If I can not make the truth free in all, I will at least not be an enemy to the truth, and will resist to the death all agreement with falsehood. Let the world flow on as the Lord permits it to flow! A good death is better than a bad life. One ought never to sin through fear of

death. To end this life, by God's grace, is to pass out of misery. The more knowledge of truth one gains, the harder he has to work. He who speaks the truth, breaks his own neck. He who fears death, loses the joy of living. Truth triumphs over all; he triumphs who dies for the truth; for no calamity can touch him, if no sin has dominion over him! Blessed are ye when men curse you, says the Truth. This is the foundation on which I build;

this is the food for my spirit, recruiting it with fresh vigor to contend against all adversaries of the truth. As to the disgrace of the king and the realm, of what harm is it, if the king is good, and some at least of the inhabitants of the realm are good? Christ passed through the greatest reproach together with his chosen, to whom he said (John 16:2; Matt. 10:21,22), Ye shall be delivered up by your parents and kinsmen; which is more than to be reproached by Stanislaus or Paletz."

124. The rector of the University of Prague had written to Huss a letter of consolation. To this Huss answered: "Very thankfully do I accept this consolation, while I fasten on those passages of Scripture and rely on this, that if I am a righteous man, nothing can trouble me or induce me to swerve from the truth. And if I live and will live devoutly in Christ, then in the name of Christ must I suffer persecutions; for if it became Christ to suffer and so enter into His glory, it surely becomes us, poor creatures, to take up the cross and so follow Him in His sufferings. And I assure you that persecution would never trouble me, if my sins and the corruption of Christian people did not trouble me. For what harm could it do me to lose the riches of this world, which are but dross? What harm, to lose the favor of the world, which might lead me astray from the way of Christ? What harm to suffer reproach, which, if borne with patience, purifies and transfigures the children of God, so that they shine like the sun, in the kingdom of their Father? And finally, what harm, to have my poor life taken from me, which is death; if he who loses this, lays death aside, and finds the true life? But this is what they can not comprehend, who are blinded by pomp, honor, and avarice, and by whom some have been seduced from the truth through fear, where nothing was to be feared.

125. "As to my body, that I hope, by the Lord Jesus Christ, if mercy bestow the strength on me, to offer up, since I desire not to live longer in

this miserable world, if I can not stir up myself and others, according to the will of God, to repentance. This I wish for you also; and I exhort you, in the Lord Jesus Christ, with all the companions of your board, that you be ready for the trial; for the prelude of antichrist must begin first, and then the contest will go on in right good earnest. And the goose [a play upon his name, Huss, which signifies goose] must flap her wings against the wings of behemoth, and against the tail which always conceals the abominations of antichrist. The Lord will reduce the tail and His prophets to nothing; i, e., the pope and his prophets, the masters, teachers, and jurists, who, under the hypocritical name of holiness, conceal the abominations of the beast. The papacy is the abomination of self-deification in the holy place. Woe then is me if I do not preach of that abomination, if I do not weep over it, write about it."

126. In a letter to his people of Bethlehem chapel, he said: "Pray for those who preach God's truth with grace, and pray also for me, that I may more richly write and preach against antichrist, and that God may lead me in the battle, when I am driven to the greatest strait, that so I may be able to maintain His own truth. For know, that I shrink not from giving up this poor body for God's truth, when I feel assured that there is no want of the preaching of God's word, but that daily the truth of the gospel is more widely spread. But I desire to live for their sakes to whom violence is done, and who need the preaching of God's word that in this way the malice of antichrist may be discovered as a warning to the pious. I preach therefore in other places, ministering to whoever may be found there; since I know that God's will is fulfilled in me, whether it be by a death hung over me by antichrist, or whether I die in sickness. And if I come to Prague, I am certain that my enemies will lie in wait for me and persecute you, they who do not serve God themselves and hinder others from serving him. But let us pray God for them, if peradventure there may be some elect ones among them, that they may be turned to the knowledge of the truth."

127. In the preparations for the Council of Constance the emperor Sigismund was urged by leading churchmen to make the situation in Bohemia one of the particular matters to be considered in the council. To this he consented. And, in order to do this, it was essential that Huss should be at the council. King Wenceslaus of Bohemia was Emperor

Sigismund's brother. The emperor now "invited his brother, King Wenceslaus to send Huss to Constance; and promised to furnish Huss with a safe-conduct." He instructed one of the two knights who were his messengers to the king, to inform Huss that he would make sufficient provision for his being heard before the council; and that if he did not submit to the decision of the council, he would send him back unharmed to Bohemia. This safe-conduct Huss did not receive until after his arrival at Constance. But, when he did receive it, it was so drawn that by it Huss was taken unconditionally under the protection of the emperor and the empire. It said, in so many words: "You shall let John Huss pass, stop, stay, and return, freely, without any hindrance whatever."

128. Before starting for Constance, Huss made one more visit to Prague, August, 1414. There, by a public notice posted on all the church doors, he invited any man, who pleased, to convict him of heresy before the archbishop or before a synod to be convoked by the archbishop. But the synod informed him that they were too busy with other affairs of the kingdom, to be able to attend to his matter. He had them give him a certificate to that effect. He then secured an interview with the archbishop, at the close of which the archbishop "made out for him a declaration, stating that he found him guilty of no heresy; that he had nothing to lay against him, save only that he had remained so long under the ban; and had nothing to advise him save only that he should get the ban removed as soon as possible." In addition to this he procured an investigation of his creed, under the direction of the pope's inquisitor, and the inquisitor also "drew up a testimonial, certifying that he found nothing heretical in him."

129. Before his departure from Prague, Huss wrote to the emperor, thanking him for the trouble which he had taken on his account. He said: "I will humbly trust my life on it, and under the safe-conduct of your protection, shall, with the permission of the Highest, appear at the next council at Constance." He asked the emperor to arrange that he might have an opportunity publicly to confess his faith in the council; "for as I have taught nothing in secret, so I wish to be heard, to be examined, to preach, and, under help of the Divine Spirit, to answer all who are disposed to accuse me, not in secret, but publicly. And I hope

I shall not be afraid to confess the Lord Christ, and, if it must be, to die for His law, which is the most true." The emperor had promised to Huss that "his cause should be conducted to a happy issue;" for which Huss again thanked him for his kind intentions, and said: "Which, too, your majesty will perform to the honor of the King of kings."

130. Several of Huss's friends cautioned him against trusting too much to the emperor's word. One of his congregation, a tailor, in bidding good-by, said: "God be with thee; for hardly, think I, wilt thou get back again unharmed, dearest Master John, and most steadfast in the truth! Not the king of Hungary, but the King of heaven reward thee with all good, for the good and true instruction that I have received from thee." In a letter to his congregation, the day before he left Prague, Oct. 10, 1414, Huss said: "You know, my brethren, that I have now long instructed you in good faith, setting before you God's word: not things remote from the faith in Christ, not false doctrines. For I have always sought, and will ever seek, so long as I live, your welfare. There will be more against me in the council of my enemies, than there were against our Saviour: first of the number of bishops and masters; next, of the princes of this world and Pharisees. But I hope in God, my Almighty Saviour, that on the ground of His own promise and in answer to your fervent prayers, He will bestow on me wisdom, and a skillful tongue, so as to be able to stand up against them. He will, too, bestow on me a spirit to despise persecutions, imprisonment, and death; for we see that Christ himself suffered for the sake of His chosen, giving us an example, that we should suffer all things for Him and for our salvation. He certainly can not perish, who believes on Him and perseveres in His truth.

131. "If my death can glorify His name, then may He hasten it, and give me grace to endure with good courage whatever evil may befall me. But if it is better for me that I should return to you, then let us beseech God for this, that I may come back to you from the council without wrong -- that is, without detriment to His

truth, so that we may from thenceforth be able to come to a purer knowledge of it, to destroy the doctrines of antichrist, and leave behind us a good example for our brethren. Perhaps you will never see me again in Prague; but if God should, in His mercy, bring me back to you again, I will with a more

688

cheerful courage go on in the law of the Lord; but especially when we shall meet together in eternal glory. God is merciful and just, and gives peace to His own here, and beyond death. May He watch over you, who has cleansed us, His sheep, through His own holy and precious blood, which blood is the everlasting pledge of our salvation. And may He grant, that you may be enabled to fulfill His will, and having fulfilled it, attain to peace and eternal glory through our Lord Jesus Christ, with all who abide in His truth."

132. Oct. 11, 1414, Huss departed for Constance, accompanied by the two knights, Wenzel of Duba, and John of Chlum, who were commissioned by the emperor to protect him from all injury. There were in the company also Chlum's secretary, a sincere friend to Huss, and the priest John Cardinalis, delegate from the University of Prague to the council, also a sincere friend of Huss. All along the way, wherever he stopped, he would post up public notices in Bohemian, in Latin, and in German, offering to give to any one who wished to speak to him on the matter of his faith, an account of his religious convictions, and to prove that he was very far from cherishing anything like heresy.

133. In one little town through which they passed, the parish priest, with his assistants, visited him, drank to his health, conversed with him on matters of Christian faith, and avowed that he fully agreed with him, and declared he had always been his friend. At Nuremberg merchants passing through, had left the word that Huss was on his way and might soon be expected in the city. When he arrived, "large bodies of the people came out to meet him." Before he had sat down to dinner, a parish priest sent a letter requesting an interview with him, which he granted. During dinner a note was handed to him, by Wenzel of Duba, stating that in consequence of the notice that had been posted up, "many citizens and masters wished to speak with him." He left the table, met them, and "in the presence of the burgomaster and many citizens, he conversed about his doctrine till nightfall; and his hearers professed to be satisfied with him."

134. "While Huss was disputing with certain persons in the little Suabian town of Bibrach, the noble knight, John of Chlum, took so lively an interest in this disputation, and spoke with so much warmth in favor of the doctrines of Huss, that he was taken for a doctor of theology;

689

hence Huss was wont, afterwards in his letters, playfully to call him the doctor of Bibrach. Well aware of the great ignorance of the people in the things of religion, Huss was accustomed wherever he lodged to leave for his hosts on departing a copy of the Ten Commandments, or even to write them in the meal, as he had written them on the walls of Bethlehem chapel."

135. Nov. 3, 1414, he arrived at Constance. He was there a month before anything was brought up with regard to his case. He wrote to a friend: "I would have found no friends in Constance if my adversaries from Bohemia had not taken pains to make me hated." These adversaries were Michael de Causis, parish priest of Prague; and Paletz, the dean of the faculty of the University; and the pope's legate, who had published the pope's bulls and indulgences in Bohemia. The very next day after his arrival in Constance, De Causis had a notice "posted on all the churches, accusing him as the vilest heretic." The emperor had not yet reached Constance; but Huss's safe-conduct was given to him there, and the emperor sent him word of his satisfaction that he had started on this journey without waiting for the letter of safe-conduct.

136. Now. 28, 1414, toward noon, an embassy came to Huss, from the pope and the cardinals, to inform him that "it was now agreed to give him the hearing which he had so often demanded; and he was invited to follow the embassy into the pope's palace. The knight of Chlum, who at once saw through the motives of the

whole arrangement, rose with indignation and exclaimed: `Such a violation of the honor of the emperor and of the holy Roman Empire is not to be tolerated. The emperor has given his own word to Huss that he shall obtain a free hearing at the council. I myself, who have received it in charge to watch over the safety of Huss, am responsible for that charge, and bound to see that nothing is done against the emperor's word. I can not permit this, and must protest against such a proceeding. The cardinals will do well to consider what they are about, and not suppose that they can be allowed to trifle with the honor of the emperor and of the empire.' "

137. The bishop of Trent replied that they had "no bad intentions whatever. Everything shall be done in peace. We wish only to avoid making a stir." Huss spoke up, saying, "I have not come here to appear before the pope and Roman court; but to appear before the whole

assembled council, to give in their presence an account of my faith. Though they use force against me, still I have a firm hope in God's grace, that they never will succeed in inducing me to fall from the truth." Then Huss followed the embassy. "On the lower floor, he was met by the mistress of the house, who took leave of him in tears. Struck with a presentiment of death, and deeply moved, he bestowed on her his blessing. Mounting on horseback he proceeded with the embassy and the knight of Chlum to the court.

138. "The prelates, fearing a movement on the part of the people, had taken care that the city magistrates, who were completely subservient to the council, should place soldiers in the neighboring streets, so that if necessary, the step might be carried through by force. When Huss appeared before the chancery, the president of the college of cardinals said: `It is reported of you that you publicly teach many and grievous heresies, and have disseminated them in all Bohemia. This thing can not be allowed to go on so any longer; hence you have been sent for, with a view to learn from yourself how the matter stands.' Huss replied: `Such is my mind. I would prefer to die rather than to teach one heresy, not to say many. And, the very reason for which I have come here is to make myself answerable to the council; and to recant if I can be convicted before it of holding any error.' The cardinals expressed their satisfaction at the temper of mind here manifested by Huss. They then adjourned, leaving Huss and Chlum under the surveillance of the men-at-arms.

139. "About four o'clock in the afternoon they again assembled in chancery, and several Bohemians were also in attendance, both enemies and friends of Huss." His enemies, especially Paletz and De Causis, did their utmost to prevent Huss from being set at liberty; and they succeeded. Then, when they were sure they had gained their point, they "burst into a loud murmur of applause, crying out insultingly to Huss: `Now we have you, nor shall you escape till you have paid the uttermost farthing!' " As evening drew on the intimation was conveyed to the knight of Chlum that he might retire to his lodgings: Huss must remain. "Filled with indignation, " Chlum made his way to the pope, "who happened to be still present in the assembly. He overwhelmed him with reproaches: that he had dared thus to trifle with the word of the

emperor: that he had thus deceived him." He held up to the pope "the inconsistency between his conduct and his promises." For the pope had assured him and another Bohemian, his uncle, Henry of Latzenbock, that Huss should be safe. The pope replied that he had nothing to do with the imprisonment of Huss. He said the cardinals were responsible for the whole transaction; and "You know very well the terms on which I stand with them." "The same night Huss was conducted to the house of a canonical priest in Constance, where he remained eight days under the surveillance of an armed guard. On the sixth of December he was conveyed to a Dominican cloister on the Rhine, and thrown into a narrow dungeon filled with pestiferous effluvia from a neighboring sink.

140. "The knight of Chlum did not cease to complain of the violation done to the emperor's safe conduct. He immediately reported the whole proceeding to the emperor. The latter expressed his indignation at it, demanded that Huss should be set free, and threatened to break into the prison by force, if the doors were not voluntarily thrown open. December 24, Chlum, in the name of the emperor, publicly posted up a certificate,

declaring in the most emphatic language that the pope had been false to his promise, that he had presumed to insult the authority of the emperor and the empire, by paying no regard whatever to the emperor's demands. He declared that when the emperor himself should come to Constance, which might be the next day, it would be seen what his indignation was at learning of such a violation of his majesty." But when the emperor arrived, a deputation of the council appeared before him, Jan. 1, 1415, and told him that "he ought not to interfere in transactions relative to matters of faith; and that the council must have its full liberty in the investigation of heresies." And the emperor promised the council, by this deputation, that he would "allow them all liberty and never interpose his authority in these matters."

141. Huss was now held a prisoner for seven months -- Dec. 6, 1414, to July 6, 1415. The horrible condition of the dungeon into which he was first cast, soon caused him a severe sickness. Fearing that he might die, the pope sent to him "his own body physician; for it was not desired that he should die a natural death." By the earnest intercession of his friends, Huss was removed from the filthy dungeon into which he was at first cast, to better and more airy rooms in the same building. He

recovered from his first attack of sickness; but in about two months was again overtaken. But his keepers were for the most part very kind to him, and would take him out occasionally to walk about a little and enjoy pure air.

142. When, March 21, 1415, Pope John XXIII fled from Constance, all his officers and servants followed him. Among these were Huss's keepers. Fearing that an attempt might be made to carry him off with the pope, Huss succeeded in getting a communication to the knight of Chlum, in which he requested the knight to ask the emperor either to appoint him new keepers, or set him at liberty. But the cardinals had their spies everywhere, and detected this, and prevented it by having the emperor deliver Huss "to the surveillance of the bishop of Constance, who at four o'clock the next morning had him removed in chains to the castle of Gottleben. In the castle of Gottleben the situation of Huss was changed much for the worse. His prison was a tower. In the daytime he was chained, yet so as to be able to move about: at night on his bed, he was chained by the hand to a post. Here he no longer experienced that mild treatment from his keepers, which mitigated the severity of his former imprisonment. His friends were not allowed to visit him. New attacks of disease, violent headaches, hemorrhages, colic, followed in consequence of his severe confinement."

143. Yet before the end of March, to his Bohemian friends in Constance he wrote: "May the God of Mercy keep and confirm you in his grace, and give you constancy in Constance; for if we are constant, we shall witness God's protection over us. Now for the first time I learn rightly to understand the psalter, rightly to pray, and rightly to represent to myself the sufferings of Christ and of the martyrs. For Isaiah says (28:19), `When brought into straits, we learn to hear' -- ; or, What does he know who has never struggled with temptation? Rejoice, all of you who are together in the Lord; greet one another, and seasonably prepare to partake worthily, before the Passover [the coming Easter], of the Lord's body; of which privilege so far as regards the sacramental participation, I am for the present deprived; and so shall continue to be as long as it is God's will. Nor ought I to wonder at this when the apostles of Christ and many other saints, in prisons and deserts, have in like manner been deprived of the same. I am well, as I hope in

Jesus Christ, and shall find myself still better after death, if I keep the commandments of God to the end."

144. In the month of June he was taken out of his oppressive dungeon at Gottleben, and was taken to Constance, and there imprisoned in a Franciscan convent. And the dungeon which he had occupied at Gottleben, was immediately filled with Pope John XXIII, who had been taken a prisoner, to be kept by the council. It is remarkable that the identical men assembled in council should deal with these two men John, Huss and John XXIII, who were so entirely at opposites in both character and position -- seeking to reform them both: and should in a measure treat them exactly alike, so far as capture, imprisonment, condemnation, and deposition:

though of course treating Huss far the worse. Than this what could possibly more clearly demonstrate their absolute deadness to all spiritual sense and moral distinctions!.

145. During this time which we have recorded, in which Huss was lying in chains, and sick, in doleful dungeons, he was also being put through the courses of theological torture by his persecutors of the council. First the pope appointed a committee of three, to examine him upon the charges and complaints entered by Paletz and De Causis. In the document appointing this committee, the pope, John XXIII (before his flight) named Huss as "a dangerous heretic, who was spreading aboard mischievous errors and had seduced many';" and charged the committee to report to the council the result of their examination, in order that the council might pass "a definitive sentence on Huss in conformity thereto." When brought before this committee, Huss first demanded a solicitor; but this was refused,because that "to a heretic no such privilege could be granted." Then said Huss: "Well, then, let the Lord Jesus be my advocate, who also will soon be your judge." Touching this action of the committee, a Parisian deputy remarked that "if Huss had been allowed an advocate [that is, one who would have held them strictly to technical canonical procedure] they would never have been able to convict him of heresy."

146. Thus, without any assistance, in fetters, and under his severe sufferings, he was obliged to make his answers to the charges laid before the committee. He soon discovered that his enemies were using against him not only his public writings, and their own open charges, but intercepted

694

letters, both of his own and of his friends; and even simple expressions used in familiar conversation with personal friends, away back before he was ever charged with any wrong: these past-time friends, when the test came, having deserted him, and being now engaged in distorting into heresy these innocent expressions. His old familiar friend Paletz was now his chief accuser and most bitter enemy. "He never spoke to Huss in the presence of the commission, but in the harshest language, -- language calculated to arouse prejudice and suspicion, -- such as that `since the time of Christ more dangerous heretics than Wicklif and Huss have not appeared.' `All that ever attended his preaching are affected with the disposition to deny the doctrine of transubstantiation.' " He even "strenuously urged that all the adherents of Huss should be cited and forced to an abjuration of heresy." But all that Huss would say of all this, was: "May God Almighty pardon him. Never in my whole life did I receive from any man harsher words of comfort than from Paletz. How, beyond all other wrong, it wounds the heart to see love converted into hate in one who has the wrong all on his own side!"

147. The instruction of the pope to the committee was that the council should give a definitive sentence when the committee should report. But Huss's enemies were determined if possible that he should have no word before the council. The committee asked him to submit to the decision of twelve or thirteen masters who might be chosen; but he refused, and presented a written demand that he be allowed to present before the whole council an account of his faith. The committee then proceeded with their examination. Even the heaviest charges that they could lay against him were that he had hindered the effect of the crusade bull of the pope; that he had continued for so long a time under the ban, and still persisted in saying mass; and that he had appealed from the pope to Christ. When they read out before him this, to their mind, the most weighty of all the charges, -- that he had appealed from the pope to Christ, -- Huss reported afterward: "With joy and a smile on my lips, I acknowledged it to be mine."

148. Afterward Huss was removed from the castle of Gottleben to the Franciscan convent, in a hall of the convent the council assembled June 5, 1415, "to investigate his affair, and to hear the man himself

695

according as it had been promised him." But, before Huss was brought in, his enemies read the charges against him, which had been approved by the committee; and the council was actually "on the point of making a beginning with the condemnation of these articles. But Peter of Mladenowic, secretary to the knight of Chlum, a man enthusiastically devoted to Huss, hastened to give information of it to the knight, his master, and to Wenzel

of Duba. They speedily reported the case to the emperor, who at once sent the palgrave Louis and the burgrave Frederick of Nuremberg, to the council, directing them to tell the prelates, that before the appearance of Huss they should not take a step in his affair; and that they should in the first place lay all the erroneous articles which they found reason to charge against him, before the emperor, who would take pains to have them carefully and minutely examined by pious and learned men."

149. The two knights presented to the council copies of the writings of Huss, from which the articles upon which they were accusing him, had been taken. When Huss was brought in, they asked him whether these writings were his. Huss answered: "Yes, and I am ready to retract every expression in them in which it can be shown that I am in error." A single article was then read. But Huss began to defend it, quoting many passages of Scripture, and citing the doctrine of the Church, they exclaimed "that all this was nothing to the point"! Then, when Huss began again to speak, "he was interrupted, and not allowed to utter a syllable. A savage outcry arose against him on all sides. At length when Huss saw that it was of no use, that he could not be heard, he determined to remain silent. This silence was now interpreted as a confession that he was convicted. Finally, it grew to be too bad: the moderate men in the assembly could stand it no longer; and as it was impossible to restore order, it was thought best to dissolve the assembly, the 7th of June having been fixed upon as the time when Huss should have his second hearing."

150. There were two more hearings which, in their manner of procedure, were but intensified repetitions of what has already been related. The emperor was present at both; but even his presence could not keep the persecutors to order. Thirty formal charges were drawn up against Huss. But it was unimportant whether there were thirty or none at all.

They were determined from the beginning to condemn him, and whatever he might have said originally, or might say now, in explanation or defense, could not affect the result one way or the other. The plainest Christian truths most solemnly stated, were received with "shouts and laughter of derision." For instance, Huss's answer to the charge that he had appealed from the pope to Christ was: "This I openly maintain, before you all, that there is not a more just nor a more effectual appeal than the appeal to Christ. For, appeal means, according to law, nothing but this: in a case of oppression, from an inferior judge to invoke the aid of a higher one. And now what higher judge is there than Christ? Who can get at the truth of a cause in a more righteous and truthful manner than he? For he can not be deceived, neither can he err. Who can more easily afford help to the poor and oppressed?" But "this was language which the council could not understand; and it was received with laughter and scorn."

151. The emperor himself took part in the proceedings against Huss. He demanded that Huss should submit to the authority of the council, because so many "credible witnesses" had testified against him. The emperor told him that if he would submit to the council for his own sake, and for the emperor's brother, the king of Bohemia, and the whole Bohemian empire, "he should be dealt with by the council in a lenient manner, and let off with slight penance and satisfaction. But, if he would not submit to the authority of the council, then the leaders of the council would know what they had to do with him." And, as for himself, the emperor declared that he would "sooner prepare the fagots for him with his own hands, than suffer him to go on any longer with the same obstinacy as before." And, when the final hearing was ended, and Huss had been removed from the council, the emperor "made a proposition to the council declaring to them that Huss, as had been already clearly proved by many witnesses, had taught so many pernicious heresies, that he deserved, in his judgment, and for some of them singly, to perish at the stake;" and even though Huss should recant, "he never should be allowed to preach or to teach again, nor permitted to return to Bohemia."

152. Next, persistent efforts were made to get Huss to recant. Forms of recantation were drawn up for him to accept and to publicly make.

And they even drew up a sentence, defining what should be done with him if he should recant. It ran as follows: --

"Since it is evident on the ground of certain conjectures and outward signs, that Huss repents of the sins he has committed, and is disposed to return with upright heart to the truth of the Church, therefore the council grants with pleasure, that he may abjure and recant his heresies, and the heresies of Wicklif, as he voluntarily offers to do, and as he himself begs the council to release him from the ban which had been pronounced on him; so he is hereby released. But inasmuch as many disturbances and much scandal among the people have arisen from these heresies, and inasmuch as great danger has accrued to the Church by reason of his contempt of the power of the keys, therefore the council decrees, that he must be deposed from the priestly office, and from all other offices. The care of seeing to the execution of this decree is assigned to several bishops at the council, and Huss is condemned to imprisonment during life in some place appointed for that purpose."

153. But John Huss had not lived for more than three years in the presence of the stake, now to recant; nor had he lived with Christ all these years, now to deny Him. Accordingly the decision of the council was that he should be degraded from the priesthood and delivered over to the secular arm. By the same council three hundred propositions extracted from the writings of Wicklif were likewise condemned, and sixty articles extracted from Wicklif's works were added to the thirty from Huss's works; all of which entered into the condemnation of Huss. Thus Wicklif's work went steadily forward.

154. Through all these troubles and persecutions of Huss the two noble knights -- Chlum,and Wenzel of Duba -- stood by him, comforted him, and sustained him, especially the knight of Chlum. At one point in the trial it was charged against Huss by one of the council, in language spoken loudly, expressly that the emperor might hear: "When you were first brought before us I heard you say that if you had not proposed of your own accord to come to Constance, neither the emperor nor the king of Bohemia could have compelled you to come." Huss answered, giving his true language, thus: "My language was this: If I had not been disposed to come here of my own accord, so many of the knights in Bohemia were my friends, that I might have easily remained at home in some safe place of concealment, so that I never could have been forced to come by the will of those two princes."

155. To this "Cardinal d'Ailly exclaimed, in an angry tone: `Mark the impudence of the man!'" And when this spirit of anger was plainly spreading, "the noble knight of Chlum spoke out in confirmation of what Huss had said: `Compared with other knights, I have but little power in Bohemia; yet I could protect him, for a whole year, against all the power of these two sovereigns. How much more could be done by others, who are more powerful than I, and hold the stronger castles!'" And, when Huss's last hearing was over, and "when Huss, worn down and completely exhausted, was led back to his prison, the noble-hearted knight of Chlum hastened to visit him, under the full influence of the impression made by his appearance and defense of himself, and, seizing his hand, pressed it in a way which must have told more than words. Huss himself describes the effect which this testimony of friendship, made at such a time, produced on his mind: `O, what joy did I feel, from the pressure of my lord John's hand, which he was not ashamed to give me, the wretched outcast heretic, in my chains!'"

156. But more closely and more firmly than even the noble-hearted Knight John of Chlum, the Lord Jesus stood by him. One night in January, 1415, Huss dreamed that certain persons had resolved to destroy in the night all the pictures of Christ that were painted on the walls of Bethlehem chapel; and that, indeed, they did destroy them. But the next day he beheld many painters who were drawing more pictures, and more beautiful ones, than were there before, upon which Huss gazed in rapture. And when the painters had finished, they turned to the company of people who were looking on, and said: "Now let the bishops and priests come and destroy these pictures!" And a great multitude of people in Bethlehem joyed over it; and Huss rejoiced with them. And, in the midst of the laughter and the joy, he awoke.

157. Now there were no real pictures of Christ painted on the walls of Bethlehem chapel: there were only the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and precious verses of Scripture inscribed there. Huss wrote to the knight of Chlum, told him of his dream, and asked him to tell him what he thought it meant. The knight said: "The pictures of Christ painted on the wall of Bethlehem chapel is the life of Christ which we are to imitate: the immovable words of Holy Scripture, which are there inscribed, and His words which we are to follow. The enemies

of the cross of Christ seek to destroy both, in the night, because the Sun of Righteousness has gone down to them by reason of their wicked lives; and they seek to bring both into oblivion among men. But at the morning dawn, when the Sun of Righteousness arises, the preachers restore both after a more glorious manner, proclaiming from the housetops that which has been said in the ear and is nearly forgotten. And from all this will proceed great joy to Christendom. And though the `goose' is now brought down by sickness, and may next be laid a sacrifice on the altar, yet will she hereafter, awaking as it were from the sleep of this life, with Him who dwells in heaven, laugh and hold them in derision, who are the destroyers at once of Christ's image and of Scripture. Nay, even in this present life, she will, with God's help, still restore those pictures and those words of Scripture to the flock and her friends, with glowing zeal."

158. Huss replied to the knight that he agreed with his explanation, and said: "I hope that the life of Christ which, by my preaching in Bethlehem, has been transcribed upon the hearts of men, and which they meant to destroy there, first by forbidding preaching in the chapels and in Bethlehem, next by tearing down Bethlehem itself -- that this life of Christ will be better transcribed by a greater number of better preachers than I am, to the joy of the people who love the life of Christ over which I shall, as the doctor of Bibrach says, rejoice when I awake, that is, rise from the dead." And this blessed work of renewing the image of Christ in men, he continued unto the end. For all the time that he was in the prisons, he continued to write and to distribute short tracts on the Ten Commandments, on the Lord's Prayer, on the knowledge and love of God, and other kindred subjects.

159. Further, in his deep sufferings in the prison, and when moved in chains from prison to prison, Christ was with him all the time. In his dream he saw beforehand the flight of the pope; and in his dream also the knight of Chlum said to him: "The pope will also return." Also, he says, "I dreamt of the imprisonment of Jerome, though not literally according to the fact [yet this also was strictly according to the fact, though the dream was before the fact; for Jerome was shortly afterwards imprisoned]. All the different prisons to which I have been conveyed have been represented beforehand to me in my dreams. There

have often appeared to me serpents, with heads also on their tails; but they have never been able to bite me. I do not write this because I believe myself a prophet or wish to exalt myself; but to let you know that I have had temptations both of body and soul, and the greatest fear lest I might transgress the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ."

160. Then came the day, July 6, 1415, when the noble soul of John Huss was to be poured out in faithful witness for Christ. He was brought before the council. There he was placed upon a high stool, that all might see him. The bishop of Lodi preached a sermon from the words of Rom. 6:6: "That the body of sin might be destroyed," and closed with looking at the emperor, and pointing to Huss, with the exclamation: "Destroy this obstinate heretic!" The charge most emphasized against him was his appeal from the pope to Christ. But when this was read out in the council and unanimously condemned as heretical, Huss spoke: " O Christ! Whose word is, by this council, publicly condemned, I appeal to Thee anew. Thou who,when Thou was ill-treated by Thine enemies, didst appeal to Thy Father; Thy cause thou didst commit to that most righteous Judge; that we, following Thy example, may when oppressed by injustice, take refuge in Thee! When, after the long ceremony, the sentence was read to him, he fell upon his knees and prayed: "Lord Jesus! Forgive my enemies; as Thou

knowest that I have been falsely accused by them, and that they have used against me false testimony and calumnies. Forgive them for the sake of Thy great mercy!" And even these words were received with laughter by many of the council.

161. Next he was caused to stand up and was clad with the priestly vestments; and the cup of the eucharist was put into his hand. "Through the whole of the transaction, the example of Christ stood distinctly before Huss, whose steps he was conscious of following in all the insults he had to endure. In this sense he interpreted many parts of the proceeding." Having been fully robed in the priestly garments, he was called upon by the bishops to recant. "for his honor and his soul's salvation." Then, with tears in his eyes and in his voice, he spoke to the assembly: "These worshipful bishops require it of me to confess before you all that I have erred. If this were of such a nature that it could be done so as to involve only the disgrace of a single individual,

they would more easily persuade me to it. But I now stand before the eyes of my God, without dishonoring whom, as well as meeting the condemnation of my own conscience, I can not do this. For I know that I have never taught anything of the kind that I have been falsely accused of teaching; but have always thought, written, and taught the contrary. With what face could I look to heaven, with what brow could I meet those who have heard my teaching, of whom the number is great, if by my fault it should happen that what hitherto they were most certainly assured of through me,should be made uncertain to them? Should I by my example destroy the peace of so many souls whom I have made familiar with the most settled testimonies of Scripture, and with the purest doctrines of the gospel, and thereby fortified against all the assaults of Satan? Far be it from me that I should value this my mortal body more highly than the salvation of those souls."

162. Next, the cup was taken from his hand, with the words: "We take from thee condemned Judas the cup of salvation." But Huss said: "But I trust in God, my Father, the Almighty, and my Lord Jesus Christ, for whose name I bear this, that He will not take from me the cup of His salvation." A dispute arose among his persecutors "about the mode of removing his tonsure." Speaking to the emperor, Huss said: "I am surprised when all are alike cruel, they can not agree among themselves about the mode of cruelty." A cap painted all over with devils, and upon it the inscription "Arch-heretic," was then placed on his head. And he said: "My Lord Jesus Christ wore, on my account, a crown of thorns; why should I not be willing, for His sake to wear this easier though shameful badge? I will do it, and gladly." Then said the bishops: "Now we give over thy soul to the devil!" Raising his eyes to heaven, Huss said. "But I commend into Thy hands, Jesus Christ, my soul, by Thee redeemed."

163. When he came to the place of execution, he kneeled and prayed, in the words of the Psalms, particularly the fifty-first, and thirty-first. He was heard often to repeat the words: "Into thy hands, Lord, I commit my spirit." Laymen standing by were moved to remark: "What he may have done before, we know not; but now we see and hear him pray and speak most devoutly." When called upon to take his place at the stake, he said: "Lord Jesus Christ! Stand by me, that by Thy help I

may be enabled, with a strong and steadfast soul, to endure this cruel and shameful death, to which I have been condemned on account of the preaching of the holy gospel and Thy word."

164. Then he was placed upon the faggots, and bound fast to the stake with a chain; to which he said: " I willingly wear these chains for Christ's sake, who wore still more grievous ones." Before the fire was lighted, the marshal of the empire rode up and called upon him, once more, to recant. He answered: "What error should I recant, when I am conscious of no error? For I know that what has been falsely brought against me, I never thought, much less have I ever preached. But the chief aim of my preaching was to teach men repentance and the forgiveness of sins according to the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ and the expositions of the holy fathers. Therefore am I prepared to die with a joyful soul." Then the fire was lighted, and Huss began in a clear voice to

sing: "Jesus, Son of the living God, have mercy upon me." And, thus singing, his voice went out with his life, in the flames, in the death that is precious in the sight of the Lord. His ashes were cast into the Rhine.

165. Early in the year 1415, Jerome of Prague heard that "the imprisonment of Huss had taken place. He could not bear to leave his friend and fellow combatant alone in this crisis." And he hastened to Constance. Shortly after the students' escapade in burning the pope's bull in Prague, Jerome had left Prague, and ever since had been traveling far through Europe, laboring "in countries the most diverse, to promote the cause of reform, and had displayed far greater zeal than the more practical Huss in diffusing the doctrines of Wicklif. In Bohemia and Moravia, he had extended his influence among all classes, at the courts of princes, in cathedral churches, in convents, even among the Carthusians, among people of both sexes, and among students at the universities." He spoke with such exalted eloquence that Gerson, the chancellor of the University of Paris, captiously charged him with wanting to emulate the angels in eloquence. He produced "great commotions at several universities by his zeal in defending the doctrines of Wicklif, for example in Paris and Heidelberg." The chancellor of the University of Paris had prepared to arrest him and bring him to trial there. But he learned of it in time to make his escape. Next, he went to

Vienna, and there excited great interest. There he was arrested by the magistrates, but was set at liberty. He visited the king of Poland, and the duke of Lithuania. He preached in Cracow with such power that the bishop of Cracow declared that "such violent commotions had never been produced there by any individual since the memory of man."

166. Early in the year 1415 Jerome returned to Prague; and there learned that Huss was in prison in Constance. April 4, 1415, Jerome arrived in Constance secretly. He soon found that he could not be heard, nor be safe there if his presence should be known; and he left the city and went to Ueberlingen, four miles from Constance. From there he wrote to the emperor and the cardinals, offering publicly to answer before any one to every charge of heresy that might be brought against him, if a safe conduct were granted him. But no safe conduct was given; and Huss's experience with the emperor had demonstrated that the emperor Sigismund's safe conduct was nothing of the kind.

167. He then caused to be fastened to the gate of the emperor's palace on the doors of the principal churches, and on the residences of the cardinals and other eminent prelates, a notice in Bohemian, Latin, and German, stating that he was ready to defend himself in public before the council, against every accusation made against his faith; provided only that he were assured full liberty and security to come to Constance and leave it again. But neither could this be had. Then he procured from the Bohemian knights resident in Constance a certificate, sealed with their seals, to the effect that he could not obtain a hearing from the council; and, with this to serve as a vindication of himself to his friends, he started to return to Bohemia.

168. But still he was in doubt as to whether it was not his duty to go boldly to Constance rather than to return to Bohemia. Because of this, he traveled very slowly. And, his traveling so slowly, gave to his enemies a chance to waylay him and to capture him. He was conducted in chains to the council, May 23; and "appeared before a public convocation of the same body in the Franciscan convent." In the council were "a number of eminent men from the Universities of Paris, Heidelberg, and Cologne." who remembered him and his preaching in those places; and now were glad that they should be able to "triumph over the man who had once given them so much alarm." Against all that

was objected to him, and the many demands that he should recant, he replied that he held himself ready to recant as soon as he was taught anything better. But soon, "amid the noisy shouts was heard the cry,`Jerome must be burnt!' He answered with coolness, `Well, if you wish my death, let it come, in God's name!'"

169. After the prelates had retired from the assembly, Peter of Mladenowic, secretary to John of Chlum, came from Huss, to the window of Jerome's room, with a message exhorting him to "stand fast by the truth, and not shrink even from dying for that truth for which he had so stoutly spoken." Jerome replied: "I hope with the grace of God to remain faithful to the truth even unto death. We have talked a good deal about death: now we are to learn what it is." In the night he was delivered to a guard, who took him to a tower "where he was bound to a stake, by his hands, feet, and neck, so that he could scarcely move his head." There he was held two days, with nothing to eat but bread and water. His keepers conveyed to Peter of Mladenowic information of Jerome's situation; and Peter brought to him sufficient food. Jerome's hard treatment caused a violent attack of sickness. The knights of Bohemia and Moravia addressed the council in a letter, September 2, expressing their indignation at the death of Huss and the imprisonment of Jerome by the council.

170. The council had spent much time and effort to secure from Huss a recantation. This same thing they persistently followed up with Jerome. At last he accepted one of the forms of recantation which they presented; and by this their true disposition was revealed. For, by this acceptance of the recantation Jerome was entitled to his liberty. This was acknowledged by the commission to whom was committed the trial of his case; and the commission insisted on his liberation. Yet Paletz and De Causis led such a determined opposition that the commission resigned, and a new commission was appointed, by which Jerome was subjected to a new accusation and trial. But, after Jerome had endured for a time the inquisition of this new committee, he refused to submit any further, and demanded a public trial. This was allowed him; and May 23, 1416, he was brought before the whole council, where new articles of complaint were laid against him; upon which he obtained permission to answer there in the presence of the council. The council

demanded that he should take an oath to speak the truth; but he refused, because he refused to "acknowledge the competency of the new tribunal, or the regularity of the new examination," after having accepted the recantation which they themselves had dictated.

171. "On the twenty-third and the twenty-sixth of May he defended himself, from seven o'clock in the morning till one in the afternoon, against all accusations, one by one, unraveled in a connected discourse all the events in Prague in which he had taken a part, with such presence of mind, such eloquence, so much wit, as to excite universal admiration. Then, finally, he was allowed to speak of himself; and it was expected that he would only complain of the injustice of the new examination, appealing to the fact that he had done all that could be required of him, and close with demanding that the acquittal which had been put off so long should now be granted him. He actually commenced with something of this sort, describing the injustice of renewing the process against him, complaining of his new judges, and protesting against the competency of this new tribunal.

172. "But soon his discourse took a new turn altogether. In a dazzling strain of eloquence he brought up, one after another, those men who among pagans, Jews, and Christians, had fallen victims to false accusations, and particularly to priestly hatred. He spoke of Socrates, Seneca, Boethius, John the Baptist, Stephen, and, last of all, John Huss, enthusiastically dilating on the latter, as a man known to him only by his zeal for piety and truth; one who had drawn down upon himself the persecutions of a worldly-minded clergy only by the faithfulness with which he rebuked their corruption. He ended by declaring that there was no one of his sins he more painfully rued, than that of having suffered himself to be moved by the fear of death to acquiesce in the condemnation of that saintly confessor of the truth. He took back all he had said concerning Wicklif and Huss. He declared that he assuredly should not be the last of those who would fall victims to the cunning malignity of bad priests; and turning round to his judges he exclaimed: `I trust in God, my Creator, that one day, after this life, you shall see Jerome preceding you and summoning you all to judgment, and then you must render your account to God and to me, if you have proceeded against me wrongfully.'

173. "This last declaration of Jerome was his death warrant. But partly by his eloquence and presence of mind, contrasted with his emaciated looks, in which were depicted the marks of his long and severe imprisonment, he had excited so deep a sympathy in many, that they were anxious to save him; and partly, they were loath to excite to a still higher degree by this new martyrdom, the angry feelings of the Bohemians. A respite of forty days was therefore given him for reflection. Let us hear how an eyewitness, a man quite destitute of susceptibility to religious impressions, one of the restorers of ancient literature, Poggio, of Florence, the chosen orator of the council of Constance, expresses himself when speaking of the impression which this discourse of Jerome could not fail to make on all that heard it. He says, in a letter to his friend Aretino, or Leonard Bruno, of Merezzo: `He had for three hundred and forty days been pining away in a dark tower full of offensive effluvia. He had himself complained of the harsh severity of such confinement, saying that he, as became a steadfast man, did not murmur at being forced to endure such unworthy treatment, but that he could not help being astonished at the cruelty of men towards him. It was a place where he could not even see, much less read or write. I pass over the mental anguish which must have daily tortured him, and which was enough to destroy the power of memory itself within him. He cited so many learned and wise men as witnesses in behalf of his opinions, so many teachers of the Church, that they would have sufficed, if he had passed the whole of this time in all quietness in the study of wisdom. His voice was pleasant, clear, full-sounding, accompanied with a certain dignity; his gestures adapted to excite indignation or pity, which, however, he neither asked for, nor sought to obtain. He stood up fearlessly, undaunted, not merely contemning death, but even demanding it, so that one might look upon him as a second Cato. O, what a man! a man worthy of everlasting remembrance!'"

