CROWN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

PRESIDENT WHITE LIBRARY
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Cornell University Library
BX955 .K94 1909

Papacy, the idea and its exponents / by

3 1924 029 388 158
olin

Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924029388158

THE PAPACY

THE PAPACY

THE IDEA AND ITS EXPONENTS

BY

GUSTAV KRÜGER

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF GIESSEN

TRANSLATED BY F. M. S. BATCHELOR AND C. A. MILES

NEW YORK
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
27 AND 29 WEST 23D ST.
1909

NOTE

As no satisfactory short history of the Papacy, covering its entire development, at present exists in English, it is hoped that this volume, by one of the foremost German authorities on ecclesiastical history, may prove useful in its translated form.

(All rights reserved.)

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 7

CHAPTER II

THE BEGINNINGS 13

CHAPTER III

TWO GREAT POPES 28

CHAPTER IV

THE COMPACT WITH THE FRANKS . . . 45

CHAPTER V

STORMY TIMES 58

CHAPTER VI

GREGORY VII. AND HIS SUCCESSORS . . . 78

CHAPTER VII

AT THE SUMMIT OF POWER 99

CHAPTER VIII

PAGE

THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY AND THE PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH . . . 120

CHAPTER IX

THE POPES AS PATRONS OF THE FINE ARTS . . 141

CHAPTER X

THE GERMAN REVOLUTION 160

CHAPTER XI

FRESH TROOPS. 180

CHAPTER XII

DEFEATS 199

CHAPTER XIII

RECONSTRUCTION 219

CHAPTER XIV

THE FUTURE IN THE LIGHT OF THE PRESENT . 249

BIBLIOGRAPHY 267

LIST OF ROMAN PONTIFFS 269

INDEX 271

THE PAPACY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

IN his famous essay on Ranke's "History of the Popes" Macaulay writes: "There is not, and there never was on this earth, a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church. The history of that Church joins together the two great ages of human civilisation. No other institution is left standing which carries the mind back to the times when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon, and when cameleopards and tigers bounded in the Flavian amphitheatre. The proudest royal houses are but of yesterday, when compared with the line of the Supreme Pontiffs. That line we trace back in an unbroken series, from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth

century to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth; and far beyond the time of Pepin the august dynasty extends, till it is lost in the twilight of fable. The republic of Venice came next in antiquity. But the republic of Venice was modern when compared with the Papacy; and the republic of Venice is gone and the Papacy remains. The Papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigour."

In 1840, when these winged words were written, men's minds were full of the extraordinary increase of power which the Papacy, seemingly doomed to decay at the time of the Revolution and of Napoleon, had gained under the Restoration. Since then two generations have passed. The year 1870 has intervened, with its triumph and its defeat. The jewel of Infallibility has been added to the papal tiara by Pius IX., and that at the very moment when the movement for Italian unity robbed him of the temporal crown. To-day Rome is still a world-power, and the successor of St. Peter does not shun the fight, but looks forward—even in the most difficult circumstances of the present time—to that victory which grace from on high shall give him.

Two hundred and sixty Popes have sat in Peter's Chair. It is not our intention to tell

of those—and they are many—who have ruled in name only, for the greatness of the story of the Papacy lies precisely in this: that the small men pass away like dust, while constantly, after periods of decline, strong personalities arise to carry the Idea onward to victory. What is this Idea, and of what sort have the men been who have stood for it? This is the question which we will set ourselves to answer.

"When Jesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi, He asked His disciples, saying, Whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Such is the tradition, declared sacred by the Church, according to the evangelist St. Matthew.

The battle over these words still rages on

all sides. Roman Catholics see in them the solid foundations on which stands the heavenward-soaring fabric of their papal Church. Orthodox Protestants, resting their faith on the Bible, will have none of that. They do not question the promise to St. Peter, which to them also is sacred; but they will not extend it to his successors, and are careful to distinguish spiritual from temporal power. Finally, modern critics have put a question mark against this tradition, as against so many others. They point out that the words of Jesus to St. Peter have no parallel in a similar context in the other Gospels. They remind us that in the literature of the two first centuries of the Christian era nothing is heard of this weighty promise, nay, that the authenticated history of apostolic and post-apostolic times stands in strange contradiction to it. Nor can they find in the words and acts of Jesus anything to render intelligible such a care for His "Church"—or His "congregation," as Luther prudently rendered it. We need not settle the dispute, but we make no secret of the fact that to us also the authenticity of these words of Jesus seems more than improbable. Like a prophet wise in the light of past events, the historian can only say that no better motto can be found for the history

of the Papacy than this sentence of the "Rock" which shines in golden letters in the dome of St. Peter's—a glittering symbol of the might and splendour of the Roman Church.

If we consider the personality of St. Peter, what significance has it for our history? According to the traditions of the Primitive Church, put together most fully by St. Jerome at the end of the fourth century, St. Peter, after he had been bishop of Antioch and had preached to the believers of the Circumcision in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, came to Rome in the second year of the reign of the Emperor Claudius (A.D. 42), and there ruled as bishop for twenty-five years, finally suffering martyrdom on the cross, head downwards, in the last year of the reign of the Emperor Nero (in A.D. 67 therefore, not 64). In this tradition almost everything is legendary, especially St. Peter's silver wedding, to repeat a well-known expression, with the Roman See. It cannot even be clearly proved by unquestioned testimony that St. Peter ever was in Rome at all; in any case he exercised no demonstrable influence on the course of events. Yet here also the historian must acknowledge that nothing could more worthily preface this history than the haloed figure of the chief of the apostles. With words of power—so legend

tells—he brings his arch-enemy, the heaven-storming magician, Simon, down again to earth, so that he is dashed to pieces before all Rome. And yet in his humility he feels himself unworthy to be crucified in the same manner as his Lord and Master.

According to the account in the last chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, the risen Lord said to St. Peter, "Feed My lambs!" and twice He repeated it with emphasis, "Feed My sheep!" That also is a legend. But if ever a legend contained a truth these words do. They reveal the inmost meaning of the history of the Papacy. Every Pope who has taken his office seriously has looked upon it as the office of Pastor to the flock of the faithful entrusted to him by God and His Anointed in the succession of St. Peter.

CHAPTER II

THE BEGINNINGS

IN the days of the Emperors Claudius (A.D. 41–54) and Nero (54–68) a Christian church was formed in Rome. We do not know who was the founder, but it is improbable that any single person played the part which legend assigns to St. Peter. Jews and Jewish proselytes were probably in the majority until the increase of heathen converts pushed them into the background and they gradually disappeared. This church very soon gained prestige beyond the boundaries of Rome. Even in early times the Christians in the Empire looked to her for leadership and advice. Towards the end of the first century a letter was sent on behalf of the Roman church by the learned Clement—the third successor of St. Peter according to the official reckoning of the Popes—to the church at Corinth, at that time torn by dissensions. It testifies eloquently to the discreet way in

which the Romans gave their advice after judiciously weighing all the circumstances, and also to the assurance with which they asserted their authority. Shortly after, Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, on his way to martyrdom in Rome, praises the church in the highest terms in a letter addressed to the brethren there; and again, a few decades later, we read as follows in a letter of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth: "From the beginning ye have been wont to show forth divers good works towards all the brethren. To many churches in divers towns have ye sent supplies and in this manner either relieved the poverty of the needy or provided necessary sustenance for the brethren in the mines. By such gifts do ye as Romans remain faithful to the customs inherited from your fathers. So also has your worthy bishop Soter not only kept up this custom, but has practised it in increasing measure, for not only does he make lavish distribution of the gifts for the saints [*i.e.*, the members of the church], but he also cheers the brethren coming from afar with blessed words, as a loving father cheers his children."

The above-mentioned Bishop Soter, in office about the year 170, was certainly the sole head of the church. Roman Catholic tradition, however, asserts that from the beginning the

Roman church was directed by *one* bishop as successor of the chief of the apostles; Linus, Cletus, Clement, Evaristus, Alexander, Sixtus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, and Anicetus are the names of those who are reckoned as "Popes" before Soter. But no unimpeachable testimony supports this tradition. The small bands of believers who, in different quarters of the great city, assembled in the house of some good master-worker for praise and prayer, for the hearing of God's Word, and for the breaking of bread, were not at first so closely connected with each other that it would be possible to speak of one centralised leadership. It is indeed in the nature of human relationships that even in such circumstances certain men stand out as leaders by virtue of some commanding quality. Such must have been the case, for example, with Clement, who as a freedman of the Flavian imperial house may have gained an ascendancy over his fellows through his superior education. But in the letter to the Corinthian church which goes by his name it is in no way the bishop who speaks; the name of Clement is nowhere mentioned, and only indirect evidence points to him as the author. Nevertheless there are distinct indications that at an early date the exigencies of worship and administration, but above all the

need for a line of demarcation between the Christian Church and sundry conventicles which fostered heathen or Jewish heresies under the cloak of Christianity, compelled the separate congregations to band themselves together under a common head. With enthusiastic idealism Ignatius of Antioch composes variations on the theme of the bishop as vicegerent of God, without whom Church life is an impossibility. Before him even, and with considerably greater realistic force, it had been explained in Clement's epistle how the apostles, after they had received their charge from Jesus Christ, the envoy of God, proclaimed the news of the Kingdom of God in town and village and appointed those converts who were the first-fruits of their missionary labours to be bishops and deacons of the future believers. The bishops as "successors of the apostles" form a chain which maintains the unity of the present with the earliest times, and the Roman bishop as the successor of St. Peter is called to be the chief link in this chain of tradition.

In the meantime legend had been at work. It was an established historical fact that St. Paul, having appealed to Cæsar, had preached to the church in Rome while undergoing light imprisonment pending his trial. The manner of his going to Rome is related simply and

trustworthily in the Acts of the Apostles. In the year 170 A.D., however, the Corinthians believed, and Bishop Dionysius bears witness to it, that St. Peter and St. Paul had founded the church of Corinth, that both had laid the foundation of the Roman church also, and had suffered martyrdom together. The dispute between the two apostles at Antioch, so clearly described by St. Paul himself in the Epistle to the Galatians, had thus been forgotten. It is in the name of St. Peter and St. Paul that Rome is to conquer. A few years after Dionysius, Bishop Irenæus of Lyons, whom the Catholic Church honours as the oldest of the Fathers, wrote these now famous words:—

"As it would be tedious in a book of this nature to enumerate the [apostolic] successions of all the churches, I will point to the tradition (which she inherits from the apostles) of the church of Rome, the greatest and the oldest, known everywhere, founded and established by the glorious apostles Peter and Paul, and to the faith proclaimed throughout the whole world [Rom. i. 8], which has come down through a succession of bishops to our own time. . . . With this church, on account of her special rank, every church, *i.e.*, the faithful in every place, must be in agreement."

The precise explanation of these words, which

are only preserved in a Latin translation from the Greek and can hardly be rendered into good English, is still a matter of controversy. It is clear, however, that the Roman church is singled out as the foremost of a great number of churches reaching back to early Christian times, in order to show by her example the value of the unbroken ecclesiastical tradition as against the innovating tendencies of heretical sects. It is clear, on the other hand, that we are not justified in reading into the words of Irenæus a legal superiority of the Roman church over the other churches.

In any case these churches were not disposed to admit such a claim, if it was ever advanced, and the so-called Paschal controversy affords a proof of it. The Christian churches on the coast of Asia Minor, especially those of Ephesus and Smyrna, had always jealously guarded their independence. They too appealed to apostolic tradition. The graves of St. John and St. Philip were to be seen at Ephesus, and the venerable Polycarp, himself one of the Apostle's pupils, was at the head of the church in Smyrna until the year 156. Now it was one of the ancient customs of these churches always to keep the Paschal feast on the day of the Old Testament Passover—*i.e.*, on the fourteenth day of the Jewish month Nisan, regardless of the day of

the week on which it fell. At Rome, on the contrary, and, as it appears, everywhere else, it had become the custom to hold the feast on the Lord's Day (Sunday) after the 14th Nisan, in commemoration of Christ's resurrection on that day. Polycarp of Smyrna, with one foot in the grave, had not shrunk from the long journey to Rome (in 154) in order to discuss this question with his colleague Anicetus. If a complete understanding had not been possible, they had at least agreed on mutual tolerance. A generation later relations once more became strained. The energetic and ruthless Victor of Rome (189–198), whose term of office is important for more than one reason, took advantage of a division among the Asiatics to interfere. He threatened to excommunicate those churches which were still resolved to keep to the old custom, and carried out his threat. He was severely censured by many of the bishops, but the result was in his favour. The bishop of Rome now begins to assert the rights of an overlord.

Victor might well be called the first Pope. But this title belongs even more justly to his next successor but one, Calixtus I. (217–222). After a doubtful past—he was said to have been guilty of dishonest banking transactions—this ambitious man succeeded Bishop Zephyrinus

(199–217), whose right hand he had become. The church of Rome must at that time have already numbered some thousands, and it is easy to understand how the severe discipline of the Primitive Church, which expelled grievous sinners from the ranks of the faithful, relaxed by degrees. Calixtus took an important step by admitting the principle that, after due penance done, even infringements of the sixth commandment should not involve permanent excommunication from the Church. He based this arbitrary decision upon his "power of the keys," *i.e.*, upon the judicial authority bestowed by the Lord on the apostles, and in particular on St. Peter. He encountered lively opposition in the matter. Part of his congregation elected a rival bishop, the presbyter Hippolytus, in opposition to him, and in a passionate lampoon the Carthaginian Tertullian attacked with his biting sarcasm the Roman bishop's claims to supremacy. Thus for the first time was the promise to St. Peter brought into ecclesiastical controversy.

The episcopate of Calixtus occurred at a time of peace for the churches as regards their relation with the State. The Emperor Septimius Severus (*cir.* 200) had oppressed them and had tried in particular to curb their missionary activity. Under Caracalla, Elagabalus, and

Alexander Severus they were able to develop undisturbed. This was especially true of the Roman church. According to a statement made by Bishop Cornelius, in the middle of the third century, there were in office in Rome forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven sub-deacons, and ninety-four clergy of lower grades, while the list of those recommended to the benevolence of the church showed more than fifteen hundred in need of aid. If we consider how rigid the clerical organisation—to judge by manifold indications—must have been, even as early as this, we can understand the saying reported of the Emperor Decius, that a rival emperor was less vexatious to him than a new Roman bishop. It was this same Emperor who, thinking that the Christian hierarchy was in a fair way of becoming dangerous to the State, organised the first general persecution of the Christians (from 250 onwards). Under him and the Emperor Valerian two Roman bishops received the baptism of blood—Cornelius in September, 253, and Sixtus II. on August 6, 258.

Our attention is next drawn particularly to Stephen I. (254–257), because, in imitation of Victor and Calixtus, he entered the lists with reckless energy, to further the idea of the Roman primacy. He had differed in opinion from his colleagues in Asia and Africa on a

question of Church government which bordered upon the realm of doctrine. The question was whether a heretic should be baptized on joining the Church or whether the laying on of hands and the consequent bestowal of the Holy Spirit should suffice. Stephen upheld the view that baptism by a heretic according to the regular form should be recognised as valid, but that only in the Church as the fellowship of the Holy Spirit did it become efficacious. His opponents were of opinion that such a baptism was nothing but an unhallowed ablution which did not blot out sins but rather added to them, and was therefore to be considered as not having taken place. In order to enforce the acceptance of his view, Stephen now invoked the fact that as occupant of the Chair of St. Peter, chief of the apostles, the first-chosen of the Lord, he ranked above his colleagues and thus had the right to provide authoritatively for the maintenance of the true doctrine in the Church.

The spokesman of the other side was Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. Some years before, in a bulky treatise on "the Unity of the Church," he had had occasion to set forth his views on the position of the bishops—views which were at that time in complete agreement with those of Cornelius of Rome. A schism in the Church,

which arose on the election of Cornelius, and endangered the prerogatives of the episcopal office, had involved the Carthaginian community. As against the schismatics Cyprian had pointed out that the unity of the Church depended on the unity of the episcopate, for since all bishops were successors of the apostles, and after His resurrection the Lord had extended to all the apostles (John xx. 21) the promise to St. Peter (Matt. xvi. 18), it followed that in their multiplicity unity was reflected. Cyprian had at that time no occasion to go into the question whether or how far superiority over the other bishops belonged to the Roman bishop as successor to St. Peter in the narrower sense. But his correspondence with Cornelius shows that he saw in the Roman church "the womb and the root of the Catholic Church" for the very reason of her peculiar relation to St. Peter.

At the same time, Cyprian's dispute with Stephen shows that from this pre-eminent dignity of the Roman See he deduced no rights that would affect the independence of the other bishops, but, on the contrary, set his face firmly against any such pretensions on the part of the Roman bishop. He vigorously repels his opponent's attempts to put the primacy of St. Peter on a different footing from that of the other apostles. St. Peter himself, he points out,

claimed no rights of primacy in his dispute with St. Paul on the question of circumcision. In the direction of the Church each bishop has full discretion, each one has received a part of God's flock to feed, and is answerable to God alone for it. He and Bishop Firmilian of Cæsarea, who hastened to his support, expressed themselves very sharply about the unbrotherly behaviour of Stephen, who set himself up as chief bishop and with foolish arrogance boasted of his succession to St. Peter. Stephen, on the other hand, called Cyprian a false Christian and a false apostle, refused to receive the messengers of the bishop of Carthage, and excommunicated the African bishops, when they still refused to accept the Roman custom. It is impossible to say what the result of the dispute would have been, if the persecution of Valerian, to which Cyprian fell a victim (September 14, 258), had not diverted attention from it. As a typical example of the opposition between the theories later called papalistic and episcopalistic, this episode has remained of permanent significance. The question of the validity of heretical baptism was not decided till the beginning of the fourth century, in quite different circumstances, and then in favour of the Roman view.

To questions of dogma, in the narrower sense, the Roman bishops early gave their attention.

Not, indeed, that they were ever great theologians, but from the beginning they felt themselves called upon to protect and preserve the true faith. The words of Jesus to St. Peter, recorded in the Gospel of St. Luke (xxii. 32), "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not," contained, as they firmly believed, the guarantee that the "gift of Grace," the "Charisma" of truth, which all bishops possessed as successors of the apostles, was granted to them in a special manner. Bishop Victor made a far-reaching use of such a claim when he cut off the Roman leather-worker Theodotus from fellowship with the church, *i.e.*, excommunicated him, because of doctrinal differences.

An episode which occurred soon after the middle of the third century, and which is known as the "Dionysian Controversy," is full of significance as regards the claims and authority of the Roman bishop in questions of belief. Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria, a man with theological and philosophical interests, had used erroneous terms in defining more closely the metaphysical relation of the Father and the Son in the Godhead. His colleague, Bishop Dionysius of Rome (261–272), heard of it and decided—we should now say *ex cathedra*, *i.e.*, in virtue of his office—that it was best to leave such subtleties undiscussed and to be content

to speak—in the words of the Creed—only of God the Father, of Jesus Christ His Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The Bishop of Alexandria submitted, and said that he had been misunderstood. About the same time also the Emperor Aurelian settled a dispute between two parties in the church of Antioch by adjudicating the possession of the church building to those who were agreed in doctrine with the Italian bishops and, in particular, with the bishop of Rome.

The meagreness and fragmentary character of tradition make it impossible to depict in striking colours the position of the bishop of Rome about the year 300. But we get the definite impression that his opinion had unique weight in the councils of the bishops. It is in the nature of things that this applies primarily to his influence in the West, where there was no other see that could have had the slightest chance of competing with the Roman in antiquity or in pureness of tradition. Even Cyprian of Carthage never forgot that Africa had received Christianity from Rome. Yet there can be no question of a legal superiority of the Roman bishop even over the Western bishops outside Italy. Only over the Italian bishops had he ecclesiastical authority, which meant that the right of consecrating and punishing them was admittedly his. This right was not in any way confirmed at the

first General Council of Nicæa in the year 325, but was accepted as existing and as a matter of course. Beyond that, however, this synod granted nothing to the bishop of Rome; and when in later times the canon of the synod, in which the prerogative of Rome is alluded to, was provided with the heading, "*Ecclesia romana semper habuit primatum*" ("the Roman church has always had the primacy,"), this is only the first of the numerous falsifications that accompany and support the continuous growth of this primacy. It will cost many a hard struggle yet to attain the ideal which imagination—or was it skilful calculation?—projected back into the past.

CHAPTER III

TWO GREAT POPES

THE founding of Constantinople in the year 330, and the permanent removal of the centre of gravity of the Imperial government to the east of the huge Empire, brought great advantages to the bishop of Rome. It is true that the bishop of the new capital was an inconvenient rival who had in view nothing less than the seizing of the ecclesiastical supremacy over the whole East by pushing the leading bishops of Alexandria and Antioch into the background. But while the bishop of Constantinople became more and more a court prelate, who had to set his sails according to the wind if he wished to maintain his place, the bishop of Rome was able, except for a few fleeting disturbances, to consolidate his position unhindered by the control of the secular arm. And when, after the death of the Emperor Theodosius, the two halves of the Empire were

finally separated and an "Imperator" resided once more in Italy, he was but a man of straw, in face of whom the Pope, as we may now justly call him, found no difficulty in maintaining his independence.

That, however, would at best have given him supremacy over the West. What he claimed as successor of St. Peter was more than this—the command, "Feed My sheep," covered the whole of Christendom. And this claim also was favoured by circumstances. Hardly had the bishops, smiled upon by imperial favour, been permitted to exercise their office in full publicity, when they broke out into heated religious controversies. Over the Arian dispute, *i.e.*, the quarrels as to the dogma of the consubstantiality of God the Father and His Son, the Church threatened to fall to pieces. Now her unity was all-important to the imperial government, and, in order to preserve it, Constantine and his successors brought the secular arm into play. Many a saintly man, full of religious zeal, had to go into exile because he would not give up his convictions at the imperial command, and the frequently ill-advised government was for a long time in hurtful conflict with those religious instincts which had the profoundest hold on Christian truth.

For a time, too, the hand of the Emperor

weighed heavily on the Roman bishop; Liberius had to spend several years (355–358) in far-off Thrace, until he gave way and signed what was laid before him. That, however, is but an episode. Enshrined in the annals of history there remains the decree with which, after more than half a century of bitter disputes, the Emperor Theodosius ended the religious controversy by order of the State, the decree with which Justinian and his jurists later prefaced their code of civil law and in the opening of which we read: "All the peoples over whom we rule with mildness and clemency must, such is our will, accept the religion transmitted by the Divine apostle St. Peter to the Romans." Bishop Damasus of Rome and Bishop Peter of Alexandria are named as the authorities on orthodox doctrine. The Alexandrian bishop had soon to give place to him of Constantinople, and the way remained clear for the bishop of Rome.

It goes without saying that men of powerful personality were needed to achieve such results and to make the most of them. Yet Sylvester (314–335), probably the best known of the Roman bishops of this period, was not so great as legend has made him out to be: for it is not true that he baptized the Emperor Constantine, and the so-called "Donation of

Constantine"* is a forgery of the eighth century, when it was important to impress the Franks and the Byzantines.

A much more important part was played by Julius (341–352), the friend and protector of Athanasius. To him, as successor of St. Peter, the Synod of Sardica granted the right of forming a Court of Revision in cases where a bishop, summoned before the court of his peers, thought himself wronged by the sentence. This right, it is true, was only recognised at first to a limited extent.

One of the few non-Roman occupants of the Apostolic See in the early centuries was the Spaniard Damasus (366–384), a passionate man who made his way to the episcopal throne over corpses. He had the ear of the Emperor to such an extent that he was able to make the bold request that the Roman bishop might in his own affairs be answerable to the imperial jurisdiction only. He was also the originator of the translation of the Bible by the learned Jerome, which, as the Vulgate, has become the standard version for the Church. His

* By the terms of the Donation Constantine gives to Sylvester and his successors the sovereignty over the provinces of the Western Empire and imperial dignities and privileges. Lest the secular government should cramp the freedom of the spiritual, he removes the seat of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople. (See also pages 53–4.) (Trans.)

successor, Siricius (384–398), who in his circular letters adopted quite the attitude of the ecclesiastical law-giver towards the Spanish, the African, and even the Gallic bishops, also deserves special mention.

Nevertheless the Popes were only able to make their way step by step, and often enough at a wearisome pace. In Italy they had to contend against the authority of the bishops of Milan, Ravenna, and Aquileia, who temporarily checked the influence of Rome in the north of Italy and on the shores of the Adriatic. The African bishops still had some of the self-confidence of their great predecessor Cyprian, and in the south of Gaul many a hard struggle had to be fought before the Roman See succeeded in gaining that recognition the refusal of which was even then considered an insult. In these and similar complications Innocent I. (402–417) in particular proved himself a clear-sighted exponent of papal policy. He is the greatest forerunner of the first great Pope, Leo I. (440–461).

In the palace of the Vatican, Raphael has portrayed the following scene: Pope Leo, at the head of an Imperial embassy, advances to meet the King of the Huns, who threatens Rome. In the sky above the Pope are St. Peter and St. Paul with drawn swords.

Sober consideration brings to our mind, indeed, other motives which induced Attila to give up his marauding expedition; but to the people Leo was their saviour from the Scourge of God; once more, after many centuries, "pater patriæ," the Father of the Fatherland. And he actually was that. What mattered it that an Emperor reigned beside him in Rome? Valentinian III. was completely dependent on the Pope, and made public avowal of his dependence in the following decree:—

"Since that by reason of the merit of St. Peter, who is chief of the company of the bishops, the dignity of the city of Rome and the decision of the holy Synod [*i.e.*, that of Nicæa, which really decided nothing of the sort] the superiority of the see of Rome has been established, let none henceforward dare to question the authority of this see with presumptuous claims: for then only will peace continue throughout the Church when the bishop of Rome is recognised by all as Lord and Master. . . . Henceforth it shall not be permitted to dispute over Church matters or to oppose the orders of the Primate in Rome. . . . What is ordered by the Apostolic See, by virtue of its authority, shall be law to all, so that, if a bishop refuse compliance with the judicial sentence of the Roman Primate, he

shall be compelled by the provincial government to appear before him. Thus in every respect will that be observed which our august ancestors have granted to the Roman Church."

This decree had been called forth by the opposition offered to the Pope by the Metropolitan of Arles in the south of Gaul, who had once again tried to vindicate his independence of ultramontane control. The Emperor, whose pen had been guided by the Pope, even let a sentence in the document stand to the effect that the papal ordinances by which the metropolitan districts in Gaul had been rearranged had not needed imperial sanction; and Leo gave the Bishop of Arles clearly to understand that it was only thanks to his clemency that he remained in office. The Metropolitan of Thessalonica in Illyria, a district in which, as a province belonging to the eastern half of the Empire, the influence of Constantinople was strong and decidedly anti-Roman, was informed by the Pope that as his vicar he had a share in the duties of his office, but not in his power.

He would fain have adopted the same tone towards the Eastern Empire itself; but here his struggles for sovereignty met with invincible obstacles. In the Eastern Churches the unhappy strife over the mysteries of faith had

not yet come to an end. This strife accorded well both with the theologians' love of nice distinctions and with the temporal ambitions of the chief bishops, who, by mutual accusations of heresy, made life a burden to one another. In 451 the Emperor convened a council at Chalcedon, in order that some decision might be arrived at. A letter from Leo to the Patriarch of Constantinople served as basis for this decision. In it the Pope, without entering too much into theological difficulties, had expounded in clear language the doctrine of the intimate union of the Divine and human natures in the one Person of Christ. A damper, however, was immediately put upon the Pope's consciousness of triumph on the dogmatic question. To his great chagrin the council perpetuated with a solemn resolution the decision, arrived at several generations earlier in a synod at Constantinople, that the privileges of the see of Old Rome should indeed still be conceded to her by virtue of her position as imperial city, but that the see of New Rome should enjoy the same privileges for the same reason, and should have her place in the ecclesiastical order of rank immediately below that of Old Rome. In vain did Leo assert that there was a difference between temporal and spiritual order,

and that the higher rank of a church could only be founded on its apostolic origin. The matter remained there, at least as regards the Eastern Churches, which, with fewer and fewer exceptions, rejected every interference of the Pope in their affairs.

And yet the Pope acted wisely when, with inalterable firmness, he based his primacy over the nations on the Divine promise, quite apart from all earthly considerations. Leo did this in an especially emphatic way in a sermon preached in his cathedral on the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, June 29th. Here we read:—

"Truly the whole world has a share in all holy feasts, and the one true faith demands that that which was done for the salvation of all shall everywhere be commemorated amidst common rejoicing. But to-day's feast must be celebrated with special and peculiar jubilation in this our city. Where the chief of the apostles so gloriously ended their lives, there also must the day of their martyrdom be celebrated with special joy. For they are the men through whom thou, O Rome, didst first receive the light of the gospel of Christ. Through them hast thou, who wast the teacher of error, become the disciple of truth. They are thy holy fathers and true shepherds, who established thee much better and more

happily in the membership of the heavenly kingdom than those who by their toil laid the first foundation of thy walls. He who gave thee thy name disgraced thee by fratricide. But the apostles have so magnified thee that, because of Peter's Chair, thou art become the holy nation, the chosen people [*cf.* 1 Peter ii. 9], the priestly and royal city, the head of the world, and that through the worship of God thou hast attained a wider sway than thou didst of old through thy worldly power. For although thou, rich in victories, didst extend thy rule over land and sea, yet thy toils in war brought less under thy yoke than the Christian faith has made tributary to thee."

Rightly indeed has admiring posterity given the name of Great to Leo, who, in a time of general unsettlement, inscribed Roman pride and Christian faith upon his banner with a trust in God that promised victory.

The successors of the great Pope carried on his pretensions readily enough. Did not Gelasius I. (492–496) compare the relation of temporal and spiritual power to that of the sun and moon? As the moon receives her light from the sun, so the secular kingdom receives all its brilliancy from the Papacy. But power was lacking to give weight to such pretensions by action. In the history of the Roman

See we shall not seldom meet with such paralysis; but we shall also be able to observe that as a rule it is connected with a state of general unsettlement and transition. The century after Leo marked the golden age of the Eastern Empire, the culminating point of which was reached in the person of the mighty Justinian (527–565), who stood head and shoulders above his contemporaries, in spite of the many shadows that mar his career. The West, however, was ruled by the barbarians, filled with the exuberance of youth, who shattered the organism of the Old World, but were as yet without the wisdom and experience necessary to build afresh on its ruins; even the great East Goth Theodoric did not succeed in producing anything durable. In these wholly changed times the Popes found their bearings but slowly. Byzantium became their master. The papal authority reached its lowest point in the time of Vigilius (537–555), whom Theodora, the courtesan on the imperial throne, put into office. His subjection to Byzantium cost him the hard-won confidence of the Western Churches. At a time when the weakness of the papal government was so notorious, it makes a curious impression on one to read that Pope Felix II. (483) upbraided his rival in Constantinople, previous to excommunicating him,

and thus beginning a schism between the two Churches that lasted for thirty-five years, with the words of Jesus (Matt. xii. 30; Luke xi. 23): "He that is not with Me is against Me: and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth."

But the evil times pass. The attention of the Byzantines becomes fully absorbed by the revolutions in the East, brought about first by the Persians and then by the Arabs. The German barbarians in the West begin to yield to the influence of civilisation, and the Church appears to them more and more as the power which attends the destiny of nations with the blessing of God—a power before which they must bow the knee. But at the head of the Church—so thought these peoples—stood the Pope in Rome, who seemed to embody in his person everything worthy of veneration that the Old World had left to the New. Gregory the Great (590–604) proved that they had not looked to Rome in vain.

Historians not seldom dispute or entirely deny the right of Gregory I. to the title of "Great." However unjust that may be, it is easy to understand that there should be some hesitation in according to Gregory what is universally and ungrudgingly granted to Leo. Gregory was not cast in the imperious mould of his great predecessor. It is hard to imagine

Leo adopting that title of "servant of the servants of God," which Gregory in proud humility did not bear for show only, and which all the Popes bore after him, even when they showed no trace of his devout spirit. Gregory can only be called Great because of his importance for the Church, which has commemorated him from early times by the side of Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine as one of her four great doctors.

A member of the Gens Anicia and therefore of the old Roman nobility, to which, even in the time of the Republic, the State had owed high civil officials and successful commanders, Gregory had reached in his worldly career the highly honourable position of "prætor urbanus," when he suddenly left the world and joined the monks, of whom there were great numbers in and around Rome since Benedict of Nursia's reorganisation of monastic life (in the first half of the sixth century). He spent some fifteen years in good works, until the Pope induced him, much against his will, to devote himself once more to public life, this time in the Church. For a while he held the difficult and responsible office of papal representative in Constantinople. After the death of Pelagius II. he was raised to the papal chair by the wish of both secular and ecclesiastical authorities.

That he had not spent his youth as an administrator in vain was seen in his management of the property of the Roman Church. Even at that time it was a matter of landed property, of which the extent in Italy and the neighbouring islands, on the coast of Dalmatia, in the south of Gaul and the north of Africa may be estimated at thousands of square miles, and the revenue at millions of pounds in our money. Gregory did not manage this "Patrimonium Petri," this heritage of St. Peter, as a sovereign—that right belonged to the Byzantine Emperor—but as a skilful administrator, and, by his attention to every detail, he laid the foundation of what was later called the States of the Church or Papal States. But, well as he understood these things, his soul was not tied to them. In his heart of hearts he still remained faithful to the object for which he had formerly renounced the pomps and vanities of this world—the service of Christ and the magnifying of His name among men. The first monk to sit in Peter's Chair, he used for missionary purposes the forces set free by Benedict. His messengers went forth to England, to win new countries for the preaching of the gospel, naturally according to the Roman Catholic form, which they and their chief regarded as the only one that could bring salvation. Com-

bining religious with political aims, he formed new connexions in the territory of the Frankish kings, renewed old ties in the Spanish Church, now under the rule of the West Goths, and peaceably and unostentatiously strengthened on all sides the weakened authority of his see.

At the same time he was ever mindful of his duty to his Divine Master. He was the successor of that apostle who had been commissioned to feed the Christian flock. No one else had received such a commission, least of all the Bishop of Byzantium, who had so often to sacrifice his duty as a Christian at the beck of his earthly master. It seemed to the Pope diabolical presumption on the part of this patriarch that he should allow himself to be styled, or, according to Gregory, should style himself, the "ecumenical" patriarch, *i.e.*, as Gregory, perhaps wrongly, interpreted it, the universal patriarch—in short, the chief patriarch. His protests died away unheard; there was no longer any inclination, across the water, to listen to the Bishop of Rome.