174. May 30, 1516, Jerome was formally condemned by the council, and delivered over "to the secular arm." He was led to the identical spot where Huss's life had been offered up. And there, as Huss had been, he was fastened to the stake and burned, his last audible words being: "Into thy hands, O God, I commit my spirit. Lord God, have pity on me, forgive me my sins, for thou knowest I have sincerely loved thy truth."

And when his voice could no longer he heard, it was seen, through the flames, that his lips were moving as in prayer. "The eyewitness, Poggio, then describes the impression which the martyrdom of Jerome made on him, though he found it impossible to comprehend what gave him the power so to die. `With cheerful looks he went readily and willingly to his death; he feared neither death, nor the fire and its torture. No stoic ever suffered death with so firm a soul, as that with which he seemed to demand it. Jerome endured the torments of the fire with more tranquillity than Socrates displayed in drinking his cup of hemlock.'"

175. When information of the execution of Huss reached Bohemia, the whole country was immediately a flame. Even the University of Prague took the lead in expressing indignation. It issued "a manifesto addressed to all Christendom, vindicating the memory of the man who had fallen a victim to the hatred of the priesthood and the perfidy of the emperor. His death was declared to be murder, and the fathers of Constance were styled `an assembly of the satraps of antichrist.' Every day the flame of the popular indignation was burning more fiercely. . . . But deeper feelings were at work among the Bohemian people than those of anger. The faith which had produced so noble a martyr was compared with the faith which had immolated him, and the contrast was found to be in no wise to the advantage of the latter. The doctrines which Huss had taught were recalled to memory now that he was dead. The writings of Wicklif which had escaped the flames, were read and compared with such portions of Holy Writ as were accessible to the people; and the consequence was a very general acception of the evangelical doctrines. The new opinions struck their root deeper every day; and their adherents, who now began to be called Hussites, multiplied one might almost say, hourly. The execution of Jerome only added to the already mighty impulse; and "within four years from the death of Huss, the bulk of the nation had embraced the faith for which he died. His disciples included not a few of the higher nobility, many of the wealthy burghers of the towns, some of the inferior clergy, and the great majority of peasantry." -- Wylie.7

13 [Page 633] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. v. sec. ii. part ii. All quotations in the following account as to Bohemia, are from this portion of Neander.

14 [Page 644] Wylie's "History of Protestantism," book iii, chap. 1. par. 16.

2[Page 682] 2 Thess. 2:9; Rev. 13:13, 14: 16:13, 14.

3[Page 682] See Matt. 24:13; Luke 21:19; Rev. 14:12.

4[Page 682] See Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22; Rev. 3:10,

5[Page 682] Amos 8:12,

6[Page 683] See "Great controversy " Vol.iv, chap. xxxix, par. 31.

7[Page 707] "History of Protestantism," book iii, chap. xiii, pars. 1, 2, 4.

24. THE REFORMATION -- GERMANY.

GOD would have healed even Babylon. But she would not be healed. And, now there must be sounded to the world the word from heaven: "Forsake her!" From Wicklif the good seed of the Word of God had been sown throughout Europe. In Bohemia and at Constance it had been watered with the blood of the saints, and had been proved by fire. Time was given it to take firm root, when again God would visit his vineyard, that it might spring forth and bear abundant fruit.

2. Wicklif had declared that from that taproot of the papacy, from monkery, "some brothers whom God may vouchsafe to teach, will be devoutly converted to the primitive religion of Christ, and, abandoning their false interpretations of genuine Christianity, after having demanded or acquired of themselves permission from antichrist, will freely return to the original religion of Christ; and they will build up the Church like Paul." -- Neander.1 Matthias of Janow had said: "There shall arise one from among the common people, without sword or authority, and against him they shall not be able to prevail."2 And now the time, and the man from among the common people, the one from among the monks, had come. Martin Luther lives, and the Reformation triumphs.

3. A hundred years had passed since the martyrdom of Huss and Jerome. God had given to "that woman Jezebel. . . space to repent of her fornication; and she repented not."3 Instead of repenting she still ran into the depths of even papal wickedness. "During the generation which preceded the Reformation, that court [of Rome] had been a scandal to the Christian name. Its annals are black with treason, murder, and incest. Even its more respectable members were utterly unfit

to be ministers of religion. They were men like Leo the Tenth; men who, with the Latinity of the Augustan age, had acquired its atheistical and scoffing spirit. They regarded those Christian mysteries, of which they were stewards, just as the augur, Cicero, and the high pontiff, Caesar, regarded the Sibylline books and the pecking of the sacred chickens. Among themselves, they spoke of the incarnation, the eucharist, and the Trinity, in the same tone in which Cotta and Velleius talked of the oracle of Delphi or the voice of Faunus in the mountains. Their years glided by in a soft dream of sensual and intellectual voluptuousness. Choice cookery, delicious wines, lovely women, hounds, falcons, sonnets, and burlesque romances, in the sweet Tuscan, just as licentious as a fine sense of the graceful would permit; plate from the hand of Benvenuto, designs for palaces by Michael Angelo,

frescoes by Raphael, busts, mosaics, and gems just dug up from among the ruins of ancient temples and villas -- these things were the delight and even the serious business of their lives." -- Macaulay.4

4. In the testimonies of Wicklif, Militz, Matthias of Janow, Huss, and Jerome, God had made plain by His word and the light of His salvation, the essential iniquity of the Catholic Church. He had made plain her complete antagonism to the Word of God, and to the way of salvation which she professed not only to know, but exclusively to be. He had called her to repentance and conversion. He then gave her even a hundred years of "space to repent;" but she would not repent. She despised all His counsel, and would none of His reproof. By His faithful witnesses God had called for a reformation of the Church, that by her He might do His great work in the reformation of man. But the Church would not be reformed; she persisted in her self-chosen way. And when this had been demonstrated even to infinite fullness, then God began -- He must begin -- anew and upon the original foundations, His work of the reformation of man. This is why it is that the one grand feature of the Reformation in Germany, for the world and for all time, is the fundamental and all-embracing truth, JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

5. About 1511 Luther visited Rome, and was compelled to exclaim: "It is almost incredible what sins and infamous actions are committed at Rome. One would require to see it and hear it in order to believe

it. Hence, it is an ordinary saying, that if there is a hell, Rome is built upon it. It is an abyss whence all sins proceed."5 But at that time Luther was a devout monk of the Augustine Order; and, though shocked at the iniquities which he found, he still thought that Rome was the way of salvation. He "entered devoutly into all the vain observances, to which, as a price, the Church has annexed the expiation of sins. One day, among others, wishing to gain an indulgence which the pope had promised to every one who should on his knees climb up what is called Pilate's Stair, the Saxon monk was humbly crawling up the steps, which, he was told, had been miraculously transported to Rome from Jerusalem. But, while he was engaged in this meritorious act, he thought he heard a voice of thunder, which cried at the bottom of his heart as at Wittemberg and Bologna, `The just shall live by faith.'

6. These words, words, which had already, on two different occasions, struck him like the voice of an angel of God, resounded loudly and incessantly within him. He rises up in amazement from the steps, along which he was dragging his body. Horrified at himself, and ashamed to see how far superstition had abased him, he flies far from the scene of his folly. . . . Luther had carefully studied the Epistle to the Romans, and yet, though justification by faith is there taught, he had never seen it so clearly. Now he comprehends the righteousness which alone can stand in the presence of God; now he receives from God himself, by the hand of Christ, that obedience which he freely imputes to the sinner as soon as he humbly turns his eye to the God-man who was crucified.

7. "This is the decisive period in the internal life of Luther. The faith which has saved him from the terrors of death, becomes the soul of his theology, his fortress in all dangers, the stamina of his discourse, the stimulant of his love, the foundation of his peace, the spur of his labors, his consolation in life and in death. But this great doctrine of a salvation which emanates from God, and not from man, was not only the power of God to save the soul of Luther, it also became the power of God to reform the Church; -- a powerful weapon which the apostles wielded, a weapon too long neglected, but at length brought

forth, in its primitive luster, from the arsenal of the mighty God. At the moment when Luther stood up in Rome, all moved and thrilling with the words which Paul had addressed, fifteen centuries before, to the inhabitants of this metropolis, truth, till then a fettered captive within the Church, rose up also, never again to fall."

8. Of this change in his life, Luther himself says: "Although I was a holy and irreproachable monk, my conscience was full of trouble and anguish. I could not bear the words, `Justice of God.' I loved not the just and holy God who punishes sinners. I was filled with secret rage against Him and hated Him, because, not satisfied with terrifying us, His miserable creatures, already lost by original sin, with His law and the miseries of life, He still further increased our torment by the gospel. . . . But when, by the Spirit of God, I comprehended these words; when I learned how the sinner's justification proceeds from the pure mercy of the Lord by means of faith, then I felt myself revive like a new man, and entered at open doors into the very paradise of God. From that time, also, I beheld the precious sacred volume with new eyes. I went over all the Bible, and collected a great number of passages, which taught me what the work of God is. And as I had previously, with all my heart, hated the words, `Justice of God,' so from that time I began to esteem and love them, as words most sweet and most consoling. In truth, these words were to me the true gate of paradise."

9. In 1502 the Elector Frederick had founded the University of Wittemberg; and in 1508 called Luther to the professorship there. Soon after Luther's return from Rome he was promoted to the doctorate of divinity in the University of Wittemberg. Oct. 18, 1512. Like Wicklif at Oxford, he was made doctor of theology, or "Biblical doctor, not doctor of sentences: and in this way was called to devote himself to the study of the Bible, and not to that of human tradition." The oath which he took at his installation, contained the words: "I swear to defend evangelical truth by every means in my power." He was required also to promise to preach the Holy Scripture "faithfully, to teach it purely, to study it during his whole life, and to defend it by discussion and by writing, as far as God should enable him to do so." This solemn oath was Luther's call to be the Reformer. In laying it upon his conscience

freely to seek, and boldly to announce Christian truth, this oath raised the new doctor above the narrow limits to which his monastic vow might perhaps have confined him. Called by the university and by his sovereign, in the name of the emperor and of the see of Rome itself, and bound before God, by the most solemn oath, he was thenceforth the intrepid herald of the word of life. On this memorable day Luther was dubbed "Knight of the Bible."

10. "Accordingly, this oath taken to the Holy Scriptures may be regarded as one of the causes of the renovation of the Church. The infallible authority of the Word of God alone was the first and fundamental principle of the Reformation. All the reformations in detail which took place at a later period -- as reformations in doctrine, in manners, in the government of the Church, and in worship -- were only consequences of this primary principle. One is scarcely able at the present time to form an idea of the sensation produced by this elementary principle, which is so simple in itself, but which had been lost sight of for so many ages. Some individuals of more extensive views than the generality, alone foresaw its immense results. The bold voice of all the Reformers soon proclaimed this powerful principle, at the sound of which Rome is destined to crumble away: `Christians, receive no other doctrines than those which are founded on the express words of Jesus Christ, His apostles, and prophets. No man, no assembly of doctors, are entitled to prescribe new doctrines.'"

11. Luther began his Biblical lectures. The new life which he had found in Christ vivified and brightened all that he said. He himself said, and truly: "In my heart, faith in my Lord Jesus Christ reigns sole, and sole ought to reign. He alone is the beginning, the middle, and the end, of all the thoughts which occupy my mind night and day." This caused that whether in lectures to his classes or in sermons to a congregation, he was heard gladly. Justification by Faith, on the basis of the Ten commandments and the keeping of the Ten Commandments on the basis of Justification by Faith -- this was his message to the world; and this was the inspiration of every subject that he might he might be called upon to consider. Of justification he said: "The desire of justifying ourselves is the source of all anguish of heart: whereas he who receives Jesus Christ as a Saviour, has peace, and not only peace, but

purity of heart. Sanctification of the heart is entirely a fruit of faith; for faith is in us a divine work, which changes us, and gives us a new birth, emanating from God himself. It kills Adam in us by the Holy Spirit, which it communicates to us, giving us a new heart, and making us new men. It is not by hollow speculation, but by this practical method, that we obtain a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ."

12. Shortly after his promotion to the doctorate, he delivered a series of discourses on the Ten Commandments. An extract on the First Commandment will illustrate his teaching: --

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

"All the sons of Adam are idolaters; and guilty of violating this First Commandment.

"There are two kinds of idolatry -- the one without, the other within.

"The one without is when man worships wood and stone, beasts and stars.

"The one within is when man, fearing punishment or seeking his ease, does not give worship to the creature, but loves it internally, and confides in it.

"What religion is this? You do not bend the knee before riches and honors, but you offer them your heart, the noblest part of you. Ah! You worship God with the body, and with the spirit you worship the creature.

"This idolatry reigns in every man until he is cured of it freely, by the faith which is in Jesus Christ.

"And how is this cure performed?

0 "In this way: Faith in Christ strips you of all confidence in your own wisdom, your own righteousness, your own strength.

1 "It tells you, that if Christ had not died for you, and so saved you neither yourself nor any creature could have done it. Then you learn to despise all those things which remained useless to you.

2 "There now remains to you only Jesus -- Jesus alone -- Jesus fully sufficient for your soul. No longer having any hopes in the creatures, you have now Christ only, in whom you hope all, and whom you love above all. Now Jesus is the sole, the only, the true God. When you have Him for God you have no longer other gods."

13. "His mode of explaining the Scriptures was such that in the judgment of all pious and enlightened men, it was as if a new light had risen upon doctrine after a long night. He pointed out the differences between the law and the Gospel. He refuted the error then prevalent in churches and schools, that men merit the forgiveness of sins by their own works, and are rendered righteous before God by means of external discipline. He thus brought back the hearts of men to the Son of God. Like John the Baptist, he pointed to the Lamb of God, which had taken away the sins of the world. He explained how sins are pardoned freely for the sake of the Son of God, and how man receives the blessing through faith. . . . He labored more and more to make all comprehend the great and essential doctrines of conversion, of the forgiveness of sins, of faith, and the true consolation which is to be found in the cross. The pious were charmed and penetrated with the sweetness of this doctrine, while the learned received it gladly. One would have said that Christ, the apostles, and prophets, were coming forth from darkness and a loathsome dungeon." -- Melancthon.

14. To a friend, a monk in the convent of Erfurt, Luther wrote: "O, my dear brother, learn to know Christ, and Christ crucified. Learn to sing unto Him a new song; to despair of thyself, and say, `Thou, O Lord Jesus! Thou art my righteousness, and I am thy sin! Thou hast taken what is mine, and given me what is thine.

What thou wert not Thou hast become, in order that what I was not I might become.' Take care, O, my dear George, not to pretend to such a purity as will make you unwilling to acknowledge yourself a sinner; for Christ dwells in sinners only. He came down from heaven, where He dwelt among the righteous, that He might dwell also among sinners. Meditate carefully on this love of Christ, and thou wilt derive ineffable blessing from it. If our labors and our afflictions could give us peace of conscience, why should Christ have died? Thou wilt find peace only in Him, by despairing of thyself and of thy works, and learning with what love He opens His arms to thee, takes upon Him all thy sins, and gives thee all His righteousness."

15. To Spalatin, chaplain to the elector Frederick, who was also his friend, Luther wrote: "My Dear Spalatin, the thing which displeases me in Erasmus, that man of vast erudition, is, that by the righteousness of works or of the law, of which the apostle speaks, he understands the

fulfillment of the ceremonial law. The justification of the law consists not in ceremonies only, but in all the works of the decalogue. When these works are performed without faith in Christ, they may, it is true, make Fabriciuses, Reguluses, the other men of strict integrity in the eyes of the world; but then they as little deserve to be called righteousness, as the fruit of a medlar to be called a fig. For we do not become righteous, as Aristotle pretends, by doing works of righteousness; but when we have become righteous we do such works. Abel was first pleasing to God, and then his sacrifice."

16. Luther made a clear distinction between Christianity and the philosophy of the schools. In an official visit to a number of monasteries he instructed the monks: "Do not attach youself to Aristotle, or to other teachers of a deceitful philosophy; but diligently read the Word of God. Seek not your salvation in your own strength, and your own good works, but in the merits of Christ and divine grace." And, amongst others, in a series of ninety-nine propositions in opposition to rationalism and scholastic theology, he said: --

"On the part of man there is nothing which precedes grace, unless it be impotence and even rebellion.

"We do not become righteous by doing what is righteous; but having become righteous, we do what is righteous.

"He who says that a theologian who is not a logician, is an heretic and an adventurer, maintains an adventurous and heretical proposition.

"There is no form of syllogism which accords with the things of God.

"If the form of the syllogism could be applied to divine things, we should Know the article of the Holy Trinity, and should not believe it.

"In one word, Aristotle is to theology as darkness to light.

"He who is without the grace of God, sins incessantly, even though he neither kills, nor steals, nor commits adultery.

"He sins, for he does not fulfill the law spiritually.

0 "Not to kill, and not to commit adultery, externally, and in regard to action merely, is righteousness of hypocrites.

1 "The law of God and the will of man are two adversaries, who, without the grace of God, can never agree.

2 "Every work of the law appears good externally, but internally is sin.

3 "Cursed are those who do the works of the law.

716

"Blessed are all those who do the works of the grace of God.

"The law, which is good, and in which we have life, is the law of the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit (Rom. 5:5).

"Grace is not given in order that works may be done more frequently and more easily, but because without grace there can not be any work of love.

"To love God is to hate one's self, and know nothing out of God."

17. Leo X, like many of the popes before him, considered himself in need of more money than the enormous revenues of the papacy were already bringing him. The jubilee scheme had been exhausted by its successive reduction from a hundred years to fifty, to thirty-three, and to twenty-five. The crusading scheme had also been worn out. Leo X, therefore, was compelled to send throughout Christendom hawkers of indulgences. And the bait was that the money received was to be employed in the erection of the Church of St. Peter. Accordingly, John Tetzel, one of these hawkers of indulgences, came into Germany, in 1516. When Luther heard of it, he remarked: "Please God, I'll make a hole in his drum." Tetzel had reached Juterboch, about four miles from Wittemberg; and there, says Luther, "this great thrasher of purses set about thrashing the country in grand style; so that the money began to leap, tumble, and tinkle in his chest."

18. The manner of vending these indulgences was that Tetzel, after loud announcements by forerunners, had come to the place appointed, would set up first a cross painted red, with the coat-of-arms of the pope above it. Then Tetzel would mount a pulpit erected for the purpose, and harangue the crowd in his own gross style, of which the following is a sample: --

"Indulgences are the most precious and most sublime gift of God.

"The cross (pointing to the red cross) has the very same efficacy as the actual cross of Jesus Christ.

"Come, and I will give you letters under seal, by which even the sins which you may have a desire to commit in future will all be forgiven.

0 "I would not exchange my privileges for that of St. Peter in heaven; for I have saved more souls by my indulgences than the apostle by his sermons.

1 "There is no sin too great for an indulgence to remit; . . . let him only pay well, -- and it shall be forgiven him.

2 "Think, then, that for each mortal sin you must, after confession

717

and contrition, do penance for seven years, either in this life or purgatory. Now, how many mortal sins are committed in one day -- in one week? How many in a month -- a year -- a whole life? Ah! these sins are almost innumerable, and innumerable sufferings must be endured for them in purgatory. And now, by means of these letters of indulgence, you can at once for life, -- in all cases except four, which are reserved to the apostolic see, -- and afterwards at the hour of death, obtain a full remission of all your pains and all your sins."

"But more than this, indulgences not only save the living; they also save the dead.

"For this repentance is not even necessary.

"Priest! -- noble! -- merchant! -- young girls! -- young men! -- hear your departed parents and your other friends, crying to you from the bottom of the abyss, `We are enduring horrible torments! A little alms would deliver us; you can give it, and yet will not!'

"At the very instant when the piece of money chinks on the bottom of the strong box, the soul comes out of purgatory, and, set free, flies upward into heaven."

19. Many of the people of Wittemberg went to this indulgence market at Juterboch. Luther occupied the confessional, and these people came to him one after another, confessing "the grossest immoralities. Adultery, libertinism, usury, ill-gotten wealth, were the crimes with which the minister of the word was entertained by persons of whose souls he was one day to give account. He rebukes, corrects, and instructs them: but what is his astonishment when these people tell him that they do not choose to abandon their sins! Quite amazed, the pious monk declares that since they refuse to promise amendment, he can not give them absolution. The wretched creatures then appealed to their letters of indulgence, exhibiting them, and extolling their virtues. But Luther replies, that he cared little for the paper which they had shown him, and added: `Unless you repent, you will all perish.' They made an outcry, and expostulated; but the doctor was immovable: `they must cease to do evil, and learn to do well -- otherwise no absolution.' `Beware,' added he, `of lending an ear to the harangues of the vendors of indulgences; you might be better employed than in buying those licenses which are sold you for the most paltry sum.'"

20. By these things Luther was so stirred, that he ascended the pulpit and preached: --

"No man can prove by Scripture that the justice of God exacts a

penalty or satisfaction from the sinner; the only duty which it imposes upon him is true repentance, sincere conversion, a resolution to bear the cross of Jesus Christ, and to be diligent in good works. It is a great error to think we can ourselves satisfy the justice of God for our sins. He always pardons them gratuitously by His inestimable grace.

"The Christian Church, it is true, requires something from the sinner, and consequently has the power of remitting what she so requires; but that is all. Even these indulgences of the Church are tolerated, only on account of indolent and imperfect Christians, who will not zealously exercise themselves in good works. For they stimulate none to satisfaction, but leave all in imperfection.

"It would be much better to contribute to the erection of St. Peter's church from love of God, than to purchase indulgences in this view. . . . But you ask, Are we then never to purchase them? I have already said, and I repeat it; my advice is, Don't purchase. Leave them to sleepy Christians; but do you walk apart in your own path. The faithful must be diverted from indulgences, and urged to do the works which they neglect.

"If some cry out that I am a heretic (for the truth which I preach is very hurtful to their strong box), their clamor gives me little concern. They are dull and sickly brains; men who never felt the Bible, never read Christian doctrine, never comprehended their own teachers, and who turn to rottenness, wrapped up in the tatters of their vain opinions . . . . God grant them and us a sound mind. Amen."

21. This sermon was printed, and widely distributed; and, of course, awakened much interest. And now the feast of All Saints drew nigh (Oct. 31, 1517). The night before -- the night of October 30 -- the elector

Frederick of Saxony was dwelling at his castle of Schweinitz, about six leagues from Wittemberg. On the morning of October 31, "being in company with his brother, Duke John, who was then coregent, and became sole elector after his death, and with his chancellor, the elector, said to the duke: --

"Brother, I must tell you a dream which I had last night, and the meaning of which I should like much to know. It is so deeply impressed, on my mind, that I will never forget it, were I to live a thousand years. For I dreamed it thrice, and each time with new circumstances.

719

Duke John. -- "Is it a good or a bad dream?"

The Elector. -- "I know not: God knows."

Duke John. -- Don't be uneasy at it; but be so good as to tell it to me."

The Elector. -- "Having gone to bed last night, fatigued and out of spirits, I fell asleep shortly after my prayer, and slept quietly for about two hours and a half; I then awoke, and continued awake till midnight -- all sorts of thoughts passing through my mind. Among other things, I thought how I was to observe the feast of All Saints. I prayed for the poor souls in purgatory; and supplicated God to guide me, my counsels, and my people, according to truth. I again fell asleep, and then dreamed that Almighty God sent me a monk, who was a true son of the Apostle Paul. All the saints accompanied him by order of God, in order to bear testimony before me, and to declare that he did not come to contrive any plot; but that all that he did was according to the will of God. They asked me to have the goodness graciously to permit him to write something on the door of the Church of the castle of Wittemberg. This I granted through my chancellor. Thereupon the monk went to the Church, and began to write in such large characters that I could read the writing at Schweinitz. The pen which he used was so large, that its end reached as far as Rome, where it pierced the ears of a lion that was couching there, and caused the triple crown upon the head of the pope to shake. All the cardinals and princes, running hastily up, tried to prevent it from falling. You and I, brother, wished also to assist, and I stretched out my arm -- but at this moment I awoke, with my arm in the air, quite amazed, and very much enraged at the monk for not managing his pen better. I recollected myself a little: it was only a dream.

"I was still half asleep, and once more closed my eyes. The dream returned. The lion, still annoyed by the pen, began to roar with all his might, so much so that the whole city of Rome, and all the States of the holy empire, ran to see what the matter was. The pope requested them to oppose this monk, and applied particularly to me, on account of his being in my country. I again awoke, repeated the Lord's Prayer, entreated God to preserve his holiness, and once more fell asleep.

"Then I dreamed that all the princes of the empire, and we among them, hastened to Rome, and strove, one after another, to break the pen; but the more we tried the stiffer it became -- sounding as if it had been made of iron. We at length desisted. I then asked the monk (for I was sometimes at Rome, and sometimes at Wittemberg) where he got his pen, and why it was so strong. `The pen,' replied he, `belonged to an old goose of Bohemia -- a hundred years old. I got it from one of my old schoolmasters. As to its strength, it is owing to the impossibility of depriving it of its pith or marrow; and I am quite astonished at it myself.' Suddenly I heard a loud noise, -- a large number of other pens had sprung out of the long pen of the monk, -- I awoke a third time: it was daylight."

720

Duke John. -- "Chancellor, what is your opinion? Would we had a Joseph or a Daniel enlightened by God!"

Chancellor. -- "Your highnesses know the common proverb, that the dreams of young girls, learned men, and great lords, have usually some hidden meaning. The meaning of this dream, however, we will not be able to know for some time, -- not till the things to which it relates have taken place. Wherefore, leave the accomplishment to God, and place it wholly in his hand."

Duke John. -- "I am of your opinion, Chancellor; `tis not fit for us to annoy ourselves in attempting to discover the meaning; the God will overrule all for His glory."

Elector. -- "May our faithful God do so; yet I will never forget this dream. I have indeed thought of an interpretation, but I keep it to myself. Time, perhaps, will shew if I have been a good diviner."

22. This dream occurred the night of October 30, and was related the morning of October 31. That day, October 31, was All-Saints' Day. That day especially the relics of the saints, which the elector Frederick had deposited in Wittemberg church, "adorned with silver and gold and precious stones, were brought out and exhibited to the eyes of the people, who were astonished and dazzled by their magnificence. Whoever on that day visited the church, and confessed in it, obtained a valuable indulgence. Accordingly, on this great occasion, pilgrims came in crowds to Wittemberg."

23. And there on that "31st of October, 1517, Luther, who had already taken his resolution, walks boldly toward the church to which the superstitious crowds of pilgrims were repairing, and puts up on the door of this church ninety-five theses or propositions against the doctrine of indulgences. Neither the elector, nor Staupitz, nor Spalatin, nor any, even the most intimate of his friends, had been previously informed of this step. In these theses, Luther declares, in a kind of preamble, that he had written them with the express desire of setting the truth in the full light of day. He declares himself ready to defend them on the morrow at the university, against all and sundry. The attention which they excite is great; they are read and repeated. In a short time the pilgrims, the university, the whole town is ringing with them."

24. In the principle of this rejection of indulgences by Luther, there is nothing new beyond that which was done by Huss on the same

subject, in opposition to the bull of John XXIII. The same principle, however, was now newly, and very forcibly stated, and in a variety of forms. This same truth which Huss had preached a hundred years before, had never lost its influence in Europe. As a consequence, this new and forcible statement of the principle falling upon ground already prepared, rapidly spread and rapidly grew. The vital ones of these theses were: --

"1. When our Lord and Master Jesus Christ says `repent,' He means that the whole life of His followers on the earth is a constant and continual repentance.

"2. This expression can not be understood of the sacrament of penitence, -- that is to say, of confession and satisfaction, -- as administered by the priest.

"3. Still the Lord intends not to speak merely of internal repentance. Internal repentance is null, if it does not manifest itself externally by the mortification of the flesh.

"4. Repentance and sorrow -- that is to say, true penitence -- continue so long as a man is displeased with himself; that is, until he passes from this life into life eternal."

"27. It is the preaching of human folly to pretend that at the very moment when the money tinkles in the strong box, the soul flies off from purgatory.

"28. This much is certain, as soon as the money tinkles, avarice and the love of gain arrive, increase, and multiply. But the aids and prayers of the Church depend only on the will and good pleasure of God."

"32. Those who imagine they are sure of salvation by means of indulgences, will go to the devil, with those who teach them so."

"35. It is an antichristian doctrine to pretend that, in order to deliver a soul from purgatory, or to purchase an indulgence, there is no need of either sorrow or repentance.

"36. Every Christian who truly repents of his sins has entire forgiveness of the penalty and the fault; and, so far, has no need of indulgence.

0 "37. Every true Christian, dead or alive, participates in all the blessings of Christ and of the Church by the gift of God, and without a letter of indulgence."

1 "43. Christians must be told that he who gives to the poor, or lends to the needy, does better than he who buys an indulgence.

2 "44. For the work of charity makes charity increase, and renders a man more pious; whereas, the indulgence does not make him better, but only gives him more self-confidence, and makes him more secure against punishment.

3 "45. Christians must be told that he who sees his neighbor want,

and, instead of helping him, purchases an indulgence, purchases not the indulgence of the pope; but incurs the divine displeasure."

"52. To hope to be saved by indulgences is an empty and lying hope, even should the commissary of indulgences -- nay, the pope himself -- be pleased to pledge his own soul in security for it."

25. "These theses spread with the rapidity of lightning. A month had not elapsed before they were at Rome. `In a fortnight,' says a contemporary historian, `they were in every part of Germany, and in four weeks and traversed almost the whole of Christendom; as if the angels themselves had been the messengers, and carried them before the eyes of all men. Nobody can believe what a noise they made.' They were afterward translated into Dutch and Spanish, and a traveler even sold them at Jerusalem. `Every one,' says Luther, `was complaining of the indulgences; and as all the bishops and doctors had kept silence, and nobody had ventured to bell the cat, poor Luther became a famous doctor, because, as they expressed it, one had at length come who dared to do it. But I liked not this glory; the music seemed to me too lofty for the words.'"

26. All this time Luther had still great respect for the office and the person of the pope. Indeed, no small portion of his ninety-five theses was occupied with a defense of the pope, against what he held to be the abuses of the indulgences, practiced by the vendors of them. He sent a copy of his theses to the archbishop of Mainz and Magdeburg, with a letter in which he asked the archbishop to read the theses. The archbishop's assistant replied to Luther that "he was attacking the power of the Church; that he would involve himself in great trouble and vexation; that the thing was beyond his strength; and that his earnest advice to him was to keep quiet." Zealous papists vigorously denounced him. Many of Luther's friends were frightened, and advised him to keep quiet. And the monks of his Order in Wittemberg pleaded with him not so to bring shame on their Order.

27. To all of this Luther replied: "They call upon me for moderation, and they themselves, in the judgment which they pass upon me, trample it underfoot! Truth will no more gain by my moderation than it will

lose by my presumption. I desire to know what errors have been found in my theses. Who knows not that a new idea is seldom

723

advanced without an appearance of arrogance, and an accusation of disputatiousness. Were humility herself to undertake something new, those of an opinion would charge her with pride. Why were Christ and all the martyrs put to death? -- Because they were deemed proud despisers of the wisdom of the time, and advanced new truths without previously taking counsel of the organs of ancient opinion. Let not the wise of the present day, then, expect of me humility, or rather hypocrisy, enough to ask their opinion before publishing what duty calls me to say. What I do will be done, not by the prudence of men, but by the counsel of God. If the work is of God, who can arrest it? If it is not of God, who can advance it? Not my will, nor theirs, nor ours, but thy will be done, O holy Father, who art in heaven!"

28. Tetzel came out with an attack on Luther's theses, in which he was very abusive and insulting. To this Luther replied, defending his theses, and enlarging upon them; and closed with these words: "For the rest, although it is not usual to burn heretics for such points, here, at Wittemberg, am I Doctor Martin Luther! Is there any inquisitor who pretends to chew fire, and makes rocks leap into the air? I give him to know that he has a safe-conduct to come here, an open door, and bed and board certain, all by the gracious care of our admirable Duke Frederick, who will never protect heresy."

29. Spalatin, the elector's chaplain, in writing to Luther to express his friendship for him in the contest, asked him: "What is the best method in studying the Holy Scripture?" Luther's answer is valid instruction for all time: "Till now, my dear Spalatin, you have asked questions which I could not answer. But to direct you in the study of the Scriptures, is more than I am able to do. However, if you would absolutely know my method, I will not hide it from you: It is most certain that we can not succeed in comprehending the Scripture either by study or mere intellect. Your first duty, then, is to begin with prayer. Entreat the Lord that He will, in His great mercy, deign to grant you the true knowledge of His Word. There is no other interpreter of the Word of God than the Author of that Word, according as it is said, `They will all be taught of God.' Hope nothing from your works, nothing from your intellect. Trust only in God, and in the influence of His Spirit. Believe one who is speaking from experience."

724

30. Next Tetzel proceeded to present a series of counter-theses, amongst which were: --

"Christians must be taught that whosoever says that the soul does not fly away from purgatory as soon as the money tinkles on the bottom of the strong box, is in error.

"Christians must be taught that the pope, by the greatness of his power, is above the whole universal Church and all councils. His orders ought to be implicitly obeyed.

"Christians must be taught that the pope alone is entitled to decide in matters of Christian faith; that he and none but he has the power to explain the meaning of Scripture in his own sense, and to approve or condemn all words or works of others.

"Christians must be taught that the judgment of the pope in things that concern the Christian faith, and which are necessary to the salvation of the human race, can not possibly err.

"Christians must be taught that in matters of faith, they ought to lean and rest more upon the opinion of the pope, as manifested by his decisions, than on the opinion of all wise men, as drawn by them out of Scripture.

"Christians must be taught that those who attack the honor and dignity of the pope are guilty of the crime of lese majeste, and deserve malediction.

"Christians must be taught that there are many things which the Church regards as authentic articles of universal truth, although they are not found either in the canon of Scripture or in ancient doctors."

31. The others were to the effect that Christians must be taught to regard as heretics under excommunication, all who wrote or taught, against indulgences; and all who protected such, were obstinate heretics, infamous, and should be severely punished with various punishments, in terms of law, and to the terror of all men. He next proceeded to burn the theses which Luther had put forth. In return, the students of Wittemberg University burned Tetzel's theses. This act of the students was, of course, laid to the charge of Luther. But, to a friend who had inquired about it, Luther wrote: "I am astonished how you could think that it was I that burned Tetzel's theses. Do you think that I am so devoid of sense? But what can I do? When I am the subject of remark, everything seems to be believed. Can I tie up the tongues of the whole world? Very well! Let them say, let them hear, let them see, let them pretend, whatever they please. I will act as long as the Lord gives me strength, and with His help will fear nothing."

32. The opposition of the papists to Luther's theses not only caused the general interest in them to increase, but drew Luther farther and farther forward in the essential logic of the principles thus announced. The attention of Rome, and the pope himself, were soon attracted. May 30, 1518, Luther wrote a friendly letter to the pope, Leo X; because, as yet, Luther still believed that the pope could not indorse the indulgences that were being vended throughout Germany.

33. In the same year a diet was held at Augsburg, and the emperor, Maximilian, desiring to gain special favor with the pope, wrote to him, August 5, the following letter: --

"Most holy Father, we learned, some days ago, that a friar of the Augustine Order, named Martin Luther, had begun to maintain divers propositions as to the commerce in indulgences. Our displeasure is the greater because the said friar finds many protectors, among whom are powerful personages. If your holiness and the very reverend fathers of the Church (the cardinals) do not forthwith employ their authority to put an end to these scandals, not only will these pernicious doctors seduce the simple, but they will involve great princes in their ruin. We will take care that whatever your holiness may decide on this matter, for the glory of Almighty God, shall be observed by all in our empire."

34. Instead of the pope accepting in a friendly way Luther's friendly letter, Luther was thunderstruck when, August 7, he received from the pope a summons to appear personally in Rome within sixty days. And the emperor and the German princes were being diligently stirred up by the pope's legate, against Luther. On the other hand, Luther's friends were everywhere aroused by this citation to Rome, and earnestly prayed the elector to have the case examined in Germany. Also, the pope's legate himself, in carrying out some political scheme, had asked the pope that the case might be examined in Germany. Accordingly, Leo issued a brief empowering the legate so to do. In this brief Leo wrote: --

"We charge you to bring personally before you, to pursue and constrain without delay, and as soon as you receive this our letter, the said Luther, who has already been declared heretic by our dear brother, Jerome, bishop of Asculum. For this purpose invoke the arm and assistance of our very dear son in Christ, Maximilian, the other princes of Germany, and all its commonalties, universities, and powers, ecclesiastical or secular; and if you apprehend him, keep him in safe custody, in order that he may be brought before us. If he returns to himself, and asks pardon for his great crime, asks it of himself, and without

being urged to do it, we give you power to receive him into the unity of holy mother Church. If he persists in his obstinacy and you can not make yourself master of his person, we give you power to proscribe him in all parts of Germany; to banish, curse, and excommunicate all who are attached to him, and to order all Christians to shun their presence.

"And, in order that this contagion may be the more easily extirpated, you will excommunicate all prelates, religious orders, communities, counts, dukes, and grandees, except the emperor Maximilian, who shall refuse to seize the said Martin Luther and his adherents, and send them to you, under due and sufficient guard. And if (which God forbid) the said princes, communities, universities, grandees, or any one belonging to them, offer an asylum to the said Martin and his adherents, in any way, and give him, publicly or in secret, by themselves or others, aid and council, we lay under interdict these princes, communities, and grandees, with their towns, burghs, fields, and villages, whither said Martin may flee, as long as he shall remain there, and for three days after he shall have left.

"In regard to the laity, if they do not obey your orders instantly, and without any opposition, we declare them infamous (with the exception of the most worthy emperor), incapable of performing any lawful act, deprived of Christian burial, and stripped of all fiefs which they may hold, whether of the apostolic see, or of any other superior whatsoever."

35. At the same time Leo sent a most flattering letter to the elector Frederick, calling him "the ornament, the glory, and sweet savor of your noble race," and urged him to deliver Luther to the legate "lest the pious people of our time and of future times, may one day lament and say, The most pernicious heresy with which the Church of God has been afflicted, was excited by the favor and support of this high and honorable house."

36. A hearing was finally arranged for Luther to be held at Augsburg, before the legate. Three times Luther appeared there. But as the legate insisted that Luther should retract, and would accept nothing else, nor even listen to anything else, this attempt only further widened the breach. When the hearings were over, Luther, not willing to trust Rome, escaped from Augsburg, and returned safely to Wittemberg; and the action of the legate immediately following this, proved that Luther was wise in making his escape just when he did. For the legate wrote a letter to the elector, breathing vengeance and demanding that "since friar Martin can not be brought by paternal methods to acknowledge his error, and remain faithful to the Catholic Church, I

pray your highness to send him to Rome, or banish him from your States. Be assured that this difficult, naughty, and venemous affair can not last longer; for when I shall have acquainted our most holy lord with all the craft and malice, there will soon be an end of it."

37. Luther wrote to the elector, suggesting the injustice of requiring of him all this, when no attempt had been made to show wherein he was in error; but for the peace of the elector and his dominions, Luther informed him that he willingly submitted to leave Wittemberg and to go into exile, wherever the Lord might lead him. But this was not called for; for the elector wrote to the legate: "Since Doctor Martin appeared before you at Augsburg, you ought to be satisfied. We did not expect that, without having convicted him, you would have thought of constraining him to retract. None of the learned in our dominions have told us that the doctrine of Martin was impious, antichristian, and heretical."

38. Luther wrote an account of the proceedings in his affair at Augsburg, and published it under the title of "Acts of the Conference at Augsburg," in which he said: "Great God! What new, what astonishing crime, to seek light and truth! And more especially to seek them in the Church; in other words, in the kingdom of truth." And, in a letter to a friend he said of this production: "I send you my acts. They are more cutting, doubtless, than the legate expected; but my pen is ready to give birth to far greater things. I know not myself whence those thoughts come. In my opinion, the affair is not even commenced: so far are the grandees of Rome from being entitled to hope it is ended. I will send you what I have written, in order that you may see whether I have divined

well in thinking that the antichrist of whom the apostle Paul speaks, is now reigning in the court of Rome. I believe I am able to demonstrate that it is at this day worse than the very Turks." And, to another he wrote: "But the more their fury and violence increase, the less I tremble."

39. Nov. 28, 1518, Luther, at Wittemberg, publicly "appealed from the pope to a general council of the Church." And, expecting that this further step would certainly, for the elector's sake, require that he should leave Wittemberg, he wrote a protest against the methods of procedure of the pope which had forced him to make this appeal from the pope to

a general council. In that document he said: "Considering that the pope, who is the vicar of God upon earth, may, like any other vicar, err, sin, or lie, and that the appeal to a general council is the only safeguard against unjust proceedings which it is impossible to resist, I feel myself obliged to have recourse to it." On December 13, the pope, by his legate in Germany, issued a bull, "confirming the doctrine of indulgences on the very points in which they were attacked, but without mentioning either the elector or Luther."

40. In 1519, a debate was held at Leipsic between Doctor Eck, the papist, and Carlstadt first, and afterward, Luther; because Doctor Eck had said even to Luther that it was really for Luther that he had come to Leipsic, and "if I can not debate with you, I am not anxious to have anything to do with Carlstadt." Duke George had forbidden Luther to enter a debate; and the duke's objections had to be overcome. But Doctor Eck accomplished it. In persuading the duke, he said: "We must strike at the head. If Luther stands erect, so do all his adherents -- if he falls, they all fall."

41. July 4, at seven in the morning, was begun the debate between Eck and Luther. The debate was opened by Eck asserting the primacy of the papacy, in the words: --

"There is in the Church of God a primacy derived from Jesus Christ himself. The Church militant is an image of the Church triumphant. But the latter is a monarchical hierarchy, rising step by step up to the sole Head who is God; and, accordingly, Christ has established the same graduation upon earth. What kind of monster should the Church be if she were without a head!"

Luther -- (Turning toward the audience) -- "The doctor is correct in saying that the universal Church must have a head. If there is any one here who maintains the contrary let him stand up! The remark does not at all apply to me."

Eck. -- "If the Church militant has never been without a monarch, I should like to know who that monarch is if he is not the pontiff of Rome."

Luther. -- "The Head of the Church militant is not a man, but Jesus Christ himself. This I believe on the testimony of God. Christ (says the Scripture) must reign until He has put all enemies under His feet. We can not, therefore, listen to those who would confine Christ to the Church triumphant in heaven. His reign is a reign of faith. We can not see our Head, and yet we have him."