The Church gives Gregory the title of Doctor, and in truth he had a peculiar and conclusive influence in the province of doctrine, in that he sifted theological tradition for the West, and completed the process of preserving what was

of practical use to the Church, and of blunting the edge of what was dangerous. Gregory was only able to follow from afar the bold flight of thought of Augustine (d. 430), whom he honoured as his master; but the giant stature of the great African bishop reached far beyond ordinary human standards, and the Church could but be thankful to have in Gregory one who extended the "Civitas Dei" even in these matters. To say that the Pope stands at the head of the Kingdom of God on earth was a materialisation of the thought of Augustine, but it accorded with actual facts. With this was also naturally bound up an increase of the importance of the Roman Church, represented by the Pope, as the highest authority on doctrine. Augustine, indeed, never stated as a principle that "when Rome has spoken, the matter is at an end" ("Roma locuta, causa finita"), but certain expressions of his could be so interpreted.

If we add to all this Gregory's services as regards the instruction of the clergy, the furtherance of Church life, the development of public worship, and, last but not least, Church music, we have grounds enough to pronounce one-sided the opinion of Mommsen that he was only a "very little great man." Gregory stands at the parting of the ways, everything of value that had been

evolved by the early Catholic Church goes over with him as a recognised inheritance to the New World of the Germanic and Romance peoples, for whom it is reserved to utilise the treasure in all directions.

CHAPTER IV

THE COMPACT WITH THE FRANKS

THE connexion with the Eastern Empire was becoming looser and looser. Under the sway of the Lombards imperial influence in Italy had weakened from decade to decade —not without the assistance of the Popes— and the military stations had become fewer and fewer. Pope Martin I. could venture to incense his sovereign by ignoring the imperial right of confirming his election. It must be added that the Emperor, through his Exarch, soon seized the opportunity of abducting the offender in the middle of the night from the church of St. John Lateran, and had him conveyed to Constantinople and thence to the Black Sea, where he suffered a painful death (655). The Popes of the seventh century were not always happy in their handling of Church matters. One of them, Honorius I. (625–638), was even laid under the

ban of the Church as a heretic, after his death, by a general council at Constantinople (681), because, contrary to the custom of the Roman See, he had gone too far on a question of doctrine which had stirred up much feeling, and had decided before there was anything to decide. This is the oft-quoted show case for papal non-infallibility, which on closer examination proves to be merely a harmless interlude.

Separation from Byzantium had become a vital question, but there was no hope of effecting it successfully as long as definite support was lacking. From the Lombards, although they had recently turned from Arianism to Catholicism, there was but little to be expected, since the important sees of Milan and Aquileia, which since the time of Vigilius had again become keen rivals of Rome, were on friendly terms with the German conquerors, who on their side continually coveted the Patrimony of St. Peter. Rome began then to look for help to the Frankish kingdom, where she had had faithful adherents since the time of Gregory. An opportunity of testing this fidelity soon occurred.

Byzantium had once more become the scene of fierce ecclesiastical controversies. The Emperor Leo III., the Isaurian, had roughly

interfered with the religious life of numbers of bigoted souls by forbidding image worship (726), which in the Eastern Church had assumed the character of idolatry far more than in the West. Apart from this debasement of worship, the veneration of images, as such, was undoubtedly of vital interest to the whole Church; and we can understand that Pope Gregory II. (714–731) could not keep silence in face of the hostile measures of the Isaurian. But the tone which he adopts in writing to the Emperor sounds strange to our ears. It is no longer the subject speaking to his sovereign, but an ecclesiastical prince conscious of his power, who does not fear the authority of the Emperor, and who is working towards a breach. He censures Leo for meddling with the dogmas of the Church and for attempting to unite in his person the king and the priest. He calls the Emperor a simpleton, a fool, at whose head the school-children, who have more sense than he, would throw their tablets. Leo ordered his arrest, and the fate of Martin threatened him; but the troops refused to obey orders. Shortly afterwards the Pope died. His successor, another Gregory (731–741), found himself in a position of exceptional difficulty. The Lombard Liutprand was threatening Rome, and he hourly expected to see the city

attacked. In these circumstances he considered it advisable to show his good-will by seeking —this is the last instance of the practice— confirmation of his election from the Emperor. But in the very year of his accession he made, at a Synod in Rome, a pronouncement in which Leo could not fail to see an unmistakable declaration of war, to the effect that whosoever henceforth, contrary to the custom of the Primitive Church, removed, destroyed, desecrated or reviled the holy images, was to be cut off from the Body and Blood of Christ and from the fellowship of the one true Church. The breach became a fact, and the Pope owed it only to a combination of fortunate circumstances that the military demonstration immediately set on foot by the Emperor came to nothing.

He could indeed have obtained help from Liutprand. But then the Lombard would have become the Pope's master, and his rule would have been even heavier than that of the Emperor, away in Constantinople. In this emergency Gregory III. took a step which, though for the moment it was without result, became later of great importance for the world's history. He turned to Charles Martel. He sent to the Frank the consecrated keys of St. Peter's tomb, and entreated him, as

he would be saved, to come and help him. Charles did not come; it was not to his interest to engage in a struggle with Liutprand, who had just done him good service against the Arabs. But the ice was broken, and a few years later there came to pass what Gregory III. had in vain tried to accomplish.

For about a century the power of the Merovingian kings had been slowly decaying. Taking advantage of this fact, the mayors of the palace seized upon the reins of government. Charles Martel, *i.e.*, the Hammer, routed the Arabs (in 732), but he also managed the internal affairs of the kingdom. The bishops having allowed themselves to be drawn into the quarrels of the nobles, the Frankish Church had fallen into a state of wild confusion. Charles Martel did not exactly treat her with tenderness. He has been much blamed for seizing a large part of the property of the cathedral churches, which pious gifts had swelled to immense proportions, in order to obtain a sufficiently large body of cavalry against the Arabs. At the same time there was really no question of ill-will towards the Church and her spiritual mission, for Charles showed that he could appreciate the latter by his behaviour to Boniface, whose missionary and organising efforts in Hesse, Thuringia, and

Bavaria he took under his powerful protection. On the other hand, it was just the activity of Boniface which made Charles and his successors realise the importance of a firmly united Church, fostering the gentler instincts of the masses. That this organisation, also as the result of Boniface's activity, was closely linked to Rome did not trouble them, since they looked upon their sovereignty over the Church as a matter of course, and had no reason to fear ultramontane influence. They could appreciate and utilise the moral power of Rome.

When, in 751, Pepin, the son of Charles Martel, deposed the Merovingian King Childeric, it was of the greatest importance to him to have the blemish of illegality, which might attach to his crown, removed. The mere acclamations of his Franks could not effect this —supernatural confirmation was necessary. This confirmation he found in the decision of the Church, which stood in God's stead on earth. He therefore put this question to the Pope: "Is it right, or not, that the kings of the Franks should not possess the royal authority?" "No," answered Pope Zacharias (741–752), "it is not right." Now the crown was free of stain. "By the grace of God" ("Dei gratia") Pepin styled himself. Here for

the first time these words are used in connexion with a king's crown; hitherto it was only the bishops who had been "by the grace of God," and since the time of Israel and Judah no ruler's head had been touched with the anointing oil. Boniface, the Pope's legate, anointed the King of the Franks.

Perhaps the matter would have ended there if, at the same time, the papal throne had not fallen into sore straits. The Lombard Aistulf occupied Ravenna and demanded tribute from Rome. Thereupon Stephen III. decided to appeal once more to the Franks. He crossed the Alps in winter time and appeared at the King's residence in Ponthieu, begging for protection. The pious Pepin paid him the honours which he deemed due to the successor of St. Peter, and himself led the Pope's palfrey. But he did more: he assured him of his protection, and promised, if he were victorious, to ensure his safety by putting at his dis-disposal the territory won from the Lombards, while he himself took the title of Patrician of Rome and therewith the position of protector to the Pope. By way of thanks Stephen anointed him again. Pepin kept his word, and after a short war overthrew his opponent. To the imperial envoys who came to demand the restoration of the land to the Emperor

he answered that it was for love of St. Peter and to obtain forgiveness of his sins, not to please men, that he had undertaken the war against the Lombard chief, with whom, it may be mentioned, he had—unlike his father—not been on friendly terms.

Upon the alliance thus formed between the Frankish king and the Pope hung all the future. Everything depended on the mutual relations of the two powers. Pepin had given the Pope territory that legally belonged to the Emperor, and it had thereby become clear to all that the union with the East was finally at an end. But that the Pope was now a sovereign equal with himself did not occur to the Frank, although he allowed him to do as he pleased within the boundaries of what we may henceforth rightly term the "Papal States." The Pope knew this. At the same time the advantages which accrued to the Roman See at this turning-point in the history of the world were very great. The price paid for the removal of the Lombard peril cannot indeed be called too high when we reflect that the papal policy, built upon a single, unalterable, firmly-rooted idea, has always been, and has remained, as independent of the men who have embodied it as the policy of temporal states has been dependent

on politicians. Rome could wait. With strong personalities like Pepin and his great son, caution was necessary. But a time was coming when it would be possible for the Pope to act otherwise, supported by the enormous influence which as shepherd of souls he exercised over the mind of Christendom.

For the rest, there was no shrinking from very worldly means of increasing this influence. The papal chancery, about the middle of the eighth century, suffered from no excess of conscientiousness. That, at the moment of Rome's greatest need, advantage was taken of "the days of darkness in the land of the Franks"—in Döllinger's phrase—to fabricate a letter in which St. Peter besought the kings of the Franks, his adopted sons, to rescue his city of Rome, appears to us as harmless as the superstition of its recipients, who seem to have been impressed by it. More serious was the "Donation of Constantine," by means of which an attempt was made to render that of Pepin unnecessary. It was, indeed, an extraordinarily bold proceeding to fabricate a deed purporting to show that the Emperor Constantine had made over to Pope Sylvester his imperial palace, the city of Rome, and the temporal dominion of the West, as well as the ecclesiastical supremacy over the Eastern

patriarchates, together with many other privileges and titles. By this document Rome hoped to put her pretensions on a solid foundation, unassailable by either the Franks or the Byzantines, but more especially, perhaps, the latter. In the West at least, the forgery attained its object, though the actual course of events was hardly ever influenced by it.

Shortly after, the Papacy had to play the part of the moon beside the sun which rose upon the Western world in the person of Charlemagne (768–814). The "peaceful tyrant," as Gustav Freytag calls him, had already pursued his beneficent course for more than thirty years, and had strengthened his position both within and without his kingdom by gaining the confidence of his subjects, when he found himself confronted by the highest task that could fall to the lot of a ruler—to renew in his own person the old Roman imperial dignity. This task, moreover, was set him by the Pope. The coronation of Charles as Emperor is an event that has caused much discussion up to the present day as regards cause and effect. One thing only is certain, that the suggestion did not come from the King. But that he knew nothing about it is, on the face of it, really too improbable. He certainly could not have produced off-hand

the rich gifts which he distributed in St. Peter's immediately after the ceremony. He had his followers with him in Italy, and they at least knew that the time was ripe for solemnly setting the seal to the separation between East and West which had long existed in fact. The Pope, on his side, had every reason not to refuse his co-operation in the spectacle, and it says much for his diplomatic skill that he succeeded in playing the chief part. For the rest, Leo III. (795–816), the successor of Hadrian I. (772–795), who was a personal friend of Charles, was a man of inferior character. Even though the oath, with which two days before the coronation, in the presence of the King, the Pope had to clear himself from a charge of grave offences against morality, does not appear to merit the doubt so constantly thrown upon it, he still remains too worldly and unspiritual for us to resist the impression that in this case, at any rate, an event of world-wide importance was brought about by a man unworthy of the task.

It has been said that the coronation did not in reality come up to the epic greatness attributed to it in contemporary accounts; that it created no new relations and brought no new forces into play. "It accomplished nothing, it was but a sign." We may, however, well ask

whether history does not need such signs, and whether, as there have been men who drew on the past for the benefit of the future without giving the world anything really new, there are not also events which continue to shine like beacons in the memory of men even if the source of their light has long been extinguished. Karl Hase grasped this when he wrote: "By his coronation Charlemagne gained nothing in men or land that he did not already possess, but the idea of a spiritual God-given empire of the world—an idea which had been developing since the days of the heathen Augustus and the Christian Constantine—descended upon him, and remained through the centuries a power in the minds of nations, whenever it rested upon a ruler who was great enough to understand it."

It has also been said that this Kingdom of God under two monarchs, the one a warrior, the other a priest, was, to say the least, a misfortune for the German people. There is a great deal of truth in this. The connexion with the imperial throne and the journeys of the Emperors to Italy for coronation brought much misery to Germany; and from the dissensions between Pope and Emperor there came later much distress to the Empire and to its Church. But this view, again, does not take times and persons sufficiently into con-

sideration. For Charlemagne, the Pope remained what he had been before. He took it as much for granted as did his father before him that he, the King-Emperor, was also the "Rector" of the Church. Had he not sat in judgment on the Pope as on any other bishop in the Empire, without any one taking exception? That later "the Roman gang," as Luther complained, "would assert and loudly proclaim that the Pope had taken the holy Roman Empire from the Greek Emperor and had given it to the Germans, for which honour and favour he justly deserved and required submission, thanks, and every service at the hands of the Germans" lay beyond all calculation at that time; and the claim is based upon a historical fiction.

But in every historical fiction there is a grain of truth to be found. At the coronation at the imperial Diet at Aix-la-Chapelle in 813, Charlemagne bade his son Louis take the crown from the altar himself; thereby revealing clearly enough his conception of the imperial office. In 871, his great-grandson, Louis II., appealed to his Divine right of office against the Greek Emperor, arguing that he had been anointed Emperor by the Pope, as in former times David had been anointed king by Samuel after the rejection of Saul. What had happened to produce such a change of ideas?

CHAPTER V

STORMY TIMES

THE last of the great German kings sank into the grave. Charlemagne had ruled the Empire he had created with a strong arm, but after his death centrifugal forces became active. Louis the Pious or, as the French more aptly call him, Louis the Debonair, who could not control his own sons, was not the man to extend the Empire. A clerical party began to form itself among the nobility both ecclesiastical and secular, a party which no longer looked to the Court as its source of inspiration, but rather across the Alps to Rome.

Meanwhile events had not stood still in Rome. There were increasing indications that an independent papal policy once again existed, and that the Pope no longer felt the weight of a strong ruler's hand. The pontificate of Leo IV. (847–855) is important because he gained the goodwill of the Romans by building fortifi-

cations at the mouth of the Tiber and by circumvallating the quarter round St. Peter's, called after him the "Leonine City." These prudent measures obviated a repetition of the state of panic produced in the city not long before by the approach of a fleet of Saracen pirates. An increase of self-assertion is also shown by the fact that Leo was the first to use in his documents the papal reckoning of years beside the imperial reckoning.

Leo prepared the way for Nicholas I. (858–867) from whom posterity has unjustly withheld the title of Great. He was the first Pope to be crowned, as far as we know. If Richard Rothe saw in Louis the Pious the "startled conscience" of his age, we, with even greater justice, may call Nicholas the rebuking and judging conscience of his time. When the Emperor Charles the Bald complained of the tone which the Pope found good to adopt, Nicholas declared that, even if his rebuke were for once unmerited, the King must submit to it patiently, as Job submitted to the chastisement of God; it would then have an inner healing power. And the Emperor wrote to him: "We are ever ready to obey the commands of Your Holiness." The state of affairs in the different kingdoms of the Carolingian Empire was favourable to such pretensions.

When Nicholas, in face of the wretched Lothair of Lorraine, who was alarmed at his own immorality, maintained that a tyrant was not worthy of the name of ruler, he had the best men on his side. If we honour Charlemagne as the moral force of his time, we must admit that Nicholas stepped into his place. "Feed My sheep," the Lord had said to Peter; Nicholas was possessed by this great task; but instead of the shepherd's crook, he took the whip and the scorpion in his hand. Abbot Regino of Prüm in the Eifel, a serious observer, wrote after the Pope's death: "Since Gregory (the Great) of blessed memory, there has been no Pontiff like him. He issued his commands to kings and tyrants as if he were lord of the whole earth. To the bishops and priests who walked blameless after God's commandments he showed himself a mild and gracious ruler, but to those who turned from the right way he appeared hard and terrible, so that it might truly be said that in our day there was arisen a new Elias in spirit and in power if not in the flesh."

All, indeed, were not inclined to agree with this opinion, least of all the greater archbishops. Not only to the guilty consciences of the Bishops of Cologne and Treves, the shield-bearers of Lothair, was it insupportable that Nicholas

should "set himself up as the lord of all the earth." A man so far above his contemporaries in intellect as Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, was also of the number of the Pope's passionate opponents, although he stood by him in the dispute with Lothair. But this is not to be wondered at, when we remember that Hincmar was himself cut out for a Pope and was relentless in asserting his superiority over the Frankish bishops. On the other hand, the bishops had for many years already been inclined to seek support from the Pope against the increasingly autocratic rule of their metropolitans. They thought also that in him they would find the surest protection against the encroachments of the temporal power. It did not occur to them that if the Pope's arm was remote it could also reach far.