Eck. -- "Very well, I come to the essential point. The venerable

doctor calls upon me to prove that the primacy of the Church of Rome is of divine institution. I prove it by these words of Christ: Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church. St. Augustine, in one of his epistles, has thus expounded the passage: `Thou art Peter, and upon this rock -- that is to say, on this Peter -- I will build my Church.' It is true Augustine has elsewhere said that by this rock must be understood Christ himself; but he never retracted his former exposition."

Luther. -- "If the reverend doctor would attack me, he should first reconcile these contrary statements of Augustine. It is undeniable that St. Augustine has, again and again, said that the rock was Christ; and he may, perhaps, have once said that it was Peter himself. But even should St. Augustine and all the Fathers say that the apostle is the rock of which Christ speaks, I would combat their view on the authority of an apostle -- in other words, divine authority; for it is written: No other foundation can any man lay than that is laid, namely, Jesus Christ. Peter himself calls Christ the chief and cornerstone, on which we are built up a spiritual house."

42. This lead was followed farther, and with other subjects, with Eck in the presence of all, and for himself, constantly and consciously losing ground. Finally, on the second day of the debate, he took a turn by which he sought so to prejudice the audience against Luther, as to destroy the effect of his words. Thus he said: "From primitive times downward it was acknowledged by all good Christians that the Church of Rome holds its primacy of Jesus Christ himself, and not of man. I must confess, however, that the Bohemians, while obstinately defending their errors, attacked this doctrine. The venerable father must pardon me if I am an enemy of the Bohemians, because they are the enemies of the Church, and if the present discussion has reminded me of these heretics; for . . . according to my weak judgment, . . . the conclusions to which the doctor has come, are all in favor of their errors. It is even affirmed that the Hussites loudly boast of this."

43. Eck knew his ground, and "had calculated well. All his partisans received the insinuation with acclamation, and an expression of applause was general throughout the audience." Luther answered: "I love not a schism, and I never shall. Since the Bohemians, of their own authority, separate from our unity, they do wrong, even were divine authority decisive in favor of their doctrines; for at the head of all divine authority is charity and the union of the Spirit." At the close of this

speech of Luther's, the meeting was adjourned for dinner. And in this interval Luther was obliged to question himself as to whether he had done right in speaking thus of the Christians of Bohemia. His conscience was touched; and he decided that he would correct the doubtful impression which he had left upon the minds of the people.

44. This decision involved the rejection of the Council of Constance, one of the greatest councils of the Church. And he himself was now standing on an appeal to a general council! And now for him to indorse the attitude of the Christian Bohemians was to strike from under himself his sole remaining standing ground with the papacy; and, so, to open all the floodgates of papal opposition. Yet he decided that he would do it. He said to himself: "I must do my duty, come what may." Accordingly, as soon as the meeting had assembled in the afternoon session, Luther seized the first moment. He arose, and, with the decision of conviction in his voice said: "Certain of the tenets of John Huss and the Bohemians are perfectly orthodox. This much is certain. For instance, `That there is only one universal Church;' and again, `That it is not necessary to salvation to believe the Roman Church superior to others.' Whether Wicklif or Huss has said so, I care not. It is the truth."

45. "This declaration of Luther produced an immense sensation in the audience. The abhorred names of Huss and Wicklif, pronounced with eulogium by a monk in the heart of a Catholic assembly! A general murmur was heard. Duke George himself felt as much alarmed as if he had actually seen the standard of civil war, which had so long desolated the States of his maternal ancestors, unfurled in Saxony. Unable to conceal his emotion, he struck his thigh, shook his head, and exclaimed, loud enough to be heard by the whole assembly, `The man is mad!' The whole audience was extremely excited. They rose to their feet, and every one kept talking to his neighbor. Those who had fallen asleep awoke. Luther's opponents expressed their exultation, while his friends were greatly embarrassed. Several persons, who till then had listened to him with pleasure, began to doubt his orthodoxy. The impression produced upon the mind of the duke by this declaration was never effaced; from this moment he looked upon the Reformer with an unfavorable eye, and became his enemy."

46. Dr. Eck had said: "I am astonished at the humility and modesty

with which the reverend doctor undertakes single-handed to combat so many distinguished Fathers and to know better than sovereign pontiffs, councils, doctors, and universities. It would certainly be astonishing that God should have concealed the truth from so many saints and martyrs . . . and not revealed it until the advent of the reverend father!" Luther replied: "The reverend doctor flees before the Holy Scriptures as the devil does before the cross. For my part, with all due deference to the Fathers, I prefer the authority of Scripture, and recommend it to our judges."

47. Even Duke George showed that he was conscious that Luther's arguments shook the papacy, by remarking: "Let the pope be pope, whether by divine or human law; at all events he is pope." When news of the discussion reached Bohemia, the Christians there wrote to Luther: "What Huss was formerly in Bohemia, you, O Martin, are now in Saxony. Wherefore pray, and be strong in the Lord." June 15, 1520, the pope issued a bull against Luther as follows: --

"Arise, O Lord! -- Arise and be judge in thy own cause. Remember the insults daily offered to Thee by infatuated men. Arise, O Peter! remember thy holy Roman Church, the mother of all Churches, and mistress of the faith! Arise, O Paul! for here is a new Porphyry, who is attacking thy doctrines, and the holy popes, our predecessors! Arise, in fine, assembly of all the saints, holy Church of God, and intercede with the Almighty!

"The moment this bull is published, it will be the duty of bishops to make careful search for the writings of Martin Luther, which contain these errors [that is, forty-one propositions from Luther's writings, which Leo denounced as "pernicious, scandalous, and poisonous"], and to burn them publicly and solemnly in presence of the clergy and laity. In regard to Martin himself, good God! what have we not done! Imitating the goodness of the Almighty, we are ready, even yet, to receive him into the bosom of the Church; and we give him sixty days to transmit his retraction to us in a writing sealed by two prelates; or, what will be more agreeable to us, to come to Rome in person, that no doubt may be entertained as to his submission. Meanwhile, and from this moment, he must cease to preach, teach, or write, and must deliver his works to the flames. If, in the space of sixty days he do not retract, we, by these presents, condemn him and his adherents as public and absolute heretics."

48. All this time Luther was industriously following up his teaching, his preaching, and his writing, on his two great subjects, Justification

by Faith, and The Iniquity of Rome: which, indeed was but the one great subject of Justification by Faith. Of Justification by Faith he had already written: "I see that the devil is incessantly attacking this fundamental article, by the instrumentality of his doctors, and that, in this respect, we can not rest or take any repose. Very well, I, Doctor Martin Luther, unworthy evangelist of our Lord Jesus Christ, hold this article -- that faith alone, without works, justifies in the sight of God; and I declare that the emperor of the Romans, the emperor of the Turks, the emperor of the Tartars, the emperor of the Persians, the pope, all the cardinals, bishops, priests, monks, nuns, princes, and nobles, all men, and all devils, must let it stand, and allow it to remain forever. If they will undertake to combat this truth, they will bring down the flames of hell upon their heads. This is the true and holy gospel, and the declaration of me, Doctor Luther, according to the light of the Holy Spirit. . . Nobody has died for our sins but Jesus Christ, the Son of God. I repeat it once more; should the world and all the devils tear each other, and burst with fury, this is, nevertheless, true. And if it be He alone who takes away sin, it can not be ourselves with our works; but good works follow redemption, as the fruit appears on the tree. This is our doctrine; and it is the doctrine which the Holy Spirit teaches with all true Christians. We maintain it in the name of God. Amen."

49. And now, although Luther had not yet heard of the pope's bull, he declared, "The time of silence is past: the time for speaking has arrived. The mysteries of antichrist must at length be unveiled." Accordingly,

June 20, 1520, he published an "appeal to his Imperial Majesty and the Christian nobility of Germany, on the Reformation of Christianity," in which on this mighty subject, he sounded the trumpet to all Germany, and to all the world for all time. He wrote: "It is not from presumption that I, who am only one of the people, undertake to address your lordships. The misery and oppression endured at this moment by all the States of Christendom, and more especially by Germany, wring from me a cry of distress. I must call for aid; I must see whether God will not give His Spirit to some one of our countrymen, and stretch out a hand to our unhappy nation. God has given us a young and generous prince (the emperor Charles V), and thus filled our hearts with high hopes. But we too, must, on our own part, do all we can.

733

50. "Now the first thing necessary, is, not to confide in our own great strength, or our own high wisdom. When any work otherwise good is begun in self-confidence, God casts it down, and destroys it. Frederick I, Frederick II, and many other emperors besides, before whom the world trembled, have been trampled upon by the popes, because they trusted more to their own strength than to God. They could not but fall. In this war we have to combat the powers of hell; and our mode of conducting it must be to expect nothing from the strength of human weapons -- to trust humbly in the Lord, and look still more to the distress of Christendom than to the crimes of the wicked. It may be that, by a different procedure, the work would begin under more favorable appearances; but suddenly, in the heat of the contest, confusion would arise, bad men would cause fearful disaster, and the world would be deluged with blood. The greater the power, the greater the danger, when things are not done in the fear of the Lord.

51. "The Romans, to guard against every species of reformation, have surrounded themselves with three walls. When attacked by the temporal power, they denied its jurisdiction over them, and maintained the superiority of the spiritual power. When tested by Scripture, they replied, that none could interpret it but the pope. When threatened with a council, they again replied that none but the pope should convene it. They have thus carried off from us the three rods destined to chastise them, and abandoned themselves to all sorts of wickedness. But now may God be our help, and give us one of the trumpets which threw down the wall of Jericho. Let us blow down the walls of paper and straw which the Romans have built around them; and lift up the rods which punished the wicked, by bringing the wiles of the devil to the light of day.

52. "It has been said that the pope, the bishops, the priests, and all those who people convents, form the spiritual or ecclesiastical estate; and that princes, nobles, citizens, and peasants, form the secular or lay estate. This is a specious tale. But let no man be alarmed. All Christians belong to the spiritual estate; and the only difference between them is in the functions which they fulfill. We have all but one baptism, but one faith; and these constitute the spiritual man. Unction, tonsure, ordination, consecration, given by the pope, or by a bishop, may make a

734

hypocrite, but can never make a spiritual man. We are all consecrated priests by baptism, as St. Peter says: `You are a royal priesthood;' although all do not actually perform the offices of kings and priests, because no one can assume what is common to all without the common consent. But if this consecration of God did not belong to us, the unction of the pope could not make a single priest.

53. "If ten brothers, the sons of one king, and possessing equal claims to his inheritance should choose one of their number to administer for them, they would all be kings, and yet only one of them would be the administrator of their common power. So it is in the Church. Were several pious laymen banished to a desert, and were they, from not having among them a priest consecrated by a bishop, to agree in selecting one of their number, whether married or not, he would be a truly a priest, as if all the bishops of the world had consecrated him. In this way were Augustine, Ambrose, and Cyprian elected. Hence it follows, that laymen and priests, princes and bishops or, as we have said, ecclesiastics and laics, have nothing to distinguish them but their functions. They have all the same condition, but they have not all the same work to perform.

54. "This being so, why should not the magistrate correct the clergy? The secular power was appointed by God for the punishment of the wicked and the protection of the good, and must be left free to act throughout Christendom, without respect of persons, be they pope, bishops, priests, monks, or nuns. St. Paul says to all Christians, Let every soul (and, consequently, the pope also) be subject to the higher powers; for they bear not the sword in vain (Rom. 13:1, 4).

55. "It is monstrous to see him who calls himself the vicar of Jesus Christ displaying a magnificence unequaled by that of any emperor. Is this the way in which he proves his resemblance to lowly Jesus, or humble Peter? He is, it is said, the lord of the world. But Christ, whose vicar he boasts to be, has said: My kingdom is not of this world. Can the power of a vicegerent exceed that of his prince?

56. "Do you know of what use the cardinals are? I will tell you, Italy and Germany have many convents, foundations, and benefices, richly endowed. How could their revenues be brought to Rome? . . . Cardinals were created; then on them cloisters and prelacies were

bestowed; and at this hour . . . Italy is almost a desert -- the convents are destroyed -- the bishoprics devoured -- the towns in decay -- the inhabitants corrupted -- worship dying out, and preaching abolished. . . . Why? -- Because all the revenue of the churches go to Rime. Never would the Turk himself have so ruined Italy.

57. "And now that they have thus sucked the blood of their won country they come into Germany. They being gently; but let us be on our guard. Germany will soon become like Italy. We have already some cardinals. Their thought is -- before the rustic Germans comprehend our design, they will have neither bishopric, nor convent, nor benefice, nor penny, nor farthing. Antichrist must possess the treasures of the earth. Thirty or forty cardinals will be elected in a single day; to one will be given Bamberg, to another the duchy of Wurzburg, and rich benefices will be annexed, until the churches and cities are laid desolate. And then the pope will say: `I am the vicar of Christ, and the pastor of His flocks. Let the Germans be resigned.' How do we Germans submit to such robbery and concussion on the part of the pope? If France has successfully resisted, why do we allow ourselves to be thus sported with and insulted? Ah! if they deprived us of nothing but our goods! But they ravage churches, plunder the sheep of Christ, abolish the worship, and suppress the Word of God.

58. "Let us endeavor to put a stop to this desolation and misery. If we would march against the Turks, let us begin with the worst species of them. If we hang pickpockets, and behead robbers, let us not allow Roman avarice to escape -- avarice, which is the greatest of all thieves and robbers; and that, too, in the name of St. Peter and Jesus Christ. Who can endure it? Who can be silent? Is not all that the pope possesses stolen? He neither purchased it nor inherited it from St. Peter, nor acquired it by the sweat of his own brow. Where, then, did he get it?

59. "Is it not ridiculous, that the pope should pretend to be the lawful heir of the empire? Who gave it to him? Was it Jesus Christ, when He said: The kings of the earth exercise lordship over them; but it shall not be so with you? (Luke 22:25, 26.) How can he govern an empire and at the same time preach, pray, study, and take care of the poor? Jesus Christ forbade His disciples to carry with them gold or clothes, because the office of the ministry can not be performed without

freedom from every other care; yet the pope would govern the empire, and at the same time remain pope.

60. "Let the pope renounce every species of title to the kingdom of Naples and Sicily. He has no more right to it than I have. His possession of Bologna, Imola, Ravenna, Romagna, Marche d'Ancona, etc., is unjust, and contrary to the commands of Jesus Christ. No man, says, St. Paul, who goeth a warfare entangleth himself

with the affairs of this life (2 Tim. 2:2). And the pope, who pretends to take the lead in the war of the gospel, entangles himself more with the affairs of this life than any emperor or king. He must be disencumbered of all this toil. The emperor should put a Bible and a prayer book into the hands of the pope, that the pope may leave kings to govern, and devote himself to preaching and prayer.

61. "The first thing necessary is to banish from all the countries of Germany the legates of the pope and the pretended blessings which they sell us at the weight of gold, and which are sheer imposture. They take our money; and why? -- For legalizing ill-gotten gain, for loosing oaths, and teaching us to break faith, to sin, and go direct to hell. . . Hearest thou, O pope! -- not pope most holy, but pope most sinful. . . May God, from His place in heaven, cast down thy throne into the infernal abyss!

62. "And now I come to a lazy band, which promises much, but performs little. Be not angry, dear sirs, my intention is good; what I have to say is a truth at once sweet and bitter, -- viz., that it is no longer necessary to build cloisters for mendicant monks. Good God! we have only too many of them; and would they were all suppressed. . . To wander vagabond over the country, never has done, and never will do good.

63. "Into what a state have the clergy fallen, and how many priests are burdened with women, and children, and remorse, while no one comes to their assistance! Let the pope and the bishops run their course, and let those who will, go to perdition; all very well! but I am resolved to unburden my conscience, and open my mouth freely, however pope, bishops, and others, may be offended! . . . I say, then, that according to the institution of Jesus Christ and the apostles, every town ought to have a pastor or bishop, and that this pastor may have a wife, as St. Paul

writes to Timothy: Let the bishop be the husband of one wife (1 Tim. 3:2), and as is still practiced in the Greek Church. But the devil has persuaded the pope, as St. Paul tell Timothy (1 Tim. 4:3), to forbid the clergy to marry. And hence evils so numerous that it is impossible to give them in detail. What is to be done? How are we to save the many pastors who are blameworthy only in this, that they live with a female, to whom they wish with all their heart to be lawfully united? Ah! let them save their conscience! -- let them take this woman in lawful wedlock, and live decently with her, not troubling themselves whether it pleases or displeases the pope. The salvation of your soul is of greater moment than arbitrary and tyrannical laws -- laws not imposed by the Lord."

64. "It is time to take the case of the Bohemians into serious consideration, that hatred and envy may cease and union be again established. . . In this way must heretics be refuted by Scripture, as the ancient Fathers did, and not subdued by fire. On a contrary system, executioners would be the most learned of doctors. Oh! would to God that each party among us would shake hands with each other in fraternal humility, rather than harden ourselves in the idea of our power and right! Charity is more necessary than the Roman papacy. I have now done what was in my power. If the pope or his people oppose it, they will have to give an account. The pope should be ready to renounce the popedom, and all his wealth, and all his honors, if he could thereby save single soul. But he would see the universe go to destruction sooner than yield a hairbreadth of his usurped power. I am clear of these things.

65. "I much fear the universities will become wide gates to hell, if due care is not taken to explain the Holy Scriptures, and engrave it on the hearts of the students. My advices to every person is, not to place his child where the Scripture does not reign paramount. Every institution in which the studies carried on, lead to a relaxed consideration of the Word of God, must prove corrupting."

66. "I presume, however, that I have struck too high a note, proposed many things that will appear impossible, and been somewhat too severe on the many errors which I have attacked. But what can I do? Better that the world be offended with me than God! . . . The utmost

which it can take from me is life. I have often offered to make peace with my opponents, but through their instrumentality, God has always obliged me to speak out against them. I have still a chant upon Rome in reserve; and if they have an itching ear, I will sing it to them at full pitch. Rome! do ye understand me?"

67. "If my cause is just, it must be condemned on the earth, and justified only by Christ in heaven. Therefore let pope, bishops, priests, monks, doctors, come forward, display all their zeal, and give full vent to their fury. Assuredly they are just the people who ought to persecute the truth, as in all ages they have persecuted it."

68. This address was put forth from the press, June 26, 1520; and in only a little while 4,000 copies had been sold -- "a number, at that period, unprecedented. the astonishment was universal, and the whole people were in commotion. The vigor, spirit, perspicuity, and noble boldness by which it was pervaded, made it truly a work for the people, who felt that one who spoke in such terms, truly loved them. The confused views which many wise men entertained, were enlightened. All became aware of the usurpations of Rome. At Wittemberg no man had any doubt whatever that the pope was antichrist. Even the elector's court, with all its timidity and circumspection, did not disapprove of the Reformer, but only awaited the issue. The nobility and the people did not even wait. The nation was awakened, and, at the voice of Luther, adopted his cause, and rallied around his standard. Nothing could have been advantageous to the Reformer than this publication. In palaces, in castles, in the dwellings of the citizens, and even in cottages, all are now prepared and made proof, as it were, against the sentence of condemnation which is about to fall upon the prophet of the people. All Germany is on fire; and the bull, come when it may, never will extinguish the conflagration."

69. The address to the German nation was followed Oct. 6, 1520, by the publication of a treatise entitled "Babylonish Captivity of the Church," in which Luther said: "Whether I will or not, I daily become more learned, spurred on as I am by so many celebrated masters. Two years ago I attacked indulgences; nut with so much ear and indecision, that I am now ashamed of it. But, after all, the mode of attack is not to be wondered at for I had nobody who would help me to roll the

stone. . . I denied that the papacy was of God; but I granted that it had the authority of man. Now, after reading all the subtleties by which these sparks prop up their idol, I know that the papacy is only the kingdom of Babylon, and the tyranny of the great hunter, Nimrod. I therefore beg all my friends, and all booksellers, to burn the books which I wrote on this subject, and to substitute for them the single proposition: `The papacy is a general chase, by command of the Roman pontiff, for the purpose of running down and destroying souls.'"

70. On baptism, in the same book, he said: "God has preserved this single sacrament to us clear of human traditions. God has said, Whoso believeth and is baptized, shall be saved. This divine promise must take precedence of all works, however splendid, of all vows, all satisfactions, all indulgences, all that man has devised. On this promise, if we receive it in faith, all our salvation depends. If we believe, our heart is strengthened by the divine promise; and though all else should abandon the believer, this promise will not abandon him. With it he will resist the adversary who assaults his soul, and will meet death though pitiless, and even the judgment of God himself. In all trials his comfort will be to say, ` God is faithful to His promises, and these were pledged to me in baptism; if God be for me, who can be against me?' Oh, how rich the Christian, the baptized! Nothing can destroy him but his own refusal to believe."

71. "Wherefore, I declare that neither the pope, nor the bishop, nor any man whatever, is entitled to impose the smallest burden on a Christian -- at least without his consent. Whatsoever is done otherwise is done tyrannically. We are free of all men. The vow which we made in baptism is sufficient by itself alone, and is more than all we could ever accomplish. Therefore all other vows may be abolished. Let every one who enters the priesthood, or a religious order, consider well that the works of a monk or a priest, how difficult soever they may be, are, in the view of God, in no respect superior to those of a peasant laboring in the field, or a woman

attending to the duties of her house. God estimates all these things by the rule of faith. And it often happens that the simple labor of a manservant, or maidservant, is more agreeable to God than the fastings and works of a monk, these being

740

deficient in faith . . . The Christian people are the people of God led away into captivity, to Babylon, and there robbed of their baptism.

72. "I learn that a new papal excommunication has been prepared against me. If so, the present book may be regarded as part of my future recantation. In proof of my obedience, the rest will soon follow; and the whole will, with the help of Christ, form a collection, the like to which Rome never saw or heard before."

73. What Luther had thus far said upon the pope, was not spoken with reference to the person of Leo X, but of the pope as the center of papacy. For Leo X personally, Luther had great respect. And now, he sends a personal letter to Leo, appealing to him, against the papacy as a system; and pleading with him to accept the gospel and separate from Rome. It was a Christian letter, presenting to the pope the truth. It was God's call even to the pope, to forsake Babylon. In this letter, Luther wrote: "To the most holy father in God, Leo X, pope at Rome, salvation in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

74. "From amid the fearful war which I have been waging for three years with disorderly men, I can not help looking to you, O Leo, most holy father in God. And although the folly of your impious flatterers has compelled me to appeal from your judgment to a future council, my heart is not turned away from your holiness; and I have not ceased to pray God earnestly and with profound sighs, to grant prosperity to yourself and your pontificate.

75. "It is true I have attacked some antichristian doctrines, and have inflicted a deep wound on my adversaries because of their impiety. Of this I repent not, as I have here Christ for an example. Of what use is salt if it have lost its savor, or the edge of a sword if it will not cut? Cursed be he who does the work of the Lord negligently. Most excellent Leo, far from having conceived any bad thoughts with regard to you, my wish is that you may enjoy the most precious blessings throughout eternity. One thing only I have done: I have maintained the Word of truth. I am ready to yield to all in everything; but as to this Word, I will not, I can not abandon it. He who thinks differently on this subject is in error.

76. "It is true that I have attacked the court of Rome; but neither yourself nor any man living can deny that there is greater corruption

741

in it than was in Sodom and Gomorrah, and that the impiety which prevails makes cure hopeless. Yes; I have been horrified on seeing how, under your name, the poor followers of Christ were deceived. I have opposed this, and will oppose it still, -- not that I imagine it possible, in spite of the opposition of flatterers, to accomplish anything in this Babylon, which is confusion itself; but I owe it to my brethren to endeavor, if possible, to remove some of them from these dreadful evils.

77. "You know it; Rome has for many years been inundating the world with whatever could destroy both soul and body. The Church of Rome, formerly the first in holiness, has become a den of robbers, a place of prostitution, a kingdom of death and hell; so that antichrist himself, were he to appear, would be unable to increase the amount of wickedness. All this is as clear as day.

78. "And yet, O Leo, you yourself are like a lamb in the midst of wolves -- a Daniel in the lion's den. But, single-handed, what can you oppose to these monsters? There may be three or four cardinals who to knowledge add virtue. But what are these against so many? You should perish by poison even before you could

try any remedy. It is all over with the court at Rome -- the wrath of God has overtaken and will consume it. It hates counsel -- it fears reform -- it will not moderate the fury of its ungodliness; and hence it may be justly said of it as of its mother, We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed; forsake her. It belonged to you and your cardinals to apply the remedy; but the patient laughs at the doctor, and the horse refuses to feel the bit. . . .

79. "Cherishing the deepest affection for you, most excellent Leo, I have always regretted that, formed as you are for a better age, you were raised to the pontificate in these times. Rome is not worthy of you, and those who resemble you; the only chief whom she deserves to have is Satan himself; and hence the truth is, that in this Babylon he is more king than you are. Would to God that, laying aside this glory which your enemies so much extol, you would exchange it for a modest pastoral office, or live on your paternal inheritance. Rome's glory is of a kind fit only for Iscariots. . . O my dear Leo, of what use are you in this Roman court, unless it be to allow the most execrable

men to use your name and your authority in ruining fortunes, destroying souls, multiplying crimes, oppressing faith, truth, and the whole Church of God? O Leo, Leo! you are the most unfortunate of men, and you sit upon the most dangerous of thrones. I tell you the truth because I wish you good.

80. "Is it not true that, under the vast expanse of heaven there is nothing more corrupt, more hateful, than the Roman Court? In vice and corruption it infinitely exceeds the Turks. Once the gate of heaven, it has become the mouth of hell -- a wide mouth which the wrath of God keeps open, so that, on seeing so many unhappy beings thrown headlong into it, I was obliged to lift my voice, as in a tempest, in order that, at least, some might be saved from the fearful abyss. Such, O Leo, my Father, was the reason why I inveighed against this death-giving see. Far from attacking your person, I thought I was laboring for your safety, when I valiantly assaulted this prison, or rather, this hell in which you are confined. To do all sorts of evil to the Court of Rome, were to discharge your own duty; to cover it with shame is to honor Christ; in one word, to be a Christian is to be anything but a Roman.

81. "Meanwhile, seeing that in succoring the see of Rome I was losing my labor and my pains, I sent her a letter of divorce. I said to her, `Adieu, Rome!' He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still (Rev. 22:11), and devoted myself to the tranquil and solitary study of the sacred volume. Then Satan opened his eyes and awoke his servant, John Eck, a great enemy of Jesus Christ, in order that he might oblige me again to descend into the arena. Eck's wish was to establish the primacy, not of Peter, but of himself, and for that purpose, to lead vanquished Luther in triumph. The blame of all the obloquy which has been cast on the see of Rome rests with him.

82. "Now, then, I come to you, O most holy Father, and prostrated at your feet, pray you, if possible, to put a curb on the enemies of the truth. But I can not retract my doctrine. I can not permit rules of interpretation to be imposed on the Holy Scriptures. The Word of God, the source whence all freedom springs, must be left free." "O Leo, my father! listen not to those flattering sirens who tell you that you are not a mere man, but a demigod, and can ordain what you

please. You are the servant of servants; and the seat which you occupy is of all others the most dangerous, and the most unhappy. Give credit not to those who exalt, but to those who humble you. Perhaps I am too bold in giving advice to so high a majesty, whose duty it is to instruct all men. But I see the dangers which surround you at Rome; I see you driven hither and thither, tossed, as it were, upon the billows of a raging sea. Charity urges me; and I can not resist sending forth a warning cry.

83. "Not to appear empty-handed before your holiness I present you with a little book, which has appeared under your name; and which will make you aware of the subjects to which I will be able to devote

myself, if your flatterers permit me. It is a small matter as regards the size of the volume; but a great one in regard to its contents; for it comprehends a summary of the Christian life. I am poor and have nothing else to offer; besides, you have no want of anything but spiritual gifts. I commend myself to your holiness. May the Lord keep you for ever and ever! Amen."

84. This little book which Luther sent to the pope was entitled "Treatise on the Liberty of the Christian;" in which most precious Christian truth was brought to the attention of the pope, in the following gracious words: "The Christian is free -- all things are his. The Christian is a servant, subject to all in everything. By faith he is free; by love he is subject. Faith unites the soul with Christ, as a bride with the bridegroom. Everything that Christ has, becomes the property of the believer; everything that the believer has, becomes the property of Christ. Christ possesses all blessings, even eternal salvation; and these are thenceforth the property of the believer. The believer possesses all vices and all sins; and these become thenceforth the property of Christ. A happy exchange now takes place. Christ, who is God and man, Christ, who has never sinned, and whose holiness is invincible, Christ, the Omnipotent and eternal, appropriating to himself by His wedding ring -- that is to say, by faith -- all the sins of the believer; these sins are swallowed up in Him and annihilated, for no sin can exist in the presence of His infinite righteousness.

85. "Thus, by means of faith, the soul is delivered from all sins, and invested with the eternal righteousness of Jesus Christ, the Bridegroom.

O happy union! Jesus Christ the rich, the noble, the holy Bridegroom, takes in marriage this poor, guilty, contemned bride, deliveres her from all evil, and decks her in the richest robes. . . Christ, a king and priest, shares this honor and glory with all Christians. The Christian is a king, and consequently possesses all things. He is a priest, and consequently possesses God. And it is faith, not works, which procures him this honor. The Christian is free from all things, and above all things -- faith giving him everything in abundance."

86. "Although the Christian has thus been made free, he voluntarily becomes a servant, that he may act towards his brethren as God acted towards him through Jesus Christ. I desire freely, joyfully, and gratuitously, to serve a Father who hath thus shed upon me all the riches of His goodness. I wish to become everything to my neighbor, as Christ has become everything to me. . . From faith flows love to God, and from love a life full of liberty, charity, and joy. Oh, how noble and elevated a life the life of the Christian is! But alas! none know it, and none preach it. By faith the Christian rises even to God, -- by love he descends to man, still, however, remaining always in God. This is true liberty, -- a liberty as far above every other species of liberty as the heavens are above the earth."

87. Oct. 3, 1520, the pope's bull was published in Germany, upon which Luther said: "At length this Roman bull has arrived. I despise it, and defy it as impious, false, and in all respects worthy of Eck. It is Christ himself who is condemned. It gives no reasons; it merely cites me, not to be heard, but simply to sing a palinode. I will treat it as spurious, though I have no doubt it is genuine. Oh, if Charles V were a man, and would, for the love of Christ, attack these demons! I rejoice in having to endure some hardships for the best of causes. I already feel more liberty in my heart; for, at length, I know that the pope is antichrist, and that his see is that of Satan himself."

88. In accordance with the decree of the bull, Luther's books were being gathered together by the agents of Rome, and burnt. At Louvain in the Netherlands, when the decree was published that all his books should be gathered together, and on a certain day, burnt at a certain spot, when the time came, there was a great crowd present and "students and burghers were seen hastening through the crowd, their arms filled with

large volumes, which they threw into the flames. Their zeal edified the monks and doctors;" but it was afterwards discovered that "instead of the writings of Luther, they had thrown into the fire the `Sermones Discipuli Tartaret,' and other scolastic and popish books!" The doctors of Louvain told Margaret, regent of the Netherlands: "Luther is subverting the Christian faith." She asked: "Who is this Luther?" They said: "An ignorant monk." The princess replied: "Well, then, do you who are learned, in such numbers, write against him. The world will credit a multitude of learned men sooner than an isolated monk."

89. November 4, following, Luther published a treatise entitled, "Against the Bull of Antichrist," in which he said: "What errors, what impostures, have crept in among the poor people under the cloak of the Church and the pretended infallibility of the pope! How many souls have thus been lost! How much blood shed! what murders committed! what kingdoms ruined! I know very well how to distinguish between art and malice; and set very little value on a malice which has no art. To burn books is so easy a matter, that even children can do it; how much more the holy father and his doctors. It would become them to show greater ability than is requisite merely to burn books. . . . Besides, let them destroy my works! I desire nothing more; for all I wished was to guide men to the Bible, that they might, thereafter, lay aside all my writings. Good God; if we had the knowledge of Scripture, what need would there be for my writings? . . . I am free, by the grace of God; and bulls neither solace nor frighten me. My strength and consolation are where neither men nor devils can assail them."

90. It was a crime for any person to appeal from the pope to a general council. But, November 17, Luther committed this crime. A notary and five witnesses were called by Luther to the convent where he resided; and there Luther had the notary draw up in legal form his appeal, in the following words: --

"Considering that a general council of the Christian Church is above the pope, especially in all that concerns the faith:

"Considering that the power of the pope is not above, but beneath the Scripture, and that he has no right to worry the sheep of Christ, and throw them into the wolf's mouth:

"I, Martin Luther, Augustine, doctor of the Holy Scriptures at Wittemberg, do, by this writing, appeal for myself, and for all who shall adhere to me, from the most holy Pope Leo, to a future universal Christian council.

"I appeal from the said Pope Leo, first, as an unjust, rash, tyrannical judge, who condemns me without hearing me; and without explaining the grounds of his judgment; secondly, as a heretic, a strayed, obdurate apostate, condemned by the Holy Scriptures, inasmuch as he ordains me to deny that Christian faith is necessary in the use of the sacraments; thirdly as an enemy an antichrist, an adversary, a tyrant of the Holy Scripture, who dares to oppose his own words to all the words of God; fourthly, as a despiser, a calumniator, a blasphemer of the holy Christian Church and a free council, inasmuch as he pretends that a council is nothing in itself.

"Wherefore, I most humbly supplicate the most serene, most illustrious, excellent, generous, noble, brave, sage, and prudent lords, Charles, the Roman emperor, the electors, princes, counts, barons, knights, gentlemen, councilors, towns, and commonalties, throughout Germany, to adhere to my protestation, and join me in resisting the antichristian conduct of the pope, for the glory of God, the defense of the Church, and of Christian doctrine, and the maintenance of free councils in Christendom. Let them do so, and Christ our Lord will richly recompense them by His eternal grace. But if there are any who despise my prayer, and continue to obey that impious man, the pope, rather than God, I, by these presents, shake myself free of the responsibility. Having faithfully warned their consciences, I leave them, as well as the pope, and all his adherents, to the sovereign judgment of God."

91. December 10, notices were posted on the walls in public places of Wittemberg, "inviting professors and students to meet at nine o'clock in the morning, at the east gate, near the holy cross. A great number of teachers and pupils assembled; and Luther, walking at their head, led the procession to the appointed spot. . . . A

scaffold had been prepared. One of the oldest masters of arts applied the torch. At the moment when the flames arose, the redoubted Augustine, dressed in his frock, was seen to approach the pile, holding in his hands the Canon Law, the Decretals, the Clementines, the Extravagants of the popes, some writings of

747

Eck and Emser, and the papal bull. The Decretals having first been consumed, Luther held up the bull, and saying, `Since thou hast grieved the Lord's Anointed, let the eternal fire grieve and consume thee,' threw it into the flames."

92. Luther and the crowd all quietly returned to the town, Luther further remarking: "In all the papal laws there is not one word to teach us who Jesus Christ is. My enemies have been able, by burning my books, to injure the truth in the minds of the common people, and therefore I burnt their books in my turn. A serious struggle has now commenced. Hitherto I have only had child's play with the pope. I began the work in the name of God; it will be terminated without me, and by His power. If they burn my books, in which, to speak without vain glory, there is more of the gospel than in all the books of the pope, I am entitled, a fortiori, to burn theirs, in which there is nothing good."

93. The next day, at the close of his regular lecture, he said: "If you do not with all your heart combat the impious government of the pope, you can not be saved. Whoever takes pleasure in the religion and worship of the papacy, will be eternally lost in the life to come. If we reject it, we may expect all kinds of dangers, and even the loss of life. But it is far better to run such risks in the world than to be silent! As long as I live I will warn my brethren of the sore and plague of Babylon, lest several who are with us fall back with the others into the abyss of hell. The pope has three crowns, and they are these: the first is against God, for he condemns religion; the second, against the emperor, for he condemns the secular power; and the third, against society, for he condemns marriage."

94. All these things, of course, created greater and greater commotions throughout Germany, and even beyond. His enemies were attacking him from all sides: the hesitating ones were frightened: even his friends feared that he was going too fast and too far. Aleander, the pope's nuncio at the coronation of Charles V at Cologne, addressed the elector, Frederick of Saxony, whose subject Luther was: --

"See the immense perils to which this man exposes the Christian commonwealth. If a remedy is not speedily applied, the empire is destroyed. What ruined the Greeks, if it was not their abandonment of the pope? You can not remain united to Luther without separating

748

from Jesus Christ. In the name of his holiness, I ask of you two things: first, to burn the writings of Luther; secondly, to punish him according to his demerits, or at least to give him up a prisoner to the pope. The emperor, and all the princes of the empire, have declared their readiness to accede to our demands; you alone still hesitate."

95. The elector answered that this was a matter of too much importance to be decided upon the spur of the moment, and at a later time he would give a definite answer. On his own part Luther wrote to Spalatin, the elector's chaplain: "If the gospel was of a nature to be propagated or maintained by the power of the world, God would not have intrusted it to fishermen. To defend the gospel appertains not to the princes and pontiffs of this world. They have enough to do to shelter themselves from the judgments of the Lord and His Anointed. If I speak, I do it in order that they may obtain the knowledge of the divine word, and be saved by it."

96. Luther was, practically, alone; and even this began to be used as a charge against him. But, to all he said: "Who knows if God has not chosen me, and called me; and if they ought not to fear that, in despising me, they may be despising God himself?. . . Moses was alone on coming out of Egypt, Elijah alone in the time of

King Ahab, Isaiah alone in Jerusalem, Ezekiel alone at Babylon. . . . God never chose for a prophet either the high priest or any other great personage. He usually chose persons who were low and despised. On one occasion he even chose a shepherd (Amos). At all times the saints have had to rebuke the great -- kings, princes, priests, the learned -- at the risk of their lives. And under the new dispensation has it not been the same? Ambrose in his day was alone; after him Jerome was alone; later still Augustine was alone. . . . I do not say that I am a prophet; but I say they ought to fear just because I am alone, and they are many. One thing I am sure of, the Word of God is with me, and is not with them.

97. "It is said also that I advance novelties, and that it is impossible to believe that all other doctors have for so long a period been mistaken. No, I do not preach novelties. But I say that all Christian doctrines have disappeared, even among those who ought to have preserved them, -- I mean bishops and the learned. I doubt not, however, that the truth has remained in some hearts, should it even have been in infants in

749

the cradle. Poor peasants, mere babes, now understand Jesus Christ better than the pope, the bishops, and the doctors.

98. "I am accused of rejecting the holy doctors of the Church. I reject them not; but since all those doctors try to prove their writings by Holy Scripture, it must be clearer and more certain than they are. Who thinks of proving an obscure discourse by one still more obscure? Thus, then, necessity constrains us to recur to the Bible, as all the doctors do, and to ask it to decide upon their writings; for the Bible is lord and master."

99. Jan. 28, 1521, the Diet of Worms was opened by Charles V in person, the first imperial assembly since his accession. Never had a diet been attended by so many princes." And, among the subjects to be considered there, the emperor had named, in his letter convening the diet, "The Reformation." He had written to the elector Frederick to "bring Luther to the diet, assuring him that no injustice would be done him, that he would meet with no violence, that learned men would confer with him." Information of this was conveyed by the elector, through his chaplain, to Luther. Luther's health was just then quite poor; and his friends were afraid.

100. But Luther, never fearing, only said: "If I can not go to Worms in health, I will make myself to be carried; since the emperor calls me, I can not doubt but it is a call from God himself. If they mean to employ violence against me, as is probable (for assuredly it is not with a view to their own instruction that they make me appear), I leave the matter in the hands of the Lord. He who preserved the three young men in the furnace, still lives and reigns. If He is not pleased to save me, my life is but a small matter; only let us not allow the gospel to be exposed to the derision of the wicked, and let us shed our blood for it sooner than permit them to triumph. Whether would my life or my death contribute most to the general safety? It is not for us to decide. Let us only pray to God that our young emperor may not commence his reign with dipping his hands in my blood; I would far rather perish by the sword of the Romans. You know what judgments befel the emperor Sigismund after the murder of John Huss. Expect everything of me save flight and recantation; I can not fly, still less can I recant."

101. But the elector would rather trust Luther to the care of God;

750

and without waiting for a reply from Luther, he wrote to the emperor: "It seems to me difficult to bring Luther with me to Worms; relieve me from the task. Besides, I have never wished to take his doctrine under my protection; but only to prevent him from being condemned without a hearing. The legates, without waiting for your orders, have proceeded to take a step, insulting both to Luther and to me; and I much fear that in this way they have hurried him on to an imprudent act [the burning of the pope's bull], which might expose him to great danger, were he to appear at the diet."

102. In the diet the pope's nuncio made a great speech, three hours in length, against Luther. The papacy did not want Luther to go to the diet: she did not want him to be heard. Aleander's speech was designed especially to persuade the emperor not to summon him. He closed with the following words: --

"Luther will not allow any one to instruct him. The pope summoned him to Rome; but he did not obey. The pope summoned him to Augsburg before his legate; and he would not appear without a safe-conduct from the emperor, -- i. e., until the hands of the legate were tied, and nothing left free to him but his tongue. Ah! I supplicate your imperial majesty not to do what would issue in disgrace. Interfere not with a matter of which laics have no right to take cognizance. Do your own work. Let Luther's doctrines be interdicted throughout the empire; let his writings be everywhere burnt. Fear not; there is enough in the writings of Luther to burn a hundred thousand heretics. . . And what have we to fear?. . . The populace? Before the battle they seem terrible from their insolence; in the battle they are contemptible from their cowardice. Foreign princes? The king of France has prohibited Luther's doctrine from entering his kingdom; while the king of Great Britain is preparing a blow for it with his royal hand. You know what the feelings of Hungary, Italy, and Spain are, and none of your neighbors, how great soever the enmity he may bear to yourself, wishes you anything so bad as this heresy. If the house of our enemy is adjacent to our own, we may wish him fever, but not pestilence. . . Who are all these Lutherans? A huddle of insolent grammarians, corrupt priests, disorderly monks, ignorant advocates, degraded nobles, common people, misled and perverted. Is not the Catholic party far more numerous, able, and powerful? A unanimous decree of this assembly will enlighten the simple, give warning to the imprudent, determine those who are hesitating, and confirm the feeble. . . . But if the axe is not laid to the root of this poisonous shrub, if the fatal stroke is not given to it then . . . I see it covering the heritage of Jesus Christ with its branches, changing the vineyard of the Lord into a howling forest, transforming the kingdom of

God into a den of wild beasts, and throwing Germany into the frightful state of barbarism and desolation to which Asia has been reduced by the superstition of Mohammed."