From this point of view we can understand the great forgery which, since it has been recognised as such, is usually called the collection of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. It was nothing less than an attempt made in the West Frankish Church, about the middle of the ninth century, to effect a complete transformation of the canon law, not by a systematic exposition but in such a way that the innovations appeared in the shape of forged papal circular letters (decretals), dating from the time of Clement I. to that of

Gregory II.* Rome had nothing whatever to do with the forgery. But when Nicholas heard of the Decretals, being like all despots but little scrupulous as to ways and means, he seized at once upon them and profited to the full by the immense advantages they offered him. It is true that when there was question of a judgment in a lawsuit, in which one of Hincmar's bishops had appealed against him to the Pope, on the strength of the Decretals, Hincmar objected that the canon law knew nothing of these letters; but Nicholas had his answer ready: "The Decretals of the Roman Pontiffs are to be obeyed, even if they are not to be found in the canon law." He boldly asserted that these decrees had been preserved in the archives of the Roman Church from early times. He curtly declared Hincmar guilty of

* The purport of the decretals was to render the priesthood immune from secular control, and to exalt the Papacy. Infringements of the rights of the clergy were declared to be sins against God's ordinance. Ecclesiastical causes were not to be judged by lay courts; and laymen might not appear as witnesses, or as accusers of the clergy. The validity of the official acts and words of the clergy was asserted to depend in no way on their personal character. The Pope was set forth as the fountain of ecclesiastical authority and justice. No secular power might call a council without his consent. No bishop might be tried by his metropolitan only, but by a provincial synod summoned by the Holy See. To the Pope every inferior might appeal, and no verdict was final without his sanction. (Trans.)

disobedience if he did not accept his decision, and threatened to depose him in case of refusal.

Nicholas had perhaps strung the bow too tightly; in any case, like his great predecessor in the fifth century, he had no successor who could keep it at the same tension. But the scenes which history, the great enchantress, next brings before us are so absolutely different that we might well imagine ourselves in another world. About the year 900 general ruin threatened the Christian civilisation of Western Europe; Normans, Slavs, Magyars, and Arabs were all pressing forward, and the Empire of Charlemagne was bleeding to death in civil and foreign wars. The Papacy also fell from its lofty position into the gulf of turbulence and confusion. The revolutions in Rome and Italy which bore now one, now another, warrior-prince on to the crest of the wave, swept the Papacy along also. German influence was a thing of the past. Pope Formosus (891–896), who had helped Arnulf of Carinthia to win the imperial crown, had to pay for this treasonable act after his death. His successor caused his body to be exhumed, sentenced by a synod, and thrown naked into the Tiber, after the finger used in blessing had been cut off.

This terrible deed introduces the period in the history of the Papacy which is generally

stigmatised as a pornocracy, or reign of harlots. And certainly Theodora, who took the name of Senatrix, and her daughters Theodora the younger and Marozia, paid little heed to morality. If, however, one takes up the position —a very unspiritual one, it must be admitted— that in men and women of supreme force of will looseness of morals is almost inevitable, one will rather be inclined to wonder at the magnificent audacity with which these highly gifted women used their great attractions to exploit the Roman nobles and even to bring Popes to their feet. Pope John XI. (931–936) was the son of Marozia, and her grandson Octavian, the son of the Margrave Alberic II.—who as "Patrician, Senator, and Grand Consul of Rome" ruled the State, and, the Popes being ineffective, the Church also, for nearly a quarter of a century—ascended the papal throne in 956 as John XII.—the first Pope, by the way, who changed his name.

During the whole of this time the imperial rights had been in abeyance. For their restoration the first thing needed was the clearing away of the *débris* of the Carolingian *régime* and the laying of new foundations for the work of reconstruction. Henry, the castle-builder, had no time to cross the Alps. His great son, Otto I. (936–973), was the first to take up again the

work of the first Emperor, but in a different way. He was a man of much prayer, and saw things in a supernatural light, to which Charlemagne, with his clear, practical vision, had not been susceptible. We may quite correctly speak of the "Holy Roman Empire of the German nation" that he established. The writers of the period, who paint the atrocities at Rome in the darkest colours, saw in Otto one who fulfilled a divine mission, and he himself felt that he was in some measure the representative of God. If only for this reason, it was impossible for him to permit any infringement of the supremacy of the Emperor when order was being restored in Rome. It is true that, before his coronation, he assured the Pope on oath that he would promulgate no laws and make no arrangements in Rome without consulting him. But though it had been already implied in this oath that the Emperor would also hold a court of justice in Rome, only not without an understanding with the immediate justiciary (*i.e.*, the Pope), no doubt whatever was left on this point in the decree issued after the coronation, in which Otto confirmed the donations of Pepin and Charles to the Roman See. Most important, however, is the provision in the deed that thenceforth no Pope should be recognised as such who had not taken, in the presence of

the King's envoys, the solemn oath which Otto demanded from Leo VIII., who was personally instituted by him.

All this is hard to understand, unless it be remembered that, before proceeding to Rome, Otto had put the relations of the German Church to the State upon a wholly new basis. In the time of Louis the Pious and his sons, the bishops had aimed at breaking free from that dependence on the State which had weighed so heavily upon them since the time of Charles Martel. Otto's rule acted as a counterblast to these aspirations, which had, moreover, been baffled by the unfavourable conditions of the time. The free election required by the Church's canons did not exist in the eyes of the King. When a bishopric fell vacant he chose a man acceptable to himself. From his royal master the new bishop received the Church property, which was made over to him to administer. The King gave him the ring and staff, emblems of his office (this was later called investiture), and asked little or nothing about his ecclesiastical qualifications.

This state of things, which lasted for a century, was bound, and the more so the longer it continued, to rouse the opposition of those who took a serious view of the Church's functions. The expression of this opposition came from the

monastery of Cluny and those other monastic communities which were founded or influenced by it.

In the year 910, when society was still in a state of general disorganisation, William, Count of Auvergne and Duke of Aquitaine, who had inherited the estate of Cluniacum in Burgundy, south of the modern Chalons, provided by will for the establishment of a monastic community there. The monastery was to be entirely independent and subject to no outside authority, whether secular or ecclesiastical. Even the Pope's interference in the affairs of the monastery was forbidden in respectful terms by the charter. It lay far from the thought of the pious duke, who was thus ministering to his soul's welfare, that this modest foundation of his would become the hearth from which the holy fire of the freedom of the Church would shortly blaze up to heaven. The great abbots Majolus, Odilo, and Hugo, who for a century and a half directed the destinies of Cluny, did their utmost to fan this fire, and its light soon shone over every country. First, the dissolute life of the monks had to be regenerated by closely uniting under the headship of Cluny the separate monasteries which showed themselves amenable to reform. Then the Church was wakened from her torpor, and her eyes opened

to the chains with which the earthly powers held her bound. New life was breathed into the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. And gradually, very gradually, there began to grow a desire to become master of those same earthly powers and to translate into fact the idea of the Kingdom of God on earth which had once taken shape in the mind of St. Augustine, that passionate spirit who could grasp at once the earthly and the heavenly, the idea that the Church is the Kingdom of God.

The mighty growth of this idea is one of the greatest spectacles to be seen in the history of the Church. France is laid under its spell, Lorraine serves as the bridge to Germany, it presses forward across the Alps, it approaches Rome, gains possession of the Papal See, and seizes upon the throne of the world, embodied in the mighty hierarchs whose aim is to compel the rulers of the nations into their service.

In the meantime the Empire and the Papacy had once more formed an almost mystical alliance. The piety of Otto showed itself again in his grandson Otto III. (983–1002), but in a fantastic and distorted form. This romantic youth, who took up his residence in Rome and manifested by the magnificence of his court the preference for Byzantine ways of living which he had inherited from his Greek mother, grati-

fied his unbalanced religious aspirations by severe penances, visited monastery after monastery, and once even thought of assuming the monastic habit. Towards the Papacy he played the part of ruler without seeing that he himself was becoming more and more the tool of the Pope. Pope Sylvester II. (999–1003), while still Gerbert, Archbishop of Rheims, had won the easily inflamed heart of the impetuous youth by his many-sided culture and his sagacious counsel. This distinguished man of letters, to whom legend has imputed a league with the devil, was also an extremely astute politician. As archbishop he combated the Pseudo-Isidorian canon-law, as Pope he begged for the blessing of Cluny and gave his mind to the subordination of the State to the Church. At the same time he nourished in his imperial admirer the fantastic dream of an universal monarchy and succeeded in keeping him to the end in the illusion that he was leading while in reality he was being led.

The reigns of the first Salic Emperors were not favourable to the Popes' desire for independence. Conrad II. and Henry III. held firmly to the rights of the Crown, as they had received them from Otto I. And yet things were otherwise than under the Saxon emperors. Cluny had not worked in vain. The bishops

and abbots were still faithful to the King, but they had learnt that a bishop or an abbot, by reason of his vocation, was different from a duke or a count, and they began to feel that their unconditional inclusion in the official order of the Empire was a hindrance to their spiritual mission. Henry III. (1039–56), who was otherwise minded than his father, fully understood this mission. Nor must it be overlooked that in Agnes, the mother of Henry IV., he had married a princess of the house of Aquitaine, in which the idea associated with the name of Cluny was, so to speak, hereditary. But when he checked simony, *i.e.*, the deeply rooted evil of exploiting the gift of spiritual offices for material ends—he did so by virtue of his rights as Emperor, even when the Papacy was concerned. It was by virtue of these rights that Henry, in the splendid synod of Sutri, deposed two Popes (1046) and forced the third to resign; it was by virtue of these rights that he made a German prelate Pope, and, on his death shortly after, yet another, so that the appointment to the Papal Chair appeared more than ever to have become the Emperor's concern. But when Henry raised his cousin, Bishop Bruno of Toul, to the Holy See, it so happened that his nominee carried with him into his high office the ideas of Cluny, in which he was entirely wrapped up,

and helped to prepare the overthrow of the imperial rights.

Leo IX. (1049–54), the first Pope since Nicholas I. to be numbered among the Saints of the Church, made his entrance into Rome in the garb of a pilgrim. He would not enter upon his office until he had submitted himself to the election of both clergy and laity, as the rule of the Church required. He honestly used the few years of his pontificate to restore the authority of Rome over the nations. He took frequent journeys, and at the synods he himself saw that things went right. It was, however, the yearly Lenten synod held in Rome which served him as the means of showing to the whole Church that in Peter's Chair also that spirit of reform had become active, which had long spoken to Christendom through the abbots of Cluny. For centuries the Church had been unaccustomed to listen to the Pope in religious matters. Even now all did not lend him a willing ear; but the change was at hand.

About the same time the union between the Greek and Roman Churches, which had so often been endangered and only patched up with difficulty, came finally to an end. There had been no question of any sort of common life since the synod held in 692 in the great hall of the Emperor's Palace in Constantinople, which

had been convoked as an ecumenical synod, but had not been recognised by Rome, and had given sharp expression to the antagonism between the two Churches as regards ritual and government. Only once more was any action taken in common. At Nicæa in 787 the seventh general synod established the principles of the veneration of images for the whole Church. When, shortly after, the Western Church made the addition to the third article of the Nicene Creed that the Holy Ghost proceeded not only from the Father—as the words ran till then—but also from the Son, both the devout and the mighty in the Greek Church took fright at such heresy. When, moreover, Pope Nicholas took advantage of his ascendency to interfere in the internal affairs of the sister Church, the latter bluntly refused (879) to admit the Roman claims. Since then nearly two centuries had elapsed. The situation had finally become intolerable. Greatly against his will Leo IX. was forced to carry out the judgment already pronounced by the centuries. The patriarch Michael Cærularius, availing himself of certain diplomatic obeisances which his imperial master, hard beset by wars, had made to the Pope, had renewed in an intensified form the old reproaches against Rome. The dissensions which resulted from this could not be smoothed over. So it

came to pass that on July 16, 1054, the envoys of Leo IX. laid the papal sentence of excommunication on the altar of the Church of St. Sophia, and it has remained in force up to the present day. When they returned to Rome they found the Pope dead.

The Cardinal-bishop Humbert, one of the most trusted of the Pope's confidants, had been one of the envoys. A few years after the incident in Constantinople he published a treatise, "Against the Simonists," in which the programme of the Church reformers is expounded more clearly than anywhere else. His interpretation of the past is worthy of attention. Every disorder in the Church is due to the Ottos, who wrested the government from the Roman pontiffs. They arrogated to themselves rights which belong only to the "sacerdotium" (the priesthood), by investing clerics with the crosier. Now simony rages in every country. Nor was the judgment of God lacking. The Ottos barely reached the third generation, and Henry II. died childless. Humbert approves only of Henry III.; because he tried to root out simony, he has gone to a better world. But even Henry III.'s pious behaviour cannot alter the fact that the Church has her own laws as well as her own judges, viz., those she has placed in authority. Only when these last

neglect their duties should a temporal ruler be called in to help. And the priestly order is the highest: it is like the eyes in the human head, while the lay power resembles the breast and arms and must obey and defend the Church. It is no mere coincidence that about the same time the austere Peter Damiani, another champion of high Church ideas, uses for the first time the metaphor by which after him the relation between Church and State is always explained—the metaphor of the two swords. "The kingship and the priesthood," writes Damiani, "have each their respective provinces: the king wields the weapons of this world, the priest is girded with the sword of the Spirit, *i.e.*, God's Word," and: "Well is it when the sword of the kingship is so allied with the sword of the priesthood that the sword of the priest mitigates the sharpness of the Emperor's sword, and the Emperor's sword gives an edge to that of the priest. Then will both be had in great honour."

These thoughts also filled the mind of the man who, long before he astonished the world as Gregory VII., had the ruling of the Church. Hildebrand had grown up in poor circumstances. It is not known for certain where he was born. He appears to have come in his early youth to Rome and there to have been educated in a

monastery. It is still doubtful whether he ever became a monk, though it is probable that he did, and also that he was, if only for a short time, at Cluny. Leo IX., with whom he entered Rome, gave him an office in the administration and he very soon gained great, even preponderating, influence. His hand is recognisable in all the papal elections after Leo's death. It was he who induced Nicholas II. (1059–61) to issue, at the Roman synod of 1059, the decree which placed the election of the Pope in the hands of the cardinals and reduced the influence of the Emperor to practically nothing. He guided the foreign policy of the Holy See into new channels, he formed new ties and prepared everything for the contest which had become inevitable.

During the last few years the Papacy had gained new allies in Italy. The Normans, towards whom Leo IX. had made advances, and who had for a short time held the Holy Father prisoner, were brought over to the papal camp by Robert Guiscard—it was Hildebrand who received the Duke's oath of fealty. "In the defection of the Normans from the German Empire it sustained one of its greatest losses," writes Ranke, and "through the alliance with them the Pope became Emperor in Southern Italy." Godfrey of Lorraine took his duchy in

fee from Alexander II. (1061–73), Gregory's immediate predecessor, and in his step-daughter Matilda, the great Countess of Tuscany, the Holy See had a fervent adherent. But the Roman statesmen took advantage, in a particularly skilful way, of the movement of the lower classes in the republican cities of Northern Italy—called "Pataria" from a street in Milan—with the socialistic aims of which were associated the catchwords against simony and the marriage of priests. The less the Papacy was certain of the higher clergy in Upper Italy, the more important it was to procure definite support from the party opposed to them.

The development of affairs in Germany was particularly fortunate for the Papacy. Henry III. had died on October 5, 1056, in his thirty-ninth year. It is impossible to imagine what would have happened if, instead of his son, who was swayed in all directions by the most varied influences, this great ruler had been able to guide the destinies of Germany for another generation. The ultramontane attack would have encountered a steadier and more intelligent opposition, and this opposition would have been the more effective in that Henry was capable of understanding the legitimate claims of the Church. Now, just at the critical moment when—for the first time

for centuries—a papal party was beginning to form itself again in Germany, there was no one to give heed to events full of menace for the future and with a firm hand to nip the evil in the bud. Adalbert, the great Archbishop of Bremen, who saw further than his colleagues, fell a victim to the government of the nobles at the court of the young king. We see the Bishop of Constance, who had been invested by Henry IV. himself with the ring and staff, solemnly resigning his office because he had stained it with simony. And February, 1073, brings the event that reveals for the first time the acuteness of the impending conflict: two candidates contend for the archiepiscopal see of Milan; the King is asked for his approval of the papal candidate, and, when he refuses it, Alexander takes a step of immeasurable significance: he excommunicates the royal councillors. A few weeks pass; the Pope dies, and the next day Gregory comes forward as the absolute ruler of the Church.

CHAPTER VI

GREGORY VII. AND HIS SUCCESSORS

UNDER the title of "What belongs to the Roman Pontiff," Cardinal Deusdedit, a distinguished canonist of the time, put together twenty-seven short propositions which were included in the collection of Gregory VII.'s State letters, and thus acquired an official character. The claims contained in this so-called "Dictatus Gregorii Papæ" are based on the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, but taken together they exceed anything previously heard of. The following are the main points: The Pope has absolute power over the Church—he alone can depose bishops or receive them again into her communion, and that without a synod being necessary; he can translate a bishop from one see to another, if it appears necessary, and can appoint clergy to any church at his good pleasure; no general synod can be summoned except at his command; his

legate has precedence of all the bishops, even when he is of lower ecclesiastical rank, and no canonical decision can be recognised without his sanction; all the more important lawsuits must be submitted to him; he himself, however, is to be judged of none. His absolute superiority to all temporal authority is also laid down—the Pope may depose the Emperor; he may release subjects from their oath of allegiance to "unrighteous" rulers; he may bear imperial insignia, and all rulers must kiss his feet. And over and above all this rises the idea that a lawfully elected Pope undoubtedly becomes a saint through the merit of the blessed Peter, and that the Roman Church—*i.e.*, the Pope—has never erred, and, as Scripture testifies, never can err.