103. But, a few days afterward, Aleander's effort was completely nullified by a speech of Duke George, Luther's greatest enemy amongst the nobles. And, from his widely known enmity to Luther, his speech had so much the more effect. "Seeing the nuncio sought to confound Luther and reform in one common condemnation, George suddenly stood up amongst the assembled princes, and, to the great astonishment of those who knew his hatred to the Reformer, said: --

"The diet must not forget the grievances of which it complains against the court of Rome. What abuses have crept into our States! The annats which the emperor granted freely for the good of Christendom now demanded as a debt, -- the Roman courtiers every day inventing new ordinances, in order to absorb, sell, and farm out ecclesiastical benefices, -- a multitude of transgressions winked at, -- rich offenders unworthily tolerated, while those who have no means of ransom are punished without pity, -- the popes incessantly bestowing expectancies and reversions on the inmates of their palace, to the detriment of those to whom the benefices belong, -- the commendams of abbeys and convents of Rome conferred on cardinals, bishops, and prelates, who appropriate their revenues, so that there is not one monk in convents which ought to have twenty or thirty, -- stations multiplied without end, and indulgence shops established in all the streets and squares of our cities, shops of St. Anthony, shops of the Holy Spirit, of St. Hubert, of St. Cornelius, of St. Vincent, and many others besides, -- societies purchasing from Rome the right of holding such markets, then purchasing from their bishop the right of exhibiting their wares, and, in order to procure all this money, draining and emptying the pockets of the poor, -- the indulgence, which ought to be granted solely for the salvation of souls, and which ought to be merited only by prayers, fastings, and the salvation of souls, sold at a regular price, -- the officials of the bishops oppressing those in humble life with penances for blasphemy, adultery, debauchery, the violation of this or that feast day, while, at the same time, not even censuring ecclesiastics who are guilty of the same crimes, -- penances imposed on the penitent, and artfully arranged, so that he soon falls anew into the same fault, and pays so much the more money.

"Such are some of the crying abuses of Rome; all sense of shame has been cast off, and one thing only is pursued -- money! money! Hence, preachers who ought to teach the truth, now do nothing more than retail lies -- lies, which are not only tolerated, but recompensed, because the more they lie, the more they gain. From this polluted well comes forth all this polluted water. Debauchery goes hand in hand with avarice.

752

The officials cause women to come to their houses under divers pretexts, and strive to seduce them, sometimes by menaces, sometimes by presents; or, if they can not succeed, injure them in their reputation. Ah! the scandals caused by the clergy precipitate multitudes of poor souls into eternal condemnation! There must be a universal reform, and this reform must be accomplished by summoning a general council. Wherefore, most excellent princes and lords, with submission I implore you to lose no time in the consideration of this matter."

104. Other members of the diet followed Duke George in a similar strain. They said: "We have a pontiff who spends his life in hunting and pleasure. Benefices of Germany are given at Rome to huntsmen, domestics, grooms, stable boys, body servants, and other people of that class: ignorant, unpolished people, without capacity, and entire strangers to Germany." Duke George put his speech and grievances in writing. A committee was appointed to collect the grievances. And, when they had rendered their report, the list of grievances against Rome numbered one hundred and one. "A deputation, consisting of secular and ecclesiastical princes, presented the list to the emperor, imploring him to give redress, as he had engaged to do at his election. `How many Christian souls are lost,' said they to Charles V. `How many depredations, how much extortion, are caused by the scandals with which the spiritual chief of Christendom is environed! The ruin and dishonor of our people must be prevented. Therefore, we all, in a body, supplicate you most humbly, but also must urgently, to ordain a general reformation, to undertake it, and to accomplish it." Even the emperor's confessor had "denounced the vengeance of heaven against him if he did not reform the Church." One effect of all this was that "the emperor immediately withdrew the edict which ordered Luther's writings to be committed to the flames in every part of the empire; and in its place substituted a provisional order remitting these books to the magistrates."

105. These occurrences had awakened in the diet a real desire that Luther should appear there. His friends were always insisting that it was unjust to condemn him without a hearing; and now some of his enemies said: "His doctrine has so taken possession of men's hearts that it is impossible to arrest their progress without hearing him." But the pope's nuncio, really afraid that Luther might be brought, exerted himself more diligently than ever to prevent it. He went even to the emperor himself, and said: --

753

"It is unlawful to bring into question what the sovereign pontiff has decided. There will be no discussion with Luther, you say; but will not the power of this audacious man -- will not the fire of his eye, and the eloquence of his tongue, and the mysterious spirit which animates him, be sufficient to excite some sedition? Several already venerate him as a saint; and you, everywhere, meet with his portrait surrounded with a halo of glory, as round the head of the Blessed. If it is determined to cite him, at least let it be without giving him the protection of public faith."

106. But all opposition was in vain. The emperor decided that Luther should come. And the emperor gave him not only the imperial safe-conduct, but had each of the princes through whose States he should pass, also give him a safe-conduct. March 6, 1521, the emperor sent to him the following summons: --

"Charles, by the grace of God, elected Roman emperor, always Augustus, etc., etc.

"Honorable, dear, and pious! We, and the States of the holy empire, having resolved to make an inquest touching the doctrine and the books which you have published for some time past, have given you, to come here and return to a place of safety, our safe-conduct, and that of the empire, here subjoined. Our sincere desire is, that you immediately prepare for this journey, in order that, in the space of twenty-one days, mentioned in our

safe-conduct, you may be here certainly, and without fail. Have no apprehension of either injustice or violence. We will firmly enforce our safe-conduct underwritten; and we expect that you will answer to our call. In so doing, you will follow our serious advice.

"Given at our imperial city of Worms, the sixth day of March, in the year of our Lord, 1521, and in the second year of our reign. CHARLES.

"By order of my lord the emperor, with his own hand, Albert, cardinal of Mentz, archchancellor. NICHOLAS ZWILL.

107. April 2 Luther started to Worms. "Wherever he passed, the people flocked to see him. His journey was a kind of triumphal procession. Deep interest was felt in beholding the intrepid man who was on the way to offer his head to the emperor and the empire. An immense concourse surrounded him. `Ah!' said some of them to him, `there are so many cardinals and so many bishops at Worms, they will burn you; they will reduce your body to ashes, as was done with that of John Huss.' But nothing terrified the monk. `Were they to make a fire,' said he, `that would extend from Worms to Wittemberg, and reach even to the

sky, I would walk across it in the name of the Lord; I would appear before them; I would walk into the jaws of this behemoth, and break his teeth, and confess the Lord Jesus Christ."

108. At another place an officer said to him: "Are you the man who undertakes to reform the papacy? How will you succeed?" Luther replied: "Yes, I am the man. I confide in Almighty God, whose Word and command I have before me." The officer looked earnestly into his face, and said: "Dear friend, there is something in what you say. I am the servant of Charles; but your Master is greater than mine. He will aid you and guard you." At yet another place an aged widow said to him: "My father and mother told me that God would raise up a man who should oppose the papal vanities, and save the Word of God. I hope you are that man. And I wish you, for your work, the grace and the Holy Spirit of God."

109. As he drew to Worms, Aleander and the other chief papists were more than ever concerned. They set a trap, to have him turn aside at the invitation of some friends, where they would meet him for a conference, and detain him till the safe-conduct was expired. But Luther would accept no invitation. He said: "I continue my journey; and if the emperor's confessor has anything to say to me, he will find me at Worms. I go where I am called." Even Spalatin, a true friend, so far weakened as to send a messenger to meet Luther, with the message: "Don't enter Worms!" Luther looked straight at the messenger, and replied: "Go, and tell your master that were there as many devils in Worms as there are tiles upon the roofs, I would enter."

110. And he did enter. A hundred mounted gentlemen met him outside the gates, to escort him into the city. A crowd awaited him at the gates. Two thousand people accompanied him through the streets. As he passed along, "suddenly a man clad in singular dress, and carrying a large cross before him, as is usual at funerals, breaks off from the crowd, advances toward Luther, and then in a loud voice, and with the plaintive cadence which is used in saying mass for the repose of the souls of the dead, chants the following stanzas, as if he had been determined that the very dead should hear them: --

"Advenisti, O desiderabilis!

"Quem expectabamus in tenebris!

"Thou hast arrived, O desired one! thou whom we longed and waited for in darkness."

111. The emperor immediately assembled his council of State, and said: "Luther is arrived! What must be done?" The bishop of Palermo said: "We have long consulted on this subject. Let your imperial majesty speedily get rid of this man. Did not Sigismund cause John Huss to be burned? There is no obligation either to give or observe a safe-conduct to a heretic." But Charles answered: "No! What has been promised must be performed!" The next morning, Friday, April 17, the marshal of the empire came to Luther, and summoned him to "appear at four o'clock P. M. in the presence of his imperial majesty and the States of the empire."

112. As four o'clock struck, the marshal again appeared, and escorted Luther to the hall of the diet. "The herald walked first; after him the marshal; and last the Reformer. The multitude thronging the streets was still more numerous than on the previous evening. It was impossible to get on; it was vain to cry, Give place! -- the crowd increased. At length, the herald, seeing the impossibility of reaching the town hall, caused some private houses to be opened, and conducted Luther through gardens and secret passages to the place of meeting. The people, perceiving this, rushed into the houses on the steps of the monk of Wittemberg, or placed themselves at the windows which looked into the gardens, while great numbers of persons got up on the roofs. The tops of the houses, the pavement, every place above and below, was covered with spectators."

113. They finally reached the hall. But here the crowd was greater than anywhere else. The soldiers had to make a way for them. As he was entering the hall, an old general, "seeing Luther pass, clapped him on the shoulder, and shaking his head, whitened in battle, kindly said to him: `Poor monk! Poor monk! You have before you a march, and an affair, the like to which neither I nor a great many captains have ever seen in the bloodiest of our battles. But if your cause is just, and you have full confidence in it, advance in the name of God, and fear nothing. God will not forsake you."

114. Luther stood before the diet. "Never had man appeared before an assembly so august. The emperor Charles V, whose dominions

embraced the old and the new world; his brother, the archduke Ferdinand; six electors of the empire, whose descendants are now almost all wearing the crown of kings; twenty-four dukes, the greater part of them reigning over territories of greater or less extent, and among whom are some bearing a name which will afterward become formidable to the Reformation (the duke of Alva, and his two sons); eight margraves; thirty archbishops, bishops, or prelates; seven ambassadors, among them those of the kings of France and England; the deputies of ten free towns; a great number of princes, counts, and sovereign barons the nuncios of the pope; -- in all, two hundred and four personages.

115. "This appearance was in itself a signal victory gained over the papacy. The pope had condemned the man; yet here he stood before a tribunal which thus far placed itself above the pope. The pope had put him under his ban, debarring him from all human society; and yet here he was convened in honorable terms, and admitted before the most august assembly in the world. The pope had ordered that his mouth should be forever mute; and he was going to open it before an audience of thousands, assembled from the remotest quarters of Christendom. An immense revolution had thus been accomplished by the instrumentality of Luther. Rome was descending from her throne -- descending at the bidding of a monk.

116. "Some of the princes, seeing the humble son of the miner of Mansfeld disconcerted in presence of the assembly of kings, kindly approached him, and one of them said: `Fear not them who can kill the body, but can not kill the soul.' Another added: `When you will be brought before kings, it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.' Thus the Reformer was consoled, in the very words of his Master, by the instrumentality of the rulers of the world."

117. Finally they had made their way to the presence of the emperor, and stood in front of his throne. Then the marshal, instructing him not to speak till he was asked, withdrew. In a moment an official addressed him, first in Latin, and then in German: "Martin Luther, his sacred and invincible imperial majesty has cited you

before his throne, by the advice and counsel of the States of the holy Roman Empire, in order to call upon you to answer these two questions: First, Do you admit

757

that these books were composed by you [pointing to a collection of about twenty books lying on a table]? Secondly, Do you mean to retract these books and their contents, or do you persist in the things which you have advanced in them?"

118. Luther was about to reply, but his counsel interrupted, saying: "Read the titles of the books." The titles were read. Then, first in Latin, next in German, Luther said: "Most gracious emperor! gracious princes and lords! His imperial majesty asks me two questions. As to the first, I acknowledge that the books which have been named are mine: I can not deny them. As to the second, considering that it is a question which concerns faith and the salvation of souls, -- a question in which the Word of God is interested; in other words, the greatest and most precious treasure either in heaven or on the earth, -- I should act imprudently were I to answer without reflection. I might say less than the occasion requires, or more than the truth demands, and thus incur the guilt which our Saviour denounced when He said: Whoso shall deny me before men, him will I deny before My Father who is in heaven. Wherefore, I pray your imperial majesty, with all submission, to give me time, that I may answer without offense to the Word of God."

119. The emperor, who had narrowly watched Luther all this time, turned to one of his courtiers, and said: "Assuredly that is not the man who would ever make me turn heretic!" After a consultation of the emperor and his lords, proclamation was made: "Martin Luther, his imperial majesty, in accordance with the goodness which is natural to him, is pleased to grant you another day; but on condition that you give your reply verbally and not in writing." Luther returned to his rooms, and wrote to a friend: "I write you from the midst of tumult. I have within this hour, appeared before the emperor and his brother. I have acknowledged the authorship, and declared that to-morrow I will give my answer concerning retractation. By the help of Jesus Christ, not one iota of all my works will I retract."

120. The next day, as the hour drew near, Luther felt the solemnity of the occasion. He was to speak to the whole world, for God and His truth. He therefore engaged earnestly in prayer, some sentences of which were overheard by his friends and were preserved: "God Almighty! God Eternal! how terrible is the world! how it opens its mouth to

758

swallow me up! and how defective my confidence in thee! How weak the flesh! how powerful Satan! If I must put my hope in that which the world calls powerful, I am undone!. . . The knell is struck, and judgment is pronounced! . . . O God! O God! O thou, my God! assist me against all the wisdom of the world! Do it: thou must do it. . . . Thou alone; . . . for it is not my work, but thine. I have nothing to do here, -- I have nothing to do contending thus with the mighty of the world. I, too, would like to spend tranquil and happy days. But the cause is thine; and it is just and everlasting! O Lord! be my help. Faithful God! immutable God! I trust not in any man. That were vain. All that is of man vacillates! All that comes of man gives way! O God! O God! dost thou not hear? . . . My God! art thou dead? . . . No; thou canst not die! Thou only hidest thyself! Thou hast chosen me for this work! I know it. Act, then, O God! . . . Stand by my side, for the sake of thy well-beloved Son, Jesus Christ, who is my defense, my buckler, and my fortress! . . .

121. "Come! Come! I am ready! . . . I am ready to give up my life for thy truth, . . . patient as a lamb. For the cause is just, and it is thine! . . . I will not break off from thee, either now or through eternity! . . . And though the world should be filled with devils, though my body, -- which, however, is the work of thy hands -- should bite the dust, be racked on the wheel, cut in pieces . . . ground to powder, . . . my soul is thine. Yes, thy Word is my pledge. My soul belongs to thee, and will be eternally near thee . . . Amen. . . O God, help me! . . . Amen."

122. At four o'clock the imperial herald came, to conduct him to the diet. When they arrived at the hall, "many persons entered with him; for there was an eager desire to hear his answer. All minds were on the stretch, waiting impatiently for the decisive moment which now approached. This time Luther was free, calm, self-possessed, and showed not the least appearance of being under constraint. Prayer had produced its fruits. The princes having taken their seats, -- not without out difficulty, for their places were almost invaded, -- and the monk of Wittemberg again standing in front of Charles V, the chancellor of the elector of Treves rose up and said: `Martin Luther! you yesterday asked a delay, which is now expired. Assuredly it might have been denied

you, since every one ought to be sufficiently instructed in matters of faith, to be able always to render an account of it to whosoever asks, -- you above all, so great and able a doctor of Holy Scripture. . . Now, then, reply to the question of his majesty, who has treated you with so much mildness: Do you mean to defend your books out and out, or do you mean to retract some part of them?'"

123. Then, says the Acts of Worms: "Then Doctor Martin Luther replied in the most humble and submissive manner. He did not raise his voice; he spoke not with violence, but with candor, meekness, suitableness, and modesty, and yet with great joy and Christian firmness."

124. "Most serene emperor! illustrious princes! gracious lords! I this day appear humbly before you, according to the order which was given me yesterday; and by the mercies of God, I implore your majesty and august highnesses, to listen kindly to the defense of a cause which I am assured is righteous and true. If, from ignorance, I am wanting in the usages and forms of courts, pardon me; for I was not brought up in the palaces of kings, but in the obscurity of a cloister.

125. "Yesterday, two questions were asked me on the part of his imperial majesty: the first, if I was the author of the books whose titles were read; the second, if I was willing to recall or to defend the doctrine which I have taught in them. I answered the first question, and I adhere to my answer.

126. "As to the second, I have composed books on very different subjects. In some, I treat of faith and good works in a manner so pure, simple, and Christian, that my enemies even, far from finding anything to censure, confess that these writings are useful, and worthy of being read by the godly. The papal bull, how severe soever it may be, acknowledges this. Were I then to retract these, what should I do? . . . Wretch! I should be alone among men, abandoning truths which the unanimous voice of my friends and enemies approves, and opposing what the whole world glories in confessing.

127. "In the second place, I have composed books against the papacy -- books in which I have attacked those who, by their false doctrine, their bad life, and scandalous example, desolate the Christian world, and destroy both body and soul. It not the fact proved by the complaints of all who fear God? Is it not evident that the human laws and doctrines

of the popes entangle, torture, martyr the consciences of the faithful; while the clamant and never-ending extortions of Rome engulf the wealth and riches of Christendom, and particularly of this illustrious kingdom?

128. "Were I to retract what I have written on this subject, what should I do? . . . What but fortify that tyranny, and open a still wider door for these many and great iniquities? Then, breaking forth with more fury than ever, these arrogant men would be seen increasing, usurping, raging more and more. And the yoke which weighs upon the Christian people would, by my retractation, not only be rendered more severe, but would become, so to speak, more legitimate; for by this very retractation, it would have received the confirmation of

your most serene majesty, and of all the States of the holy empire. Good God! I should thus be, as it were, an infamous cloak, destined to hide and cover all sorts of malice and tyranny.

129. "Thirdly, and lastly, I have written books against private individuals who wished to defend Roman tyranny and to destroy the faith. I confess frankly that I have perhaps attacked them with more violence than became my ecclesiastical profession. I do not regard myself as a saint; but no more can I retract these books: because, by so doing, I should sanction the impiety of my opponents, and give them occasion to oppress the people of God with still greater cruelty.

130. "Still, I am a mere man, and not God; and I will defend myself as Jesus Christ did. He said: "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil (John 18:23). How much more should I, who am but dust and ashes, and so apt to err, desire every one to state what he can against my doctrine!

131. "Wherefore, I implore you, by the mercies of God, you, most serene emperor, and you, most illustrious princes, and all others of high or low degree, to prove to me by the writings of the prophets and the apostles that I am mistaken. As soon as this shall have been proved, I will forthwith retract all my errors, and be the first to seize my writings and cast them into the flames.

132. "What I have just said shows clearly, I think, that I have well considered and weighed the dangers to which I expose myself; but, far from being alarmed, it gives me great joy to see that the gospel is now,

as in former times, a cause of trouble and discord. This is the characteristic and the destiny of the Word of God. I came not to send peace, but a sword, said Jesus Christ (Matt. 10:34). God is wonderful and terrible in working: let us beware, while pretending to put a stop to discord, that we do not persecute the holy Word of God, and bring in upon ourselves a frightful deluge of insurmountable dangers, present disasters, and eternal destruction. . . Let us beware that the reign of this young and noble prince, the emperor Charles, on whom, under God, we build such high hopes, do not only begin, but also continue and end under the most fatal auspices. I might cite examples taken from the oracles of God. I might remind you of the Pharaohs, the kings of Babylon and of Israel, who never labored more effectually for their ruin than when by counsels, apparently very wise, they thought they were establishing their empire. God removeth the mountains, and they know not (Job 9:5).

133. "If I speak thus, it is not because I think such great princes have need of my counsels, but because I wish to restore to Germany what she has a right to expect from her children. Thus, commending myself to your august majesty, and your serene highnesses, I humbly supplicate you not to allow the hatred of my enemies to bring down upon me an indignation which I have not deserved."

134. Luther had spoken in German. After resting a moment, he repeated his address in Latin, "with the same vigor as at first." "As soon as he had ceased, the chancellor of Treves, the orator of the diet, said to him, indignantly: `You have not answered the question which was put to you. You are not here to throw doubt on what has been decided by councils. You are asked to give a clear and definite reply. Will you, or will you not, retract?'"

135. Without hesitation Luther gave the answer that was called for: "Since your most serene majesty, and your high mightinesses, call upon me for a simple, clear, and definite answer, I will give it; and it is this: I can not subject my faith either to the pope or to councils, because it is as clear as day, that they have often fallen into error, and even into great self-contradiction. If, then, I am not disproved by passages of Scripture, or by clear arguments, -- if I am not convinced by the very passages which I have quoted, and so bound in conscience to submit

to the Word of God -- I neither can nor will retract anything, for it is not safe for a Christian to speak against his conscience. [Looking around upon the assembly] I CAN NOT OTHERWISE: GOD HELP ME! AMEN."

136. The emperor remarked: "The monk speaks with an intrepid heart and immovable courage." Then the chancellor said to Luther: "If you do not retract, the emperor and the States of the empire will consider what course they must adopt toward an obstinate heretic." But again Luther answered only: "God help me; for I can retract nothing."

137. The emperor withdrew; the diet adjourned; Luther returned to his lodgings. The next day the emperor presented to the diet, and caused to be read, the following message, which he had written with his own hand: --

"Sprung from the Christian emperors of Germany, from the Catholic kings of Spain, the archdukes of Austria, and the dukes of Burgundy, who are all illustrious as defenders of the Roman faith, it is my firm purpose to follow the example of my ancestors. A single monk, led astray by his own folly, sets himself up in opposition to the faith of Christendom. I will sacrifice my dominions, my power, my friends, my treasure, my body, my blood, my mind, and my life, to stay this impiety. I mean to send back the Augustine Luther, forbidding him to cause the least tumult among the people; thereafter, I will proceed against him and his adherents as against declared heretics, by excommunication and interdict, and all means proper for their destruction. I call upon the members of the States to conduct themselves like faithful Christians."

138. The representatives of the pope and several of the princes, demanded that the safe-conduct be violated. They said: "The Rhine must receive his ashes, as a century ago it received the ashes of John Huss." The elector Palatine said: "The execution of John Huss brought too many calamities on Germany, to allow such a scaffold to be erected a second time." And Duke George vigorously declared: "The princes of Germany will not allow a safe-conduct to be violated. This first diet, held by our new emperor, will not incur the guilt of an act so disgraceful. Such perfidy accords not with old German integrity."

139. Luther was allowed to return. As he was on his way home, the elector Frederick had him captured and carried away to the Wartburg, where he was kept in confinement to protect him from the wrath of the papacy, which, through the imperial power, was expressed as follows: --

"We, Charles the Fifth, to all the electors, princes, prelates, and others, whom it may concern:-

"The Almighty having intrusted to us, for the defense of his holy faith, more kingdoms and power than he gave to any of our predecessors, we mean to exert ourselves to the utmost to prevent any heresy from arising to pollute our holy empire.

"The Augustine monk, Martin Luther, though exhorted by us, has rushed, like a madman, against the holy Church, and sought to destroy it by means of books filled with blasphemy. He has, in a shameful manner, insulted the imperishable law of holy wedlock. He has striven to excite the laity to wash their hands in the blood of priests; and, overturning all obedience,has never ceased to stir up revolt, division, war, murder, theft, and fire, and to labor completely to ruin the faith of Christians. . . In a word, to pass over all his other iniquities in silence this creature, who is not a man, but Satan himself under the form of a man, covered with the cowl of a monk, has collected into one stinking pool all the worst heresies of past times, and has added several new ones of his own. . .

"We have therefore sent this Luther from before our face, that all pious and sensible men may regard him as a fool, or a man possessed of the devil; and we expect that, after the expiry of his safe-conduct, effectual means will be taken to arrest his furious rage.

"Wherefore, under pain of incurring the punishment due to the crime of treason, we forbid you to lodge the said Luther so soon as the fatal term shall be expired, to conceal him, give him meat or drink, and lend him by word or deed, publicly or secretly, any kind of assistance. We enjoin you, moreover, to seize him, or cause him to be seized, wherever you find him, and bring him to us without any delay, or to keep him in all safety until you hear from us how you are to act with regard to him, and till you receive the recompense due to your exertions in so holy a work.

"As to his adherents, you will seize them, suppress them, and confiscate their goods.

"As to his writings, if the best food becomes the terror of all mankind as soon as a drop of poison is mixed with it, how much more ought these books, which contain a deadly poison to the soul, to be not only rejected, but also annihilated! You will therefore burn them, or in some other way destroy them entirely.

"As to authors, poets, printers, painters, sellers or buyers of placards, writings, or paintings against the pope of the Church, you will lay hold of their persons and their goods, and treat them according to your good pleasure.

"And if any one, whatever be his dignity, shall dare to act in contradiction to the decree of our imperial majesty, we ordain that he shall be placed under the ban of the empire.

0 "Let every one conform hereto."

140. Luther remained in the Wartburg until March 3, 1522, when, without permission from anybody, he left and returned to Wittemberg. Knowing that his leaving the Wartburg without saying anything to the elector, would be ungrateful, and knowing also that his returning at all was virtually disclaiming the elector's protection, he addressed to him, the third day of his journey, the following letter: --

"Grace and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

"Most serene elector, gracious lord: What has happened at Wittemberg, to the great shame of the gospel, has filled me with such grief, that if I were not certain of the truth of our cause, I would have despaired of it. "Your Highness knows -- or if not, please to be informed -- I received the gospel not from men, but from heaven, by our Lord Jesus Christ. If I have asked for conferences, it was not because I had doubts of the truth, but from humility,and for the purpose of winning others. But since my humility is turned against the gospel, my conscience now impels me to act in a different manner. I have yielded enough to your Highness in exiling myself during this year. The devil knows it was not from fear I did it. I would have entered Worms, though there had been as many devils in the town as there were tiles on the roofs. Now, Duke George, with whom your Highness tries so much to frighten me, is far less to be feared than a single devil. Had that which has taken place at Wittemberg taken place at Leipsic (the duke's residence), I would instantly have mounted my horse and gone thither, even though (let your Highness pardon the expression) for nine days it should have done nothing but rain Duke Georges, and every one of them been nine times more furious than he is. What is he thinking of in attacking me? Does he take Christ, my Lord, for a man of straw? The Lord be pleased to avert the dreadful judgment which is impending over him.

"It is necessary for your Highness to know that I am on my way to Wittemberg, under a more powerful protection than that of an elector. I have no thought of soliciting the assistance of your Highness; so far from desiring your protection, I would rather give you mine. If I knew that your Highness could or would protect me, I would not come to Wittemberg. No sword can give any aid to this cause. God alone must do all without human aid or co-operation. He who had most faith is the best protector. Now, I observe that your highness is still very weak in the faith.

"But since your Highness desires to know what to do, I will answer with all humility. Your electoral Highness has already done too much, and ought to do nothing at all. God does not wish, and can not tolerate, either your cares and labors, or mine. Let your Highness, therefore, act accordingly.

765

"In regard to what concerns myself, your Highness must act as elector. You must allow the orders of his imperial majesty to be executed in your towns and rural districts. You must not throw any difficulty in the way, should it be wished to apprehend or slay me; for none must oppose the powers that be, save He who established them.

"Let your Highness, then, leave the gates open, and respect safe-conducts, should my enemies themselves, or their envoys, enter the States of your Highness in search of me. In this way you will avoid all embarrassment and danger.

"I have written this letter in haste, that you may not be disconcerted on learning my arrival. He with whom I have to deal is a different person from Duke George. He knows me well, and I know something of Him.

"Your electoral Highness's most humble servant,

"MARTIN LUTHER.

"Borna, the Conductor Hotel, Ash-Wednesday, 1522".

141. During his absence, fanatical spirits had arisen, and extreme and somewhat violent steps had been taken, and amongst the first words which he spoke upon his arrival in Wittemberg were these: "It is by the word that we must fight; by the word overturn and destroy what has been established by violence. I am unwilling to employ force against the superstitious or the unbelieving. Let him who believes approach; let him who believes not stand aloof. None ought to be constrained. Liberty is of the essence of faith."

142. In 1524 the Swabian peasants revolted, and in January, 1525, Luther addressed to them the following words: "The pope and the emperor have united against me; but the more the pope and the emperor have stormed, the greater the progress which the gospel has made. . . Why so? -- Because I have never drawn the sword, nor called for vengeance; because I have not had recourse either to tumult or revolt. I have committed all to God, and awaited His strong hand. It is neither with the sword nor the musket that Christians fight, but with suffering and the cross. Christ, their captain, did not handle the sword; He hung upon the tree."

143. In 1526 the Diet of Spires had decreed that the princes and people of Germany should not be interfered with in their worship after the Protestant order in the freedom of their own consciences, until a general council should meet to consider the whole question. But, in 1529, at the second Diet of Spires, an attempt was made to reverse this

766

decision. But the princes who favored the Reformation, said: "Let us reject this decree. In matters of conscience the majority has no power. It is to the decree of 1526 that we are indebted for the peace that the empire enjoys: its abolition would fill Germany with troubles and divisions. The diet is incompetent to do more than to preserve religious liberty until the council meets."

144. But a majority was in favor of the papacy, and was determined to carry through its will. The princes said: "We will obey the emperor in everything that will contribute to maintain peace and the honour of God." But "it was declared that the evangelical States should not be heard again." They were informed that their only

remaining course was to submit to the majority. Then the evangelical princes determined "to appeal from the report of the diet to the Word of God, and from the emperor Charles to Jesus Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords." They drew up a protest, the substantial part of which is as follows:-

"Dear Lords, Cousins, Uncles, and Friends: -- Having repaired to this diet at the summons of his majesty, and for the common good of the empire and of Christendom, we have heard and learned that the decisions of the last diet concerning our holy Christian faith are to be repealed, and that it is proposed to substitute for them certain restrictive and onerous resolutions. . .

"We can not, therefore, consent to its repeal:-

. . . . . .

"Secondly, because it concerns the glory of God and the salvation of our souls, and that in such matters we ought to have regard, above all, to the commandment of God, who is King of kings and Lord of lords; each of us rendering Him account for himself, without caring the least in the world about majority or minority.

"We form no judgment on that which concerns you, most dear lords; and we are content to pray God daily that He will bring us all to unity of faith, in truth, charity, and holiness, through Jesus Christ, our throne of grace, and our only Mediator.

"But, in what concerns ourselves, adhesion to your resolution (and let every honest man be judge!) would be acting against our conscience, condemning a doctrine that we maintain to be Christian, and pronouncing that it ought to be abolished in our States, if we could do so without trouble.

"This would be to deny our Lord Jesus Christ, to reject His holy Word, and thus give Him just reason to deny us in turn before His Father, as He has threatened. . .

"Moreover, the new edict declaring the ministers shall preach the gospel, explaining it according to the writings accepted by the holy Christian Church; we think that, for this regulation to have any value, we should first agree on what is meant by the true and holy Church. Now, seeing that there is great diversity of opinion in this respect; that there is no sure doctrine but such as is conformable to the Word of God; that the Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine; that each text of the Holy Scriptures ought to be explained by other and clearer texts; that this holy book is in all things necessary for the Christian, easy of understanding, and calculated to scatter the darkness: we are resolved, with the grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of His holy Word, such as it is contained in the biblical books of the Old and the New Testament, without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to it. This Word is the only truth; it is the sure rule of all doctrine, and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all the human vanities that are set up against it shall fall before the face of God.

"For these reasons, most dear lords, uncles, cousins, and friends, we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we PROTEST by these presents, before God, our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Saviuors, and who will one day be our Judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and for our people, neither consent nor adhere in any manner whatsoever to the proposed decree, in anything that is contrary to God, to His holy Word, to our right conscience, to the salvation of our souls, and to the last decree of Spires."

145. "The principles contained in this celebrated protest of the 19th of April, 1529, constitute the very essence of Protestantism. Now this protest opposes two abuses of man in matters of faith: the first is the intrusion of the civil magistrate, and the second the arbitrary authority of the Church. Instead of these abuses, Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate; and the authority of the Word of God above the visible Church. In the first place, it rejects the civil power in divine things, and says with the prophets and

apostles, We must obey God rather than man. In presence of the crown of Charles the Fifth, it uplifts the crown of Jesus Christ. But it goes farther: it lays down the principle, that all human teaching should be subordinate to the oracles of God. Even the primitive Church, by recognizing the writings of the apostles, had performed an act of submission to this supreme authority, and not an act of authority, as Rome maintains; and the establishment of a tribunal charged with the

interpretation of the Bible, had terminated only in slavishly subjecting man to man in what should be the most unfettered -- conscience and faith. In this celebrated act of Spires no doctor appears, and the Word of God reigns alone. Never has man exalted himself like the pope; never have men kept in the background like the Reformers."

146. And when, June 25, A. D. 1530, the memorable confession of Protestantism was made at Augsburg, that confession, framed under the direction of Luther, though absent, accordingly announced for all future time the principles of Protestantism upon the subject of Church and State. Upon this question that document declared as follows:-

"ARTICLE XXVIII.

"OF ECCLESIASTICAL POWER.

"There have been great controversies touching the power of the bishops, in which some have in an unseemly manner mingled together the ecclesiastical power, and the power of the sword. And out of this confusion there have sprung very great wars and tumults, while the pontiffs, trusting in the power of the keys, have not only instituted new kinds of service, and burdened men's consciences by reserving of cases, and by violent excommunications but have also endeavored to transfer worldly kingdoms from one to another, and to despoil emperors of their power and authority. These faults godly and learned men in the Church have long since reprehended; and for that cause ours were compelled, for the comforting of men's consciences, to show the difference between the ecclesiastical power and the power of the sword. And they have taught that both of them, because of God's command, are dutifully to be reverenced and honored, as the chief blessings of God upon earth.

"Now, their judgment is this: that the power of the keys, or the power of the bishops, according to the gospel, is a power or command from God, of preaching the gospel, of remitting or retaining sins, and of administering the sacraments. For Christ sends His apostles forth with this charge: `As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.' John 20: 21-23. `Go, and preach the gospel to every creature,' etc. Mark 16:15.

"This power is exercised only by teaching or preaching the gospel, and administering the sacraments, either to many, or to single individuals, in accordance with their call. For thereby not corporeal, but eternal things are granted; as, an eternal righteousness, the Holy Ghost, life everlasting. These things can not be obtained but by the ministry of the word and of the sacraments; as Paul says. `The gospel is the power

of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' Rom. 1:16. Seeing, then, that the ecclesiastical power bestows things eternal, and is exercised only by the ministry of the word, it does not hinder the civil government any more than the art of singing hinders civil government. For the civil administration is occupied about other matters, than is the gospel. The magistracy does not defend the souls, but the bodies and bodily things, against manifest injuries; and coerces men by the sword and corporal punishments, that it may uphold civil justice and peace.

"Wherefore the ecclesiastical and the civil power are not to be confounded. The ecclesiastical power has its own command, to preach the gospel and to administer the sacraments. Let it not by force enter into the office of another; let it not transfer worldly kingdoms; let it not abrogate the magistrates' laws; let it not withdraw from them lawful obedience; let it not hinder judgments touching any civil ordinances or contracts; let it not prescribe laws to the magistrate touching the form of the State; as Christ says, `My kingdom is not of this world.' John 18:36. Again: `Who made me a judge or a divider over you?' Luke 12:14. And Paul says, `Our conversation is in heaven.' Phil. 3:20. `The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations,' etc. 2 Cor. 10:4, 5.

"In this way ours distinguish between the duties of each power, one from the other, and admonish all men to honor both powers, and to acknowledge both to be the gifts and blessings of God.

"If the bishops have any power of the sword, they have it not as bishops by the command of the gospel, but by human law given unto them by kings and emperors, for the civil government of their goods. This, however, is another function than the ministry of the gospel.

"When, therefore, the question is concerning the jurisdiction of bishops, civil government must be distinguished from ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Again, according to the gospel, or, as they term it, by divine right, bishops, as bishops, that is, those who have the administration of the Word and sacraments committed to them, have no other jurisdiction at all, but only to remit sin, also to inquire into doctrine, and to reject doctrine inconsistent with the gospel, and to exclude from the communion of the Church wicked men, whose wickedness is manifest, without human force, but by the Word. And herein of necessity the churches ought by divine right to render obedience unto them; according to the saying of Christ, `He that heareth you, heareth me.' Luke 10:16. But when they teach or determine anything contrary to the gospel, then the churches have a command of God which forbids obedience to them: `Beware of false prophets.' Matt. 7:15. `Though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel, let him be accursed.' Gal. 1:8. `We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.' 2 Cor. 12:8. Also, `This power the Lord hath given me to edification, and not to destruction.' 2 Cor. 13:10."

147. This confession is a sound exposition of the doctrine of Christ concerning the temporal and the spiritual powers. It clearly and correctly defines the jurisdiction of the State to be only in things civil; that the sword which is wielded by the powers that be, is to preserve civil justice and peace; and that the authority of the State is to be exercised only over the bodies of men and the temporal concerns of life, that is, of the affairs of this world. This shuts away the State from all connection or interference with things spiritual or religious. It separates entirely religion and the State.

148. While doing this for the State, it also clearly defines the place of the Church. While the State is to stand entirely aloof from spiritual and religious things and concern itself only with the civil and temporal affairs of men, the Church on its part is to stand aloof from the affairs of the State, and is not to interfere in the civil and temporal concerns of men. The power of the Church is not to be mingled with the power of the State. The power of the Church is never to invade the realm, or seek to guide the jurisdiction, of the State. The duty of the clergy is to minister the gospel of Christ, and not the laws of men. In dealing with its membership in the exercise of discipline, the Church authorities are to act without human power, and solely by the Word of God. The ministry of the gospel is with reference only to eternal things, and is not to trouble itself with political administration.

149. This is Protestantism. This is Christianity. Wherever these principles have been followed, there is Protestantism exemplified in the Church and the State. Wherever these principles have not been followed, there is the principle of the papacy, it matters not what the profession may have been.

150. "Thus the diet of Augsburg, destined to crush the Reformation, was what strengthened it forever. It has been usual to consider the Peace of Augsburg (1555) as the period when the Reformation was definitely established. That is the date of legal Protestantism; evangelical Christianity has another -- the autumn of 1530. In

1555 was the victory of the sword and of diplomacy; in 1530 was that of the Word of God and of faith; and this latter victory is, in our eyes, the truest and the surest. The evangelical history of the Reformation in Germany is nearly finished at the epoch we have reached, and the diplomatic

history of legal Protestantism begins. Whatever may now be done, whatever may be said, the Church of the first ages has reappeared; and it has reappeared strong enough to show that it will live. There will still be conferences and discussions; there will still be leagues and combats; there will even be deplorable defeats; but all these are a secondary movement. The great movement is accomplished; the cause of faith is won by faith. The effort has been made; the evangelical doctrine has taken root in the world, and neither the storms of men nor the powers of hell will ever be able to tear it up."

---

1 [Page 708] "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol v, under wickliff, last paragraph but one.

2 [Page 708] Chap xxiii, par. 30, this book.

3 [Page 708] Rev. 2:20, 21.

4 [Page 709] Essay, Von Ranke, par. 25.

5 [Page 710] D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," book ii, chap. vi. par. 15. All quotations in the following portion of this chapter are form D'Aubigne.

25. PROTESTANTISM -- TRUE AND FALSE.

WICKLIF, Huss, Luther, -- the Reformers, -- stood upon the platform of "The Word of God, the whole Word of God, and nothing but the Word of God." They abandoned the sophistries of the schools, and rested solely upon this declaration, which must be the basis of every true reform in all ages. While this principle was adhered to, the Reformation succeeded gloriously: when the principle was abandoned, the Reformation suffered accordingly. In the Word of God lies the strength of the work of God.

2. In this position there was another great advantage that the Reformers held over their papal antagonists. So long as they stood by the Word of God alone, they occupied a field with which the papists were wholly unacquainted; and the more the Reformers studied and applied the plain Word of God, and nothing but the Word of God, the more easily they could defeat their adversaries. Their adversaries knew this, and therefore they employed every artifice to draw the Reformers into the scholastic field; for there the papists had every advantage which the Protestants had in the other. While the leaders of the Reformation lived, the papists were unsuccessful in every attempt in this direction, and so the Reformation was successful everywhere; but when these leaders were removed from the world, and their faith and zeal were not inherited by their successors, and when to the craftiness of the papists were added the zeal and artfulness of Loyola and his Order, the Protestants were finally corrupted by the arts and stratagems of their opponents and induced to revive the subtleties of the schools in defending and illustrating religious truth. So it may be said with truth that, while the Protestants imbibed scholasticism from the papacy, they allowed the papacy to steal from them their pure and true Protestantism. All

that will be needed to demonstrate this will be simply to mention the subjects of controversy that engaged the Protestant disputants for more than a hundred years.

773

3. The papal doctrine of the Eucharist is that, at the word of the priest, the bread and the wine become veritably the flesh and blood of the Lord. This trans-substantiation; that is, change of substance. Luther renounced this; but went no further than to hold that while the bread and the wine are not the actual flesh and blood of the Lord, yet that the Lord is actually present with the bread and the wine. This is con-substantiation; that is, with the substance. Carlstadt and Zwingle denied both and held, as now generally by Protestants, that the bread and the wine are simply memorials of the broken body and shed blood of the Saviour. A conference of the principal men who held the two views, was held; but after much discussion, in which Zwingle plainly had the best of the evidence and argument, Luther declared that he would not be driven from his position by "reason, common sense, carnal arguments," nor "mathematical proofs." After this, in his later years even Luther swerved from the genuine Christian Protestant principle, which he had so clearly proclaimed and so valiantly defended, and denied to the Zwinglians any right of toleration; and advocated the banishment of "false teachers," and the utter rooting out of the Jews from "Christian lands."1

4. The death of Luther (Feb. 18, 1546) left Melancthon at the head of the Reformation in Germany; and his views on the Supper were almost, if not identical with, those of the Reformed, i. e., the Swiss, or Zwinglians, as distinguished from the Germans, or Lutherans. His love of peace and his respect for Luther had caused Melancthon to hold his views in abeyance while Luther lived; but after Luther's death, this very love of peace led him into a war that lasted as long as he lived. For, holding views so favorable to those of the opposition, and believing besides that, even in the widest difference of opinion on this subject, there was nothing that justified any division, much less such bitter contention, between the friends of the Reformation, his desire for peace induced him to propose a union of Lutherans and Zwinglians. This immediately caused a division among the Lutherans, and developed what Mosheim calls the "rigid Lutherans" and the "moderate Lutherans," -- the moderate Lutherans favoring union, and the rigid

774

Lutherans attacking with renewed vigor all together, and Melancthon in particular.

5. Just here also was introduced another element of contention for the rigid Lutherans. Calvin appeared, as a sort of mediator between the Lutherans and Zwinglians. He proposed to effect a more perfect union, by modifying the opinions of both parties. But instead of his efforts being acceptable, the rigid Lutherans accused all who in the least degree favored the union, of being Crypto-Calvinists; i. e., secret Calvinists. By thus adding an epithet, the prejudice was increased against any effort toward conciliation; and besides, a bitter controversy was opened between Lutherans and Calvinists.

6. The bitterness of the opposition to Melancthon was increased by his connection with the "Interim," which was this: In 1547 a diet was held at Augsburg, and Charles V required of the Protestants that they should submit the decision of religious contests to the Council of Trent. The greater part of the members of the diet consented. But under the pretext of a plague raging in Trent, the pope issued a bull transferring the council to Bologna. The legates and all the rest of the papal party obeyed the pope, but the emperor ordered all of the German bishops to remain at Trent. This virtually dissolved the council; and as the pope refused to reassemble the council at Trent, and the emperor refused to allow his bishops to go to Bologna, plainly there could be no council to decide the religious contests, and the action of the diet was nullified. Now, to keep the matter under control until the difference between the pope and the emperor could be settled, and the council reassembled, Charles ordered Julius Pflugius, bishop of Nuremburg; Michael Sidonius, a creature of the pope; and John Agricola, of Eisleben, to draw up a formulary which might serve as a rule of faith and worship for both Protestants and Catholics, until the council should be ready to act. This formulary, from its purpose of being only to cover the interval that should elapse till the council should act, was called the "Interim." But instead of

pacifying the contestants, it only led to new difficulties, and involved the whole empire in violence and bloodshed.

7. Maurice, elector of Saxony, affected to remain neutral in regard to the "Interim," but finally in 1548 he assembled the Saxon nobility

775

and clergy in several conferences, to take counsel about what should be done. In all these conferences, Melancthon was accorded the chief place. He finally gave it as his opinion " that the whole of the book of `Interim' could not by any means be adopted by the friends of the Reformation; but declared at the same time that he saw no reason why it might not be adopted as authority in things that did not relate to the essential parts of religion, or in things which might be considered indifferent." This decision set his enemies all aflame again; and with Flacius at their head, the defenders of Lutheranism attacked Melancthon and the doctors of Wittemberg and Leipsic "with incredible bitterness of fury, and accused them of apostasy from the true religion." -- Mosheim.2

8. Melancthon and his friends, however, defended his view, and a warm debate followed upon these two points: "1. Whether the points that seemed indifferent to Melancthon were so in reality? 2. Whether in things of an indifferent nature, and in which the interests of religion are not essentially concerned, it be lawful to yield to the enemies of the truth. Then out of the debate about things indifferent grew several others, from which arose yet others, and so on indefinitely. While Melancthon and his colleagues were at Leipsic discussing the "Interim," among other things they had said, "The necessity of good works in order to the attainment of eternal salvation, might be held and taught, conformably to the truth of the gospel." This declaration was severely censured by the rigid Lutherans, as being contrary to the doctrine and sentiments of Luther. George Major maintained the doctrine of good works, and Amsdorf the contrary. In this dispute Amsdorf was so far carried away by his zeal for the doctrine of Luther, as to assert that good works are an impediment to salvation. This added new fuel to the flame, and on it raged.

9. Out of this debate grew another, known as the "Synergistical" controversy, from a Greek word signifying co-operation. The disciples of Melancthon, led by Strigelius, held that man co-operates with divine grace in the work of conversion. The Lutherans, led by Flacius, head of the university of Saxe-Weimar, held that God is the only agent in the conversion of man. This dispute led to yet another, concerning

776

the natural powers of the human mind. On this subject a public debate was held at Weimar in 1560, between Flacius and Strigelius. Flacius maintained that "the fall of man extinguished in the human mind every virtuous tendency, every noble faculty, and left nothing but universal darkness and corruption." Strigelius held that this degradation of the powers of the mind was by no means universal. And, hoping to defeat his opponent by puzzling him, put this question: "Should original sin, or the corrupt habit which the human soul contracted by the fall, be classed with substances or accidents?" "Flacius replied that "original sin is the very substance of human nature." This bold assertion opened another controversy on the nature and extent of original sin.

10. In 1560 Melancthon died, glad, as he said on his deathbed, to be freed from the contentions of theologians. After his death, many who wished to see these divisions and animosities healed, endeavored to put an end to the controversies. After many vain attempts, in 1568 the elector of Saxony and the duke of Saxe-Weimar summoned the most eminent men of each party to meet at Altenburg, and there, in an amicable spirit, sought to reconcile their differences. But this effort came to naught. Then the dukes of Wirtemberg and Brunswick joined in the effort; and James Andreas, professor at Tubingen, under their patronage traveled through all parts of Germany working in the interests of concord. At last, they were so far successful as to gather, after several conferences, a company of leading divines at Torgau in 1576, where a treatise, composed by Andreas, was examined, discussed, and corrected, and finally proposed to the deliberations of a select number,

who met at Berg, near Magdeburg. There all points were fully and carefully weighed, and discussed anew; and as the result of all, there was adopted the "Form of Concord." And now that the "Form of Concord" was adopted, discord was fully assured; for it was only a source of new tumults, and furnished matter for dissensions and contests as violent as any that had gone before. Besides this, the field now widened, so that the Calvinists and Zwinglians were all included in the whirl of controversy.

11. Now that Calvin appears upon the scene, the field was not only enlarged, but new material was supplied; for he differed from both

777

Lutherans and Zwinglians, not only with regard to the Lord's Supper, but his essential tenet of absolute decrees of God, in the salvation of men, was an entirely new element in the strife; and from the very nature of the case it propagated a multitude of new disputes. It is not necessary to enlarge upon them, nor to draw them out in their full members. It will be sufficient merely to name the leading subjects. Differing from both Lutherans and Zwinglians on the presence of Christ in the Supper, of course the controversy on that subject was re-opened, and again canvassed through all its forms: First, What is the nature of the institutions called Sacraments? Second, What are the fruits of the same? Third, How great is the majesty and glory of Christ's human nature? Fourth, How are the divine perfections communicated to the human nature of Christ? Fifth, What is the inward frame of spirit that is required in the worship addressed to the Saviour?

12. On the divine decrees: 1. What is the nature of the divine attributes? 2. Particularly those of justness and goodness? 3. Fate and necessity? 4. What is the connection between human liberty and divine prescience? 5. What is the extent of God's love to mankind? 6. What are the benefits that arise from the merits of Christ as mediator? 7. What are the operations of the divine Spirit, in rectifying the will and sanctifying the affections of men? 8. The final perseverance of the elect. Other subjects: 1. What is the extent of external ceremonies in religious worship? 2. What are the special characteristics of things indifferent? 3. How far is it lawful to comply with the demands of an adversary in discussing things indifferent? 4. What is the extent of Christian liberty? 5. Is it lawful to retain, out of respect to the prejudices of the people, ancient rites and ceremonies which have a superstitious aspect, yet may be susceptible of a favorable and rational interpretation?

13. But, however bitter the opposition between Lutherans and Calvinists, and the contentions among the Lutherans themselves, and again, between all of these on the one hand and the Catholics on the other, they could call a truce upon all their differences, and unite -- all, Catholics, Lutherans, Zwinglians, and Calvinists -- in the common onset against Anabaptists. The name Anabaptists, signifies re-baptizers, and was applied indiscriminately to all who denied the validity of

778

sprinkling for baptism, and especially of infant baptism, or sprinkling, rather. Before the period of the Reformation, there were, scattered throughout almost all the countries of Europe, and persecuted everywhere, lineal descendants, in point of doctrine, of the Albigenses and the Waldenses, who did not practice infant baptism (sprinkling), but held to the genuine doctrines of baptism, the sleep of the dead, and some to the true Sabbath. Of course, these doctrines caused them even then to be considered abominable heretics; but when, unfortunately, in the early days of the Reformation, some of the name ran into wild fanaticism, all of the name were classed together in it; and the severest of penal laws of those severe times, were enacted against all who could be classed as Anabaptists.

14. "In almost all the countries of Europe, an unspeakable number . . .preferred death in its worst forms to a retraction. . . . Neither the view of the flames that were kindled to consume them, nor the ignominy of the gibbet, nor the terrors of the sword, could shake their invincible . . . constancy, or make them abandon tenets that appeared dearer to them than life and all its enjoyments. . . . And it is much to be lamented that so little distinction was made between the members of this sect, when the sword was unsheathed against them. Why

were the innocent and the guilty involved in the same fate? Why were doctrines purely theological . . . punished with the same rigor that was shown to crimes inconsistent with the peace and welfare of civil society? Those who had no other marks of peculiarity than their administering baptism to adult persons only, and their excluding the unrighteous from the external communion of the Church, ought undoubtedly to have met with milder treatment than that which was given to those seditious incendiaries, who were for unhinging all government and destroying all civil authority. . . . It is true that many Anabaptists suffered death, not on account of their being considered rebellious subjects, but merely because they were judged to be incorrigible heretics; for in this century the error of limiting the administration of baptism to adult persons only, and the practice of re-baptizing such as had received that sacrament in infancy, were looked upon as the most flagitious and intolerable of heresies." -- Mosheim.3

779

15. As before remarked, the Anabaptists became the one object of the attack of all parties, civil and religious. Their opposition to infant baptism somewhat disconcerted Melancthon in the presence of the fanatics at Wittemberg. He owned that they had hit upon a "weak point;" and his doubts on this point led him to make the familiar statement, "Luther alone can decide" the question of their inspiration. It was the fear of being landed in anabaptism that was the reason that "Luther did not face this question thoroughly." The Protestant Council of Zurich ordered " that any one who administered anabaptism should be drowned;" and the order was actually executed upon Felix Mantz, "who had formerly been associated with Zwingle at the commencement of the Reformation." One of the very earliest of Calvin's theological efforts, was the composition of a book entitled "Psychopamychia," on the immortality of the soul, in opposition to the Anabaptists in France.

16. In entering the seventeenth century we find a new element upon the sea of controversy. Philosophy of the different schools was in each school striving for ascendency; and if not a direct cause of many of the disputes of this century, it gives a coloring to them. At this time philosophy was represented in the two classes of Peripatetics (followers of Aristotle) and Fire-Philosophers (from their proposition that "the dissolution of bodies by the power of fire is the only way in which the first principles of things can be discerned"). The Peripatetics held the professorships in almost all the places of learning, and held that all who questioned Aristotle were little less criminal than downright heretics; and so there was a lively contest kept up between them and the Fire-Philosophers, or chemists. But there was a union of the interests of these two, when, about 1640, the Cartesian gauntlet, "Cogito, ergo sum" (i. e., I think, therefore I am), was thrown into the arena. Both the Peripatetics and the Chemists turned with all their energy against the new philosophy; "not so much for their philosophical system as for the honors, advantages, and profits they derived from it." And, "seconded by the clergy who apprehended that the cause of religion was aimed at and endangered by these philosophical innovations, they made a prodigious noise and left no means unemployed to prevent the downfall of their old system. . . . They not only accused Descartes of the most dangerous and pernicious errors, but went so far, in

780

the extravagance of their malignity, as to bring a charge of atheism against him." -- Mosheim.4

17. In opposition to Descartes, Gassendi also entered the lists, and this gave rise to yet another school of philosophy, the Mathematical. That of Descartes was called the Metaphysical, or Cartesian, philosophy. As the Peripatetic was the only philosophy taught in the Lutheran schools, the rise of the new philosophy was a new subject for discussion and opposition there, and gave scope for yet more exercise of the controversial propensity. Another thing that greatly troubled the Lutherans was, that in 1614 John Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, entered the communion of the Calvinists, and granted to all his subjects entire liberty in religious matters, and left to the free choice of all whether they would embrace one religion or another, or any at all. But the Lutherans "deemed it intolerable that the Calvinists should enjoy the same privileges as themselves." And this was carried to such a length that the people of Brandenburg were prohibited from studying at the university of Wittemberg.

18. But that which gave the Lutherans the most trouble in this century was the efforts of the a succession of persons to bring about a state of harmony between them and the Calvinists. James I of England tried it, and failed. In 1631, in a synod of the Calvinists at Charenton, an act was passed, which granted that the Lutheran religion "was conformable to a spirit of true piety, and free from pernicious and fundamental errors," but the overture was not accepted. In the same year, a conference was held at Leipsic, between several of the most eminent doctors of both communions, in Saxony and Brandenburg. And although the Calvinists showed all possible fairness, and made concessions that the Lutherans themselves could scarcely expect, yet all their efforts were looked upon and regarded with suspicion, as being only schemes to ensnare them; and the conference broke up with nothing done. In 1645 Udislaus IV, king of Poland, called a conference at Thorn, but it only increased the party zeal. In 1661 William VI, landgrave of Hesse, called a conference at Cassel, in which the doctors there assembled came to an agreement, embraced one another, and declared that there was nothing between them of sufficient importance to

prevent union and concord. This was no sooner learned by the Lutheran brethren, than they turned all their fury against their delegates, and loaded them with reproaches of apostasy, Calvinism, etc.

19. Besides these public efforts, there were others of a private character. John Duraeus, a Calvinist, a native of Scotland, "during a period of forty-three years, suffered vexations, and underwent labors which required the firmest resolution, and the most inexhaustible patience; wrote, exhorted, admonished, entreated, and disputed: in a word, tried every method that human wisdom could suggest, to put an end to the dissensions and animosities that reigned among the Protestant churches. . . . He traveled through all the countries in Europe where the Protestant religion had gained a footing; he formed connections with the doctors of both parties; he addressed himself to kings, princes, magistrates, and ministers. . . . But his views were disappointed. . . . Some, suspecting that his fervent and extraordinary zeal arose from mysterious and sinister motives, and apprehending that he had secretly formed a design of drawing the Lutherans into a snare, even attacked him in their writings with animosity and bitterness, and loaded him with the sharpest invectives and reproaches: so that this well-meaning man, neglected at length by his own communion, . . . spent the remainder of his days in repose and obscurity at Cassel." -- Mosheim.5 That which he proposed as the foundation upon which they might unite, was, the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer.

20. Another of the most zealous of the peacemakers was John Matthias a Swedish bishop, who with George Calixtus, attempted to carry on the work of Duraeus. But the opposition was so bitter that Matthias was obliged to resign his bishopric; Calixtus was accused of syncretism, and to his "charge many other things were laid, besides the crime of endeavoring to unite the disciples of the same Master in the amiable bonds of charity, concord, and mutual forbearance."6 This "crime" was called Syncretism.

21. The Pietistical controversy was another that engaged the attention of the Lutherans during this century. This originated in the efforts

of Philip James Spener, of Frankfort, who "had in view the promotion of vital religion, rousing the lukewarm and indifferent, stemming the torrent of vice and corruption, and reforming the licentious manners of both the clergy and people."7 The better to accomplish this, Spener and his adherents proposed that, besides the stated times for public worship, private assemblies for prayer and other religious exercises should be held. For these laudable and most necessary aims they were nicknamed Pietists, and the opposition to them and their designs, was as strong as was that to any of the others.

22. This subject was carried further by some of the professors at Leipsic, who for the purpose of instructing the candidates for the ministry in something better than how to perpetuate broils, "undertook to explain in their colleges certain books of Scripture in order to render these genuine sources of religious

knowledge better understood, and to promote a spirit of practical piety and vital religion in the minds of their hearers. . . . Accordingly these lectures were much frequented, and their effects were visible in the lives and conversation of several persons, whom they seemed to inspire with a deep sense of the importance of religion and virtue." But immediately the cry arose that this was "contrary to custom." "Hence rumors were spread, tumults excited, animosities kindled, and the matter at length brought to a public trial, in which these pious and learned men were indeed declared free from the errors and heresies laid to their charge, but were at the same time prohibited from carrying on that plan of religious instruction which they had undertaken with so much zeal."8

23. But this did not put down the good work thus begun; for the contest spread rapidly through all the Lutheran Churches in Europe. Therefore the doctors and pastors of Wittemberg thought themselves obliged to proceed publicly, first against Spener in 1695, and afterward against his disciples, which gave rise to new debates. The Pietists held, (1) that none should be admitted to the ministry but such as had been properly educated, and were distinguished by wisdom and sanctity of manners, and who had their hearts filled with divine love; (2) that the scholastical theology should be abolished; (3) that polemical divinity, that is, the controversies between Christians, should be less eagerly

taught; (4) that all mixture of philosophy and human learning with the Holy Scriptures should be abandoned; and (5) that no person who was not himself a model of piety, was qualified to be a public teacher of piety, or a guide to others in the way of salvation.

24. Out of these sprung other debates on such questions as, (1) "Can the religious knowledge acquired by a wicked man be termed theology?" (2) "How far can the office and ministry of an impious ecclesiastic be pronounced salutary and efficacious?" (3) "Can an ungodly and licentious man be susceptible of illumination?" The Pietists further demanded the suppression of certain propositions that it was customary to deliver from the pulpit publicly, which, unqualified, were certainly capable of being interpreted as granting indulgence: such as, "No man is able to attain that perfection which the divine law requires. Good works are not necessary to salvation." Also the Pietists prohibited dancing, pantomimes, theatrical plays, etc., among their members; and this again gave an opportunity for the scholastics to display their ingenuity. They raised the question, first, whether these actions were of an indifferent character; and then from that, whether any human actions are truly indifferent; i. e., equally removed from moral good on one hand, and from moral evil on the other.

25. In the Calvinist Church, after the death of its founder, the controversy over the "divine decrees" continued through the seventeenth century. From the college at Geneva the doctrine of Calvin spread to all parts of Protestant Europe, and into the schools of learning. But there arose a difference of opinion, not about the "decrees" in themselves, but about the nature of the decrees. "The majority held that God simply permitted the first man to fall into transgression; while a respectable minority maintained with all their might, that to exercise and display his awful justice and his free mercy, God had decreed from all eternity that Adam should sin, and had so ordered events that our first parents could not possibly avoid falling."9 The two parties in this division were the Sublapsarians (those who held to permission) and Supralapsarians.

26. But these forgot their differences whenever and wherever there

appeared those who "thought it their duty to represent the Deity, as extending His goodness and mercy to all mankind." This new controversy arose in the early part of the century, and is known as the Arminian controversy, from James Arminius, professor of divinity in the university of Leyden, who was the originator of it. Arminius had been educated a Calvinist, at the College of Geneva, and because of his merit had been chosen to the university of Leyden. After leaving Geneva, and as he grew older, his mind more and more revolted from the doctrine of Calvin on predestination, and entertained the Scriptural doctrine that the grace of God is free to

all, and brings salvation to all men; that none are prohibited, by any decree, from its benefits, nor are any elected thereto, independent of their own actions, but that Christ brought salvation to the world, and every man is free to accept or reject this offer as he chooses. But as Calvinism was at that time flourishing in Holland, the teaching of Arminius drew upon him the severest opposition.

27. Arminius died in 1609, and Simon Episcopius, one of his disciples, carried the work forward with unabated vigor, and in a little while the controversy spread through all Europe, and created as much tumult in the Calvinist Church as Calvinism had formerly caused in the Lutheran. And the stubbornness of the Lutherans was repeated on the part of the Calvinists. Again there were those who sought to bring the contending parties to an accommodation, but with no success. At last, in 1618, by the authority of the States-General, the national synod was convened at Dort, to discuss the points of difference and come to an agreement. Deputies assembled from Holland, England, Hesse, Bremen, Switzerland, and the Palatinate; and the leading men of the Arminians came also.

28. Episcopius addressed the assembly in a discourse, "full of moderation, gravity, and elocution." But his address was no sooner finished than difficulties arose, and the Arminians found that instead of their being called there to present their views for examination and discussion, it was that they were to be tried as heretics; and when they refused to submit to the manner of procedure proposed by the synod, they were excluded from the assembly, and the famous synod of Dort tried them in their absence. Naturally enough, they were pronounced "guilty

of pestilential errors," and condemned as "corrupters of the true religion:" and all this after the solemn promise which had been made to the Arminians that they should be allowed full liberty to explain and defend their opinions, as far as they thought necessary to their justification! After this the doctrine of "absolute decrees" lost ground from day to day; and the way in which the synod had treated the Arminians only increased their determination, and besides drew to them the sympathy of many: so much so indeed, that the whole provinces of Friseland, Zealand, Utrecht, Guelderland, and Groningen, never would accept the decisions of that assembly. Immediately after this, too, the controversy over the Cartesian philosophy entered the Calvinist Church, and set it all awhirl again, and kept it so.

29. Since, in scholasticism and theological controversy, the leadership of professed Protestantism occupied so much of papal ground and partook so largely of the papal spirit, it could only be expected that the natural and logical consequence should follow, and this same professed Protestantism be found occupying the central and peculiar ground of the papacy in the union of Church and State. A second great apostasy had begun.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

30. As we have seen, at Luther's death many who had been Protestants set themselves to maintain what Luther had believed, and steadily refused to take a single advance step. These thus became Lutherans rather than Protestants, And thus was formed the Lutheran Church. and though this Church to this day holds the Augsburg Confession as one of its chief symbols; and though about the end of the seventeenth century "the Lutheran Churches adopted the leading maxim of the Arminians, that Christians were accountable to God alone for their religious sentiments, and that no individual could be justly punished by the magistrate for his erroneous opinions, while he conducted himself like a virtuous and obedient subject, and made no attempts to disturb the peace and order of civil society" (Mosheim10); yet ever since the year 1817, the Lutheran Church has been a part of the Established Church of Prussia. And in the face of the declarations of the

Augsburg Confession, the emperor of Germany to-day, as king of Prussia, is the supreme pontiff of the Lutheran Church in Prussia. In the Scandinavian countries also, the Lutheran Church is the State Church.

THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND.

31. With the Reformed, the Swiss, it was the same. Zwingle, who gave the cast to the Reformation in Switzerland, sanctioned, if he did not really create there, the union of Church and State. His view was that the State is Christian. "The Reformer deserting the paths of the apostles, allowed himself to be led astray by the perverse example of popery." He himself "resolved to be at one and the same time the man of the State and of the Church, . . . at once the head of the State and general of the army -- this double, this triple, part of the Reformer was the ruin of the Reformation and of himself." For when war came on in Switzerland, Zwingle girded on his sword, and went with the troops to battle. "Zwingle played two parts at once -- he was a reformer and a magistrate. But these are two characters that ought no more to be united than those of a minister and of a soldier. We will not altogether blame the soldiers and the magistrates in forming leagues and drawing the sword, even for the sake of religion; they act according to their point of view, although it is not the same as ours; but we must decidedly blame the Christian minister who becomes a diplomatist or a general."

32. He who took the sword, perished by the sword. In the first battle that was fought -- Oct. 11, A. D. 1531 -- twenty-five of the Swiss reform preachers were slain, the chief of whom was Zwingle, who fell stricken with many blows. "If the German Reformer had been able to approach Zwingle at this solemn moment and pronounce those oft repeated words, `Christians fight not with sword and arquebuse, but with sufferings and with the cross,' Zwingle would have stretched out his dying hand and said, `Amen.'" -- D'Aubigne.11

IN ENGLAND.

33. When Henry VIII divorced himself and England from the pope, that he might be divorced from his wife, he put himself in the

place of the pope as head of the Church in England; and that which thus became the Church of England was simply that which before had been the Catholic Church in England. "In form nothing had been changed. The outer constitution of the Church remained entirely unaltered."

34. In faith, likewise, nothing had been changed in fact, except in the mere change of the personages who assumed the prerogative of dispensers of it. Henry, as both king and pope, was now the supreme head of the Church. "From the primate to the meanest deacon, every minister of it derived from him sole right to exercise spiritual powers. The voice of its preachers was the echo of his will. He alone could define orthodoxy or declare heresy. The forms of its worship and belief were changed and rechanged at the royal caprice." For as early as 1532, Henry had laid down the proposition that "the king's majesty hath as well the care of the souls of his subjects as their bodies; and may by the law of God by his Parliament make laws touching and concerning as well the one as the other." -- Green.12

35. Such was the "Reformation" accomplished by "Henry, Eighth of the Name" so far as in him and his intention lay. But to be divorced from the pope of Rome was a great thing for England. And as Henry had set the example of revolt from papal rule when exercised from the papal throne, the English people were not slow in following the example thus set, and in revolting from the same rule when exercised from the English throne. This began even in Henry's reign, in the face of all the terrors of a rule "which may be best described by saying that it was despotism itself personified." -- Macaulay.13 During the regency of Edward VI and under the guidance of Cranmer and Ridley, advance steps were taken even by the Church of England itself -- the use of images, of the crucifix, of incense, tapers, and holy water; the sacrifice of the mass, the worship of saints,

auricular confession, the service in Latin, and the celibacy of the clergy, were abolished. During the Catholic reaction under Mary, the spirit of revolt was confirmed; and under Elizabeth, when the polity of the Church of England became fixed, and thenceforward, it constantly, and at times almost universally, prevailed.

788

36. In short, the example set by Henry has been so well and so persistently followed through the ages that have since passed, that, although the Church of England still subsists, and, although the sovereign of England still remains the head of the Church of England and Defender of the Faith, both the office and the title are of so flexible a character that they easily adapt themselves to the headship and defense of the faith of Episcopalianism in England and of Presbyterianism in Scotland. And yet even more and far better than this, the illustrious sovereign of England, Queen Victoria, distinctly renounced the claim of right to rule in matters of faith.

37. In 1859 Her Majesty issued a royal proclamation to her subjects in India, in which she said: --

"Firmly relying, ourselves, on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, we disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose our convictions on any of our subjects. We declare it to be our royal will and pleasure that none be in any wise favored, none molested or disquieted, by reason of their religious faith or observances, but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law; and we do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under us that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects, on pain of our highest displeasure.

"And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity to discharge."

CALVINISM IN GENEVA.

38. The views of Calvin on the subject of Church and State, were as thoroughly theocratic as is the papal system itself. Augustine was his master and model throughout. When at the age of twenty-eight, at the urgent call of Farel, Calvin settled in Geneva, he drew up a condensed statement of Christian doctrine, in fact, a synopsis of his "Institutes," consisting of twenty-one articles which all the citizens were called up in bunches of ten each, "to profess and swear to, as the confession of their faith." This method of making a Calvinistic city was gone through with, Calvin himself said, "with much satisfaction." This oath and confession of faith were made as citizens, not particularly as Church members. They were not asked whether they were converted;

789

they were not required to be Church members; but simply as then and citizens, were required to take the oath and accept this as the confession of their faith.

39. In fact, the oath of allegiance as a citizen, and the confession of faith as a Christian, were identical. This was at once to make the Church and the State one and the same thing with the Church above the State. Yea, more than this, it was wholly to swallow up the civil in the ecclesiastical power; for the preachers were supreme. It was but another man-made theocracy, after the model of the papacy. Indeed, according to Calvin's "Institutes," the very reason of existence of the State, is only as the support and the servant of the Church; and accordingly, when the magistrate inflicts punishment, he is to be regarded as executing the judgment of God. "What we see on the banks of the Leman is a theocracy; Jehovah was its head, the Bible was the supreme code, and the government exercised a presiding and paternal guardianship over all interests and causes, civil and spiritual." -- Wylie.14 The burning of Servetus was only the plain logic of the governmental system of Calvin, which by his

persistency was established in Geneva. It is not without reason that, by one of his admirers, Calvin has been compared to Innocent III.15

40. Calvin's system of government was not confined to Geneva, however, nor did his idea die with him. It occupies almost as large a place in the subsequent history as does the papacy itself, of which throughout it is so close a counterpart. He himself tried during the reign of Edward VI to have it adopted in England. "He urged Cranmer to call together pious and rational men, educated in the school of God, to meet and agree upon one uniform confession of doctrine according to the rule of Scripture," declaring: "As for me, if I can be made use of, I will sail through ten seas to bring it about." -- Bancroft.16 All his personal effort in this direction failed, however. He died May 27, A. D. 1564.

CALVINISM IN SCOTLAND.

41. It has been written that before his death Calvin had the satisfaction of knowing that his system of Church polity had been adopted

in Scotland. No doubt this furnished him much satisfaction indeed. But if he could only have lived to see the time when that system was being worked in Scotland according to its perfect ideal, we may well believe that even he could have fairly wept in the fullness of his unspeakable joy.

42. From A. D. 1638 to 1662, under the Covenanters, the Calvinistic system was supreme in Scotland. And "when the Scotch Kirk was at the height of its power, we may search in vain for any institution which can compete with it, except the Spanish Inquisition. Between these two there is a close and intimate analogy. Both were intolerant, both were cruel, both made war upon the finest parts of human nature, and both destroyed every vestige of religious freedom." -- Buckle.17

CALVINISM IN NEW ENGLAND.

43. After Scotland, it was in Puritan New England that the Calvinistic system of government most nearly reached its ideal. In 1631, as soon as their numbers had become such that a definite policy must be established, they enacted the following statute: --

"To the end this body of the commons may be preserved of honest and good men, it is ordered and agreed that, for the time to come, no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic but such as are members of some of the Churches within the limits of the same."

44. "Thus the polity became a theocracy; God himself was to govern His people; and the `saints by calling,' . . . were, by the fundamental law of the colony, constituted the oracle of the divine will. . . Other States have confined political rights to the opulent, to free-holders, to the first-born; the Calvinists of Massachusetts, refusing any share of civil power to the clergy, established the reign of the visible Church, a commonwealth of the chosen people in covenant with God." -- Bancroft.18 This was the Calvinistic system precisely. The preachers were not to hold office in itself, but they were to be the rulers of all who did. For, as no man could be a citizen unless he was a member of the Church; and as none could become members of the Churches or even "propounded to the congregation, except they be first allowed by the elders;" this

was to make the preachers supreme. This is exactly the position they occupied. They were consulted in everything, and everything must be subject to their dictation.

45. The leading minister in Massachusetts Colony at this time was John Cotton. He distinctly taught the blessedness of persecution in itself, and in its benefit to the State, in the following words: --

"But the good brought to princes and subjects by the due punishment of apostate seducers and idolaters and blasphemers, is manifold.

"First, it putteth away evil from among the people, and cutteth off a gangreene which would spread to further ungodlinesse. . . .

"Secondly, it driveth away wolves from worrying and scattering the sheep of Christ. For false teachers be wolves, . . . and the very name of wolves holdeth forth what benefit will redound to the sheep, by either killing them or driving them away.

"Thirdly, such executions upon such evil doers causeth all the country to heare and feare and doe no more such wickednesse. . . . Yea, as these punishments are preventions of like wickednesse in some, so are they wholesome medicines, to heale such as are curable of these eviles. . . .

"Fourthly, the punishments executed upon false prophets and seducing teachers, doe bring downe showers of God's blessings upon the civill state. . . .

"Fifthly, it is an honour to God's justice that such judgments are executed."19

46. And Samuel Shepard, a minister of Charlestown, preached an election sermon entitled "Eye Salve," in which he set forth the following views: --

"Men's lusts are sweet to them, and they would not be disturbed or disquieted in their sin. Hence there be so many such as cry up tolleration boundless and libertinism so as (if it were in their power) to order a total and perpetual confinement of the sword of the civil magistrate unto its scabbard (a motion that is evidently distructive to this people, and to the publick liberty, peace, and prosperity of any instituted Churches under heaven).

0 "Let the magistrate's coercive power in matters of religion, therefore, be still asserted, seeing he is one who is bound to God more than any other man to cherish his true religion; . . . and how wofull would the state of things soon be among us, if men might have liberty without controll to profess, or preach, or print, or publish what they list, tending to the seduction of others."20

47. In accordance with these principles, every inhabitant of the colony was obliged to attend the services of the Established Church on Sunday under penalty of fine or imprisonment. The fine was not to exceed five shillings, equal to about five dollars of the present day, for every absence.

48. But in 1631 there came also into New England Roger Williams. There was a vacancy in the Church at Salem. The Church called Williams to fill his place; but as Governor Winthrop and his "assistants" objected, Williams went to Plymouth Colony.

49. About 1633 Williams was called a second time to the ministry of the Salem Church. This time he was allowed to take the place; but it was not long before he was again in trouble with the theocrats. He denounced their laws making Church membership a qualification for office, all their laws enforcing religious observances, and especially their Sunday laws. He declared that the worst law in the English code was that by which they themselves when in England had been compelled to attend the parish church; and he reproved their

inconsistency in counting that persecution in England, and then doing the same things themselves in New England.

50. They maintained, as argued by Cotton, that "persecution is not wrong in itself. It is wicked for falsehood to persecute truth, but it is the sacred duty of truth to persecute falsehood." And, as stated by Winthrop: "We have come to New England in order to make a society after our own model; all who agree with us may come and join that society; those who disagree may go elsewhere; there is room enough on the American continent."21

51. Roger Williams told them that to compel men to unite with those of a different faith is an open violation of natural right; and that to drag to public worship the irreligious and the unwilling, is only to require hypocrisy. "Persons may with less sin be forced to marry whom they can not love, than to worship where they can not believe."22 Accordingly he insisted that "no one should be bound to worship or to maintain a worship against his own consent." At this the theocrats inquired with pious amaze, "What, is not the laborer worthy of his

hire?" To which Roger replied in words which they could not fail fully to understand, "Yes, from them that hire him."

52. The view that the magistrates must be chosen exclusively from membership in the Churches Roger Williams exploded with the argument that with equal propriety they should select a doctor of physic or the pilot of a ship, because of his standing in the Church. Against the statements of Cotton and Shepard and the claims of the theocrats altogether, as to the right of the magistrate to forestall corrupting influences upon the minds of the people, and to punish error and heresy, he set the evident and everlasting truth that "magistrates are but the agents of the people or its trustees, on whom no spiritual power in matters of worship can ever be conferred, since conscience belongs to the individual, and is not the property of the body politic; . . . the civil magistrate may not intermeddle even to stop a Church from apostasy and heresy; this power extends only to the bodies and goods and outward estate of men."23

53. The theocrats raised the alarm that these principles subverted all good government. To which Williams replied: "There goes many a ship to sea, with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common, and is a true picture of a commonwealth or a human combination or society. It hath fallen out sometimes that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked in one ship; upon which supposal I affirm that all the liberty of conscience that ever I pleaded for, turns upon these two hinges, that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews, or Turks be forced to come to the ship's prayers for worship, nor compelled from their particular prayers or worship, if they practice any."24 "The removal of the yoke of soul-oppression, as it will prove an act of mercy and righteousness to the enslaved nations, so it is of binding force to engage the whole and every interest and conscience to preserve the common liberty and peace."25

54. He also denied the right of the compulsory imposition of an oath. The magistrates had decided to require an oath of allegiance to

Massachusetts, instead of to the king of England. Williams would not take the oath, and his influence was so great that so many others also refused that the government was compelled to drop the project. This caused them to raise a charge against him as the ally of a civil faction. The Church at Salem stood by him, and in the face of the enmity of the theocrats elected him their teacher. This was no sooner done than the preachers met together and declared that any one who should obstinately assert that "the civil magistrate might not intermeddle even to stop a Church from apostasy and heresy," was worthy of banishment. A committee of their order was appointed to go to Salem and deal with Williams and the Church "in a Church way."

55. Meantime the people of Salem were punished for choosing him for their teacher, by the withholding of a tract of land to which they had laid claim. Williams was ready to meet the committee at every point in expressing and defining his doctrines, and in refuting all their claims. After the committee had returned, the Church by Williams wrote letters to all the Churches of which any of the magistrates were members, "that they should admonish the magistrates of their injustice." By the next general court the whole of Salem was disfranchised until they should apologize for these letters. The town and the Church yielded. Roger Williams stood alone. He was able and willing to do it, and at once declared his "own voluntary withdrawing from all these Churches which were resolved to continue in persecuting the witnesses of the Lord," and "hoped the Lord Jesus was sounding forth in him the blast which should in His own holy season cast down the strength and confidence of those inventions of men."

56. In October, 1635, he was summoned before the chief representatives of the State. He went and "maintained the rocky strength" of his position, and declared himself "ready to be bound and banished, and even to die in New England," rather than to renounce his convictions. By the earnest persuasions of Cotton, the general court, by a small majority, sentenced him to exile, and at the same time attempted to justify the sentence by the flimsy plea that it was not a restrainment on freedom of conscience, but because the application of the new doctrine to their institutions seemed "to subvert the fundamental state and government of the country."

57. In January, 1636, a warrant was sent to Williams to come to Boston and take ship for England. He refused to go. Officers were sent in a boat to bring him, but he was gone. "Three days before, he had left Salem, in winter snow and inclement weather, of which he remembered the severity even in his late old age. `For fourteen weeks he was sorely tost in a bitter season, not knowing what bread or bed did mean.' Often in the stormy night he had neither fire, nor food, nor company; often he wandered without a guide, and had no house but a hollow tree. But he was not without friends. The respect for the rights of others which had led him to defend the freedom of conscience, had made him the champion of the Indians. He had learned their language during his residence at Plymouth; he had often been the guest of the neighboring sachems; and now, when he came in winter to the cabin of the chief of Pokanoket, he was welcomed by Massassoit; and `the barbarous heart of Canonicus, the chief of the Narragansetts, loved him as his son to the last gasp.' `The ravens,' he relates, `fed me in the wilderness.'"

58. The population of the four colonies was now about twenty-four thousand, Massachusetts having about fifteen thousand, and the other three colonies about three thousand each. The Federal commissioners formed an advisory board rather than a legislative body. The formation of his league strengthened the theocracy.

59. By the strictness of the rules which had been framed by the preachers to regulate the admission of members to the Churches, there were so few that joined the Churches, that the membership, which was supposed to include at least the great majority of the people, in fact embraced not more than one third of them. And now as a demand began to be made for freedom of worship according to other than Congregational forms, the Congregational clergy saw that something must be done more firmly to confirm their power.

60. Accordingly at Cambridge, August, 1648, after two years' reflection, there was framed a "Platform of Church Discipline Gathered out of the Word of God." It was in fact the establishment of the Congregational Church upon the basis of the confederacy of the four colonies; for throughout, although it professed to maintain the principles of the independence of each congregation, it provided "councils

composed of elders, and other messengers of Churches to advise, to admonish, and to withhold fellowship from a Church," but not to exercise special acts of discipline, or jurisdiction, in any particular Church. And further it provided that if any Church should separate itself from the communion of the Churches, the magistrates might compel them to conform. "The Westminster Confession was promulgated as the creed; the powers of the clergy

were minutely defined, and the duty of the laity stated to be `obeying their elders and submitting themselves unto them in the Lord.' The magistrate was enjoined to punish `idolatry, blasphemy, heresy,' and to coerce any Church becoming 'schismatical.'"

61. In October, 1649, the platform was referred to the general court for consideration and adopted, and was further submitted by them to the Churches for their approval. In October, 1651, it was confirmed by each of the legislatures. Thus was the theocracy of Massachusetts completed and clothed with all the power of the commonwealth. And as its power was increased, so were its bitter fruits vastly increased. In 1649, Governor Winthrop died, and was succeeded by John Endicott; and in 1652 John Cotton died, and was succeeded by John Norton, and these two men, John Endicott and John Norton, have been not inaptly described as "two as arrant fanatics as ever drew breath." And with the accession of these two men to the headship of the complete and fully furnished theocracy, the New England reign of terror may be said to have begun.

62. Admission to the confederacy of the New England colonies had been absolutely refused Rhode Island, on account of its principles of liberty of conscience; but hatred of the Quakers led Massachusetts colony in 1657 to ask Rhode Island to join the confederacy in the endeavor to save New England from the Quakers. "They sent a letter to the authorities of that colony, signing themselves their loving friends and neighbors, and beseeching them to preserve the whole body of colonists against `such a pest,' by banishing and excluding all Quakers, a measure to which `the rule of charity did oblige them.'" -- Fiske.26

63. But Roger Williams was still president of Rhode Island, and, true to his principles, he replied: "We have no law amongst us whereby

to punish any for only declaring by words their minds and understandings concerning things and ways of God as to salvation and our eternal condition. As for these Quakers, we find that where they are most of all suffered to declare themselves freely and only opposed by arguments in discourse, there they least of all desire to come. Any breach of the civil law shall be punished, but the freedom of different consciences shall be respected."27

64. This reply enraged the whole confederacy. Massachusetts threatened to cut off the trade of Rhode Island. In this strait, Rhode Island, by Roger Williams, appealed for protection to Cromwell, who now ruled England. The appeal presented the case as it was, but that which made it of everlasting importance, as the grandest and most touching appeal in all history is the piteous plea, "But whatever fortune may befall, let us not be compelled to exercise any civil power over men's consciences."

65. In all respects the Puritans justified and deserved the scathing sentence of the historian of the United States, that "the creation of a national and uncompromising Church led the Congregationalists of Massachusetts to the indulgence of the passions which disgraced their English persecutors, and Laud was justified by the men whom he had wronged." -- Bancroft.28

66. Nor was it alone in New England that Church and State were united. It was so to a greater or less extent in every one of the thirteen original colonies in America, except Rhode Island. In New England the established religion was Congregationalism, while in all the colonies south from New York to Georgia, except only Pennsylvania, the Church of England was the favored one. In Pennsylvania there was no union with any particular denomination as such, but no one could hold office or even vote except "such as possess faith in Jesus Christ." And protection from compulsory religious observances was guaranteed to no one, except those "who confess and acknowledge one almighty

and eternal God to be the Creator, Upholder, and Ruler of the World." As all were thus required to be religious, and to possess faith in Jesus Christ, it was therefore required "that according to the good example of the

primitive Christians, every first day of the week, called the Lord's day, people shall abstain from their common daily labor, that they may the better dispose themselves to worship God according to their understandings."29

67. Maryland, while held by the Roman Catholics, was freer than any other colony, except Rhode Island; yet even there, as in Pennsylvania, it was only toleration that was guaranteed, and that only to persons "professing to believe in Jesus Christ." But in 1692 the Episcopalians took possession, and although other forms of religion were still tolerated, "Protestant Episcopacy was established by law," and so continued until the Revolution.

68. The Church and State system in Georgia, and even its practical working as late as 1737, may be seen in the persecution of John Wesley. The case grew out of Wesley's refusing the sacrament to certain women, and this was made only the opportunity to vent their spite upon him in whatever else they could trump up. The first step was taken thus: --

"GEORGIA. SAVANNAH SS.

"To all Constables, Tythingmen, and others whom these may concern: You and each of you are hereby required to take the body of John Wesley, clerk, and bring him before one of the baliffs of the said town, to answer the complaint of William Williamson and Sophia, his wife, for defaming the said Sophia, and refusing to administer to her the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in a publick congregation, without cause; by which the said William Williamson is damag'd one thousand pound sterling. And for so doing, this is your warrant, certifying what you are to do in the premises. Given under my hand and seal the eighth day of August, Anno Dom., 1737.