That Gregory VII. was wholly possessed by these notions, and that he strove with unwearied energy to translate them into fact, is evident from all his public utterances, as well as from all his actions. But he needed no canon-law, genuine or forged. He drew from his inmost being the conception of the life-task which he held to be imposed upon him by the chief of the apostles, who "with especial love had sheltered him from his childhood under his wings and cherished him in his bosom." It is not without purpose that

he always appeals to St. Peter, who "takes his name from the strong rocks, who bursts open the gates of hell and with iron strength breaks in pieces and scatters all that opposes him." In the name of the Apostle he fights for the extension of the Divine righteousness on earth, and to his last breath he clung to that faith. He would keep the peace with all, except those who raise their hand against St. Peter. But that is just what the present rulers do. Their government certainly has its justification, but only so far as they themselves are servants of that righteousness which is embodied in the Church. Fools are those who say that a Roman pontiff may not excommunicate the Emperor. Does not every man know that "kings and princes took their origin from those who, without knowledge of God, prompted by the devil, the Prince of this world, in blind passion and intolerable pride, usurped the lordship over their fellows—*i.e.*, over mankind—with insolence, robbery, treachery, and murder—in short, with almost every kind of crime?" With their blood-stained hands they present the sacred emblems to those who administer the Sacrament. Is it not a sacrilege that princes and nobles decide who, in the name of Christ, shall feed His flock—yea, that they even make a trade of

it? And these pastors are themselves fast bound in the chains of worldliness, they live with wife and child, they, the priests of God, who, free from all earthly cares, should live only for their sacred work.

At the very first Lenten synod, held in February, 1074, Gregory enjoined afresh the celibacy of priests, and in the following year added further the regulation that it was forbidden to hear Mass said by married priests. He met with fierce opposition. At a synod at Erfurt, summoned by the Archbishop of Mayence, there were tumultuous protests. The Pope also set his face against lay investiture. At the synod of 1075 he disallowed the right of secular authorities to confer bishoprics, and forbade all participation of the laity in the bestowal of ecclesiastical offices. But he did more: he once again excommunicated the Emperor's councillors. And he did all this in spite of the fact that he was himself in a perilous position. The good relations with the Normans had come to an end, the popular movement in Northern Italy, which the Pope had encouraged, had suffered many checks, the upper clergy in Germany were opposed to him, and the power of the Emperor seemed as strong as ever. But this same power did not stand the test applied to it.

Henry IV. is one of those historical figures that make a bad impression because they were so entirely unsuccessful. The fault was his in a lesser degree only. Few kings confronted with so responsible a task have been such victims of circumstances as he; and we feel, again and again, how disastrous was the early death of his father. While Rome was gathering all her forces for a tremendous effort, the royal authority in Germany was beginning to weaken. The trend of the papal policy could have been discerned by any one, however short-sighted, from the events under Alexander II., though truly there was little reason to expect such a reckless onslaught as that with which Gregory set to work. Least of all was the young King, who had not yet concerned himself with ecclesiastical politics, prepared. Thus Gregory enjoyed all the advantages of the attacking party. Further, he had the special advantage of being able to use the current gossip about the private life of the King to show himself the upholder of law and morality. He cared little for the arts of diplomacy. It is hard to think of anything less politic than the private message to the King with which he commenced hostilities in December, 1075. He exaggerated the gossip into a crime, and threatened Henry with excommu-

nication. No wonder the King took such treatment ill, especially as in the autumn he had received a letter from the Pope, courteously expressed and sincerely meant, congratulating him on his victory over the Saxons. That in face of such an attack he could still rely upon the clergy was proved by the synod immediately convened at Worms. It was a fortunate coincidence for him that, in this assembly, in any case ill-disposed towards Gregory, Cardinal Hugo Candidus, who had quarrelled with the Pope, heaped the most serious charges on Gregory, even to the dreadful suggestion that the death of the last Pope lay at his door. Brought forward by a man in a position to know, such accusations did not fail to make an impression, the more so that no one paused to take into consideration the Cardinal's animosity and dishonesty.

Thereupon the King put pressure on the assembly, and made each bishop sign a form in which he renounced obedience to the Pope. He himself sent the following haughty epistle to Gregory :—

"Henry, King not by usurpation but by the gracious dispensation of God, to Hildebrand, not the Pope but a false monk. This greeting hast thou deserved according to thine own confession, thou who hast spared no rank in the

Church, giving not a blessing but a curse. The rulers of Holy Church, archbishops, bishops, and priests, the anointed of the Lord, hast thou trodden underfoot like slaves, and thereby won for thyself the favour of the populace. All this have we borne with patience because we desired to uphold the honour of the Holy See. But thou hast taken our reverence for fear, hast insolently rebelled against our royal dignity conferred upon us by God, and hast threatened to deprive us of it, as if we had received our authority from thee, as if kingship and empire lay in thy hands, and not in the hands of God; though Christ, our Lord, raised us to the kingly office, but not thee to the priestly office. Thou hast risen by steps involving cunning, bribery, and violence; thou hast mounted the throne of peace and from it hast destroyed peace by arming inferiors against their superiors, by teaching contempt of our bishops, called of God, and by giving to the laity power over priests. . . . Me too, who, unworthy among the anointed, have been anointed ruler, hast thou assailed, though the holy Fathers teach that God alone can judge me, and that I can be deposed for no crime but that, which God forbid, of turning from the faith . . . St. Peter, the true Pope, exclaims: 'Fear God, honour the king.' But because thou fearest not God, thou

honourest not His anointed. . . . Therefore come down from thy place, loaded with the curse of our bishops and condemned by our judgment. Leave the apostolic throne which thou hast usurped. Let another take St. Peter's Chair, one who cloaks not his violence with religion, but teaches the true doctrine of Peter. I, Henry, by the grace of God King, with all my bishops, say unto thee, 'Down! down!'"

This step has been regarded with good reason as an act of stupidity, to be explained, indeed, by justifiable excitement and therefore to be excused, but none the less fatal. When the imperial envoys called upon the Pope, before the assembled synod in the Lateran, to vacate his see, there ensued a tremendous tumult, and Gregory appears to have protected them at the risk of his own life. Supported by the feeling of the Roman clergy, which found an echo far beyond the walls of Rome, he took immediate action. He excommunicated Siegfried, Archbishop of Mayence, who had presided at the Synod of Worms; he allowed the others who had taken part in it a certain time for retractation; finally, in the solemn form of a prayer to the Apostle, his patron saint, he also excommunicated and deposed the King:—

"Holy Peter, chief of the Apostles, incline, I pray thee, thine ear to me, hear me, thy

servant, whom thou hast nourished from childhood, and hast saved to this day out of the hand of the enemies who have hated and still hate me because I serve thee in truth. Thou art my witness, and my Lady the mother of God is witness, thy holy brother Paul also and all the saints, that thy Holy Roman Church has placed me at her head against my will, that I counted it not robbery to ascend to thy chair, and that rather would I end my days in foreign lands than snatch at thy seat by worldly intrigues. Of thy free grace, not because of my works, did it please thee that the Christian people entrusted to thy care should obey me as thy delegate, and for thy sake has the power been granted me to bind and to loose in heaven and on earth. Being full of this confidence, for the honour and protection of thy Church, in the name of Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, by virtue of thy authority, I deprive King Henry, son of the Emperor Henry, who, with unexampled pride, has risen against thy Church, of the government of the whole Empire of Germany and Italy, I release all Christians from the oath which they have made, or yet may make to him, and hereby forbid any man to serve him as King. For it is meet that whosoever strives to diminish the honour of thy Church should himself lose the

honour which he seems to have. And because he scorns to obey like a Christian, and returns not to the Lord, whom he has renounced by fellowship with the excommunicated, by divers evil deeds, by despising my admonitions administered for his salvation, and by separating himself from the Church, I do bind him, in thy name, with the bonds of anathema, that the nations may know and confess that thou art Peter, and that upon this rock the Son of the living God has built His Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

We have given these documents almost in their entirety because they are couched in terms, needing no comment, such as had never yet been heard of in history. That secular and spiritual, kingship and priesthood must necessarily come into sharp conflict on certain points we have known since the time of Agamemnon, and there are examples enough in the history of the world to prove it. Centuries ago a Pope had shown the Byzantine Emperor his proper place when he dared to infringe upon the right of the Church to self-government. But here there is more at stake. It is no longer merely a question of the wish to protect the Church from the unjustifiable encroachments of an Otto I., however good his intentions towards her, or of the pious efforts of the abbots of Cluny, however

certain it is that they had their place in Gregory's thoughts. It is rather the feeling of omnipotence of one who knows himself to be carrying out the command of a heavenly Master. The sentence of excommunication strikes a king! Nay, more, much more—for excommunication is an ecclesiastical weapon—the king is deposed! A thousand years lie behind us. Out of the mists of the past the Galilean fisherman rises up, and behind him another, greater than he; the words "Feed My sheep!" ring in our ears.

It was soon seen how incorrectly King Henry had estimated his strength. At Whitsuntide, when the King convened a new assembly at Worms, hardly any one came; a few weeks later the same thing occurred again at Mayence. One bishop after another forgot the form which he had signed. The King was excommunicated. Papal legates travelled about the country. They stirred up feeling against Henry among the lay nobles, of whom the more important had always been in opposition. Under these conditions came on the Diet at Tribur in the autumn of 1076. There, too, the legates had been at work, and the result was that the princes made the mortifying, humiliating demand to their King that he should obtain absolution within the next few months,

if he wished to remain sure of their obedience.

In these straits Henry recovered his senses. His crown hung in the balance. The son of Henry III. was in danger of losing everything. He hears that the revolted nobles are reckoning on the Pope's crossing the Alps to judge Henry on German soil. That must be prevented at all costs. The sentence of excommunication is his opponent's weapon. It must be wrested from him. How hard it was for the man who had been master of the Pope to go to Canossa is not mentioned in any of the accounts. On the other hand, the scene itself has been described with abundance of detail. We have no need of these details to realise the tremendous import of the event. A king, a German king, stands as a penitent, barefoot, in a hair-shirt before the foreign priest! Whether he stood there for hours or for days, it seems as if we could not efface the stain that clings to the crown.

That it was a stain would have been felt by none more keenly than by the King himself. We do not know how he came to make up his mind to it, nor can we say positively of any one of his advisers that he influenced his actions in this time of stress. It is certain that the resolution was good, was necessary.

Canossa was the catastrophe in the drama. But the drama should be called not "Henry IV.," but "Gregory VII.," and if it had a tragic ending it was Gregory who had to atone for it. He could not in the face of Countess Matilda and the Abbot of Cluny, his supporters, in the face of the Church, and above all in the face of his own conscience and his conviction that he stood in the Apostle's place, take upon himself to refuse absolution to a penitent sinner, were he Emperor or thrall. He gave way therefore. He must have known that in so doing he was giving away the game, and indeed this is clear from the explanatory letter which he sent to the German princes immediately after the event. It does him credit that he allowed the priest in him to conquer the statesman. He thus in his fashion expiated the fact that, carried away by irresistible forces, he had overstepped the limits of the office for which he lived. But politically he was the vanquished party.

Henry had assured Gregory on oath that he would, within a time to be fixed by the Pope, come to an agreement with the nobles in accordance with the Pope's sentence or award. Moreover, he had promised Gregory a safe-conduct for a journey to Germany. Neither a journey nor an agreement, however, came to

pass. Instead, the princes assembled at Forchheim in the district of Bamberg, elected in March, 1077 an anti-King in the person of Rudolf, Duke of Swabia, without the participation of the Pope, it would seem, though his legates were present. But the opposition which led to this action—a doubtful one from every point of view—was ill-organised, and the blow was not nearly as severe for Henry as it would have been if he had still been excommunicated. Events now proved that the King was much stronger than had been supposed. Not only the greater part of the nobility, but also the town population remained faithful to him, and he could rely upon his troops. In addition he was sure of the support of the bishops in Upper Italy, who remained steadily opposed to Gregory.

It is not necessary for our purpose to follow the details of the political and military moves and countermoves with which the next few years were filled. But it is important to lay stress upon the fact that Gregory more and more lost command of the situation. He could no longer hold in check, even in himself, the spirits he had called up. Once more, at the Lenten synod of 1080, he stringently enjoined observance of the decrees regarding simony and lay investiture, and in this he was in the

right. But when, again in the form of a solemn invocation, though this time to both the chief apostles, he excommunicated Henry anew, deprived him of his kingdom because of his disobedience, and handed it over to Rudolf; and when he grounded this action on the fact that the apostles, having the right to bind and to loose in heaven, can here on earth take empires, kingdoms, princedoms, duke-doms, margraviates and earldoms, in fine all secular property, from any person and grant them to another according to merit, it may well be asked whom he could hope to convince. The means actually at his disposal were in sharp contrast to his pretensions. It is true that he had won back Robert Guiscard, and the great Countess who ruled Central Italy and could hold Northern Italy in check remained faithful to him. But that was not enough to prevent Henry from declaring Gregory deposed (at Brixen, in the summer of the same year) and appointing an anti-Pope in the person of the Archbishop of Ravenna, who took the name of Clement III. Moreover Rudolf of Swabia died of a wound received in battle, and on the same day Matilda's troops were beaten by the King's supporters.

Any one with a sense of the dramatic must be strangely impressed by the sight of Gregory

standing unmoved by the storm which rages around him, with the heavens now dark, now fiercely illumined. The King remains excommunicate, but he lays siege to Rome. Months, years go by: he enters Rome; his Pope gives him the imperial crown, but Gregory remains intrenched in the Castle of St. Angelo, till Robert Guiscard forces the imperial army to withdraw, and takes the Pope with him to Salerno. There Gregory died, May 25, 1085.

A writer at the beginning of the twelfth century was the first to record the last words of the Pope: "I loved righteousness, I hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile." Whether he said these words or not, they contain the truth. The great antithesis "righteous" and "unrighteous" which runs through the Scriptures, especially the Old Testament (cf. *e.g.* Ezek. xviii.), also determined Gregory's view of the world. And righteousness is always in the Church, iniquity in the State. It is not only the encroachments of the secular power that constitute its unrighteousness. When Gregory spoke of the discord between the Empire and the Apostolic See, he did not mean a temporary difference, but a fundamental antagonism of principle. The State has the right to exist only in so far as it is subject to the Holy See, and its righteousness consists

in the fulfilment of the duties consequent on this subjection, else it is sinful. Naturally this applies to all states. In the spirit of this theory Gregory required the oath of fealty from William the Conqueror, and received it from many lesser rulers. That Spain belonged to the Holy See was for him a matter of course; had not St. Paul worked there, and had not both St. Peter and St. Paul sent bishops thither? It was also a self-evident consequence that all legitimate rights ceased to exist when the Holy See called upon subjects to rebel against them.

In his influence over the minds of men, Gregory ranks with those who have greatly stirred the world. It seemed as if men had been asleep until he came. Roused from their slumbers, they fell on one another in bitter conflict. A whole literature grew out of this strife: now the cry is Gregory, now Henry, now the State, now the Church, now sin, now righteousness. Seldom does a peace-maker venture to raise his voice, and no one heeds it. Only very gradually does it come to be recognised that the power over earthly things which Gregory had claimed in the name of the Church, by no means guaranteed that freedom of the Church from earthliness which was the common aim of all reformers. Men bethought them-

selves once more that kingship and priesthood were diverse in every respect. They remembered also what had been the central point of the antagonism. That the king should confer office on a priest had been felt to be a sin against the Holy Ghost. Yet, if the priest desired to exercise other than ecclesiastical rights, he must allow the secular authority a voice in his appointment. Therefore the priest must either renounce all secular rights, the "sæcularia," and be content with the "spiritualia," the exercise of his spiritual office, for which he was answerable only to the Lord of Hosts, or else, he must render to the Church what belonged to the Church, and render to the State what belonged to the State. The Church gives the bishop the ring and staff, the signs of his spiritual authority, thus investing, clothing him with his office; the secular authority may also give him the sceptre and receive his oath of fealty in exchange.