"THO. CHRISTIE."

69. Wesley was arrested, and brought before the recorder for examination. When questioned upon this matter, he replied that "the giving or refusing the Lord's Supper being a matter purely ecclesiastical, I could not acknowledge their power to interrogate me upon it." The case was deferred to the next regular sitting of the court. When the court convened, the judge charged the grand jury to "beware of spiritual

tyranny, and to oppose the new illegal authority that was usurped over their consciences." The grand jury, says Wesley, was thus composed: "One was a Frenchman who did not understand English, one a Papist, one a profest infidel, three Baptists, sixteen or seventeen others, dissenters, and several others who had personal quarrels against me, and had openly vow'd revenge."

70. A majority of this grand jury framed an indictment of ten counts, as follows: --

"That John Wesley, clerk, has broken the laws of the realm, contrary to the peace of our sovereign lord the king, his crown and dignity.

"1. By speaking and writing to Mrs. Williamson against her husband's consent.

"2. By repelling her from the holy communion.

"3. By not declaring his adherence to the Church of England.

"4. By dividing the morning service on Sundays.

"5. By refusing to baptize Mr. Parker's child otherwise than by dipping, except the parents would certify it was weak, and not able to bear it.

"6. By repelling Wm. Gough from the holy communion.

"7. By refusing to read the burial service over the body of Nathaniel Polhill.

"8. By calling himself ordinary of Savannah.

"9. By refusing to receive Wm. Agliorly as a godfather, only because he was not a communicant.

"10. By refusing Jacob Matthews for the same reason, and baptizing an Indian trader's child with only two sponsors."

71. The prosecution was made to drag along with Wesley neither convicted nor acquitted, but held, as he describes it, as a sort of "prisoner at large," until, willing to bear it no longer, he determined to go back to England. That he should leave Georgia and go somewhere was just what the Georgians wanted, and although a pretense of opposing his going was made, they were glad when he left, Dec. 2, 1737.30

72. Of the Southern colonies, Virginia took the lead, and was next to Massachusetts in intolerance and persecution. The colony was divided into parishes, and all the inhabitants were taxed to maintain the worship of the Episcopal Church. All the people were required to

attend the Churches of the establishment. The rights of citizenship were dependent upon membership in the Episcopal Church. Whoever failed to attend Church any Sunday "without an allowable excuse," was to be fined one pound of tobacco, and if any one should be absent from Sunday service for a month, the fine was fifty pounds of tobacco.

73. Virginia, however, though standing in the lead of the Southern colonies in the severity of its religious legislation, was the first of all the colonies to separate Church and State, and to declare and secure by statute the religious rights of all men.

74. From this review of Protestantism, it plainly appears that after Martin Luther, until the rise of Roger Williams, not a single Reformer preached in sincerity, nor was there found exemplified in a single country, the principles of Christianity and of Protestantism as to the rights of conscience, and that in not a single place except the colony of Rhode Island, was there even recognized, much less exemplified, the Christian and Protestant principle of the separation of Church and State, of the religious and civil powers.

75. Throughout this whole period we find that in all the discussions, and all the work, of the professed champions of the rights of conscience, there everywhere appears the fatal defect that it was only their own rights of conscience that they either asserted or defended. In other words, their argument simply amounted to this: It is our inalienable right to believe and worship as we choose. It is likewise our inalienable right to compel everybody else to believe and worship as we choose.

76. But this is no assertion at all of the rights of conscience. The true principle and assertion of the rights of conscience is not our assertion of our right to believe and worship as we choose. This always leaves the way open for the additional assertion of our right to compel others to believe and worship as we choose, should occasion seem to demand; and there are a multitude of circumstances that are ever ready strongly to urge that occasion does demand.

77. The true principle and the right assertion of the rights of conscience is our assertion of every other man's right to believe and worship as he chooses, or not to worship at all if he chooses. This at once sweeps away every excuse and every argument that might ever be offered for the restriction or the invasion of the rights of conscience by any person or any power.

78. This is the Christian doctrine. This is the Roger Williams doctrine. This is the genuine Protestant doctrine, for it is "the logical consequence of either of the two great distinguishing principles of the Reformation, as well as justification by faith alone as of the equality of all believers." -- Bancroft.31

79. Bryce's arraignment of Protestantism on this point is well deserved, and is decidedly applicable here: "The principles which had led the Protestants to sever themselves from the Roman Church should have taught them to bear with the opinions of others, and warned them from the attempt to connect agreement in doctrine or manner of worship with the necessary forms of civil government. Still less ought they to have enforced that agreement by civil penalties, for faith, upon their own showing, had no value save when it was freely given. A Church which does not claim to be infallible is bound to allow that some part of the truth may possibly be with its adversaries; a Church which permits or encourages human reason to apply itself to revelation, has no right to argue with people and then to punish them if they are not convinced.

80. "But whether it was that men only half saw that they had done; or that, finding it hard enough to unrivet priestly fetters, they welcomed all the aid a temporal prince could give; the result was that religion, or rather, religious creeds, began to be involved with politics more closely than had ever been the case before. Through the greater part of Christendom wars of religion raged for a century or more, and down to our own days feelings of theological antipathy continue to affect the relations of the powers of Europe. In almost every country the form of doctrine which triumphed associated itself with the State and maintained the despotic system to the Middle Ages, while it forsook the ground on which that system had been based.

81. "It was thus that arose national Churches, which were to be to the several Protestant countries of Europe that which the Church Catholic had been to the world at large; Churches, that is to say, each of which was to be coextensive with its respective State, was to enjoy landed wealth and exclusive political privilege, and was to be armed with coercive powers against recusants. It was not altogether easy

to find a set of theoretical principles on which such churches might be made to rest; for they could not, like the old Church, point to the historical transmission of their doctrines; they could not claim to have in any one man, or body of men, an infallible organ of divine truth; they could not even fall back upon general councils, or the argument, whatever it may be worth, `Securus indicat orbis terrarum.'

82. "But in practice these difficulties were soon got over, for the dominant party in each State, if it was not infallible, was at any rate quite sure that it was right, and could attribute the resistance of other sects to nothing but moral obliquity. The will of the sovereign, as in England, or the will of the majority, as in Holland, Scandinavia, and Scotland, imposed upon each country a peculiar form of worship, and kept up the practices of mediaeval intolerance without their justification.

83. "Persecution, which might be at least excused in an infallible, Catholic, and apostolic Church, was peculiarly odious when practiced by those who were not Catholic; who were no more apostolic than their neighbors; and who had just revolted from the most ancient and venerable authority, in the name of rights which they now denied to others. If union with the visible Church by participation in a material sacrament be necessary to eternal life, persecution may be held a duty, a kindness to perishing souls. But if the kingdom of heaven be in every sense a kingdom of the spirit, if saving faith be possible out of one visible body and under a diversity of external forms, persecution becomes at once a crime and a folly.

84. "Therefore the intolerance of Protestants, if the forms it took were less cruel than those practiced by the Roman catholic, was also far less defensible; for it had seldom anything better to allege on its behalf than motives of political expediency, or more often the mere headstrong passion of a ruler or a faction, to silence the expression of any opinions but their own. . . . And hence it is not too much to say that the ideas . . . regarding the duty of the magistrate to compel uniformity in doctrine and worship by the civil arm, may all be traced to the

relation which that theory established between the Roman Church and the Roman Empire; to the conception, in fact, of an empire Church itself."32

803

85. In the promulgation of the principles of Protestantism, and in the work of the Reformation, the names of MARTIN LUTHER and ROGER WILLIAMS can never rightly be separated. Williams completed what Luther began; and together they gave anew to the world, and for all time, the principles originally announced by Him who was the Author and Finisher of the faith of both -- JESUS CHRIST, THE AUTHOR OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

1[Page 773] Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," Vol. xiv, sec. ii, pars. 22, 23

2[Page 775] "Ecclesiastical History," cent. xvi, sec. iii, part ii, chap 1, par. 28.

3[Page 778] "Ecclesiastical History," cent. xvi, sec. iii, part ii, chap. iii, par 6.

4[Page 780] Id., cent. xvii, sec. i par 32.

5[Page 781] "Ecclesiastical History," cent xvii, sec. ii, part ii, chap. i par. 6.

6[Page 781] Id., par. 7. The Italics are his.

7[Page 782] Id., par. 26.

8[Page 782] Id., par. 87.

9[Page 783] Id., chap. ii, par. 10

10[Page 785] "Ecclesiastical History," cent xvii, sec. ii, part ii, chap. 1. par 16.

11[Page 786] See D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation," book xvi, chap, iv, par 1; chap.i par. 7. chap iv, par. 2; and chap. viii, paragraph 6 from the end.

12[Page 787] Id., book vi, chap, i, par 5, 1, and book v, chap, vi, par. 12.

13[Page 787] Essays, "Hallam," par. 27.

14[Page 789] "History of Protestantism," book xiv, chap. x, last paragraph but one.

15[Page 789] Wylie's "History of Protestantism," book xiv, end of chap. xxiv.

16[Page 789] "History of the United States," chap. "Prelates and Puritans." par. 11.

17[Page 790] "History of civilization," chap. v, last paragraph.

18[Page 790] "History of the United States," chap. "Self-Government in Massachusetts,' par. 25.

19[Page 791] "The Emancipation of Massachusetts," pp. 35, 36.

20[Page 791] Id., pp. 36,37.

21[Page 792] "Beginnings of New England," p. 178.

22[Page 792] Backus's Church History of New England," pp. 62,63.

23[Page 793] Bancroft's History of the United States," chap. "The Providence Plantations," pars. 3-6.

24[Page 793] Blakely's American State Papers," page 68, note.

25[Page 793] Bancroft's History of the United States," chap. "The Providence Plantations," par. 6.

26[Page 796] "Beginning of New England," p. 180.

27[Page 797] Id pp. 184, 185 This was not in any sense an expression of Indifference as to the teachings of the Quakers; because by discussion Roger was constantly combating them. He wrote a book against them, entitled "George Fox Digged out of his Burrowes," and at the age of seventy three he "rowed himself in a boat the whole length of Narragansett bay to engage in a theological tournament against three Quaker champions." -- Id., p. 186.

28[Page 797] "History of the United States," chap. "The Place of Puritanism in History, par. 5. in his last revision, however, this is softened into this: "The uncompromising Congregationalists of Massachusetts indulged the passions of their English persecutors."

29[Page 798] "Charters and Constitutions," Pennsylvania.

30[Page 799] "John Wesley a Missioner to Georgia," by William Stevens Perry, D. D. bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Iowa; New York Independent, March 5, 1891, pp. 5,6

31[Page 801] "History of the United States," chap, "Self-Government in Massachusetts," par 22.

32[Page 803] " Holy Roman Empire," chap xviii, par 8.

26. THE CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE TRIUMPHANT.

THEN came the American Revolution, overturning all the principles of the papacy, and establishing for the enlightenment of all nations, THE NEW REPUBLIC, -- the first national government ever established upon the earth that was in accord with the principles announced by Jesus Christ for mankind and for civil government.

2. The American Revolution did not consist merely in the establishment of a government independent of Great Britain, but in the ideas concerning man and government that were proclaimed and established by it. On the reverse side of the great seal of the United States there is a Latin inscription -- Novus Ordo Seclorum -- meaning "A New Order of Things." This new order of things is defined in the expression of two distinct ideas: first, that government is of the people; and, second, that government is of right entirely separate from religion.

3. These two ideas are nobly expressed in the Declaration of Independence which declares: --

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is right of the people to

alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

4. Thus in two sentences was annihilated the despotic doctrine which, springing from the usurped authority of the papacy, to sit in the place of God and to set up and pull down kings, and to bestow kingdoms and empires at its will, had now become venerable, if not absolutely hallowed,

805

by the precedents of a thousand years -- the doctrine of the divine right of kings; and in the place of the old, false, despotic theory of the sovereignty of the government and the subjection of the people, there was declared the self-evident truth, the subjection of government, and the sovereignty of the people.

5. In declaring the equal and inalienable right of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, there is not only declared the sovereignty of the people, but also the entire capability of the people. The declaration, in itself, presupposes that men are men indeed, and that as such they are fully capable of deciding for themselves as to what is best for their happiness, and how they shall pursue it, without the government's being set up as a parent or guardian to deal with them as with children.

6. In declaring that governments are instituted by the governed, for certain ends, and that when any government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish, it, and to institute a new government, in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness, it is likewise declared that instead of the people's needing to be cared for by the government, the government must be cared for by the people.

7. In declaring the objects of government to be to secure to the people the rights which they already possess in full measure and inalienable degree, and to effect their safety and happiness in the enjoyment of those rights; and in declaring the right of the people, in the event named, to alter or abolish the government which they have, and institute a new one on such principles and in such form as to them seems best; there is likewise declared not only the complete subordination, but also the absolute impersonality of government. It is therein declared that the government is but a device, a piece of political machinery, framed and set up by the people, by which they would make themselves secure in the enjoyment of the inalienable rights which they already possess as men, and which they have by virtue of being men in society and not by virtue of government; -- the right which was their before government which is their own in the essential meaning of the term; and "which they do not hold by any sub-infeudation, but by direct homage and allegiance

806

to the Owner and Lord of all" (Stanely Matthews), their Creator, who has endowed them with those rights. And in thus declaring the impersonality of government, there is wholly uprooted every vestige of any character of paternity in the government.

8. In declaring the equality of all men in the possession of these inalienable rights, there is likewise declared the strongest possible safeguard of the people. For this being the declaration of the people, each one of the people stands thereby pledged to the support of the principle thus declared. Therefore, each individual is pledged, in the exercise of his own inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, so to act as not to interfere with any other person in the free and perfect exercise of his inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Any person who so acts as to restrict or to interfere with the free exercise of any other person's right to life, or liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, denies the principle, to the maintenance of which he is pledged and does in effect subvert the government. For, rights being equal if one may so act, every other one may do so; and thus no man's right is recognized, true government is gone, and only despotism or anarchy remains. Therefore, by every interest, personal as well as general, private as well as public, every individual

among the people is pledged in the enjoyment of his right to life, or liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, so to conduct himself as not to interfere in the least degree with the equal right of every other one to the free and full exercise of his enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. "For the rights of man, as man, must be understood in a sense that can admit of no single exception; for to allege an exception is the same thing as to deny the principle. We reject, therefore, with scorn, any profession of respect to the principle which, in fact, comes to us clogged and contradicted by a petition for an exception. . . . To profess the principle and then to plead for an exception, let the plea be what it may, is to deny the principle, and it is to utter a treason against humanity. The rights of man must everywhere all the world over be recognized and respected." -- Isaac Taylor.2

9. The Declaration of Independence, therefore, announces the perfect

principle of civil government. If the principle thus announced were perfectly conformed to by all, then the government would be a perfect civil government. It is but the principle of self-government -- government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And to the extent to which this principle is exemplified among the people, to the extent to which the individual governs himself, just to that extent and no farther will prevail the true idea of the Declaration, and the republic which it created.

10. Such is the first grand idea of the American Revolution. And it is the scriptural idea, the idea of Jesus Christ and of God. For, the Declaration holds that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Now the Creator of all men is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and "is He the God of the Jews only? is He not also of the Gentiles? -- Yes, of the Gentiles, also." And as He "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth,"3 "there is no respect of persons with God."4

11. Nor is this the doctrine of the later scripture only; it is the doctrine of all the Book. The most ancient writings in the Book have these words: "If I did despise the cause of my manservant or of my maidservant when they contended with me; what then shall I do when God riseth up? and when He visiteth, what shall I answer Him? Did not He that made me in the womb, make him?"5 And, "The Lord your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward: He doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger in giving him food and raiment. Love ye therefore the stranger." "The stranger that dwelleth with you, shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself."6

12. In the discussions which brought forth the Declaration and developed the Revolution, the doctrine found expression in the following forceful and eloquent words: "Government is founded not on force, as was the theory of Hobbes; nor on compact, as was the theory of Locke and

of the revolution of 1688; nor on property, as was asserted by Harrington. It springs from the necessities of our nature, and has an everlasting foundation in the unchangeable will of God. Man came into the world and into society at the same instant. There must exist in every earthly society a supreme sovereign, from whose final decision there can be no appeal but directly to Heaven. This supreme power is originally and ultimately in the people; and the people never did in fact freely, nor can rightfully, make an unlimited renunciation of this divine rights. Kingcraft and priestcraft are a trick to gull the vulgar. The happiness of mankind demands that this grand and ancient alliance should be broken off forever.

13. "The omniscient and omnipotent Monarch of the universe has, by the grand charter given to the human race, placed the end of government in the good of the whole. The form of government is left to the

individuals of each society; its whole superstructure and administration should be conformed to the law of universal reason. There can be no prescription old enough to supersede the law of nature and the grant of God Almighty, who has given all men a right to be free. If every prince since Nimrod had been a tyrant, it would not prove a right to tyrannize. The administrators of legislative and executive authority, when they verge toward tyranny, are to be resisted; if they prove incorrigible, are to be deposed.

14. "The first principle and great end of government being to provide for the best good of all the people, this can be done only by a supreme legislative and executive, ultimately in the people, or whole community, where God has placed it; but the difficulties attending a universal congress, gave rise to a right of representation. Such a transfer of the power of the whole to a few was necessary; but to bring the powers of all into the hands of one or some few, and to make them hereditary, is the interested work of the weak and the wicked. Nothing but life and liberty are actually hereditable. The grand political problem is to invent the best combination of the powers of legislation and execution! They must exist in the State, just as in the revolution of the planets; one power would fix them to a center, and another carry them off indefinitely; but the first and simple principle is, EQUALITY and THE POWER OF THE WHOLE. . . .

15. "The British colonists do not hold their liberties or their lands by so slippery a tenure as the will of the prince. Colonists are men, the common children of the same Creator with their brethren of Great Britain. The colonists are men; the colonists are therefore freeborn; for, by the law of nature, all men are freeborn, white or black. No good reason can be given for enslaving those of any color. Is it right to enslave a man because his color is black, or his hair short and curled like wool, instead of Christian hair? Can any logical inference in favor of slavery be drawn from a flat nose or a long or short face? The riches of the West Indies, or the luxury of the metropolis, should not have weight to break the balance of truth and justice. Liberty is the gift of God, and can not be annihilated.

16. "Nor do the political and civil rights of the British colonists rest on a charter from the crown. Old Magna Charta was not the beginning of all things, nor did it rise on the borders of chaos out of the unformed mass. A time may come when Parliament shall declare every American charter void; but the natural, inherent, and inseparable rights of the colonists, as men and as citizens, can never be abolished. . . . The world is at the eve of the highest scene of earthly power and grandeur that has ever yet been displayed to the view of mankind. Who will win the prize, is with God. But human nature must and will be rescued from the general slavery that has so long triumphed over the species." -- James Otis.7

17. Thus spoke can American "for his country and for the race," bringing to "the conscious intelligence of the people the elemental principles of free government and human rights." Outside of the theocracy of Israel, there never has been a ruler or an executive on earth whose authority was not, primarily or ultimately, expressly or permissively, derived from the people. It is not particular sovereigns whose power is ordained of God, nor any particular form of government. It is the genius of government itself.

18. The absence of government is anarchy. Anarchy is only governmental confusion. But says the Scripture, "God is not the author of confusion." 8 God is the God of order. He has ordained order, and He

has put within man himself that idea of government, of self-protection, which is the first law of nature, and which organizes itself into forms of one kind or another, wherever men dwell on the face of the earth. And it is for men themselves to say what shall be the form of government under which they will dwell. One people has one form; another has another. This genius of civil order springs from God; it matters not whether it be exercised though one form of government or through another, the governmental power and order thus exercised is ordained of God. If the people choose to change their form of government, it is still the same power; it is to be respected still.

19. It is plain, therefore, that where the Declaration of Independence says that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, it asserts THE ETERNAL TRUTH OF GOD.

20. The second great idea of the New Order of Things inaugurated in the American Revolution -- that of right, government is entirely separate from religion -- is the logical sequence of the first. "All men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." The first and greatest of all the rights of men is religious right. Religion and the manner of discharging it is the duty which men owe to their Creator. The first of all duties is to the Creator, because to him we owe our existence. Therefore the first of all commandments, and the first that there can possibly be, is this: "Hear, O Israel: The Lord thy God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; this is the first commandment."9

21.This commandment existed as soon as there was an intelligent creature in the universe; and it will continue to exist as long as there shall continue one intelligent creature in the universe. Nor can a universe full of intelligent creatures modify in any sense the bearing that this commandment has upon any single one, any more than if that single one were the only creature in the universe. For as soon as an intelligent creature exists, he owes his existence to the Creator. And in owing to him his existence, he owes to him the first consideration in all the accompaniments and all the possibilities of existence. Such is the origin, such the nature, and such the measure, of religious right.

22. Did, then, the fathers who laid the foundation of this nation in the rights of the people -- did they allow to this right the place and deference among the rights of the people which, according to its inherent importance, is justly its due? That is, Did they leave it sacred and untouched solely between man and his Creator?

23. The logic of the Declaration demanded that they should; for the Declaration says that governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed." Governments, then, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, never can of right exercise any power not delegated by the governed. But religion pertains solely to man's relation to God, and to the duty which he owes to him as his Creator, and therefore in the nature of things it can never be delegated.

24. It is utterly impossible for any person ever, in any degree, to delegate or transfer to another any relationship or duty, or the exercise of any relationship or duty, which he owes to his Creator. To attempt to do so would be only to deny God and renounce religion, and even then the thing would not be done; for, whatever he might do, his relationship and duty to God would still abide as fully and as firmly as ever.

25. As governments derive their just powers from the governed; as governments can not justly exercise any power not delegated; and as it is impossible for any person in any way to delegate any power in things religious; it follows conclusively that the Declaration of Independence logically excludes religion in every sense and in every way from the jurisdiction and from the notice of every form of government that could result from that Declaration.

26. This is scriptural, too. For to the definition that religion is "the recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience," the Scripture responds: "It is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." 10 To the statement that religion is "man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God," the Scripture responds, "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God." 11 And to the word that religion is "the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it," the Scripture still responds, "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of

Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 12 No government can ever account to God for any individual. No man nor any set of men can ever have faith for another. No government will ever stand before the judgment seat of Christ to answer even for itself, much less for the people or for any individual. Therefore, no government can ever of right assume any responsibility in any way in any matter of religion.

27. Such is the logic of the Declaration, as well as it is the truth of Holy Writ. But did the fathers who made the nation recognize this and act accordingly? -- They did. And the history of this subject runs parallel, step by step, with the history of the subject of the fixing of the civil rights of the people in the supreme law. This history occurred in the same time precisely as did that; it occurred in the same place precisely as did that; it was made by the same identical men who made that history; and the recognition and declaration of this right were made a fixture in the same identical place by the same identical means as was that of the other. This being so makes it impossible to be escaped by anybody who has any respect for the work of those noble master-builders, or for the rights of the people.

28.Let us trace the history of this right of the people through the time which was occupied in the establishing of the rights of the people in the abstract: Like the other series of events, this began in Virginia. While Virginia was yet a colony and subject to Great Britain, and while the Church of England was the established Church of the colony, the colonial House of Burgesses, June 12, 1776, adopted a Declaration of Rights, composed of sixteen sections, every one of which, in substance, afterward found a place in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The sixteenth section, in part, reads thus: --

"That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only be reason and conviction, not by force or violence, and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience."

29. July 4 following, the Declaration of Independence was made, wherein, as we have already seen, this principle is embodied in the

statement that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." This is precisely the view that was taken of it, and the use that was made of the principle as it appeared in the Declaration of Independence, as soon as that Declaration was published to the world. For no sooner was the Declaration published abroad than the Presbytery of Hanover, in Virginia, openly took its stand, with the new and independent nation, and with the Baptists and Quakers, addressed to the General Assembly of Virginia a memorial, reading as follows: --

"To the Honorable, the General Assembly of Virginia: The memorial of the Presbytery of Hanover humbly represents: That your memorialists are governed by the same sentiments which have inspired the United States of America, and are determined that nothing in our power and influence shall be wanting to give success to their common cause. We would also represent that dissenters from the Church of England in this country have ever been desirous to conduct themselves as peaceful members of the civil government, for which reason they have hitherto submitted to various ecclesiastical burdens and restrictions that are inconsistent with equal liberty. But now, when the many and grievous oppressions of our mother country have laid this continent under the necessity of casting off the yoke of tyranny, and of forming independent governments upon equitable and liberal foundations, we flatter ourselves that we shall be freed from all the incumbrances which a spirit of domination, prejudice, or bigotry has interwoven with most other political systems. This we are the more strongly encouraged to expect by the Declaration of Rights, so universally applauded for that dignity, firmness, and precision with which it delineates and asserts the privileges of society, and the prerogatives of human nature, and which we embrace as the Magna Charta of our commonwealth, that can never be violated without endangering the grand

superstructure it was designed to sustain. Therefore we rely upon this declaration, as well the justice of our honorable Legislature, to secure us the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of our own consciences; and we should fall short in our duty to ourselves, and the many and numerous congregations under our care, were we, upon this occasion, to neglect laying before you a statement of the religious grievances under which we have hitherto labored, that they may no longer be continued in our present form of government.

"It is well known that in the frontier counties, which are justly supposed to contain a fifth part of the inhabitants of Virginia, the dissenters have borne the heavy burdens of purchasing glebes, building churches, and supporting the established clergy, where there are very few Episcopalians, either to assist in bearing the expense, or to reap the advantage; and that throughout other parts of the country there are also

814

many thousands of zealous friends and defenders of our State who, besides the invidious and disadvantageous restrictions to which they have been subjected, annually pay large taxes to support an establishment from which their consciences and principles oblige them to dissent; all of which are confessedly so many violations of their natural rights, and, in their consequences, a restraint upon freedom of inquiry and private judgment.

"In this enlightened age, and in a land where all of every denomination are united in the most strenuous efforts to be free, we hope and expect that our representatives will cheerfully concur in removing every species of religious as well as civil bondage. Certain it is that every argument for civil liberty gains additional strength when applied to liberty in the concerns of religion; and there is no argument in favor of establishing the Christian religion but may be pleaded with equal propriety for establishing the tenets of Mohammed by those who believe the Alcoran; or, if this be not true, it is at least impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith WITHOUT ERECTING A CLAIM TO INFALLIBILITY, WHICH WOULD LEAD US BACK TO THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"We beg leave farther to represent that religious establishments are highly injurious to the temporal interests of any community. Without insisting upon the ambition and the arbitrary practices of those who are favored by the government, of the intriguing, seditious spirit which is commonly excited by this as well as by every other kind of oppression, such establishments greatly retard population, and consequently the progress of arts, sciences, and manufactures. Witness the rapid growth and improvement of the northern provinces compared with this. No one can deny that the more early settlements and the many superior advantages of our country would have invited multitudes of artificers, mechanics, and other useful members of society to fix their habitation among us, who have either remained in their place of nativity or preferred worse civil governments and a more barren soil, where they might enjoy the rights of conscience more fully than they had a prospect of doing in this; from which we infer that Virginia might have been now the capital of America, and a match for the British arms, without depending on others for the necessaries of war, had it not been prevented by her religious establishment.

"Neither can it be made to appear that the gospel needs any such civil aid. We rather conceive that when our blessed Saviour declares His Kingdom is not of this world, He renounces all dependence upon State power, and as His weapons are spiritual, and were only designed to have influence on the judgment and heart of man, we are persuaded that if mankind were left in quiet possession of their inalienable religious privileges, Christianity, as in the days of the apostles, would continue to prevail and flourish in the greatest purity by its own native excellence, and under the all-disposing providence of God.

815

"We would also humbly represent that the only proper objects of civil government are the happiness and protection of men in the present state of existence, the security of the life, liberty, and property of the citizens, and to restrain the vicious and encourage the virtuous by wholesome laws, equally extending to every individual;

but that the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can only be directed by reason and conviction, and is nowhere cognizable but at the tribunal of the universal Judge.

"Therefore we ask no ecclesiastical establishments of ourselves; neither can we approve of them when granted to others. This, indeed, would be giving exclusive or separate emoluments or privileges to one set of men without any special public services, to the common reproach and injury of every other denomination. And for the reason recited, we are induced earnestly to entreat that all laws now in force in this commonwealth which countenance religious domination may be speedily repealed; that all of every religious sect may be protected in the full exercise of their several modes of worship; exempted from all taxes for the support of any Church whatsoever, farther than what may be agreeable to their own private choice or voluntary obligation. This being done, all partial and invidious distinction will be abolished, to the great honor and interest of the State, and every one be left to stand or fall according to his merit, which can never be the case so long as any one denomination is established in preference to the others.

"That the great Sovereign of the universe may inspire you with unanimity, wisdom, and resolution, and bring you to a just determination on all the important concerns before you, is the fervent prayer of your memorialists." 13

30. The Episcopalian being the established Church of Virginia, and having been so ever since the planting of the Colony, it was, of course, only to be expected that the Episcopalians would send up countermemorials, pleading for a continuance of the system of established religion. But this was not all -- the Methodists joined with the Episcopalians in this plan. Two members of the Assembly, Messrs. Pendleton and Nicolas, championed the establishment, and Jefferson espoused the cause of liberty and right. After nearly two months of what Jefferson pronounced the severest contest in which he was ever engaged, the cause of freedom prevailed, and Dec. 6, 1776, the Assembly passed a law repealing all the colonial laws and penalties prejudicial to dissenters, releasing them from any further compulsory contributions to the Episcopal Church, and discountinuing the State support of the Episcopal clergy after Jan. 1, 1777.

31. A motion was then made to levy a general tax for the support of "teachers of the Christian religion," but it was postponed till a future Assembly. To the next Assembly petitions were sent by the Episcopalians and the Methodists, pleading for the general assessment. But the Presbytery of Hanover, still strongly supported by the Baptists and the Quakers, was again on hand with a memorial, in which it referred to the points previously presented, and then proceeded as follows: --

"We would also humbly represent that the only proper objects of civil government are the happiness and protection of men in the present state of existence, the security of the life, liberty, and property of the citizens, and to restrain the vicious and to encourage the virtuous by wholesome laws, equally extending to every individual; but that the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can only be directed by reason and conviction, and is nowhere cognizable but at the tribunal of the universal Judge.

"To illustrate and confirm these assertions, we beg leave to observe that to judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an unalienable right, which, upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated and the Reformation from popery carried on, can never be transferred to another. Neither does the Church of Christ stand in need of a general assessment for its support; and most certain we are that it would be of no advantage but an injury to the society to which we belong; and as every good Christian believes that Christ has ordained a complete system of laws for the government of His kingdom, so we are persuaded that by His providence He will support it to its final consummation. In the fixed belief of this principle, that the kingdom of Christ and the concerns of religion are beyond the limits of civil control, we should act a dishonest, inconsistent part were we to receive any emoluments from human establishments for the support of the gospel.

"These things being considered, we hope that we shall be excused for remonstrating against a general assessment for any religious purpose. As the maxims have long been approved, that every servant is to obey his master, and that the hireling is accountable for his conduct to him from whom he receives his wages, in like manner, if the Legislature has any rightful authority over the ministers of the gospel in the exercise of their sacred office, and if it is their duty to levy a maintenance for them as such, then it will follow that they may revive the old establishment in its former extent, or ordain a new one for any sect they may think proper; they are invested with a power not only to determine, but it is incumbent on them to declare, who shall preach, what they shall preach, to whom, when, and in what places

817

they shall preach; or to impose any regulations and restrictions upon religious societies that they may judge expedient. These consequences are so plain as not to be denied, and they are so entirely subversive of religious liberty that if they should take place in Virginia, we should be reduced to the melancholy necessity of saying with the apostles in like cases, `Judge ye whether it is best to obey God or men,' and also of acting as they acted.

"Therefore, as it is contrary to our principles and interest, and, as we think, subversive of religious liberty, we do again most earnestly entreat that our Legislature would never extend any assessment for religious purposes to us or to the congregations under our care."14

32. In 1779, by this memorial, and, more, "by the strenuous efforts of the Baptists," the bill was defeated, after it had been ordered to the third reading.

33. At the same time, in 1779, Jefferson prepared with his own hand, and proposed for adoption "as a part of the revised code" of Virginia, "An Act for Establishing Religious Freedom," which ran as follows: --

"Well aware that Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in His almighty power to do; that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who, being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking, as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world, and through all time; that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness, and is withdrawing from the ministry those temporal rewards which, proceeding from an approbation of their personal conduct, are an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labors for the instruction of mankind; that our civil rights have no dependence upon our religious opinions, more than our opinions in physics or geometry; that, therefore, the proscribing any citizen as

818

unworthy the public confidence, by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to the offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow-citizens, he has a natural right; that it tends to corrupt the principles of that very religion it is meant to encourage, by bribing with a monopoly of worldly honors and emoluments those who will externally profess and conform to it; that, though indeed these are criminal who do not withstand such temptation, yet neither are those innocent who lay the bait in their way; that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion, and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles, on the supposition of their ill tendency, is a dangerous fallacy, which at once destroys all religious liberty, because, he being, of course, judge of that tendency, will make his opinions the rule of

judgment, and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with, or differ from, his own; that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt actions against peace and good order; and, finally, that truth is great, and will prevail if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict, unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate, errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them.

"Be it therefore enacted by the General Assembly, that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in nowise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.

"And though we well know that this Assembly, elected by the people for the ordinary purposes of legislation only, have no power to restrain the acts of succeeding assemblies, constituted with powers equal to our own, and that therefore to declare this act irrevocable, would be of no effect in law, yet we are free to declare, and do declare, that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right."15

34. This proposed law was submitted to the whole people of Virginia for their "deliberate reflection," before the vote should be taken

in the General Assembly for its enactment into law as a part of the revised code.

35. From this time forward the war for independence became the all-absorbing question, and this movement for the establishment of "the Christian religion," was compelled to stand in abeyance until the war had ended. At the first opportunity, however, after peace had come again to the country, the subject was again forced upon the General Assembly of Virginia, in the fall of 1784, by the petitioners, under the lead of "The Protestant Episcopal Church," for the establishment of "a provision for teachers of the Christian religion." "Their petitions, favored by Patrick Henry; Harrison, then governor; Pendleton, the chancellor; Richard Henry Lee, and many others of the foremost men, alleged a decay of public morals; and the remedy asked for was a general assessment."16 At this point the Presbyterian clergy swerved, and "accepted the measure, provided it should respect every human belief, even 'of the Mussulman and the Gentoo.'" -- Id. The Presbyterian people, however, held fast to the principle. And the Baptists, as ever in those days, "alike ministers and people," held steadfastly to the principle and "rejected any alliance with the State."

36. Early in the session, Patrick Henry introduced a resolution to allow the presentation of a bill in accordance with the wishes of the petitioners. Personally, Jefferson was out of the country, being minister to France; but his bill for "Establishing Religious Freedom," which had been submitted to the people in 1779, was still before them; and, though personally absent, he took a lively interest in the contest, and his pen was busy. His place in the General Assembly was most worthily filled by Madison, as the leader in the cause of religious right.

37. Madison declared against the bill, that "the assessment bill exceeds the functions of civil authority. The question has been stated as if it were, Is religion necessary? The true question is, Are establishments necessary to religion? And the answer is, They corrupt religion. The difficulty of providing for the support of religion is the result of the war, to be remedied by voluntary association for religious purposes. In the event of a statute for the support of the Christian religion, are the courts of law to decide what is Christianity? and as a consequence,

to decide what is orthodoxy and what is heresy? The enforced support of the Christian religion dishonors Christianity."17

38. "Yet, in spite of all opposition, leave to bring in the bill was granted by forty-seven votes against thirty-two." Accordingly, there was introduced "A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion;" which provided a general assessment on all taxable property for the purpose named; that each person as he paid his tax should say to what particular denomination he desired it to be conveyed; and that in all cases wherein persons declined to name any religious society all such tax received from these was to be turned to the support of schools in the counties of said persons, respectively.

39. The bill was successfully carried to the third reading, and was there checked only by a motion to postpone the subject to the next General Assembly, meantime to print the bill and distribute it among the people for their consideration, that their will in the matter might be signified to the next Assembly, which then could act accordingly. "Thus the people of Virginia had before them for their choice the bill of the revised code for `Establishing Religious Freedom,' and the plan of desponding churchmen for supporting religion by a general assessment." "All the State, from the sea to the mountains, and beyond them, was alive with the discussion. Madison, in a remonstrance addressed to the Legislature, embodied all that could be said against the compulsory maintenance of Christianity, and in behalf of religious freedom as a natural right, the glory of Christianity itself, the surest method of supporting religion, and the only way to produce harmony among its several sects."18

40. This noble remonstrance, which "embodied all that could be said" upon the subject, should be ingrained in the minds of the American people to-day; because all that it said then needs to be said now, even with a double emphasis. This masterly document, which, on the subject of religious right, holds the same high place as does the Declaration of Independence on the subject of rights in general, is here given in full, and runs as follows: --

"We, the subscribers, citizens of the said commonwealth, having taken into serious consideration a bill printed by order of the last session

of General Assembly, entitled, `A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of Christian Religion,' and conceiving that the same, if finally armed with the sanctions of a law, will be a dangerous abuse of power, are bound as faithful members of a free State to remonstrate against it, and to declare the reasons by which we are determined. We remonstrate against the said bill: --

"1. Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth `that religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence.' The religion, then, of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable, because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated in their own minds, can not follow the dictates of other men. It is unalienable, also, because what is here a right towards men is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation to the claims of civil society. Before any man can be considered as a member of civil society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the universe; and if a member of a civil society who enters into any subordinate association, must always do it with a reservation of his duty to the general authority, much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular civil society do it with a saving of his allegiance to the universal Sovereign. We maintain, therefore, that in matters of religion no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society, and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance. True it is, that no other rule exists by which any

question which may divide a society can be ultimately determined than the will of the majority; but it is also true that the majority may trespass upon the rights of the minority.

"2. Because, if religion is exempt from the authority of the society at large, still less can it be subject to that of the legislative body. The latter are but the creatures and vicegerents of the former. Their jurisdiction is both derivative and limited. It is limited with regard to the co-ordinate departments; more necessarily is it limited with regard to the constituents. The preservation of a free government requires not merely that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power be invariably maintained, but more especially that neither of them be suffered to overleap the great barrier which defends the rights of the people. The rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment exceed the commission from which they derive their authority, and are tyrants. The people who submit to it are governed by laws made neither by themselves nor by any authority derived from them, and are slaves.

"3. Because it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment upon

our liberties. We hold this prudent jealousy to be the first duty of citizens, and one of the noblest characteristics of the late Revolution. The freemen of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much soon to forget it. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish, with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects? that the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute threepence only, of his property, for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?

"4. Because the bill violates that equality which ought to be the basis of every law, and which is more indispensable in proportion as the validity or expediency of any law is more liable to be impeached. `If all men are by nature equally free independent,' all men are to be considered as entering into society on equal conditions, as relinquishing no more, and, therefore, retaining no less, one than the other of their natural rights. Above all, are they to be considered as retaining an `equal title to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience.' Whilst we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess, and to observe the religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we can not deny an equal freedom to them whose minds have not yet yielded to the evidence which has convinced us. If this freedom be abused, it is an offense against God, not against man. To God, therefore, not to man, must an account of it be rendered. As the bill violates equality by subjecting some to peculiar burdens, so it violates the same principle by granting to others peculiar exemptions. Are the Quakers and Menonists the only sects who think a compulsive support of their religions unnecessary and unwarrantable? Can their piety alone be intrusted with the care of public worship? Ought their religions to be endowed above all others with extraordinary privileges by which proselytes may be enticed from all others? We think too favorably of the justice and good sense of these denominations to believe that they either covet pre-eminences over their fellow-citizens, or that they will be seduced by them from the common opposition to the measure.

"5. Because the bill implies either that the civil magistrate is a competent judge of religious truths, or that he may employ religion as an engine of civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretension, falsified by the contradictory opinions of rulers in all ages and throughout the world; the second, an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

"6. Because the establishment proposed by the bill is not requisite for the support of the Christian religion. To say that it is, is a contradiction to the Christian religion itself, for every page of it disavows a dependence on the powers of this world. It is a contradiction to fact;

for it is known that this religion both existed and flourished, not only without the support of human laws, but in spite of every opposition from them, and not only during the period of miraculous aid, but long after it had been left to its own evidence and the ordinary care of Providence. Nay, it is a contradiction in terms; for a religion not invented by human policy must have pre-existed and been supported before it was established by human policy. It is, moreover, to weaken in those who profess this religion a pious confidence in its innate excellence and the patronage of its Author, and to foster in these who still reject it a suspicion that its friends are too conscious of its fallacies to trust it to its own meris.

"7. Because experience witnesseth that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? -- More or less, in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both, superstition, bigotry, and persecution. Inquire of the teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest luster; those of every sect point to the ages prior to its incorporation with civil polity. Propose a restoration of this primitive state, in which its teachers depend on the voluntary regard of their flocks -- many of them predict its downfall. On which side ought their testimony to have greatest weight -- when for, or when against, their interest?

"8. Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of civil government. If it be urged as necessary for the support of civil government only as it is a means of supporting religion, and it be not necessary for the latter purpose, it can not be necessary for the former. If religion be not within the cognizance of civil government, how can its legal establishment be necessary to civil government? What influence, in fact, have ecclesiastical establishments had on civil society? In some instances they have been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of civil authority; in many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; in no instance have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberty may have found in established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure and perpetuate it, needs them not. Such a government will be best supported by protecting every citizen in the enjoyment of his religion with the same equal hand which protects his person and his property, by neither invading the equal rights of any sect, nor suffering any sect to invade those of another.

"9. Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy which, offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every nation and religion, promised a luster to our country, and an accession to the number of its citizens. What a melancholy mark is this bill, of sudden degeneracy! Instead of holding forth an asylum

to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of citizens all those whose opinions in religion do not bend to those the legislative authority. Distant as it may be in its present form from the Inquisition, it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other is the last in the career of intolerance. The magnanimous sufferer of this cruel scourge in foreign regions, must view the bill as a beacon on our coast warning him to seek some other haven, where liberty and philanthropy, in their due extent, may offer a more certain repose from his troubles.

"10. Because it will have a like tendency to banish our citizens. The allurements presented by other situations are every day thinning their number. To superadd a fresh motive to emigration by revoking the liberty which they now enjoy, would be the same species of folly which has dishonored and depopulated flourishing kingdoms.

"11. Because it will destroy that moderation and harmony which the forbearance of our laws to intermeddle with religion has produced among its several sects. Torrents of blood have been spilt in the Old World in consequence of vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord by proscribing all differences in religious opinion. Time has at length revealed the true remedy. Every relaxation of narrow and rigorous policy, wherever it has been tried, has been found to assuage the disease. The American theater has

exhibited proofs that equal and complete liberty, if it does not wholly eradicate it, sufficiently destroys its malignant influence on the health and prosperity of the State. If, with the salutary effects of this system under our own eyes, we begin to contract the bounds of religious freedom, we know no name which will too severely reproach our folly. At least let warning be taken at the first fruits of the threatened innovation. The very appearance of the bill has transformed `that Christian forbearance, love, and charity,' which of late mutually prevailed, into animosities and jealousies which may not be appeased. What mischiefs may not be dreaded, should this enemy to the public quiet be armed with the force of law?

"12. Because the policy of the bill is adverse to the diffusion of the light of Christianity. The first wish of those who enjoy this precious gift ought to be that it may be imparted to the whole race of mankind. Compare the number of those who have as yet received it with the number still remaining under the dominion of false religions, and how small is the former? Does the policy of the bill tend to lessen the disproportion? -- No; it at once discourages those who are strangers to the light of revelation from coming into the region of it, and countenances by example the nations who continue in darkness in shutting out those who might convey it to them. Instead of leveling, as far as possible, every obstacle to the victorious progress of truth, the bill, with an ignoble and unchristian timidity, would circumscribe it with a wall of defense against the encroachments of error.

"13. Because attempts to enforce, by legal sanctions, acts obnoxious to so great a proportion of citizens, tend to enervate the laws in general,

and to slacken the bands of society. If it be difficult to execute any law which is not generally deemed necessary or salutary, what must be the case where it is deemed invalid and dangerous? And what may be the effect of so striking an example of impotency in the government, on its general authority?

"14. Because a measure of such singular magnitude and delicacy ought not to be imposed without the clearest evidence that it is called for by a majority of citizens; and no satisfactory method is yet proposed by which the voice of the majority in this case may be determined, or its influence secured. `The people of the respective counties are,' indeed, `requested to signify their opinion respecting the adoption of the bill, to the next session of the Assembly.' But the representation must be made equal before the voice of the representatives or of the counties will be that of the people. Our hope is that neither of the former will, after due consideration, espouse the dangerous principle of the bill. Should the event disappoint us, it will still leave us in full confidence that a fair appeal to the latter will reverse the sentence against our liberties.

"15. Because, finally, `The equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his religion, according to the dictates of conscience,' is held by the same tenure with all our other rights. If we recur to its origin, it is equally the gift of nature;, if we weigh its importance, it can not be less dear to us; if we consult the declaration of those rights `which pertain to the good people of Virginia as the basis and foundation of government,' it is enumerated with equal solemnity, or rather with studied emphasis. Either, then, we must say that the will of the Legislature is the only measure of their authority, and that in the plenitude of that authority, they may sweep away all our fundamental rights, or that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and sacred. Either we must say that they may control the freedom of the press, may abolish the trial by jury, may swallow up the executive and judiciary powers of the State; nay, that they may despoil us of our very rights of suffrage, and erect themselves into an independent and hereditary assembly, or we must say that they have no authority to enact into a law the bill under consideration.

"We, the subscribers, say that the General Assembly of this commonwealth have no such authority. And in order that no effort may be omitted on our part against so dangerous a usurpation, we oppose to it this remonstrance, earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of the universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addressed, may, on the one hand, turn their councils from every act which would affront His holy prerogative or violate the trust committed to them, and, on the other, guide them into every

measure which may be worthy of His blessing, redound to their own praise, and establish more firmly the liberties, the prosperity, and the happiness of the commonwealth.19

826

41. Washington being asked his opinion on the question as it stood in the contest, answered that "no man's sentiments were more opposed to any kind of restraint upon religious principles" than were his, and further: "As the matter now stands, I wish an assessment had never been agitated; and, as it has gone so far, that the bill die an easy death."20

42. The foregoing remonstrance was so thoroughly discussed and so well understood, and the will of the people on the subject was made so plain and emphatic, that "when the Legislature of Virginia assembled, no person was willing to bring forward the Assessment Bill; and it was never heard of more. Out of a hundred and seventeen articles of the revised code which were then reported, Madison selected for immediate action the one which related to religious freedom [pages 817-818]. The people of Virginia had held it under deliberation for six years. In December, 1785, it passed the House by a vote of nearly four to one. Attempts in the Senate for amendment produced only insignificant changes in the preamble, and on the 16th of January, 1786, Virginia placed among its statutes the very words of the original draft by Jefferson, WITH THE HOPE THAT THEY WOULD ENDURE FOREVER: `No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; opinion in matters of religion shall in nowise diminish, enlarge, or affect civil capacities. The rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind.'"21 Of this blessed result Madison happily exclaimed: "Thus in Virginia was extinguished forever the ambitious hope of making laws for the human mind."

43. The effect of this notable contest in Virginia could not possibly be confined to that State; nor was such a thing desired by those who conducted it. It was understood and intended by those who then and

827

there made this contest for religious right, that their labors should extend to all mankind this blessing and this natural right. The benefit of it was immediately felt throughout the country; and "in every other American State oppressive statutes concerning religion fell into disuse and were gradually repealed." This statute of Virginia is the model upon which the clause respecting religious right has been founded in the constitutions of all the States in the Union to this day. In every instance this statute has been embodied in its substance, and often in its very words, in the State constitutions.

44. Nor was this all. It had also "been foreseen that `the happy consequences of this grand experiment . . . would not be limited to America.' The statute of Virginia, translated into French and into Italian, was widely circulated through Europe. A part of the work of `the noble army of martyrs' was done."22 Yet the work of those who accomplished this grand victory was not then fully done, even in their direct efforts relating to their own country. As we have seen, this victory was completed Jan. 16, 1786. Just a month before this, December, 1785, the proposition made by Maryland to Virginia to call together commissioners from all the States to consider and "regulate restrictions on commerce for the whole" was laid before the very Legislature which passed the "Bill Establishing Religious Freedom in Virginia." This proposition of Maryland, created the opening, which was instantly seized by Madison, through which to push to successful issue the desire for the creation of the nation by the forming of the Constitution of the United States. And in pushing to successful issue the desire for the creation of a national power, there was carried along, also, and finally fixed in the Constitution of the United States, the same principle of religious right that had been so triumphantly fixed in the code of Virginia. Religious right was made a constitutional right.

45. The sole reference to religion in the Constitution as formed by the convention, and submitted to the people, is in the declaration that, "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or

public trust under the United States." The national government being one of delegated powers only, no mention whatever of religion, nor any reference to the subject, in the Constitution, would have totally

828

excluded that subject from the cognizance of the government. And this sole mention that was made of it, was a clear and positive evidence that the makers of the Constitution intended to exclude the subject of religion from the notice of the national power. So the people understood it when the Constitution was submitted to them for their approval. And the assurance of "the perfect liberty of conscience, prevented religious differences from interfering with zeal for a closer union."23

46. As we have seen, the contest for religious right in Virginia in 1785-86, had awakened a deep interest in the subject in the other States, and when the principle of this natural right had triumphed in Virginia, the effect of it was felt in every other State. And when the Constitution came before the other States with a clear recognition of the same principle, this was a feature immensely in its favor throughout the country.

47. After five States had ratified the Constitution, "the country from the St. Croix to the St. Mary's now fixed its attention on Massachusetts, whose adverse decision would inevitably involve the defeat of the Constitution."24 Massachusetts ratified the Constitution, and in the doing of it she considered this very question of religious right. One member of the convention objected against the proposed Constitution that "there is no provision that men in power should have any religion; a Papist or infidel is as eligible as Christians." He was answered by three members, that "no conceivable advantage to the whole will result from a test." Another objected that "It would be happy for the United States if our public men were to be of those who have a good standing in the Church." To this it was answered that "human tribunals for the consciences of men are impious encroachments upon the prerogatives of God. A religious test, as a qualification for office, would have been a great blemish." Again it was objected that the absence of a religious test would "open the door to popery and the Inquisition." And to this it was answered: "In reason and the Holy Scriptures, religion is ever a matter between God and individuals; and therefore no man or men can impose any religious test without invading the essential prerogative of the Lord Jesus Christ. Ministers first assumed this power under the Christian name; and then Constantine approved of the practice when he adopted

829

the profession of Christianity as an engine of State policy. And let the history of all nations be searched from that day to this, and it will appear that the imposing of religious tests has been the greatest engine of tyranny in the world."25

48. The action of Massachusetts, by its example, made sure the adoption of the Constitution. This particular point of religious right was specially discussed in that convention. The decision was in favor of the Constitution as it stood with reference to the separation of religion and the State. Therefore it is certain from this fact alone, if there were no other, that it was the intent of the Constitution and the intention of the makers thereof, totally to exclude religion in every way from the notice of the general government.

49. Yet this is not all. In the Virginia Convention objection was made that the Constitution did not fully enough secure religious right, to which Madison, "the Father of the Constitution," answered: "There is not a shadow of right in the general government to intermeddle with religion. Its least interference with it would be a most flagrant usurpation. I can appeal to my uniform conduct on this subject, that I have warmly supported religious freedom."26

50. Nor yet was this all. By the people of the United States it was deemed not sufficient. Knowing the inevitable tendency of men in power to fall in love with power, and to give themselves credit for inherent possession of it, and so to assert power that in nowise belongs to them, the people of the United States were not satisfied with the silence of the national charter, nor yet with this clear evidence of intention to exclude religion

from the notice of the national power. They demanded positive provisions which should, in so many words, prohibit the government of the United States from touching religion. They required that there should be added to the Constitution, articles of the nature of a bill of rights; and that religious right should in this be specifically declared.

51. A letter of Jefferson's dated Paris, Feb. 2, 1788, tells the whole story as to this point: it is therefore here presented: --

"DEAR SIR: I am glad to learn by letters which come down to the 20th of December, that the new Constitution will undoubtedly be

830

received by a sufficiency of the States to set it a-going. Were I in America, I would advocate it warmly till nine should have adopted, and then as warmly take the other side to convince the remaining four that they ought not to come into it till the declaration of rights is annexed to it; by this means we should secure all the good of it, and procure as respectable an opposition as would induce the accepting States to offer a bill of rights; this would be the happiest turn the thing could take. I fear much the effects of the perpetual re-eligibility of the president, but it is not thought of in America, and have, therefore, no prospect of a change of that article; but I own it astonishes me to find such a change wrought in the opinions of our countrymen since I left them, as that three fourths of them should be contented to live under a system which leaves to their governors the power of taking from them the trial by jury in civil cases, FREEDOM OF RELIGION, freedom of the press, freedom of commerce, the habeas corpus laws, and of yoking them with a standing army. That is a degeneracy in the principles of liberty to which I had given four centuries instead of four years, but I hope it will all come about."27

52. To see how fully this letter stated the case, it is necessary only to read the first ten amendments to the Constitution. These ten amendments were the bill of rights which the people required to be added to the Constitution as it was originally framed. The first Congress under the Constitution met March 4, 1789, and in September of the same year, these ten amendments were adopted. And in the very first of these provisions stands the declaration of the freedom of religious right under the United States government: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

53. Thus the people of the United States, in their own capacity as such, made the supreme law of the land positively and explicitly to declare the total exclusion of religion from any consideration whatever on the part of the national government. Nor was the matter permitted to stand even thus on that question; for in 1797 the treaty with Tripoli was made and signed by President Washington, and approved by the Senate of the United States, in which it is declared that, "the government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion." This being a material part of a treaty "made under the authority of the United States," it thus became a material part of "the supreme law of the land."28

831

54. Such is the history, such the establishment, and such the perfect supremacy of religious right in the United States. Thus, for the people of the United States and for the world, "religion was become avowedly the attribute of man and not of a corporation."29 Thus was expressed the will of the American people that the government of the United States is, and of right ought to be, FREE AND INDEPENDENT OF ALL ECCLESIASTICAL OR RELIGIOUS CONNECTION, INTERFERENCE, OR CONTROL. And the proof is abundant and absolutely conclusive, that it was all intentional, and that it was altogether out of respect for Christianity and the inalienable rights of men.

55. Much has been said -- none too much -- of the wisdom of the men who set to the world this glorious example. Yet in this particular thing it would be an impeachment of their common sense to suppose that they could have done otherwise. They had before them the history of the world, pagan, papal, and Protestant, from the

cross of Christ to the Declaration of Independence. And with the exception of feeble example of toleration in Holland, and of religious freedom in Rhode Island, all the way it was one uninterrupted course of suffering and torture of the innocent; of oppression, riot, bloodshed, and anarchy by the guilty; and all as a result of the alliance of religion and the State. The simplest process of deduction would teach them that it could not be altogether an experiment to try the total separation of the two; for it would be impossible for any system of government without such a union, to be worse than all so far had proved with such union.

56. They were indeed wise, and it was that sort of wisdom that is the most profitable and the rarest -- the wisdom of common sense. From all that was before them they could see that the State dominating religion and using religion for State purposes, is the pagan idea of government; that all religion dominating the State and using the civil power for religious purposes, is the papal idea of government; and that both these ideas had been followed in the history of Protestantism. Therefore they decided to steer clear of both, and by a clear-cut and distinct separation of religion and the State, establish the government of the United States upon THE CHRISTIAN IDEA.

57. Accordingly we can no more fittingly close this chapter than by

quoting the noble tribute paid by the historian of the United States Constitution, to the principles of that grandest symbol of human government, and "most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man" (Gladstone): "In the earliest States known to history, government and religion were one and indivisible. Each State had its special deity, and often these protectors, one after another, might be overthrown in battle, never to rise again. The Peloponnesian War grew out of a strife about an oracle. Rome, as it sometimes adopted into citizenship those whom it vanquished, introduced, in like manner, and with good logic for that day, the worship of their gods.

58. "No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual, till a Voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity, by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Caesar only that which is Caesar's. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men. No sooner was this religion adopted by the chief of the Roman Empire, than it was shorn of its character of universality, and enthralled by an unholy connection with the unholy State; and so it continued till the new nation, -- the least defiled with the barren scoffings of the eighteenth century, the most general believer in Christianity of any people of that age, the chief heir of the Reformation in its purest forms, -- when it came to establish a government for the United States, refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or a State.

59. "Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained of God in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the Federal government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite Spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power." -- Bancroft.30

60. Thus with "perfect individuality extended to conscience," the Constitution of the United States as it reads, stands as the sole monument

of all history representing the principle which Christ established for earthly government. And under it, in liberty, civil and religious, in enlightenment, and in progress, the nation of the United States deservedly stood as the beacon light of the world, for more than a hundred years.

1[Page 806] In Argument in Cincinnati Case, Minor et al, on "Bible in the Public Schools," p. 211.

2 Quoted by Stanley Matthews, Id., p. 242.

3[Page 807] Acts 17:26.

4 Rom 2:11.

5 Job 31: 13-15.

6 Deut. 10: 17-19: Lev. 19:34.

7[Page 809] Quoted in Bancroft's "History of the United States, "Vol. iii, chap. vii, par. 14-21.

8 1 Cor, 14:33.

9[Page 810] Mark 12:29, 30.

10[Page 811] Rom. 14:11, 12.

11 Rom. 14:22.

12[Page 812] 2 Cor. 5:10.

13[Page 815] Baird's, "Religion in America," book iii, chap. iii, pars. 9-16.

14[Page 817] Id., pars. 21-23.

15[Page 818] Id., par. 27, note.

16[Page 819] Bancroft's "History of the Constitution," Vol. i, p. 213.

17[Page 820] Id., p. 214.

18 Id., p. 215.

19[Page 825] Blakely's "American State Papers," pp. 27-38.

20[Page 826] Bancroft's "History of the Constitution," Vol. i, p. 215. The following passage from Wakeley's "Anecdotes of the Wesleys," is also worth recalling in this connection:--

"Martin Rodda was an English preacher in America during the war, and by incautiously meddling with politics exposed himself to the displeasure of those in power. At a certain time he was brought before General Washington, who asked who he was. Rodda told him he was one of John Wesley's preachers. `Mr. Wesley,' rejoined his excellency, `I respect: but Mr. Wesley, I presume, never sent you to America to interfere with political matters, but to preach the gospel to the people. Now go and mind your own proper work, and leave politics alone.'" -- Aneedote, Washington and Wesley, p. 119.

21 Id., 216.

22[Page 827] Id., 217.

23[Page 828] Bancroft's "History of the Constitution," Vol. ii. p. 239.

24 Id., p. 258.

25[Page 829] Id., pp. 263, 271, and Blakely's "American State Papers," p. 46.

26 Blakely's "American State Papers," p. 44.

27[Page 830] Bancroft's "History of the Constitution," Vol. ii, pp. 459, 460.

28 Article VI of the Constitution, par. 2.

29[Page 831] Bancroft's "History of the Constitution," Vol. ii, p. 325.

30[Page 832] "History of the Formation of the Constitution," book v, chap. i, pars. 10, 11.

27. NATIONAL APOSTASY

BUT alas, this splendid triumph of Christian principle displayed in this new nation, for all the world of mankind, was not allowed to continue. It was allowed to reign barely a hundred years, when it was utterly perverted. Like the triumph of Christianity against the Roman Empire, hardly was it allowed more than to have been barely accomplished and clearly recognized, than it was all swept away; and the nation which God had blessed with this great light and mighty truth, turned to a course of sheer apostasy.

2. The first national step in this apostasy was taken February 29, 1892, in a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. In the case of "The Rector, Church Wardens, and Vestrymen of the Church of the Holy Trinity, plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States," the Supreme Court of the United States, upon an extended argument, quoted extensively from Ferdinand and Isabella in their sending out Christopher Columbus, and their hope "that by God's assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered," etc.; from "Elizabeth, by the grace of God, of England, Fraunce, and Ireland, Queene, Defender of the Faith, etc." her grant of authority to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584 "to enact statutes for the government of the proposed colony, provided that `they be not against the true Christian faith now professed in the Church of England;'" from the New England Puritans and their expressed purpose of establishing and combining themselves together into "a civil body politick" for the furtherance of "the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith;" and from the Constitutions of States which had established religions and religious test oaths. With all these the Court mixed the declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, as of the same tenor, and then declared: --

"There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and

reaffirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons; they are organic utterances: they speak the voice of the entire people."1

3. According to this interpretation, then, when the Constitution of the United States declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States," it means that "no religious test ought ever to be required . . . other than a belief in the existence of God," and of "a future state of rewards and punishments," and a profession of "faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed forevermore; and I do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration." For this is what the Constitutions of Maryland, Mississippi, and Delaware plainly mean, which are in these words quoted by the court as evidence; and these and the Constitution of the United States are pervaded by a "universal language," "having one meaning."(!)

4. And when the Constitution of the United States declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," it means that the Congress "shall, from time to time, authorize and require the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, to make suitable provisions, at their own expense, for the institution of the public worship of God, and for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality, in all cases where such provisions shall not be made voluntarily." (!) For plainly that is what the Constitution of Massachusetts means, which is thus quoted by the Court as evidence; and behold that and the Constitution of the United States are pervaded by a "universal language" "having one meaning."(!)

5. How the court could present such a string of quotations, every one of which distinctly contemplated an establishment of religion and the prohibition of the free exercise thereof, and then quote this clause of the national Constitution, which in every feature and every intent absolutely prohibits any establishment of religion, and any interference with the free exercise thereof -- how the court could do all this and

then declare that "there is no dissonance" in the declarations, that they all have the same language and "one meaning," is a most astonishing thing.

6. But yet more astonishing is the fact that in the whole argument and decision of the Court, not a word of the history that is cited in the preceding chapter, which is the only history on the subject, is quoted nor even referred to. Of all this array of facts as to the total exclusion of religion, and specifically the Christian religion, which are the only facts pertinent to the question, not an item is referred to, any more than if there were no such history or facts in existence.

7. The language in which Abraham Lincoln characterized the position of Chief Justice Taney in the Dred Scott decision, and of Stephen A. Douglas in the defense of it, is the language that is most fitting to the position of the Supreme Court in this "Christian nation" decision; for here the two decisions are perfectly parallel. Lincoln said: --

"I ask, How extraordinary a thing it is that a man who has occupied a seat on the floor of the Senate [or on the bench of the Supreme Court -- A. T. J.] of the United States . . . pretending to give a truthful and accurate history of the slavery question [or of the question of religion and the nation -- A. T. J.] in this country, should so entirely ignore the whole of that portion of our history -- the most important of all! Is it not a most extraordinary spectacle that a man should stand up and ask for any confidence in his statements who sets out as he does with portions of history, calling upon the people to believe that it is a true and fair representation, when the leading part, the controlling feature, of the whole history is carefully suppressed?

"And now he asks the community to believe that the men of the Revolution were in favor of his `great principle,' when we have the naked history that they themselves dealt with this very subject-matter of his principle, and utterly repudiated his principle -- acting upon a precisely contrary ground. It is as impudent and absurd as if a prosecuting attorney should stand up before a jury, and ask them to convict A as the murderer of B while B was standing alive before them."

8. But the court did not stop even here. Having established "the Christian religion" for "the entire people," and settled all the appurtenances thereto as within the meaning of the Constitution, the court cited and sanctioned the declaration of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania that "Christianity, general Christianity, is and always has been, part of the common law," and then proceeded to sanction also the doctrine

837

that it is blasphemy to speak or act in contempt "of the religion professed by almost the whole community." This is done by citing the pagan decision of "Chancellor Kent, the great commentator on American law, speaking as chief justice of the Supreme Court of New York," which "assumes that we are a Christian people."

9. There remains but one thing more to cover the whole ground of the old order of things, but one thing more to complete the perfect likeness of the whole papal system, and that is the direct and positive sanction of Sunday laws. Nor is this one thing lacking. The court actually makes Sunday laws one of the proofs that "this is a Christian nation." The words are as follows: --

"If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs, and its society, we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth. Among other matters, note the following: The form of oath usually prevailing, concluding with an appeal to the Almighty; the custom of opening sessions of all deliberative bodies, and most conventions, with prayer; the prefatory words of all wills, `In the name of God, Amen;' the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath with the general cessation of all secular business, and the closing of courts, Legislatures, and other similar public assemblies on that day. . . . These, and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that THIS IS A CHRISTIAN NATION."

10. Here we may properly present in summary form the whole discussion as presented by the Court. From the very words of the Court, the sum of the argument stands thus: --

(a) "The establishment of the Christian religion," "Christianity, general Christianity," "is one of the purposes of all these" documents.

(b) "Even the Constitution of the United States . . . contains in the first amendment a declaration common to" all these; for "there is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation. . . . They are organic utterances; they speak the voice of the entire people."

(c) Conclusion: "This is a Christian nation."

11. "In accordance with this opinion" then, what has been done? "The Christian religion," that is, "Christianity, general Christianity," is legally recognized and declared to be the established religion of this nation, and that consequently "this is a Christian nation." With this also, "in language more or less emphatic," there is justified as the

838

"meaning" of the Constitution of the United States, (1) the maintenance
of the discipline of the Churches by the civil power; (2) the requirement of the religious oath; (3) the requirement of the religious test oath as a qualification for office; (4) public taxation for the support of religion and religious teachers; (5) the requirement of a belief in the Trinity and the inspiration of "the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments;" (6) the guilt of blasphemy upon everyone who speaks or acts in contempt of the established religion; and (7) laws for the observance of Sunday, with the general cessation of all "secular business."

12. Now what more was ever required by the papacy, and all phases of the old order of things, than is thus brought within the meaning of the national Constitution by this decision? What more was ever required by

the papacy itself than that "the Christian religion" should be the national religion; that the discipline of the Church should be maintained by the civil power; that the religious test oath should be applied to all; that the public should be taxed for the support of religion and religious worship; that there should be required a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity, and the inspiration of the "Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament;" that the guilt of "blasphemy" should be visited upon everyone who should speak or act "in contempt of the religion professed by almost the whole community;" and that everybody should be required by law to observe Sunday? Indeed, what more than this could be required or even desired by the most absolute religious despotism that could be imagined?

13. Therefore, it is pertinent here to inquire, Does this decision maintain the "new order of things" to which this nation stands pledged by the great seal of the United States? -- No, no, twenty times no. On the contrary, it sanctions, and restores, and fastens upon this nation, the old order of things which our revolutionary fathers hoped that we should forever escape, through their sublime efforts, which culminated in the creation of this nation and the formation of the national Constitution -- as it reads, and as they meant it.

14. What more could be done to create the very image of the papacy in this nation, in the principle of the thing, than is done in this decision? In principle we say; not in its positive workings, of

course, because the decision in itself on this point does not bear the force of a statute, that can be made at once obligatory upon all by the executive power of the nation. But it does sanction and justify beforehand any and every encroachment that the religious power may make upon the civil, and every piece of legislation that Congress might enact on the subject of religion or religious observances; so that by it the national door is opened wide for the religious element to enter and take possession in whatever way it chooses or can make effective. And there stands at the door, ready and determined to enter and take possession, the strongest religio-political combination that could be formed in the land.

15. Therefore we say that, although life is not by this given to this image that it should of itself speak and act (Rev. 13:15), yet so far as the making of the evil thing, and the establishment of the principle of it are concerned, it is certainly done. The tree does not yet stand with its branches widespread, bearing its pernicious fruit, but the tree is planted. And as certainly as the branches and the fruit are all in the natural stock that is planted, and it is only a question of time when they will appear, so certainly the widespreading branches and the pernicious fruit of the full-grown tree of religious despotism are in the evil stock of Church and State, of "the establishment of the Christian religion," that has been planted by the Supreme Court in and for this nation; and it is only a question of time when these fruits will inevitably appear.

16. We stated above that by this decision the national door was opened wide for the religious element to enter and take possession in whatever way it chooses or can make effective. And, there was at that moment, already prepared, and waiting for just such an opening of the national door, the greatest religious combination for political purposes that could be formed in the United States. For twenty-nine years there had been an organization working in the United States, with the one set and single purpose to secure a governmental recognition of religion. This was what is known as the National Reform Association, or "The National Association to Secure the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States." Article II of the constitution of that Association at its organization reads as follows; --

"The object of this society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American government; to promote needed reforms in the action of the government touching the Sabbath, the institution of the family, the religious element in education, the oath, and public morality as affected by the liquor traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate

that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."2

17. Consistently enough, like those who made the papacy, they theorize learnedly about the two distinct "spheres" of the State and the Church. According to the theory, the State is in itself a moral person distinct from the people, having an individuality and a responsibility to God, of its own. And in its sphere it must be religious and serve God, and cause all the people to do likewise in its own way, and apply the moral law to itself and everybody else. On the other hand, the Church in her sphere must be religious and serve God, and cause all the people to do likewise in her own way, and interpret the Scriptures for herself and the State, and everybody else. "The evangelist is a minister of God to preach, and the magistrate is a minister of God to rule;" yet both are ministers in the same field -- the field of morals -- with this important difference, however, the State is to "apply" the standard of morals -- the Scriptures -- as interpreted by the Church: the very doctrine of Gregory VII and Innocent III.

18. As defined by themselves, it is expressed in the following passage from a speech by D. McAllister, D. D., in the Washington, D. C., National Reform Convention, April 1-3, 1890. He said: --

"Now what does the National Reform Association say? It says, `Let the Church do its duty in her own line. Let the line of demarcation be drawn here; let the functions of the State go with the State -- with civil government, God's own ordinance. Let the Church hold the moral principles of God's law, -- the law of Jesus Christ, the only perfect law, -- and let the State apply those moral principles that pertain to its own sphere of justice and right, in her schools and everywhere else, and do her own work as she shall answer to God himself, as she is the creature of his ordaining.'" [Applause.]

19. It is yet more fully expressed in a speech by "Rev." T. H. Tatlow in a convention at Sedalia, Mo., May 23, 24, 1889, as follows: --

"To these crafty and carnal assumptions, the spiritual man, firm in Christian principle and the integrity of his convictions, replies: God's jurisdiction over man is before and above all others: and is wisely adapted to man's entire existence in all its diversified relationships, both as spiritual and secular. That this jurisdiction is not only universal but also special, including all the lesser agencies as parts of the greater; just as all its parts are included in the whole. That God has given to man in the present world, a twofold life, one part spiritual, and the other part secular; and has so blended them together that the secular life, embracing man's civil, social, and earthly good, is subordinate to his spiritual life and spiritual good. Therefore, since God's law, and his administration of it, apply to man's spiritual life, it must also necessarily apply to man's civil, social, and business life, as subordinate parts of his higher spiritual life. This spiritual life, therefore, is the fundamental, or constitutional, life of man; and God's law, as expressive of His will regarding this dual life of man, and as found in the Ten Commandments, is the constitutional law of God's jurisdiction over man, and is therefore irrepealable.

"In administering this one constitutional law to the good of this twofold life of man, God has ordained two administrative agencies, one of them the Church, as the spiritual agency in the realm of man's spiritual life, and the other the State as his secular agency in the realm of man's secular life. And although these agents are two and not one, and are diverse in their nature, and occupy separate and diverse realms of authority, yet they are both of them subject to the same law, and are ordained for the purpose of ministering to man's good through this one and same law. And therefore it is, that civil government, of whatever abstract form it be, as `an ordinance of God,' and the civil ruler as `a minister of God,' are both alike subject to the Ten Commandments. And not only are they subject, but are ministers of God to man for good. They are also his agents for applying these commandments to man's good within the realm of man's secular life, as far as the commandments have secular application. This is admitted to be so as far as these commandments apply to murder, adultery, theft, and slander; and they also in like manner apply to the worship of God, and the worship of the Sabbath, as far as these come within the province of the civil power. These things being so, neither the civil power `as God's ordinance,'nor the

civil ruler, `as God's minister.' within their special province, have any authority as such to make void any of the Ten Commandments, whether by neglect in enforcing them, or by indifference to their authority and claims.

"At this point, the party of civil policy protests, and cries out that this is uniting Church and State. The Christian replies: It is indeed a

842

union, but only so far as two separate jurisdictions, the one spiritual and primary, and the other secular and secondary, exercise each one its own appropriate authority within its own individual province, to secure a twofold good to the twofold life of man. This union, therefore, is like the union of the spiritual in man, acting conjointly with the body in man, the body being brought under and kept in subjection to the spiritual. It is like the union of the spiritual life in man acting conjointly with man's domestic life; all the members of the family being loved less than Christ; and all made subject to His claims."

20. Let us analyze this: (a) Man is composed of two parts, spiritual and secular; (b) The Ten Commandments, as expressive of the whole duty of man to God, are likewise composed of two parts -- the spiritual and the secular; (c) There are two agencies employed for applying the twofold nature of this law to the twofold nature of man; these two agencies are the Church and the State; (d) Throughout, the secular is subordinate, and must be held in subjection to the spiritual; (e) Therefore, The State as the secular and subordinate agency must be "brought under," held "in subjection" to, the Church, just as the body, the secular part of man, must be brought under and kept in subjection to the mind, the spiritual part of man.

21. In perfect accord, therefore, with this logical deduction from the two preceding extracts, one of the oldest district secretaries of the National Reform Association, "Rev." J. M. Foster, in the Christian Cynosure, of Oct. 17, 1889, said: --

"According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for the sake of, and to serve the interests of the Church." "The true State will have a wise reference to the Church's interests in all its legislative, executive, and judicial proceedings. . . . The expenses of the Church, in carrying on her public, aggressive work, it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury. Thus the Church is protected and exalted by the State."

22. From these evidences it is clear that the National Reform view of the relationship between the Church and the State, is identical with the view of Gregory VII and Innocent III. And the whole history and literature of the movement show that the spirit, as well as the principles, of the National Reform Association are identical with those of Gregory VII, and Innocent III. This of itself is of sufficient evidence that if this National Reform movement were ever to succeed

843

in its aims upon the United States government, such success would be the establishment in the United States of the very living image of the papacy.

23. Such was, and is, the National Reform Association and movement, in itself considered. That movement went steadily forward, gathering to itself in succession the firm alliance of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of the National Prohibition Party, of the American Sabbath Union, which was formed under the auspices of the General Conference (1888) of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by which was also secured the indorsement of the Presbyterian General Assemblies (1888) both North and South; the Baptist Home Missionary Convention; the Synod of the Reformed Church; and the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church. And, with all this prestige, the National Reform Association completed its course of alliances by securing, in that same year (1888) the alliance of the papacy herself. As early as 1884 the official organ of the National Reform Association had said: --

"Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them."

And almost as though it were in response to this, in his Encyclical of 1885, Pope Leo XIII addressed to Catholics everywhere the following words: --

"We exhort all Catholics who would devote careful attention to public matters, to take an active part in all municipal affairs and elections, and to further the principles of the Church in all public services, meetings, and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs; must constantly use their utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usages of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God's law. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled in the principles of the true Church. All Catholic writers and journalists should never lose for an instant from view, the above prescriptions. All Catholics should redouble their submission to authority, and unite their whole heart, soul, and body, and mind, in the defense of the Church."

24. In May, 1888, United States Senator Henry W. Blair introduced in Congress a joint resolution to amend the National Constitution so as

to recognize "the Christian religion," and require the teaching of the principles of that religion in all the public schools of the country; and also introduced a bill to enforce the observance of Sunday as "the Sabbath," "the Lord's day," "a day of religious worship," and "to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day." As all this was in complete harmony with the instruction of the pope to all Catholics; and was done upon the direct solicitation of the National Reform combination, it served to bring the National Reformers and the papacy so much the nearer to a positive and declared union.

25. In November, 1888, the American Sabbath Union became the predominating power in the National Reform alliance, and December 1, the field secretary of that organization personally addressed to the head of the papacy in this country -- Cardinal Gibbons -- a letter asking him to join hands with them in petitioning Congress to pass the bill for the enactment of a national law to "promote" the observance of Sunday "as a day of religious worship." The Cardinal promptly announced himself as "most happy" to do so, in the following letter: --

"CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE, 408 N. CHARLES STREET,

"BALTIMORE, Dec. 4, 1888.

"REV. DEAR SIR: I have to acknowledge your esteemed favor of the 1st instant in reference to the proposed passage of a law by Congress `against Sunday work in the government's mail and military service,' etc.

"I am most happy to add my name to those of the millions of others who are laudably contending against the violation of the Christian Sabbath by unnecessary labor, and who are endeavoring to promote its decent and proper observance by legitimate legislation. As the late Plenary Council of Baltimore has declared, the due observance of the Lord's day contributes immeasurably to the restriction of vice and immorality, and to the promotion of peace, religion, and social order, and can not fail to draw upon the nation the blessing and protection of an overruling Providence. If benevolence to the beasts of burden directed one day's rest in every week under the old law, surely humanity to man ought to dictate the same measure of rest under the new law.

"Your obedient servant in Christ,

"JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS, "Archbishop of Baltimore."3

845

26. Thus matters stood until Nov. 12, 1889, when the "Congress of Catholic Laymen of the United States" was held in Baltimore "to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the American hierarchy." In that congress there was a paper read by Mr. Manly B. Tello, editor of the Catholic Universe, of Cleveland, Ohio, in which it was said: --

"What we should seek is an en rapport with the Protestant Christians who desire to keep Sunday holy. . . . We can bring the Protestant masses over to the reverent moderation of the Catholic Sunday."

27. And the platform which was adopted as the result of the discussions in the congress, declared upon this point as follows: --

"There are many Christian issues to which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics, and shape civil legislation for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice and overlooking zealotry, we should seek alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judaic Sabbath, we can bring the masses over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday."

28. This was one of the "planks" of the platform which was "received with the greatest demonstrations; and the whole platform was adopted without discussion and "without a dissenting voice." As all the papers that were read in the Congress, as well as the platform, had to pass the inspection of the hierarchy before they were presented in public, these statements are simply the expression of the papacy in official response to the overtures which the so-called Protestant theocrats had been so long making to the papacy. As was only to be expected, it was received by them with much satisfaction. The American Sabbath Union joyously exclaimed: --

"The National Lay Congress of Roman Catholics, after correspondence and conference with the American Sabbath Union, passed its famous resolution in favor of co-operation with Protestants in Sabbath reform. . . . This does not mean that the millennium is to be built in a day. This is only a proposal of courtship; and the parties thus far have approached each other shyly."

29. And in a temperance (?) speech in a temperance convention in New York City, reported in the National Temperance Advocate, for May, 1889, Archbishop Ireland thanked God that "Protestants and Catholics" "stand together in demanding the faithful observance of

846

Sunday." When a union so long desired as this had been, had reached the stage of courtship, actual marriage could not be very far off. And like every other feature of the papacy, it is contrary to nature -- one woman (Church) marrying another in order that both might more readily form an adulterous connection with the State. And the fruit of the confused relationship will be just that which is pictured in the Scripture (Rev. 13:11-17) -- a hideous nondescript monster, breathing out persecution and death.

30. Thus were the leaders of professed Protestantism in the United States joined heart and hand with the papacy, with the sole purpose of creating in the United States government an order of things identical with that which created the papacy at the first. It is most appropriate, therefore, that the bond of union which united them in the evil work, should be the very thing -- the day of the sun -- by means of which the papacy at first secured control of the civil power to compel those who did not belong to the Church to submit to the dictates of the Church, and to act as though they did belong to it. It was by means of Sunday laws that the Church secured control of the civil power for the furtherance of her ends when the papacy was made.4 It is appropriate that the

same identical means should be employed by an apostate Protestantism to secure control of the civil power for the furtherance of her ends, and to compel those who do not belong to the Church to submit to the dictates of the Church, and to act as those do who do belong to the Church. And as that evil intrigue back there made the papacy, so will this same thing here make the living image of the papacy. Two things that are so alike in the making will surely be as much alike when they are made.

31. What Rome means by the transaction is shown by a letter from Cardinal Gibbons upon the subject of the authority for Sunday observance, written but a little while before the "Congress of Catholic Laymen" was held. The letter was written to Mr. E. E. Franke, then of Pittsburg, now of New York City, and is as follows: --

"CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE, 408 NORTH CHARLES STREET,

"BALTIMORE, MD., Oct. 3, 1889.

"DEAR MR. FRANKE: At the request of His Eminence, the Cardinal, I write to assure you that you are correct in your assertion that Protestants

in observing Sunday are following not the Bible, which they take as their only rule of action, but the tradition of the Church. I defy them to point out to me the word 'Sunday' in the Bible; if it is not to be found there, and it can not be, then it is not the Bible which they follow in this particular instance, but tradition, and in this they flatly contradict themselves.

"The Catholic Church changed the day of rest from the last to the first day of the week, because the most memorable of Christ's works was accomplished on Sunday. It is needless for me to enter into any elaborate proof of the matter. They can not prove their point from Scripture; therefore, if sincere, they must acknowledge that they draw their observance of the Sunday from tradition, and are therefore weekly contradicting themselves. Yours very sincerely, "M. A. REARDON."

32. This shows that it is a Roman Catholic, securing honor to an institution of the papacy, and thus to the papacy itself, that Cardinal Gibbons indorses the national Sunday-law movement; and that it is as Roman Catholics doing the same thing, that the laity and the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the United States have accepted the proffer of the professed Protestant combination for political purposes, and have joined hands with this combination in its aims upon the institutions of the country. The Cardinal understands what he is doing a great deal better than the associations for religious legislation understand what they are doing. And further, the Cardinal understands what they are doing a great deal better than they themselves do. His letter also shows that those who signed the petition for a Sunday law, as the Cardinal did, were honoring the papacy, as the Cardinal does.

33. This is the religio-political combination that was waiting and watching for any kind of an opening of the door to governmental favor of religion, when the Supreme Court of the United States unanimously declared it to be the meaning of the Constitution of the United States that already this was a Christian nation. And, the very first use that was ever made of that decision, outside of the strictly legal formula, was when, in the month of April, 1892, the President of the American Sabbath Union, the then head of the whole National Reform combination, took that decision in his hand and went before committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, recited its "argument," and demanded the closing

of the then-coming Columbian Exposition or World's Fair, on Sunday, by National authority "because this is a Christian nation." And Congress surrendered to the demand.

34. The official proceedings on the question in the Senate, opened as follows: --

"Mr. Quay. -- On page 122, line 13, after the word 'act,' I move to insert, 'and that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the Sabbath day.'

"The reasons for the amendment I will send to the desk to be read. The secretary will have the kindness to read from the Book of Law I send to the desk, the part inclosed in brackets.

"The Vice President. -- The part indicated will be read.

"The secretary read as follows: --

"'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.'"5

35. The foregoing is all that was said or done in relation to the question that day. The next legislative day, however, the question was taken up and discussed. The debate was opened by Senator Manderson, of Nebraska, who used the following language: --

"The language of this amendment is, that the Exposition shall be closed on 'the Sabbath day.' I submit that if the senator from Pennsylvania desires that the Exposition shall be closed upon Sunday, this language will not necessarily meet that idea. . . .

"The word 'Sabbath day' simply means that it is a rest day, and it may be Saturday or Sunday, and it would be subject to the discretion of those who will manage this Exposition, whether they should close the Exposition on the last day of the week, in conformity with that observance which is made by the Israelites and the Seventh-day Baptists, or should close it on the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath. It certainly seems to me that this amendment should be adopted by the senator from Pennsylvania, and, if he proposes to close this Exposition, that it should be closed on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday. . . .

"Therefore I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I hope may be accepted by the senator from Pennsylvania, to strike out the

words `Exposition on the Sabbath day,' and insert `mechanical portion of the Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.'. . .

"Mr. Quay. -- I will accept the modification so far as it changes the phraseology of the amendment proposed by me in regard to designating the day of the week on which the Exposition shall be closed.

"The Vice-President. -- The senator from Pennsylvania accepts the modification in part, but not in whole. . . .

"Mr. Harris. -- Let the amendment of the senator from Pennsylvania, as modified, be reported.

"The Vice-President. -- It will be again reported.

"The Chief Clerk. -- On page 122, line 13, after the word `act,' it is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee by inserting --

"`And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.'"6

36. This amendment was afterward further amended by the insertion of the proviso that the managers of the Exposition should sign an agreement to close the Fair on Sunday before they could receive any of the appropriation; but this which we have given is the material point.

37. All of this the House confirmed in its vote, accepting the Senate amendments. Besides this, the House had already, on its own part, by a vote of 131 to 36, decided that Sunday is the "Christian Sabbath;" and by a vote of 149 to 11 that the seventh day is not the Sabbath. And thus did the Congress of the United States, at the dictate of the Churches, not only take sides in a religious controversy, and discuss and decide a religious question, but put itself in the place, and assumed to itself the prerogative of authoritative interpreter of the divine law.

38. For, from the official record of the proceedings, there appear these plain facts: --

0 a. The divine law was officially and in its very words adopted as containing the "reasons" and forming the basis of the legislation. In other words, the legislation proposed only to enforce the divine law as quoted from the Book.