The Cluniac monk Urban II., who after the short rule of Victor II. (1085–87) was Pope for twelve years (1088–99), showed no signs of going back on the schemes and pretensions which he had inherited from Gregory; on the contrary, he sought rather to outdo his model. But Paschal II. (1099–1118) entered into the new ideas. The first of the two alternatives, however, at

once showed itself impracticable. When Paschal made a mild attempt to induce the higher clergy to give up their temporal possessions, in so far as they were feudatory, his imprudence almost cost him his throne. The other method seemed all the more promising. It fell to the lot, not of Paschal, but of his next successor but one, Calixtus II. (1119–24), to carry the matter through. In 1122 the remarkable arrangement was made between him and Henry V., which is known to history as the Concordat of Worms. The following are the documents: "In the name of the holy and indivisible Trinity, I, Henry, by the grace of God Roman Emperor, for the love of God transfer to the Holy Roman Church and to the Lord Pope Calixtus, and, for the sake of my salvation, to God and to His holy apostles Peter and Paul and to the Holy Catholic Church, all investiture with ring and staff, and I permit ecclesiastical election and free consecration in all the churches of my kingdom and Empire. The possessions and the sovereign rights [regalia] of St. Peter which have been taken away since the beginning of this time of dispute to the present day, under my father's rule or mine, do I restore, so far as I possess them, to the Holy Roman Church, and will, so far as I do not possess them, conscientiously cause them to be restored to her. The possessions also of all

the other Churches and lords and of all other clergy and laity which in this time of confusion have been lost to their owners will I restore, so far as I have them, conformably to justice and the counsel of the princes, and, so far as I have them not, I will conscientiously cause them to be restored. I do also promise true peace to the Lord Calixtus and to the Holy Roman Church and to all who are or have been on their side. And when the Holy Roman Church requires my support, I will faithfully help her, and when she brings complaints to me I will see proper justice done to her."

The Pope replies:—

"I, Calixtus, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, swear to thee, my very dear son Henry, by the grace of God, Roman Emperor, that the election of the bishops and abbots in the German Empire, in so far as they belong to the German kingdom, shall take place in thy presence without simony or force of any kind. If dissensions should arise between the parties, thou shalt give thine assent and support to the more reasonable side, conformably to the advice of the metropolitan and the other bishops of the province. The man elected shall receive the rights of sovereignty [regalia] from thee by means of the sceptre and shall fulfil the duties incident thereon. In the other parts of the Empire the con-

secrated person [*i.e.*, not the elected person] shall receive the rights of sovereignty [regalia] within six months by means of the sceptre, and shall fulfil the duties which thus devolve upon him. Excepted from this is all that belongs to the Roman Church [*i.e.*, to the Pope as temporal sovereign]. If thou bringest a complaint before me or requirest my support, I will give it to thee conformably to the duties of my office. Also I do promise true peace to thee and to all them who in this dispute are or have been on thy side."

The tone of this is indeed different from that of the letters of Henry IV. and Gregory. And yet it is not peace. The Concordat of Worms was only a truce. Like all treaties it looked well on paper; in reality the points of disagreement were too numerous for settlement. The Papacy emerged from the investiture struggle a great power, claiming one of the first places among the political factors of the time. But its ambition was not satisfied: the great power wished to become a world power. Nor was it only ambition. When the idea that the Apostle should rule the nations as well as the Church had once taken form, it was not to be expected that it would ever be forgotten. The heritage of Gregory was not thrown away.

CHAPTER VII

AT THE SUMMIT OF POWER

FOR the carrying on of wars and the making of treaties, money and soldiers are needed. Since the time of Gregory VII., the Papacy, with unresting energy, has taken care to provide itself with both. In the celibate clergy of all countries it created a faithful and often blindly devoted army, whose intelligence was kept within the bounds necessary for obedience, while a highly developed consciousness of spiritual and secular power was awakened in them by granting them privileges of all kinds. At the second Lateran Council—the name is given to the assemblies which grew out of the Lenten synods held in Rome, and in which the splendour of the old ecumenical councils was revived—the principle of the inviolability of the clergy on pain of excommunication was laid down. That priests or monks should be cited before a secular court of justice was condemned

as sacrilege. The freedom of the clergy from secular charges and taxes was demanded, though not immediately carried through. Finally the abolition of lay investiture resulted in practice in a great diminution of secular influence, however much energetic rulers might contend for their rights or more than their rights.

The headquarters of this army were in Rome. There the Pope had his court, his Curia (Lat. *curia*, a court), as it became the custom to call it after the middle of the eleventh century, in spite of the opposition of many clergy of the old school who considered it a degradation to apply such a worldly expression to the Holy Roman Church. There he formed his general staff, the Cardinals, *i.e.*, the bishops of his—in the local sense—Roman province, and the priests and deacons in whom he had special confidence. From there he directed his army by means of his legates, his ambassadors, to whom he handed over his right to interfere with the ordinary powers of the bishops. Thither, too, was to be directed the flow of funds which the field-marshal needed in order to live in princely fashion and rule undisturbed.

He drew these funds only in part from the property of the Roman Church, though it had increased enormously since the time of Gregory the Great. Even with what he drew from his

own diocese in revenue and dues there was hardly enough for the most necessary expenses. An important source of income was the Peter's Pence, the tribute to the Holy See instituted by the English kings in the eleventh century, and soon to be levied also from the northern kingdoms and Hungary and the neighbouring districts, while France, Spain, and Germany refused to pay it. Further there were the fees claimed by the Pope for the consecration or confirmation of bishops or the conferring of the "Pallium," the shoulder ornament of archbishops, manufactured in Rome. Finally the exercise of jurisdiction as the highest ecclesiastical court of appeal and the right of dispensation from ecclesiastical laws brought large sums of money to Rome, though the increasing venality of the Roman authorities on this point roused much indignation. As early as the twelfth century the Oxford deacon, Walter Map, gave expression to the general feeling in the following lines:—

> "When thou to Rome to journey makest bold,
> Her judgment seeking, this in memory hold:
> Rome sure will wrong thee if thou giv'st not gold;
> Justice and right at Rome for cash are sold."

With such ample provision Rome might venture upon the struggle for the empire of

the world, and chance favoured the venture. Since the eleventh century the longing for the possession of the holy places in the East and wrath at their being in the hands of infidels had been growing stronger and stronger in Western Christendom. The Popes succeeded in organising the movement. Sylvester II. had conceived the idea of a crusade, and Gregory VII., before his breach with Henry IV., had occupied himself energetically with it; he had once written to the King that he wished to go himself to Palestine at the head of an army. The plan first took definite shape under Urban II. The part which the pious Hermit of Amiens is said to have had in bringing about the holy war has been reduced by sober investigation to very modest proportions. The Pope's share was therefore all the greater; he inspired the cry of "Dieu le veut" at the assembly at Clermont (1095), and gave the right emphasis to the general enthusiasm by his promise of plenary absolution to all crusaders. Urban did not live to see the conquest of Jerusalem, but the fortunate conclusion of the war while it opened a new era in European history also gave fresh prestige to the papal see.

The twelfth century brought troublous times. The Papacy became once more a plaything

in the hands of the Roman nobility, and Innocent II. (1130–43) needed the help of Lothair of Supplinburg to enable him to return to Rome whence he had been driven by the Pierleoni and their Pope Anacletus. But it was a time of general fermentation, new things were everywhere in the air, and those at the head of the Church were as yet perplexed as to the course to pursue. In France there was a revival of learning. The daring Abelard explains to hundreds in his school on the Mont Ste. Geneviève in Paris that everything in the tradition of the Church is not equally valuable; he exasperates the great monks like Norbert of Xanten and Bernard of Clairvaux by his audacious criticism, but the younger generation applauds him. In secret conventicles the pious whisper to each other that the whole Church system, worldly as it has become, together with its head in Rome, belongs to the devil. Fanatics go about preaching resistance to ecclesiastical authority. At the same time the Papacy itself is hit by the attempt to set up a republic in Rome—an extension of the struggle for independence which had long been going on in secret in the cities of Northern Italy. Pope Lucius II. (1144–45) was killed by a stone thrown during the street fighting that ravaged the holy city. But

a religious character was given to the democratic plans of the leaders of the Roman citizens by the idealism of Arnold of Brescia, the ascetic of whom Bernard said, parodying Scripture: "There came a man who ate not, neither did he drink, but with the devil he thirsted after the blood of souls." He became the apostle of the masses, who cheered him when he denied the right of the Pope and clergy to temporal power and authority, though he failed to inspire them with his stern contempt of the world.

Meanwhile complications with Germany were again imminent. The family of the Hohenstaufen had risen to power in circumstances that put them under obligations to the Church. Conrad III. (1138–52) owed to ecclesiastical aid his victory over the Guelph candidate for the throne. He did not interfere in the confusion in Italy. Repeated invitations from Rome to cross the Alps and receive the crown at the hands of the people failed to move him. Still less were the Romans successful with his nephew, Frederick Barbarossa (1152–90), whose imperial pride they wounded by representing to him that he had been wrong in neglecting to obtain the ratification of his election from Rome, the mistress of the world, the creator and mother of all the Emperors.

The answer to this ridiculous demand was the treaty which Frederick concluded with Pope Eugenius III. in 1153, in which he promised to subdue the city. To carry out this promise was the object of his first expedition to Rome. The result was the hanging of Arnold of Brescia, and the coronation of Frederick as Emperor by Hadrian IV.

The relations between the Emperor and the Pope did not long remain friendly. Hadrian (1154–59), an Englishman by birth, was cast in a different mould from that of his predecessor, who, influenced by the pious Abbot of Clairvaux, could never have taken pleasure in the exercise of temporal power. His reign only lasted five years, but in this short time he showed that he felt himself strong enough to return to the traditions of Gregory VII. Frederick, on the other hand, cherished the idea of restoring the old early Christian Empire, of which Justinian appeared to him the most brilliant representative. Inspired by the code of Justinian he had his imperial rights confirmed on the plain of Roncaglia. But in so doing he had reckoned neither with the increased independence of the cities of Northern Italy nor with the augmented strength of the Papacy. The former he succeeded in overthrowing temporarily, only to suffer the most

crushing defeat later; the latter opposed the Emperor with the full force of its apostolic claims, to which that generation had become quite unaccustomed.

As was the case with Hildebrand under Alexander II., Cardinal Roland, who as Hadrian's successor took the name of Alexander III. (1159–81), had become the leading spirit of the papal government under his predecessor. He was an eminent jurist who, when professor at Bologna, had published one of the first commentaries on the version of the canon law known as the "Decretum Gratiani," compiled about the middle of the century by the Camaldolite Gratian, and soon acknowledged as the standard text-book. He also tried his hand at theology in a manual on dogma, written according to Abelard's method, though not in his spirit. Hadrian entrusted the most important missions to the Chancellor of the Church. It was while on one of these that the Cardinal handed the Emperor at the Diet at Besançon in 1157 that arrogant letter from the Pope, which so angered Frederick that he expelled the envoys forthwith. Thus when Roland became Pope there was added to the already inherent antagonism of Papacy and Empire, the personal antagonism of Pope and Emperor. Frederick immediately appointed a

rival to his enemy in the person of Victor IV., succeeded by Paschal III. Alexander excommunicated the Emperor and was successful in obtaining the recognition of the kings of France and England, whom Frederick had already offended by his arrogant behaviour. In France the Pope found refuge when the enraged Emperor marched on Italy to chastise his adversary.

It was a terrible blow to the Emperor when the miasma of the Roman Campagna attacked and ravaged his hitherto victorious army. We read with ever-fresh sympathy how more than a dozen of Frederick's generals and statesmen succumbed to the pestilence. Among them were several bishops who had remained faithful to him, and last of all his Chancellor, the Archbishop of Cologne, after whom the first years of Frederick's reign have been well called "the age of Reinald of Dassel." It seemed now as if fortune had utterly deserted him. The Lombard cities founded Alessandria to be the stronghold of the Italian opposition. Henry the Lion, by ceasing to play a double game, was the cause of his defeat at Legnano. Alexander's messengers went through Germany and stirred up feeling against Frederick, who by degrees became quite crushed and bewildered by his reverses. The scene which took place in St. Mark's Square,

Venice, in July, 1177, and which has been immortalised in a great fresco in the Doges' Palace, was a new and—to be truthful—a far worse Canossa, not because Frederick, when absolved from the sentence of excommunication, performed the customary act of homage by kissing the Pope's toe, but because he did it with the gnawing consciousness that he was vanquished. His ideal had perished.

Alexander, on the other hand, issued from this struggle more powerful than any of his predecessors. His victory over the Emperor was indeed but one, though the greatest, of his successes. On the grave of the murdered Archbishop of Canterbury the King of England performed the penance imposed upon him by the Pope. To the new Portuguese kingdom of Alfonso I. Alexander gave his blessing, and in a solemn Bull he rejected the claims of Castile and Leon. The synod which he held in 1179 in the Lateran was really an ecumenical council, to which the few Eastern Christians who had remained in communion with Rome sent representatives.

The power of the Papacy is now just below its highest point. From Alexander III. to Innocent III. (1198–1216), who, if not the greatest, was at all events the most fortunate of all the Popes, there is but a step. Four

centuries have elapsed since Charlemagne took the imperial crown in St. Peter's. Now the successor of that Leo, who had to thank God that he had escaped the judgment of the King, had the German crown at his disposal, and encountered no opposition when he asserted that the Empire depended first and last on the Holy See. He weighed against one another the claims of Philip of Swabia, of Otho the Guelf, and of the young Hohenstaufen, his ward, as if he were discussing some scholastic theme, and when Otho—to whom he gave the preference—proved less amenable than the Pope had thought he deposed and excommunicated him. It was at his command that Frederick II., a boy of seventeen, marched into Germany to carry out the sentence, and in the Golden Bull of Eger (1213) acknowledged all the spiritual and temporal claims of the Pope with the assent of the princes.

Innocent had declared that the Lord had given to St. Peter the government, not only of the Church, but also of the whole world, and facts bore out this statement. The kings of all lands had to bow before the Pope. He, not Sancho, ruled Portugal; Peter of Aragon received his crown from him, as did the Prince of Bulgaria also. When Philip Augustus of France defied him he laid the whole country under an

interdict, and the church bells ceased to ring. The English king, John "Lackland," publicly acknowledged himself the Pope's vassal, and took back the kingdom of which Innocent had deprived him, in fee from him. Here the Pope reached the limits of his power. Innocent had tyrannised over this miserable king, but in Magna Carta the English barons laid the foundations of the English Constitution, and the Roman Pontiff's protests were in vain.

The Pope's influence was equally important in Eastern affairs. He combined the dream of the great Emperor Henry VI. (1190–97)—who had died prematurely—with the idea of Gregory VII., by preaching a new crusade. Although it was not his intention that the great enterprise should take the Byzantine capital as its objective and not the Holy Land, the creation of the Latin Empire at Constantinople undoubtedly gave a special lustre to his reign. The highest point of this reign and, at the same time, the highest point of the development of papal power in general was, however, the fourth Lateran Council (1215), the greatest ecclesiastical assembly that the world has ever seen. It was attended not only by far more than a thousand ecclesiastical delegates from East and West, South and North, but also by envoys of the temporal powers. Nor is this council memor-

able only as a representative assembly. It set the seal to much that the Church had long wished to settle. At it the doctrine of transubstantiation received its official formulation, and the regulations as to confession at Easter were finally laid down.

In the preface to a collection of sermons which he himself brought out, Innocent wrote:—"So overwhelmed am I with business that I cannot possibly do justice to every detail. I meditate continually on heavenly things, but am hardly allowed time to breathe. So much am I taken up by others that I am almost a stranger to myself." This confession must be taken into consideration in judging the Pope, as also the programme which he set forth in his sermon on the day of his consecration. Government and service, he says, complete each other. The Pope's service is his personal duty, one that he has in common with all Christians; to rule is his prerogative as the Vicar of God. The man who as Pope issued his commands to kings had, when Cardinal-deacon, laid down in a special treatise that the world was only worthy of contempt, and had uttered a warning against that pursuit of vanities which made the misery of human life. As Pope he gave his attention to the religious movements in which his time was so rich. Heretics, indeed, were an abomina-

tion to him; he sent an armed force against the Albigenses, and would have nothing to do even with the devout Waldenses, because they wished to reach God in an independent and peculiar way. But he gladly authorised God-fearing laymen who called upon the world to repent, provided they pledged themselves not to disregard the ordinances of the Church; and when Francis of Assisi, in whom he heard the voice of the future, asked for his blessing, he did not refuse to give it. It is worthy of note that—on July 16, 1216—Innocent, the most brilliant of all successors of the Apostle, sank to rest at Perugia, the very place in which the gospel of poverty was then being preached with new tongues.

At the Lateran Council a fresh crusade had been decided upon. The troops were to embark from Sicily in June, 1217, under the leadership of the Emperor Frederick II. Innocent did not live to see this plan carried out, nor did his successor, Honorius III. (1216–27), witness its fulfilment. The Emperor failed to keep the promise he had made at his coronation at Aix-la-Chapelle. How did this come about?

In the centuries that we have been studying, the Emperor and the Pope had often crossed swords. But, up to Frederick II., the German kings who were at war with the Papacy were

all filled with respect for it as an institution. In the Pope they reverenced the successor of St. Peter, only they did not wish to see him encroach on their sphere of influence. In spite of momentary ebullitions of wrath they saw in the Church the mother of Christendom, and to Christianity itself they clung with devout faith. It was otherwise with Frederick II.; his attitude towards Christianity was that of a sceptic, not a believer; he saw in the Church not a mother but an intrusive inspectress, and in the Pope he saw the convinced, or not always even convinced, champion of all that hindered the extension of true civilisation, the increase of human culture and human knowledge. It was not for nothing that he was born in Sicily, the Paradise of mingled religions; it was not for nothing that he had imbibed a preference for Arab ways of thinking and living. Philosophers frequented his court, and natural science was more to him than scholastic theology. It was not that he avoided the great ultimate questions that stir the human mind, but he sought an answer acceptable to his reason, and refused to let authority dictate what was profitable for his soul.

Once again we get the sharp clash of antagonistic forces. Honorius, indeed, was nearly made a fool of by Frederick; but in Gregory IX.