1 b. Yet those to whom the legislation was directed, and who were expected to execute its provisions, were not allowed to read and construe the divine law for themselves, for the very reason that there

was a possibility that they might take the divine Word as it reads, and as it was actually quoted in the official proceedings, and shut the Exposition on the day plainly specified in the divine Word, which was cited as the basis and authority for the action taken.

c. Therefore, to preclude any such possibility, Congress assumed the prerogative of official and authoritative interpreter of the divine law, and declared that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment of the divine law -- that "the first day of week, commonly called Sunday," is the meaning of the word of the Lord which says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

39. The makers of the Constitution said that "it is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects professing the Christian faith without erecting a claim to infallibility which would lead us back to the Church of Rome." In this record it is to be particularly noticed that Congress did precisely this thing: it did adjudge the right of preference among sects that profess the Christian faith. The Seventh-day Baptists and their observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the commandment quoted, were definitely named in contrast with those who observe "the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath," with reference to the commandment quoted. And the preference was adjudged in favor of the latter.

40. Now the Seventh-day Baptists are a sect professing the Christian faith. The original Sabbath commandment was quoted word for word from the Scriptures. The words of that commandment, as they stand in the proceedings of Congress, say "the seventh day is the Sabbath." The Seventh-day Baptists, a sect professing the Christian faith, observe the very day -- the seventh day -- named in the Scripture quoted in the Record. There are other sects professing the Christian faith who profess to observe the Sabbath of this same commandment by keeping "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," and hence it is that that day is "generally known as the Christian Sabbath."

41. These facts were known to Congress, and were made a part of the record. Then upon this statement of facts as to the difference among sects professing the Christian faith, touching the very religious observance

851

taken up by Congress, the Congress did deliberately and in set terms adjudge the right of preference between these sects professing the Christian faith. Congress did adjudge the right of preference in favor of those sects which observe "the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath," as against a plainly named sect which observes the day named in the commandment which Congress quoted from the Bible. Thus the Congress of the United States did the very thing which the fathers of the nation declared it "impossible" to do "without erecting a claim to infallibility, which would lead us back to the Church of Rome."

42. Let us follow this proceeding a step or two further, and see how certainly it does lead to Rome. From the official record it is as plain as anything can be that the Congress of the United States, in its official capacity, did take it upon itself to interpret the Scripture. It did in legislative action put an interpretation upon the commandment of God. Congress quoted the commandment bodily, which from God commands the observance of the Sabbath day, and which definitely names the day -- the seventh day -- to be observed. Congress then declared that the word "sabbath day" "means" so and so, and that it "may be" one day or another, "Saturday or Sunday," and upon this did decide which day it should be, namely, "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." The Word of God plainly says that the Sabbath day according to the commandment is past before the first day of the week comes at all.7 And yet Congress declares that the first day of the week is itself the sabbath! This is as clearly an interpretation of the Bible as was ever made on earth.

43. Whatever men may believe, or whatever men may say, as to the right or the wrong of this question, there is no denying the fact that Congress did take it upon itself to interpret the Scripture for the people of the United States. This is a fact. It has been done. Then where is the difference between this assumption and that of the papacy? The papacy claims infallibility. This claim springs directly, and logically, too, from her claim of the prerogative of interpreter of the Scriptures. The Congress of the United States has also assumed and exercises this prerogative. With Congress, as certainly as with the papacy, the

852

assumption of this prerogative carries with it the assertion of infallibility. This action, of itself, therefore, placed Congress directly upon papal ground.

44. This action of Congress, however, was merely the legislative formula giving authority to the interpretation already determined upon by combined "Protestantism." This, therefore, was nothing else than the recognition, and the setting up, by "Protestantism" in the United States, of a human tribunal charged with the interpretation of Scripture, with the authoritative enforcement of that interpretation by governmental power. This proceeding, therefore, placed the combined "Protestantism" of the country altogether and thoroughly upon papal ground.

45. If this thing had been done by the papacy; if she had thus forced upon Congress herself and her interpretation of Scripture, and so had got her religious notions fixed in the law to be forced upon the people, there could be no surprise at it. In so doing the papacy would have been only acting according to her own native character, and carrying out her avowed principles. But for professed Protestantism to do it, is in positive contradiction of every principle that the term Protestantism justly implies.

46. Nor is this all. This papal prerogative of interpreting the Scripture was exercised by the professed Protestantism and the Congress of the United States in the change of the Sabbath, in the substitution of Sunday for the Sabbath of the Lord, as it stands written in the Commandment of God. And this is precisely the thing --

the very pivot -- upon which, as against Protestants, turns the argument for the validity of the claim of infallibility on the part of the papacy.

47. The supreme point that marks the difference between Protestantism and the papacy is, whether the Bible, and the Bible alone, or the Bible and tradition, is the true standard of faith and morals. "The Bible, and the Bible alone," is the claim of Protestantism. "The Bible and tradition." is the claim of Catholicism. And this term "tradition" in the Catholic system does not mean merely antiquity, "but continuing inspiration." And this "continuing inspiration" is but another form of expression for "infallibility."

48. This question as to "the Bible and tradition" was not finally settled even for Catholicism until the Council of Trent. It was one of

853

the leading questions of that council as between Protestantism and Catholicism; and it was in the settlement of the question as between these, that it was finally settled for the Catholic Church itself. The very first question concerning the faith that was considered in the council was the one involved in this issue. There was a strong party, even of the Catholics, in the council, who were in favor of abandoning tradition and adopting the Scripture only as the standard of authority in faith and morals. This was so largely and so decidedly held in the council that the pope's legates wrote to him that there was "a strong tendency to set aside tradition altogether, and to make Scripture the sole standard of appeal."8

49. To do this, however, would certainly be to go a long way toward admitting the claims of the Protestants, and this would never do. This crisis, however, forced the ultra-Catholic portion of the council to find some way of convincing the others that "Scripture and tradition" was the only sure ground to stand upon. Although two decrees were passed April 8, 1546, favoring the view of "Scripture and tradition," yet this was not satisfactory. The question kept constantly recurring in the council; many of those who had sustained the decrees were very uneasy about it.

50. Accordingly, of the council the record is: --

"The council was unanimously of the opinion of Ambrosius Pelargus that at no price should any triumph be prepared for the Protestants to be able to say that the council had condemned the teachings of the old Church. But this practice caused endless trouble, without ever giving good security. Indeed, it required for this crisis that `almost divine sagacity' which the Spanish legate ceded to the synod on March 15, 1562. . . .

"Finally, at the opening of the last session, January 18, 1562, all scruples were cast aside; the archbishop of Rheggio made a speech, in which he openly declared that tradition stood higher than the Bible. For this reason alone the authority of the Church could not be bound to the authority of the Scriptures: because the former had changed the Sabbath into Sunday -- not by the commandment of Christ, but solely by her own authority. This destroyed the last illusion, and it was hereby declared that tradition signified not so much antiquity, but rather continuing inspiration."9

854

51. This particular part of the archbishop's speech was as follows: --

"The condition of the heretics nowadays is such that they do not appeal to anything more than this [the Bible, and the Bible alone; the Scriptures, as in the written Word, the sole standard in faith and morals], to overthrow the Church under the pretext of following the Word of God. Just as though the Church -- the body -- were in conflict with the word of Christ; or as if the head could be against the body. Indeed, this very authority of the Church is most of all glorified by the Holy Scriptures; for while on the one hand the Church recommends the Word of God, declaring it to be divine, and presenting it to us to read, explaining doubtful points and

faithfully condemning all that runs counter thereto, on the other hand, by the same authority, the Church, the legal precepts of the Lord, contained in the Holy Scriptures, have ceased. The Sabbath, the most glorious day in the law, has been merged into the Lord's day. . . . This day and similar institutions have not ceased in consequence of the preaching of Christ (for He says that He did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it); but yet they have been changed, and that solely by the authority of the Church. Now, if this authority should be done away with (which would please the heretics very much), who would there be to testify for the truth and to confound the obstinacy of the heretics?"10

52. There was no getting around this; for the Protestants' own confession of faith, -- the Augsburg Confession, 1530, -- had clearly admitted that "the observation of the Lord's day" had been appointed by "the Church" only. As Dr. Holtzmann says, this argument "destroyed the last illusion," because as it was clear that in observing Sunday upon the appointment of the Church, instead of the Sabbath which stands in the written commandment of the Lord himself, the Protestants themselves held not to "the Bible and the Bible alone," but to the Bible and tradition, with tradition above the Bible. By this fact and this argument, the uneasy minds in the council were set completely at rest, and the question as between "the Bible and the Bible alone," or "the Bible and tradition," was finally settled in the Catholic Church.

53. Therefore the papal position is constructed thus: (a) The Scripture and tradition is the faith of the papacy; (b) tradition means "continuing inspiration;" (c) continuing inspiration means infallibility in matters of faith and morals; (d) and this infallibility is demonstrated in the fact of her having substituted Sunday for the

Sabbath of the Lord in the written commandment, which change Protestants themselves indorse.

54. Thus it is that the substitution of Sunday for the Sabbath is the pivot upon which turns the validity of the argument as against Protestants, for the infallibility of the papacy. This shows how fully the Protestantism and the Congress of the United States put themselves upon papal ground, in their first essay in the exercise of the prerogative of authoritative interpreter of the Scripture. They did it precisely in the likeness of the papacy by substituting Sunday for the Sabbath of the Lord as in the written commandment of God.

55. In submitting to the dictates of the Churches, and making itself the official and authoritative mouthpiece for the theological definitions and interpretations of the divine law, as Congress confessedly did, the Congress and of the United States has given over the government of the United States into the hands of the combined Churches. A forcible American writer long ago stated the principle that, "To permit a Church -- any Church -- . . . to dictate, beforehand, what laws should or should not be passed, would be to deprive the people of all the authority they have retained in their own hands, and to make such Church the governing power, instead of them."11

56. This is precisely what was done in the Sunday legislation of the Fifty-second Congress. The combined "evangelical" Churches, joined with the Catholic Church, as a united body on this question, did dictate under threats that this law should be passed. Congress did permit it, and did yield to the dictation, and in so doing, it did in principle deprive the people of the governmental authority which they had retained in their own hands by the Declaration and the Constitution, and did make the Churches the governing power in the government instead of the people. "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people," was abandoned, and there was sanctioned in its stead, the subjection of the people by the Churches and for the Churches. And ever since that day the Churches have steadily acted upon the principle.

57. And under the mistaken notion that he was pledged to maintain the government of the United States, rather than the Constitution of

the United States, the then president of the United States approved this unconstitutional procedure on the part of Congress.12

58. This, the professed Protestantism of the country has done upon the basis, and in the use, of the "Christian nation" decision. In their whole course in this matter, when any doubt or opposition was shown, they never failed to sound the merits of the Supreme Court decision -- this was final and settled all questions. The leading Methodist paper of the country, the New York Christian Advocate, in referring to the discussion of the question in Congress, said: --

"Every utterance upon this subject was in harmony with a late decision of the United States Supreme Court whereby it is to be forever regarded as a settled principle that this a Christian nation."

59. Thus in the year A. D. 1892, the government of the United States, by specific official acts of the three departments -- the Judiciary, the Legislative, and the Executive -- of which that government is composed, was turned from the "New Order of Things" to which it was committed by the Revolutionary Fathers, and to which it stands pledged by the Great Seal of the government itself, and was thrown back into the evil tide of the old order of things. Thus every principle of its Constitution as a Protestant government was repudiated. And thus this enlightened nation, the example and glory of the world, was caused to assume the place and the prerogatives of the governments of the Middle Ages in embodying in the law the dogmas and definitions of the theologians, and executing the arbitrary and despotic will of the Church.

60. There is another result, or rather, another phase of the same result, which has appeared promptly upon this action of the professed

857

Protestantism of the United States; that is, the bold and rapid strides of the papacy to take advantage of that which has been done, and through this to take possession of the country itself. Nor indeed should any one be surprised at this; it was only to be expected. For when the professed Protestantism of the country, to accomplish its lawless purpose to gain control of the national power, gladly joined hands with the Mystery of Lawlessness; what else could be expected than that she should at once lay claim to all the "benefits" to be derived from the transaction in itself, and press the principles of the transaction to the utmost limit of their logic in her own behalf?

61. The aim and purpose of the National Reform combination is identical with the aim and purpose of the papacy. It was therefore with great gladness that Rome heard the declaration of the Supreme Court of the United States that "this is a Christian nation." with the citation of Catholic documents to prove it, and also saw Congress set up the sign of her authority -- the Sunday -- as the holy day of the nation in express exclusion of the Sabbath of the Lord. It was with supreme satisfaction that she saw her own sign of her own salvation, set up in the United States by a national act as a symbol of the salvation of the nation.13 In opposition to the National Reform movement there

858

had been told to the National Reformers and all the people, over and over, that in all their efforts and arguments they were but playing into the hands of Rome; and that their success would be the assured success of Rome in this country.

62. It was perfectly fitting therefore that there should be promptly published in the United States the plan of Leo XIII, with respect to the United States and, through this, Europe and "all humanity," as follows: --

"In his [Pope Leo's] view, the United States has reached the period when it becomes necessary to bring about the fusion of all the heterogeneous elements in one homogeneous and indissoluble nation. . . . It is for this

reason that the pope wants the Catholics to prove themselves the most enlightened and most devoted workers for national unity and political assimilation. . . . America feels the need of this work of internal fusion. . . . What the Church has done in the past for others, she will do for the United States. . . . That is the reason the holy see encourages the American clergy to guard jealously the solidarity, and to labor for the fusion of all the foreign and heterogeneous elements into one vast national family. . . .

"Finally, Leo XIII desires to see strength in that unity. Like all intuitive souls, he hails in the united American States and in their young and flourishing Church, the source of new life for Europeans. He wants America to be powerful, in order that Europe may regain strength from borrowing a rejuvenated type. Europe is closely watching the United States. . . . Henceforth we [Europeans] will need authors who will place themselves on this ground; `What can we borrow, and what ought we to borrow from the United States for our social, political, and ecclesiastical reorganization?' The answer depends in great measure upon the development of American destinies. If the United States succeed in solving the many problems that puzzle us, Europe will follow her example, and this outpouring of light will mark a date in the history not only of the United States, BUT OF ALL HUMANITY.

"That is why the holy father, anxious for peace and strength, collaborates with passion in the work of consolidation and development in American affairs. According to him, the Church ought to be the chosen crucible for the molding and absorption of races into one united family. And that, especially, is the reason why he labors at the codification of ecclesiastical affairs, in order that this distant member of Christianity may infuse new blood into the old organism."14

63. This was swiftly followed by the establishment of a permanent apostolic delegation at Washington to carry out this plan. And Satolli, the first apostolic delegate to America, openly declared at the Catholic Congress in Chicago, Sept. 5, 1893, not only that this was his place and work here, but commanded the Catholics of the United States to carry out this scheme. His words are as follows: --

"In the name of Leo XIII, I salute the great American republic, and I call upon the Catholics of America to go forward, in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth, and in the other the Constitution of the United States. . . .

"To-day this is the duty of the Catholics: To bring into the world the fullness of supernatural truth and supernatural life. This especially is the duty of a Catholic Congress. There are the nations who have never separated from the Church, but who have neglected often to apply in full degree the lessons of the gospel. There are the nations who have gone out from the Church, bringing with them many of her treasures, and because of what they have brought, shedding partial light. But cut off from the source, unless that source is again brought into close contact with them, there is danger for the future.

"Bring them in contact with their past by your action and teaching. Bring your fellow-countrymen, bring your country into immediate contact with that great secret of blessedness -- Christ and His Church. And in this manner shall it come to pass the word of the psalmist shall be fulfilled: `Mercy and justice have met one another, justice and peace have kissed.'. . .

"Now all these great principles have been marked out in most illuminous lines in the encyclicals of the great pontiff, Leo XIII. He has studied them. Hold fast to them as the safest anchorage, and all will be well. These several questions are studied the world over. It is well they be studied in America, for here in America do we have more than elsewhere the key to the future. [Applause.]

"Here in America you have a country blessed specially by Providence in the fertility of field and the liberty of its Constitution. [Loud applause.] Here you have a country which will repay all efforts [loud and prolonged applause] not merely tenfold, but aye a hundredfold. And this no one understands better than the

immortal Leo. And he charges me, his delegate, to speak out to America words of hope and blessings, words of joy. Go forward! in one hand bearing the book of Christian truth -- the Bible -- and in the other the Constitution of the United States." [Tremendous applause, the people rising to their feet.]

64. The Constitution, as the fathers made it and intended it, no Catholic was ever commanded by any pope to take in one hand, with

860

the Catholic Bible in the other, for any purpose whatever. On the contrary, in the Catholic World, September, 1871, there was published by America's chief Catholic controversialist an article in which the Constitution of the United States was referred to in the following words: --

"As it is interpreted by the liberal and sectarian journals that are doing their best to revolutionize it, and is beginning to be interpreted by no small portion of the American people, or is interpreted by the Protestant principle, so widely diffused among us, . . . we do not accept it, or hold it to be any government at all, or as capable of performing any of the proper functions of government; and if it continues to be interpreted by the revolutionary principles of Protestantism, it is sure to fail. . . Hence it is, we so often say that if the American republic is to be sustained and preserved at all, it must be by the rejection of the principle of the Reformation, and the acceptance of the Catholic principle by the American people."15

65. But when that Constitution was interpreted to mean that "this is a Christian nation;" when that Constitution was interpreted according to Rome's principles, and the sign of her authority, with Catholic documents, was cited to support this interpretation, then it was, and not till then, that all Catholics were commanded to take this Catholic Constitution in one hand, and the Catholic Bible in the other, and, with Satolli at their head, go forward to their "hundredfold" reward in the United States, and through this bring again "all Europe" and "all humanity"back into immediate contact with the "the Church."

66. Then it was that, with the Catholic Bible in one hand, and the Catholic Constitution of the United States in the other, the Catholic Church stepped forth and declared that this is a Catholic Christian nation. And September, 1894, issued a rescript "elevating the United States to the first rank as a Catholic nation." We know what the papacy has done for other nations; and it is not at all to be doubted that that is what, so far as lies in her power with the efficient aid of apostate Protestantism, she will now do for the United States, and, through this, for all humanity.

67. Another special feature of National Reform apostasy adopted by the nation of the United States is the repudiation of that other

861

principle of the Declaration of Independence that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." In a joint convention of the whole National Reform combination, held at Sedalia, Mo., May 23, 24, 1889, the "Rev." W. D. Gray, who was secretary of the convention, and was elected corresponding secretary of the American Sabbath Union for the Omaha District, made a speech as follows: --

"I, for one, have made this question very much of a study, especially this topic of it. To appeal to divine authority in our legislation would be to fundamentally change the law of our land, or the principle adopted by our fathers when they said that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. I for one do not believe that as a political maxim. I do not believe that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. And I believe as Brother Gault on this, I think. And so the object of this movement is an effort to change that feature in our fundamental law. Jefferson was under the influence of French ideas when the Constitution was framed, and that had something to do with leaving God out of the Constitution.16 And I think that the provincial history of this country will compel us to come back to that, and recognize God in our

Constitution. And I see in this reform a providence teaching us the necessity of recognizing something else besides the will of the people as the basis of government."

68. And at the Chautauqua (N. Y.) Assembly in August following, Col. Elliott F. Shepard, speaking as president of the American Sabbath Union, said: --

"Governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. God is the only lawgiver. His laws are made clear and plain in His Word, so that all nations may know what are the laws which God ordained to be kept."

69. In 1898 there was war between the United States and Spain. As a consequence of her victories, there fell to the United States the islands of Porto Rico and the Philippines. Immediately there began to be disregarded by the national administration of the United States, the principle of her own Declaration of Independence, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

862

This awoke discussion all over the land. The Church leaders and the younger generation of public men generally arrayed themselves in denial of the principle of the Declaration, while the old men, generally, maintained the principle. This soon became so marked that in the discussion of the question in national circles, it was distinctly recognized that it is the younger generation of public men who are leading in the path of world-glory at the expense of the fundamental principles of the nation; while the old men are the conservatives, and call for allegiance still to these principles wherever the jurisdiction of the nation may be extended.

70. There is a reason for this. For thirty-five years up to 1898, the National Reform combination had had its agents traveling throughout the length and breadth of the land, diligently teaching these principles, which are antagonistic to the principles of the nation. These agents had unquestioned entry into the academies and colleges of the whole country; they had been prominent on the programs of Chautauqua assemblies; they had the sympathy and support of the churches, and of religious and temperance organizations, everywhere. And all these opportunities they employed to the uttermost.

71. And now, those who are the younger generation of public men of to-day were the boys in the academics and colleges of the country twenty to thirty years ago -- in the time when the National Reformers were sowing that evil seed in the colleges and academies everywhere. These were the boys who in those academies and colleges were inoculated in those years with this virus of the National Reformers -- that governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. And now when those boys, as the men of the younger generation in public affairs to-day, meet a crisis in which it must be decided whether the fundamental principles of the nation shall be adhered to or repudiated, they are prepared, and have long been prepared, to repudiate these principles in the interests of a will-o-the-wisp of "the empire of the Son of God," and in order to the execution of "His will"!

72. This is the secret and the true philosophy of this national repudiation of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the nation to-day, -- the repudiation of the principles of republicanism.

863

Thus this national repudiation of the principles of republicanism in 1898 and onward, is just as certainly an element in the National Reform movement, is just as certainly a part of that movement, as was the national repudiation of the principles of Protestantism in 1892.

73. A remarkably expressive observation on this apostasy was published in the Independent of Oct. 19, 1899, by Countess Von Krockow, of Dresden, Germany, quoting from an article by Professor Niemand in a German journal, the following: --

"If the American Republic ever meant anything historically, it meant a protest against Europe. Its Declaration of Independence was a looking backward over European conditions, and a summing up of all the experience thus won. It corresponded politically to Luther's theses; just as the one was a renunciation of Catholicism, so was the other a renunciation and defiance of imperialism. Over one hundred years it has endured.

"Europe has not changed essentially meanwhile. It has forms of liberty; but the substantial reality is still militarism, or government by authority and the might of the strongest. So if Europe be unchanged, why should America relinquish her avocation of Protestation by turning round and becoming like her? . . . Oh, madness! I say, madness! They are doing they know not what. -- giving up their birthright for a mess of pottage; surrendering their grand attitude of protest, wherein they commanded the respect of the powerful and the adoration of the idealists of the world, to scramble with the effete old nations for land! for land, although they already possess so much. They repudiate their Declaration in spirit and in word for a strip of rich land. The fact seems incredible."

74. Along with this repudiation of the principles of the Declaration, of course there went steadily the abandonment of the Constitution, and the adoption in the government of the new island possessions, of the principle of governing "without the Constitution," under the plea that the Constitution does not extend to those possessions: in other words that the jurisdiction of the United States extends beyond the supreme law of the United States! And when the whole twofold scheme of repudiation of the fundamental principles of the nation was indorsed by the distinct voice of the whole nation in the overwhelming victory of the same administration in the national election of 1900, this was swiftly followed by the actual, official, national repudiation of the

Constitution and the principles of the Declaration. In the United States Senate, Wednesday, Feb. 27, 1901, and in the House of Representatives, Friday, March 1, 1901, there was enacted as law, for the governing of the Philippine Islands, the following: --

"All military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine Islands acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner, as the president of the United States shall direct for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of such islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion: Provided. That all franchises granted under the authority hereof shall contain a reservation of the right to alter, amend, or repeal the same."

75. First of all it is to be noticed that this is a distinct abandonment of the Constitution, and a distinct abdication of its powers by the Congress of the United States. For Section 1 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States says: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives." And Section 1 of Article III of the Constitution says: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

76. Now, when the Constitution definitely confines to Congress all legislative powers granted, and to a supreme court, and such inferior courts as may from time to time be provided, all judicial powers; and then Congress passes over to, and vests in, "such person and persons . . . as the president of the United States shall direct," all civil and judicial powers necessary to govern territory of the United States, that is nothing less than for Congress so far to abdicate its own powers; and, so far, to take away from the courts their powers. It is also a clear abandonment of the Constitution of the United States, so far as the Philippine Islands are concerned, and, in principle, so far as any place is concerned.

77. Nor is this abandonment of the Constitution merely tacit, by the wording of the law relating of the government of the Philippine Islands. It is explicit, and was repeatedly confirmed.

865

78. For an amendment was proposed to the Philippine section of the bill, as follows: --

"SEC. --. That the Constitution of the United States is hereby extended over and declared to be in force in the Philippine Islands so far as the same or any provision thereof may be applicable."

This was rejected, by a vote of thirty-nine to twenty-three; not voting, twenty-six.

79. Afterward there was offered the following amendment: --

"And Provided further, That no judgment, order nor act by any of said officials so appointed shall conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States."

That amendment was rejected by a vote of forty-five to twenty-five; not voting, eighteen.

80. After this an amendment was offered requiring that: --

"Every person in whom authority is vested under this grant of power shall take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States."

This was also rejected, by a vote of forty-one to twenty-five; not voting, twenty-two.

0 81. After this there was offered the following amendment: --

1 "All person shall be bailable unless for capital offenses where the proof shall be evident or the presumption great. All fines shall be moderate, and no cruel or unusual punishment shall be inflicted. No man shall be deprived of his life, liberty, or property but by the judgment of his peers and the law of the land. If the public exigencies make it necessary for the common preservation to take the property of any person, or to demand his particular services, full compensation shall be made for the same. No ex post facto law or law impairing the obligation of contracts shall be made. No law shall be made which shall lay any person under restraint, burden, or disability on account of his religious opinions, professions, or mode of worship, in all of which he shall be free to maintain his own, and not burdened for those of another."

2 This, too, was rejected, by a vote of forty-one to twenty-three; not voting, twenty-four.

3 82. When, thus,it had been voted, over and over again, to bestow unlimited power upon such persons as the president shall name to

866

govern the Philippine Islands, then attempt was made to limit the time of the exercise of this power. Accordingly, an amendment was offered, limiting this time to March 4, 1903. But this was rejected by a vote of forty-three to twenty-six; not voting, nineteen.

83. When it had been so positively decided that unlimited power should be give to these men, -- and for unlimited time, -- an attempt was made to give the Filipinos a part in the government of themselves. Accordingly, an amendment was offered as follows: --

"And secure to them such participation in the affairs of the civil government so to be established as shall be consistent with the safety of the government."

But this was rejected by a vote of thirty-nine to twenty-three; not voting, twenty-six.

84. When it had thus been explicitly and confirmedly settled that the powers of such men as the president shall appoint to govern the Philippines. shall be unlimited, shall be unlimited for all time, and shall be absolute over the people of the islands, attempt was made to save at least a vestige of Constitutional liberty, as follows: --

"Mr. Hoar. -- Mr. President,there is one principle of Constitutional liberty not yet slain, and I desire to give it a little chance for its life. I move the amendment which I send to the desk, to be inserted at the end of the bill.

"The Presiding Officer. -- The senator from Massachusetts submits an amendment which will be stated.

"The Secretary. -- It is proposed to add as a new section the following: --

`"In the government of the Philippine Islands no person vested with legislative powers shall ever exercise the executive or judicial powers, or either of them; no person vested with executive powers shall ever exercise the legislative or judicial powers, or either of them; no person vested with judicial powers shall ever exercise the legislative or executive powers, or either of them; to the end that it may be a government of laws and not of men.'

"The Presiding Officer. The question is on the amendment of the senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Hoar] to the amendment of the committee.

0 "Mr. Jones, of Arkansas, and Mr. Pettus called for the yeas and nays.

1 "The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll."

867

And even this last principle of Constitutional liberty was slain. It was rejected, by a vote of forty-three to twenty-six; not voting, nineteen.15

85. As already stated, the House of Representatives passed this legislation, as it came from the Senate, without any change whatever. And since it was all done at the demand of the president, of course it was all approved by him when it came before him to be signed. And thus the government of the United States has, in principle, -- and for the Philippines in practice, -- deliberately and expressly repudiated every principle of its Constitution as a republican government. Not a single item, nor even an iota, of the principle of republican or Constitutional government remains. National apostasy from Christian principle is complete.

CONCLUSION.

THE papacy, the Beast of Revelation 13, was formed of a union of the apostate Church with an apostate Republic. Again an apostate Church -- professed Protestantism -- is fast forming a union between that Church and this other apostate Republic. And thus will be formed the Image of the Beast of Revelation 13.

2. In the first ten verses of that chapter there is given a description of the rise and career of a certain power under the symbol of "a beast." Then from the eleventh to the seventeenth verse inclusive, there is given

the description of another power under the symbol of "another beast" and "the image of the beast." The first of these powers is also designated as "the first beast," and "the beast which had the wound by a sword."

3. The full description of the first one is as follows: --

"And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a

bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshiped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshiped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? Who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme His name, and His tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If any man have an ear, let him hear. He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints."

4. Every evidence of history certifies to the truth of this scripture as exactly descriptive of the papacy. The description of the "other beast," or the Image of the Beast, is as follows: --

"And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name."

5. This prophecy says that it would be said unto them that "they should make an image to the beast." This would be to make an image to the papacy. The papacy being a union of Church and State, with the Church using the power of the State to enforce the doctrines of the Church and to compel submission to her decrees, the making of an

image of this would be only to make or establish an order of things by which a union of Church and State would be created, with the civil power in the hands of the Church to compel submission to Church doctrines, and observance of Church institutions. But in order for this to be made, it must be that before this there was no union of Church and State in the place where this is to be done. As it is necessary to say "that they should make an image" of the papacy, -- that is, union of Church and State, -- it is plain on the face of it that this is said and must be said, in a place where there is no union of Church and State, and where the Church has no control of civil affairs and no connection with the civil power.

6. Now where was there ever a place or a nation on earth in which there was no union of Church and State except in the United States alone? With the single exception of the United States government, there never was a government on earth, pagan, papal, or professed Protestant, in which from the beginning of its existence, as such, until this day, there was no union of religion and the State; in which the religious power had no control of, or connection with, the civil power. This is the truth, and any one may satisfy himself of it by thinking, whether little or much. This being the truth, it follows that in the United States is the only place on earth where it could be said that they should make a union of Church and State. Consequently, in the government of the United States alone could the Image of the Beast -- the image of the papacy -- be made. There are many other points corroborative of this, but his is sufficient for this place.

7. Because of this prophecy of Rev. 13: 11-17, it has been preached and published by the Seventh-day Adventists for more than forty years that there would be formed in the United States a union of Church and State, with national Sunday legislation -- that there would be made here an image of the papacy. For instance: nearly fifty years ago -- January, 1852 -- a little pamphlet of about seventy-five pages, perhaps 2 1\2 x 5 inches in size, was published, giving a brief exposition of Revelation 13, and especially that part in verses 11-17. On this point in that pamphlet there was printed the following words: --

"The two-horned beast says to them that dwell on the earth, `Make an image.' The dwellers on the earth, or territory of this beast, it

seems, have a part to act in this world. This clearly marks the United States as the scene of action. This is the manner in which laws are made here -- by the representatives of the people. As all men by the Declaration are declared to be equal, it became necessary that some course should be taken by which all could have equal privileges in the construction of the laws. If the whole mass were called together, there would be an endless discussion and no laws made. Therefore the people were to elect such representatives as would carry out their principles; and they were to meet and make laws, which, when passed, should be considered the laws of the people. The image is to be formed by the people or their representatives.

"It appears probable to us that this Sunday institutions is the very point on which this union will be effected. Here is a point on which all Protestant sects can unite. A point which we may safely say is the important item in the faith of Protestants is their Sunday worship.

"Verse 15: `And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed.' From this text we may draw two conclusions: --

"1. The Image of the Beast is to be made in the same territory where the two-horned beast rules; for the two-horned beast can exercise that authority in no territory but its own.

"2. That it already has it in its power to give life to the Image of the Beast, or cause the decree to be made and executed. It it not in the power of the United States to pass such laws? They declare `all men shall be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of their own consciences.' We see the mass hold the first day of the week as a holy day. If a memorial should be sent in to Congress with one million names signed to it, declaring that their rights were infringed upon, and praying them to pass a solemn enactment that the first day should not be profaned by labor, how soon the result would be a law upon the point!

"Were the United States, as a body, to pass a law that Sunday should be kept holy, or not profaned by labor, there would be. I conceive, an image to the papacy; for the law would then be in the hands of the Church and she could inflict penalties on those who did not obey the Sunday institution."

8. That was printed in 1853. And no man can deny that in 1892 the very things were done which in this exposition of the prophecy were said would be done. The churches professedly representing millions of petitioners, did that year memorialize Congress with threats in behalf of Sunday sacredness; and how soon the result a law upon the point!

871

9. Again: in 1884, this same denomination printed the following on the same prophecy -- Rev. 13:11-17: --

"By this first beast is represented the Roman Church, an ecclesiastical body clothed with civil power, having authority to punish all dissenters. The Image of the Beast represents another religious body clothed with similar power. The formation of this image is the work of the beast whose peaceful rise and mild professions render it so striking a symbol of the United States. Here is to be found an image of the papacy. When the churches of our land, uniting upon such points of faith as are held by them in common, shall influence the State to enforce their decrees and sustain their institutions, then will Protestant America have formed an image of the Roman hierarchy."16

10. This has been done. In 1892-93 the churches of our land did unite upon the Sunday issue, and then united with the Catholic Church itself, and in this unity they influenced the State to enforce the Church decree for Sunday observance, and to sustain the Church institution of Sunday. And in the doing of it, they made the living image of the papacy in this land. Nine years before this was done, we published that it would be done; and now it has been done. On the strength of the prophecy we published that it would come; and on the strength of facts, everybody may know that it has come. The prophecy is fulfilled. The Image of the Beast is made, and lives in the United States to-day.

11. Once more: in 1885 this same people published will yield to the demand for a Sunday law."17

To secure the popularity and patronage which were put up at public auction by the churches, the nation's legislators assembled in Congress did yield to the demand for a Sunday law.

12. Also in the year 1885 this same people published in a standard work that "our country shall repudiate every principle of its Constitution as a Protestant and republican government, and shall make provision for the propagation of papal falsehoods and delusions."18 And nobody can fairly deny that this has been and is being steadily fulfilled to the very letter.

872

13. And now the apostasy of Protestantism having developed the very image of that which was developed from he apostasy of Catholicism, there is demanded a revival of true Protestantism to protest against this apostate Protestantism, this Image of the Beast, as at the first, true Protestantism protested against the papacy, the Beast. The ground of this protest is the same as always before and ever -- the ever-lasting gospel, the Commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. And the word of God distinctly calls all to this blessed work. And here is the word: --

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.

"And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.

"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.

"And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them. And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on His head a golden crown, and in His hand a sharp sickle. And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to Him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle, and reap: for the time is come for thee to reap: for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And He that sat on the cloud thrust in His sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped."19

14. Just here while all are to be compelled to worship the papacy and its image, and to receive its mark, the Lord sends the everlasting gospel to all, calling them to worship Him alone, who made heaven, and

873

earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters, for the hour of His judgment is come. And the sign which He himself has set up that men may know that He is the Lord, the true God, who made heaven and earth and the sea and the fountains of waters, is the Sabbath of the Lord.20 There is also made the announcement of the fall of Babylon; and then the dreadful warning against obedience to the decrees of the papacy anywhere, or its image in the United States. And the next thing that follows is the coming of the Lord to reap the harvest of the earth. And the harvest is the end of the world. Matt. 13:39.

15. The apostasy of Protestantism exalts the papacy, because this is an open confession to the world by professed Protestantism that the papal principles alone are correct. The making of the Image to the Beast restores and magnifies the power of the Beast -- Rev. 13:12. This brings about the situation described in Rev. 13:8. And this in turn develops the fulfillment of Rev. 18:8. The scheme of Leo XIII, as stated on pages 858, 859, is thus caused to succeed. The kings and nations that have been separated from her, are drawn back into illicit connection with her; once more she guides and dominates the nations. Consequently she glorifies herself and lives deliciously; the kings of the earth commit fornication and live deliciously with her, as did the false prophets with Jezebel of old; and therefore she congratulates herself, saying in her heart, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." And saith the Lord: "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire; for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." Verse 9.

16. The apostasy of Protestantism restores and exalts the papacy, and so assures the success of Leo's scheme. Leo's scheme embraces America, and through this Europe, and through these, "all humanity;" in short, it embraces the world. This is precisely the thing that the prophecy announced long ago that the papacy would do. The success of this scheme marks the perdition, and absolute ruin of the papacy. This ruin therefore of the papacy marks the ruin of the world, the end of the reign of evil, the perfect reign of righteousness -- the complete annihilation of the mystery of iniquity and the everlasting triumph of the mystery of God.21

874

17. The movements, both earthly and heavenly which are to accomplish this eternal consummation are now in active progress before the eyes of all the world. For in 1885 it was written: "When our country shall repudiate every principle of its Constitution as a Protestant and republican government, and shall make provision for the propagation of papal falsehoods and delusions, then we may know that the time has come for the

marvelous working of Satan, and that the end is near. As the approach of the Roman armies was a sign to the disciples of the impending destruction of Jerusalem, so may this apostasy be a sign to us that the limit of God's forbearance is reached, that the measure of our nation's iniquity is full, and that the angel of mercy is about to take her flight never to return.

18. "The Lord is doing His work. All heaven is astir. The Judge of all the earth is soon to arise and vindicate His insulted authority. The mark of deliverance will be set upon the men who keep God's Commandments, who revere His law, and who refuse the mark of the Beast or his Image."22

19. Then will be consummated the visions, the hopes, the labors, and the sufferings of the faithful Christians of the Middle Ages, of Wicklif, Militz, Conrad, Matthias, Huss, Jerome, Luther,and even all the saints and prophets of all ages; for "In her was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that have been slain upon the earth." Then will the voice be heard from heaven, "Rejoice over her thou heaven, and ye saints, and ye apostles and ye prophets; for God hath judged your judgment on her." Then shall the mighty angel take up that stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea saying: "Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all." And then shall be heard the "great voice of much people in heaven saying Hallelujah! Salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God; for true and righteous are His judgments, for He hath judged the great harlot which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of His servants at her hand.

"HALLELUJAH! FOR LORD GOD OMNIPOTENT REIGNETH."

1[Page 835] For the decision in full, and a detailed discussion of it, see "The Rights of the People."

2[Page 840] For a full history of the National Reform movement, see "The Two Republics,: pp. 699-752.

3[Page 844] Senate Hearing on "Sunday Bill," p. 18.

4[Page 846] "Great Empires of Prophecy," chap. xxxii.

5[Page 848] Congressional Record, July 10, 1892, p. 6614.

6[Page 849] Id., July 12, 1892, pp. 6694, 6695, 6701.

7[Page 851] Luke 23; 56; 24:1; Mark 16:1, 2.

8[Page 853] "Encyclopedia Britannica," Trent, Council of.

9[Page 853] Holtzmann's "Kanon and Tradition," p. 263.

10[Page 854] Id.

11[Page 855] Hon. Richard W. Thompson, "The Papacy and the Civil Power," p. 45.

12[Page 856] This is a fact. In a personal interview with the author of this book, the reason and the only reason which he gave for approving this legislation, was that it was "part of the general appropriation bill for the running expenses of the government; that to disapprove this he would have to disapprove the whole bill; and if that were done, all the machinery of the government would have to stop, and the whole government itself be brought to a standstill." This, too, while admitting that if this Sunday legislation had come before him separated from other legislation, so that it might be considered upon its merits alone, the result might be different. This was nothing else than to argue that he was responsible for the maintenance of the government. But this was

altogether a mistake. The maintenance of the government devolves altogether upon Congress. And if the president were to veto a general appropriation bill because of an unconstitutional piece of legislation which had been tacked to it; and if the whole government should in consequence be brought indeed to a standstill, he would be no more responsible for it than would any private citizen. President Harrison's assumption, therefore, was altogether a mistaken one, and his plea wholly irrelevant.

13[Page 857] That it was for the salvation of the nation was definitely expressed in the Senate. Senator Hawley said: "This very day and this hour, I would not for the wealth of ten expositions, have upon my shoulders the responsibility of having decided this question wrongly upon what may be a turning point in the history of the United States. Open the Exposition on Sunday, and the flood gates are opened. . . . I ask you to regard that which is of immeasurable importance in the salvation of a nation, the great, profound sense of religious obligation." -- Congressional Record, July 12, 1892, pp. 6699-6700.
Senator Colquitt said: "Without legislation relating to the great contests that are going on in this country, without the interference of bayonets, without calling upon the militia, without the marshaling of armed forces, if there is one palliative, if there is one preventive, if there is one check, if there is one remedy that is going to cure all of these discordant elements of strife and bloodshed, it is the observance of the Sabbath day and the observance of the restraints of our home in addition." -- Id., July 13, 1892, p. 6755.
Senator Frye said: "I believe that the salvation of this country depends upon the nearness to which it approaches the Sabbath of the early days. We have been wandering from it from time to time, getting away from it. The sooner we get back to it, the better it will be for this republic." -- Id., July 12, 1892, p. 6703.
It is a forcible comment on Senator Colquitt's speech, that whereas Sunday was thus set up to save the nation from "the interference of bayonets," etc., one of the very first things done by the church leaders after the passage of this act, was to call upon the president to enforce it at the point of the bayonet; and in the year 1894 the principal part of the country from ocean to ocean was marked with "the interference of bayonets," with "calling upon the militia," and with "the marshaling of armed forces." The Pharisees of old rejected the Lord of the Sabbath, and chose a robber instead to save that nation; but their action destroyed the nation. The Pharisees of our day rejected the Sabbath of the Lord and chose a robber -- Sunday -- in its stead, to save this nation. But like the efforts of the Pharisees before, instead of saving the nation, it will destroy the nation.

14[Page 858] Letter from the Vatican to the New York Sun, July 11, 1892.

15 [Page 860] Page 736

16 [Page 861] The gentleman can not have made this so very much of a study after al, or he would have known that Jefferson was not in this country at that time, and had nothing to do with the framing of the Constitution. Yet even though he had. It would only have been to his everlasting honor, and would have been no reflection on that document.

15 [Page 867] See the whole account in Congressional Record dated Wednesday Feb. 27, 1901. And for the real principles of the procedure, see chap. vii pars. 61-69; and par. 2, page 821, of this book.

16 [Page 871] "Great Controversy," Vol. iv, p. 278.

17 [Page 871] "Testimonies for the Church," No. 32, p. 207

18 [Page 871] Id.

19 [Pate 872] 19 Rev. 14: 6-16.

20 [Page 873] Ezek. 20:20; 31:17, 20:8-11.

21 [Page 873] Rev. 16:17; 18 and 19.
22 [Page 874] "Testimonies for the Church." No. 82, p. 207.