(1227–41), the nephew of Innocent, the Emperor found an adversary of a different kind. Only a few months after his accession he excommunicated Frederick, who continued to find excuses for putting off the burdensome crusade, which seemed to him to hinder more important business. And then an unheard-of thing happened. As if he took pleasure in the idea of setting the Pope at defiance and of entering the Holy Land while still under the Church's ban, Frederick at once set sail and, without drawing his sword, achieved what earlier crusaders had purchased only at the cost of much blood or not at all. The holy places were restored to the Christians. The excommunicate Emperor, however, himself took the crown of Jerusalem. He soon returned to Europe, routed the Pope's troops, and forced him to grant him absolution. Then he again devoted himself to his Sicilian kingdom, and also to the refractory cities of Lombardy. Ten years passed, and again the Pope excommunicated the Emperor, who replied with a defence which resembled a challenge. The Pope then threw off the last vestige of restraint and hurled at Frederick reproaches which go beyond anything that a Pope had hitherto dared to say to his Emperor. He compared him with the Beast of the Apocalypse; he accused him of treachery to the Church, of ill-using her adherents, of perjury

in regard to his earlier promises, and finally of heresy and blasphemy:

"Since the Emperor asserts that he cannot be excommunicated by us, the Vicar of Christ, he himself shows how badly he thinks of the other chief articles of the Christian faith. But if any one should doubt that he has entangled himself in his own words let him listen to the convincing evidence of the truth. This pestilent king asserts—we use his own words—that the whole world has been deceived by three impostors, Moses, Mahomet, and Christ, of whom two died in honour, but the third on the cross. Further, he has dared loudly to affirm (or rather to lie) that all are fools who believe that God Almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth, was born of a Virgin. He bases this heresy on the erroneous idea that none can be born without the previous union of man and woman, and that man in general should believe nothing that cannot be proved by the nature of things and by reason."

Although the Pope could never prove his chief accusation — the Emperor's saying about the three impostors—and although he doubtless committed himself dangerously by the carelessness with which he made the charge, in the main his reproaches were justified. Frederick II. was a heretic if there ever was one, and when

the fugitive Innocent IV. (1243–54) declared in a solemn speech at the Council of Lyons in 1245, that the Emperor had forfeited his throne, he did what he must have felt himself called upon to do by virtue of his apostolic office. It is one of the most important indications of the disintegration of the Church which was already beginning, that the Emperor's friends remained faithful to him until his death, in spite of the fact that the curse not only of the Church but also of Heaven seemed to rest upon him.

To return to Gregory IX. His reign, though lacking in the outward splendour which makes that of Innocent III. stand out in such brilliant light, was a period of events of high importance for the Church. He was the great patron of the Mendicant Orders. It is true that Honorius III. had already confirmed the Orders of the Dominicans (Preaching Friars), and the Franciscans (Minorites, Friars Minor), but the Protector of the Franciscans was Ugolino, Cardinal-bishop of Ostia, the future Gregory IX. He supplemented the mountain-moving faith of the Saint of Assisi, whose best friend he was, with the sagacity of the ecclesiastical prince, and helped first and foremost to give to St. Francis's ideal the form which made its efficacy in the Church and in the world possible and assured. He set the work of the Dominicans, who had

been founded to convert heretics, on a firm foundation, by transferring to them, as in the name of the Pope, the powers of inquisition, *i.e.*, investigation into heterodoxy, hitherto exercised by the bishops (1232).

This measure is associated with blood, but it was only the outcome of the charge of souls given to the Apostle, and is based on Scripture. The doctrine of the two swords which was first heard of in the eleventh century, and to which Bernard of Clairvaux gave its classical form, had in the meantime been included among the Pope's pretensions. Both swords, including the secular one, belong to the Church; for the Lord (Matt. xxvi. 52) did not say to the disciple, "Put thy sword away from thee," but "Put up again thy sword into his place." The Church therefore is not to discard the temporal sword, she is only not to use it; she has given the handling of it to the secular arm, which has to use it in her name, and therefore only in accordance with her views. Does not Constantine's Donation prove, as Gregory IX. wrote, that he to whom God has given the direction of heavenly things, shall also rule over earthly things?

The papal canon law that culminates in this claim was officially put together for the first time by Gregory (1234). When Raphael, at the command of Julius II., decorated the hall in

which the Pope's mandates were sealed, he immortalised the granting of the canon and the civil law in two pictures: on the left the Emperor Justinian is handing the Roman code to Tribonian, on the right Gregory IX. gives his code to one of his jurists. What Gelasius, in advance of his age, once said, what Gregory VII. repeated to William of England, appears to be coming true—the State receives its light from the Papacy as the moon from the sun.

One other thing is significant. Gregory IX. gave to the rapidly developing science of theology its noblest scene of action. In the newly founded University of Paris, the constitution of which the Pope settled in a Bull (1231), the theologians were preponderant. Here studied or taught the great luminaries of Dominican and Franciscan scholasticism, like Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, and Thomas Aquinas. It was Thomas Aquinas who fixed the idea of the world-rule of the Papacy from a theological point of view. Before him theologians had at best expressed themselves with reserve on the doctrine of papal infallibility. Thomas gave it a dogmatic basis on the strength of the Gregorian canon law, and of a forgery which he accepted as genuine, and which led him to

believe that the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries had already supported the doctrine. He also penned the proposition that subjection to the Pope is necessary to salvation. With that the utmost is said and the highest point is reached.

Then Fate knocks at the door.

CHAPTER VIII

THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY AND THE PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH

WHEN Innocent IV. heard in France of the death of Frederick, he might well have uttered a sigh of relief, for he was freed from a powerful antagonist. He immediately returned to Italy, passing through Northern and Central Italy in triumph, but he did not see his capital for several years. His position was difficult. However much he may have been convinced—to use his own words—that the eternal King and Priest after the order of Melchizedek had given him supreme power, he would have been glad to receive help in destroying the dragon-seed of the Hohenstaufen. He first offered the crown of Sicily to an English prince, who declined it with thanks; then to Charles of Anjou, but the negotiations came to nothing. Manfred became stronger and stronger, and Innocent

died. His successor, Alexander IV. (1254–61), was not more fortunate. Urban IV. (1261–64) at last succeeded in prevailing upon Charles to accept the crown. Whether for that reason he may be reckoned among the Popes who influenced history, may remain an open question, for he was only carrying out the idea of another. But the fact itself was of great significance. In Frederick II. the destiny of the world-empire had worked itself out; other powers now took its place. The coming of the house of Anjou to Naples, and the strengthening of the French monarchy, marked a turning-point in political history; the centre of gravity had shifted. But we may ask whether the Papacy stood to gain by this. That Charles of Anjou and his brother Saint Louis of France were pious Christians and devout adherents of the Roman Curia was only a guarantee for the time being. Other times might come—and they did come.

In any case, the state of the Church was far from satisfactory to the Curia. The strict or "spiritual" Franciscans were indignant at the interference of the Popes with their statutes, and at their attempts to wring from the Order the utmost measure of fixed abode that was compatible with their principles. The beginning of this conflict goes

back to the time of Gregory IX. It became more acute under Innocent IV., and the disputes of the last years of Frederick's reign cannot be understood unless it is taken into consideration. It is most interesting to observe how the zealots begin to cast a halo round the head of the unbelieving Emperor, as the scourge of the worldly Papacy. When the enemy of the Church lies in his grave, they set their hopes on his return as judge. They reckon that in the year 1260 the three times and half a time spoken of in the Revelation of St. John (xii. 14) will be fulfilled, and they live in the belief that the end of all things is at hand. They await the catastrophe with feverish impatience, and stir up excitement among the people. The critical year arrives, no Frederick comes, the Chair of St. Peter does not totter, but the world sees for the first time the spectacle of those Flagellants who pour forth from Perugia, the focus of the Franciscan movement, over Lombardy, before long to Rome, then over the Alps into Provence and Germany, and as far as Hungary and Poland. The excitement lasted for several decades; even then it did not really die out, but only changed its form.

It was soon to be seen whether in this altered condition of affairs the Papacy would

be able to maintain the claim to the empire of the world, which it had disputed with the Hohenstaufens, with varying fortune, but victoriously on the whole. In 1294 Boniface VIII. (1294–1303), who was the first to give the shape of a crown to the papal mitre, became Pope. Modern research has attempted, not without success, to remove the blackest shadows from his portrait, which his embittered contemporaries painted in the darkest colours. But his extravagance, bordering on mania, still remains, as also his malicious delight in sarcasm and mockery — certainly no sign of good nature. It can be no mere accident that the miserable shattering of his life-work lacks that element of tragedy which gives so poignant an interest to other great dramas in the world's history.

And yet just such a drama was being played between the Pope and the French King as was played of old between Henry and Gregory. But what was great in Gregory strikes us as bizarre in Boniface. He did not fight for an ideal with the self-surrender of a heart filled with strength from on high, for he lacked any religious impulse, but held with crazy obstinacy to the display which he had not the means to keep up. Nor was Philip the Fair made of very fine stuff. He was harshly

despotic and absolutely unscrupulous. But what he won for himself and for his crown, with all the egoism of a forceful tyrant, served to help on progress in general. He was able to impress on his nobles, and through them on large sections of the people, a hatred of clerical tutelage so deep that it never disappeared. It was absurd that the Pope, presuming on legal titles of a bygone age, should wish to forbid the King to tax Church property when the military reputation of the Crown required it. We need only compare the polemics of this period with those of the time of Gregory, or consider the quiet assurance with which the French Chancery made the Pope's threatening letters look ridiculous, in order to see on which side the victory would lie. In the light of these facts, the famous—not to say notorious—Bull "Unam Sanctam" of November 18, 1302, loses its exciting character. In this Bull, Boniface once more summed up the claims of the spiritual power to supremacy over the temporal power with biting acrimony, as though he felt that it was already too late. It contains nothing new for us, and nothing characteristic of the Pope except perhaps the little spiteful remark that the Church can only have one head, not two, for otherwise she would be a "monster." "Feed

My lambs," we hear once more; the prophet Jeremiah is called to witness: "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms"; the Apostle Paul testifies: "He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man." The theory of the two swords is also spun out at length. And, lest theology should fall short, the document closes with the statement of Thomas Aquinas, that obedience to the Pope is necessary to salvation.

On his side Philip summoned the States General. He caused the Pope to be solemnly accused not only of ill-will towards France, but also of personal crimes. Even the charge of heresy was not lacking. Boniface, it was alleged, did not believe in immortality, and denied the reality of the transubstantiation in the Eucharist. On the advice of excellent canonists the King appealed — the first time that this had occurred—to a general council and to a future legitimate Pope. But he went further. He caused his chancellor, William de Nogaret, to arrest the Pope, who was at Anagni preparing ban and interdict against the sinful land and its King. Boniface succeeded in escaping, and in returning to Rome, but succumbed a few weeks later (October 11, 1303), to the disease from which he had

long been suffering. It is said that in an attack of fever he beat his head against the wall.

We shall hardly be guilty of exaggeration if we call the Bull "Unam Sanctam" the swan-song of the supremacy of the spiritual power in temporal affairs. Often again, it is true, was it preached to the world, but it failed to find the faith that alone could make it a living force. And the great Emperors' dream of an universal Christian monarchy was also at an end. Dante, indeed, broke a lance for the Empire as a divine institution, but even in him we see clearly that the change is at hand, for it is not from the Pope but from the people that the Emperor receives his crown.

When we turn from the Bull to that remarkable book to which its authors, the Paris scholars Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun, gave the title of "Defensor Pacis" ("The Advocate of Peace"), we can gauge the extent of the change. In the first we have variations on a theme suitable for any period, expressed in hackneyed catchwords; in the second a system of thought, constructed, it is true, out of old material, but set forth in a wholly new way. Marsilius had read his Aristotle differently from Thomas Aquinas. All political rights belong to the people, their rulers are their delegates and

are answerable to them. They are therefore entrusted with extensive powers, and the Church especially has no right to interfere. In so far as she is the fellowship of the faithful she has a divine and supernatural character, but she is a spiritual institution with spiritual powers. The priest opens the door to God; he has no right of judgment on earth, nor has the Pope any such right, for his so-called power of office rests on stolen titles. St. Peter was not above the other apostles, and all bishops are successors of the apostles. To them, therefore, in a general council in which laymen are also called to take part, it belongs to decide questions that are purely questions of doctrine, and not to the Pope.

When in 1326 these heretical notions were introduced at the court of Louis of Bavaria—who was at first filled with horror at them, but finally accepted them with reservations, impelled thereto by considerations of ecclesiastical policy—Rome had already been without a Pope for many years. The second successor of Boniface, Clement V. (1305–14), had in 1309 transferred his court to Avignon, which belonged to the King of Naples and was sold in 1348 to the Curia, in whose possession it remained until the French Revolution. Clement was wholly dependent on the King of France; the

condemnation of the Templars (March 22, 1312), for which all the machinery of a general council was employed, was the worst result of this dependence, and is hard to justify from an ecclesiastical point of view. But all the Avignon Popes were not underlings, least of all John XXII. (1316–34), who became Pope when quite an old man, and only resigned the tiara, unwillingly enough, at the age of ninety. The papal pretensions with which he angered others besides King Louis, the stubbornness with which he opposed the idealistic theories of the Franciscan zealots, and last, but not least, his theological arbitrariness, procured him a whole host of enemies in his lifetime and injured his memory among future generations. But he was decidedly above the average and, if nothing else, was a living proof that the old ideas had not yet lost all their efficacy. Indeed, the Avignon Popes in general were much better than their reputation, and their reputation itself would be much better if the disparity between their pretensions and their external situation had not continually urged them to doubtful actions. They needed money, and not knowing how to get it honestly, they stole it.

As early as the reign of Innocent III. loud protests had been raised against the greed of the Curia. A French chronicler calls the Pope

the most insatiable of mortals, and Walther von der Vogelweide raged in noble indignation against the "Stock"* which the Pope had sent into Germany to procure him money. The great Pope's whole manner of living defended him from the personal attacks which were levelled at him. But if a man desires to rule over kings and peoples he cannot do without money. At Avignon in the "Babylonian captivity" there was indeed but little question of ruling, but the thirst for power remained, and prudent men would naturally think of the future, which might bring better days. The fatal thing, however, was that general interests gave way more and more to personal ones and to those family interests which may be summed up in the word "Nepotism." Fatal also were luxury and that corruption inevitably connected with court-life, in which men are dependent on the goodwill of a crowd of base hirelings. It is difficult to know which to admire most—the capacity shown for inventing new taxes, the skill with which they were collected, or the good-nature of those who paid them. Hundreds of thousands of pounds thus flowed to Avignon year in year out—occasional dues for the consecration of bishops, the income

* *Stock* (*Opferstock*), the money-box in which the offerings of the faithful are collected.

of livings that were skilfully kept vacant, above all the firstfruits (annats), *i.e.*, the dues payable to the Curia from the first year's revenues of newly appointed bishops and abbots. Those immediately liable to taxation naturally enough took it out of their subjects, for they, too, were rulers and wished to live up to their position. So taxation increased and with it exasperation.

This scandalous state of affairs became still worse when, after the removal of Gregory XI. to Rome (1377), and partly through the fault of his impolitic successor, Urban VI. (1378–89), that dual Papacy was created which lasted for a generation. There was one Pope in Rome and another at Avignon. The people were divided as to whom they should recognise, and the revenues were divided also. Without any consideration for religious feeling, Boniface IX. (1389–1404) increased the taxes paid by the countries that acknowledged him to the point of extortion, knocked down vacant offices to the highest bidders after he had taken the money of those who bid less, and thus acquired such large means that he became an ally whom the King of Naples, harassed by France, could not afford to despise.

But at the same time preparations were being made in France to put an end to this unedifying state of affairs. The University of Paris became

the centre of these efforts. Men like Henry of Langenstein, Pierre d'Ailly, Jean Charlier de Gerson, and Nicholas de Clémanges awakened public opinion. King Charles VI., who at that time had one of his lucid moments, gave his approval in 1394 to an academic opinion that suggested three ways for doing away with the schism—voluntary abdication by both Popes and a fresh election, a court of arbitration, and a general council. The two first ways did not attain the aim in view. The suggestion of a court of arbitration seems hardly to have been considered, and neither of the Popes cared to abdicate so long as he was not sure whether his rival would do the same. When, then, after the death of Clement of Avignon, the Cardinals, in spite of their having repeatedly declared that they would do everything to end the schism, elected another Pope in the person of Benedict XIII., the French Government lost patience. It refused to recognise Benedict, but it had no wish to accept the Roman Pope either, and for several years the French Church was managed by the State—a sort of State Catholicism which proved impossible as a permanency.

Thus only the last of the three ways was left. The demand for a general council was becoming louder and louder and had long since passed the borders of France. The time was ripe for

reform. The progressives were no longer content merely to restore the single headship of the Church in the person of one Pope only; they wished to use this opportunity to put the Papacy under the control of the Church. "Reformatio ecclesiæ in capite et membris"—the reform of the Church in head and members—inasmuch as the corruption from above had gone down lower and lower, became the oft-repeated catchword. If England showed the way, and if English ideas were adopted by the French politicians, it was France that took decisive action. Immense significance lay in the fact that in May, 1408, the appointment to benefices in the French Church and the taxation of the clergy by the Pope were declared illegal. This Gallicanism, or, to speak more generally, the principle of the independence of national churches as regards Papal influence, remained the order of the day in discussions on Church politics.

The Council of Pisa, which met in March, 1409, was a new departure in the history of church assemblies, inasmuch as not only cardinals and patriarchs, bishops and abbots, as well as envoys of the temporal powers, but also the representatives of theological and canonistic learning, met together to deliberate. Academic ideas dominated the assembly. They culminated

in the thesis that the Church as represented by the council had the right to impeach and depose an unworthy Pope. This claim was actually made good. It is true that the Popes did not appear when cited, but they were condemned in their absence, and on June 5th the people assembled in the cathedral were informed that Peter de Luna, otherwise known as Benedict XIII., and Angelus Corrarius, otherwise known as Gregory XII., were deprived of their dignity, as schismatics, heretics, and perjurers, and that all Christians were forbidden to obey them on pain of excommunication. A new Pope was elected in the person of Alexander V. Benedict and Gregory, however, did not give up their position, and as the countries not under French influence did not withdraw their obedience from the Popes whom they had previously acknowledged, there resulted that state of affairs which has been sarcastically called the "Papal Trinity." Thus the resolutions of the Council of Pisa had no effect.

The confusion seemed thus to have reached its highest pitch, when personal considerations increased it still further, and this time to an intolerable degree. Alexander enjoyed his doubtful position for a few months only. In May, 1410, he was succeeded by the man who was suspected of having poisoned him. To attempt

to whitewash John XXIII. would be a thankless task. "He had no conscience, but, instead, so happy a temperament and a disposition so cheerful—not to say childlike—that in the midst of his misdeeds, the phantoms of which in no way disturbed his slumbers, he woke up each morning in better spirits than when he had gone to bed." At the same time, the long list of atrocities of which he was accused by the Council of Constance must not blind us to the fact that this John—perhaps not without reason the last Pope of his name—was an unusually talented and by no means insignificant man. Under different conditions he might possibly have accomplished great things. As matters were, however, the result of his notorious iniquities was to strengthen the opposition against the Papacy all along the line and to make it victorious. What the Council of Pisa had failed to accomplish it became the task of the Council of Constance to attempt once more.

Never before had a general council taken place in a German city. King Sigismund had carried his point with John—whom he had recognised shortly after his election—as to the convocation of this assembly, and hoped to obtain far-reaching results from it. Not only were church questions of the widest range to be settled, but political questions also: for

instance, the ending of the war between England and France was a subject of serious consideration. The event that lingers most in our memory, the trial of Huss, was probably the subject of least interest to the King and even to the prelates and theologians. Indeed, the ideas of church reform current among the theologians in the council had no reference to questions of dogma. It was quite natural to them to condemn the memory of Wyclif, the socialistic heretic, even apart from any question of courtesy towards the English Government; and it was self-evident that Huss must die, in spite of the so often misunderstood letter of safe-conduct, after he had once, for conscience sake, acknowledged his acceptance of the Englishman's tenets. It was impossible to foresee what political consequences would result from the exasperation caused in Bohemia by the burning of Huss, and even had they been foreseen the decision would hardly have been influenced thereby.

The central interest of this church parliament, with its commissions, its party meetings, and its plenary sittings, conducted in accordance with standing orders quite different from those hitherto customary, was the "reform of the Church in head and members." We have only to consider it in so far as it affected the "head."

For the first few months John enjoyed all the honours of a recognised Pope. At the first public session of the council, on November 16, 1414, he presided, and he opened the second on March 2, 1415, by celebrating High Mass. In this very session, however, he had to read the document in which he resigned his office, provided his rivals did the same. That he was in earnest may reasonably be doubted, in spite of his oaths and assurances. In any case, he fled from Constance three weeks later, and from Schaffhausen sent word to Sigismund that he had no intention of abdicating. The council almost fell to pieces over the subject; but the Emperor rode through the town and caused it to be announced that every one must remain till the reforms were completed. It became necessary to declare solemnly in a public sitting (April 6, 1415) that the council had the right to continue to sit even without the Pope and without prejudice to its authority. Then began the trial of John, which ended with his deposition on May 29. A few months afterwards Gregory XII. abdicated of his own accord, but Benedict XIII. was not to be prevailed upon to withdraw. Nothing remained but to isolate him. Sigismund did not shrink from the long journey necessary to persuade Spain to abandon the Pope. When the political position allowed

of it, Benedict also was formally deposed (July 26, 1417), and Martin V. (1417–31) was elected Pope by the Conclave, in which not only cardinals took part, but also delegates of the nations represented at the council.

With remarkable skill the Pope broke up the unity of the assembly by treating with each nation separately, making a concordat with each, and he thus rescued for the Papacy all that could be rescued. Naturally, this could not be done without substantial concessions: the excesses of the papal fiscal and judicial systems were reduced to tolerable dimensions. Nevertheless, the Curia obtained what was essential to it: the definite stipulation of certain important rights which would serve as a starting-point for others when circumstances became more favourable. Of real reform either in "head" or "members" there was no question.

It is easy to understand that the reform party were not satisfied with this result, and all the less because the Pope and his court on their return to Rome by no means kept within reasonable limits, but provoked the earnest-minded, as well as the Pharisees, by their barefaced extortions. At that time the representative of the Knights of the Teutonic Order in Rome wrote to his superior: "Dear master, send me money, for at this court all friendship ceases

when the cash is gone," and Canon Hemmerlin of Zürich complained that "Benefices were sold in Rome as publicly as pigs in the market." Nor was it the misdeeds of the Curia only that kept up the agitation, but the general condition of the Church and the world. Before the election of the new Pope at Constance a resolution had been passed, couched in unctuous terms, to the effect that such general assemblies should take place regularly at certain fixed intervals, and Martin had been bound over to this arrangement. He kept, indeed, to the letter of it, but the first assembly in Siena did nothing. Yielding to the pressure of those who looked to parliamentary deliberations for the solution of all difficulties, he summoned a new council at Bâle in 1431, but died before it met.

The Council of Bâle (1431–49) has been compared with the great assemblies of the French Revolution, and there are certainly many points of resemblance. Anyhow, it meant the uncompromising introduction of democratic principles into the government of the Church and the negation of all authority. Any cleric was welcome as a member of the assembly, if he had passed the easy test of the election committee, and no one troubled about Pope or cardinal, bishop or archbishop. There was a time when the efforts of the council, as later

those of the French revolutionaries, were approved of enthusiastically by all progressive minds. This was during the years in which reforms were seriously undertaken, and provisions, expectatives, annats, and kindred ecclesiastical excrescences were cut away, and in which France adopted the decrees of the Council of Bâle as the law of the State in the "Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges" (1438), while a German Imperial Diet recognised the reforms in the "Acceptation of Mayence" (1439). Later on, however, not only did those in authority become alarmed, but many a man who thought more of his advancement than of his principles, sought shelter with the leaders of Church and State, though it vexed him to be unable to dabble in revolution. Finally, when the radicals and demagogues gained the upper hand and a kind of Reign of Terror ensued—only without the guillotine—the "Bâle Fathers" lost the last remnant of the sympathy which they had inspired, and the hopes which had been placed in church parliamentarianism died away.

From the first, the council had given its close attention to the Pope's affairs. It worked out a kind of rule for him, and regulated his life even in small details. In June, 1438, however, it deposed Martin's successor, Eugenius IV.

(1431–47), who was not disposed to dance to their piping. It did him no harm, for there was no possibility of carrying out the sentence. Moreover, when the council passed the decree it had degenerated into a sort of Rump Parliament. As early as March, 1437, a strong minority, headed by the ecclesiastical dignitaries, who did not agree with this fundamental opposition to the Papacy, had left Bâle, and with them Eugenius was able to form a rival council, first at Ferrara and afterwards at Florence. This council is only noteworthy for its not very successful negotiations towards a union with the Greek Church. All things considered, the last years of Eugenius's pontificate brought the turn of the tide. The witches' cauldron ceases to boil, the bubbling stops, the steam clears away, and we see once more the old picture of a triumphant Papacy. But this time the picture has a different frame.

CHAPTER IX

THE POPES AS PATRONS OF THE FINE ARTS

A NEW era had just risen over Italy. As early as the year 1300 a flush of dawn had heralded it. Any one who has studied Giotto's pictures, has been moved by the songs of Jacopone and the great poem of Dante, and has felt the influence of the architecture of their time, can realise the importance for early Italian art of the religious revival brought about by the Saint of Assisi. When, however, the heavenly orb rose high in the sky and sent its rays over the whole land, it was seen that yet other sources of light were stored up within it: the wealth of the ancients streamed out in dazzling brilliance; learning and art awoke to new and independent life.

Immediately there was a division of minds. To some men Christianity, in the light of this sun, seemed of inferior value, something out of date, if not a wandering from the true

path. Back to the gods of Olympos was their cry; let Zeus be enthroned once more. Back also to the philosophy of Plato and the other great minds which had been forgotten in the monkish wisdom of the theologians. Others judged differently. They sought to refine the "holy treasure of Plato" like gold in the crucible, to fit it, in a different setting, into the crown of their religion, and thus to reconcile the classic with the Christian spirit, which for them also had become too narrow. All, however, were agreed that the world was not to be looked upon as "a vale of tears, which the Pope and the Emperor must guard till the coming of Antichrist," but as the place in which the Divine Spirit worked itself out, preparing for mankind a glorious lot even on earth. The consummation of this blessedness was hoped for in other spheres, without the conduct of life on earth being made dependent upon it. In this garden of God there bloomed Art, the most beautiful of all flowers. Almost untouched by the intellectual conflict around them, bathed in heavenly light, her disciples wandered on soft paths like blessed spirits.

It is one of the most remarkable transformations in the history of the Church that when the Papacy began slowly to recover from its severe defeat it also took on the

new spirit of art and learning, and gained a new right to the admiration of the faithful. After a while, however, succumbing to the sweetness of the temptation, it forgot for a time its lofty apostolic mission under the magic of the new forces.

Without suspecting to what a dangerous height his successors would climb, Nicholas V. (1447–55) stepped on to the giddy path. His gentle spirit hovers over the devout frescoes with which Fra Giovanni of Fiesole, the Angelic, whom the Church reckons among her beatified, decorated the papal bedchamber in the Vatican. As a young man he had said, "I would like to spend all my money on books and buildings"; and as Pope he carried out his wish. He was the real founder of the Vatican library, which at his death contained more than a thousand manuscripts and the greatest number of books that any library could boast. He summoned many distinguished scholars to Rome, and entrusted them with literary work, especially with translations from the Greek. Among them were men like Laurentius Valla, who discovered the spuriousness of the Donation of Constantine and other old ecclesiastical documents, and who would have fallen a victim to the Inquisition if he had not been supported by the Pope and pro-

tected by the King of Naples. Nicholas not only began to make Rome more habitable, and supplied the town with water, but he also conceived the gigantic plan for the reconstruction of the Leonine city, the Vatican and St. Peter's, and thus gave the impulse to the erection of monuments which were to employ hundreds of artists and astonish the world. He did all this from a proud conviction that the capital of Christendom must look what it was: "Only through the greatness of what they see can the weak be strengthened in their faith."

It was the prelude to a magnificent spectacle that grew more and more imposing from act to act.

Æneas Silvius Piccolomini, who had given up a frivolous life, and who, as Pope, took the name of Pius II. (1458–64) not from Pius I., but from the "pius" Æneas of Virgil, was himself a many-sided man of letters. But he kept a close watch over his purse so that the Humanists complained that they did not get their due; and what he did do for art benefited his native town of Siena rather than Rome. Paul II. (1464–71) may not have been a "hater of learning," as he has commonly been depicted; but he was no enthusiast for it. Sixtus IV. (1471–84) was the first really to add to the legacy

left by the Humanist Pope. It was he who transferred the Vatican library to new rooms and allowed free access to its treasures. He encouraged the building of churches, and went on with what Nicholas had planned and suggested for the beautifying of the city. But it was painting especially that benefited by the favour of the Pope. Under him Melozzo da Forli painted his Ascension, the lost beauty of which is still to be seen in the wonderful angels' heads, while Botticelli, Signorelli, Ghirlandajo, Pinturicchio, and Perugino decorated the walls of the chapel in the Vatican (called Sistine after him) with those representations of the history of Moses and the Saviour, the Olympian calm of which stands out in such solemn contrast to the Titanic figures of Michael Angelo, their later rival in this place.

In spite, however, of all these great works, Rome was not really the centre of intellectual life at this period. Florence exercised the greatest power of attraction. Cosimo, the great merchant, and even more his grandson Lorenzo the Magnificent, who ruled the Republic from 1469, won undying fame for their native city, and at the same time added lustre to their own house. In the Medici gardens the members of the Platonic Academy engaged in brilliant conversation on the writings of their master.

It was the Medici who gave employment to skilful hands, and afforded an outlet for the artistic conceptions which found immortal expression in architecture, sculpture, and painting. But after the death of Lorenzo (1491) and with the fall of his house (1494) this supremacy passed from Florence to Rome, where it long remained.

The services of Innocent VIII. (1484–92) and Alexander VI. (1492–1503) to the fine arts were but insignificant, and one must be very apologetically minded to mention them at all. All the greater appeared the outburst under Julius II. (1503–13). He was the Mæcenas of Bramante, Michael Angelo, and Raphael. It was he who set tasks for these great men; for him Bramante drew the plans of the new cathedral of St. Peter; for him Raphael gave sensuous form to the intellectual life of mankind at that period under the symbols of theology, poetry, philosophy, and jurisprudence; at his command Michael Angelo painted the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, and the Pope would not let him go till he had completed the work. On the other hand, Leo X. (1513–21), the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, who as Cardinal Medici had made his villa on the Pincian Hill the social centre of the artists and men of letters, wished only to enjoy

not to stimulate. Even Raphael's colour was little more to him than decoration, and Buonarotti's strong arm remained idle under him. The easy elegance of the Humanists of his court tickled the Pope's refined intellect as the exquisite dishes which came in extravagant profusion to his table tickled his fastidious palate. The patronage of this Medici Pope did not raise art; on the contrary, it brought it down from the height on which his predecessor had placed it.

But we are not concerned with art only. We can no longer suppress the question, What did these Popes do for the Church? The Lord had bidden His Apostle feed His sheep, and all the great Popes had acted according to this charge. Has the voice been silenced? For the answer to this question we must go back once more to the time of the councils.

In the great struggle between parliamentarianism and absolutism the former had been vanquished. It is true that the ideas and aims connected with it never disappeared from the consciousness of the nations and their churches, but they were soon pushed into the background by the force of circumstances. This was least the case in France, where the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges remained in force and with it also the independence of

the national church in face of the Papacy, episcopalism in face of papalism. But the strengthening of the King's absolute power after the end of the Hundred Years' War with England resulted in the decline of papalism being turned to the advantage of the crown; the Church had only changed masters. This was still more the case in England, where, moreover, the Curia had ceased to count since the second half of the fifteenth century. It was otherwise in Germany. There the development, as regards the influence of the Curia, was in the opposite direction. When King Albert II. and his Electors "accepted" the Bâle decisions at the Diet of Mayence, they left no doubt that the will of the temporal power came before that of the spiritual power. But Frederick III., who in a reign of nearly fifty-four years (1440–93) did more injury to German interests than any other king, acted very differently and in opposition to the majority of the Electors. With the short-sightedness of the finished egoist he cared only for himself, and perhaps also for his dynasty; he allowed the Pope to buy from him a declaration of obedience, and, as if that were not enough, he let himself be continually tricked by Eugenius and his agents, whose diplomacy did not shrink from the most hazardous intrigues.

The result was the miserable Concordat concluded in Vienna (1448), not under Eugenius but under Nicholas V., and made a law of the Empire at Aschaffenburg (1449). It surrendered all that had been achieved by the councils, and gave a new basis of legality to the abuses of reservations, expectatives, and provisions. But the Curia did not keep even to this. A new theory was invented and put into practice, viz., that the nations were bound by their treaties with the Pope, but that he was not bound. Naturally the opposition to such a presumptuous claim never died out, but it accomplished nothing. Archbishop Diether, of Mayence, who objected to the increased rate at which the Curia reckoned the payment due on his taking office, and who wished to obtain justice by force of arms, was deposed by Pius II. and obliged to submit. The full wretchedness of the situation, however, is revealed in the fact that in 1452 Frederick III.—the last German Emperor to be crowned in Rome—received the crown by favour of Pope Nicholas.

If the increased power of the Curia may be inferred from these facts alone, it may well be asked whether the Papacy realised and acted up to the new ecclesiastical responsibilities that arose out of this power. The

question, even from the papalistic point of view, can only be answered in the negative. It would be difficult to find a period in the annals of papal history which, while outwardly brilliant, was marked by so absolute a lack of sympathy with church or even religious interests, as that comprising the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries. In the middle of the fifteenth century the fall of Constantinople and the irresistible advance of the Turks had reminded Nicholas V. that the Pope as the protector of Christendom was called upon to stir up war against the infidel. His successors, Calixtus III. and Pius II., were also in earnest with their preaching of crusades, and Pius had even had the intention of placing himself at the head of the army that was to set sail from Italy, when he was overtaken by death at Ancona. This last gleam of idealism finally flickered out with the reign of Paul II., who also failed to make any impression worthy of mention in church politics. Under Sixtus IV. the evil spirits once more stretched out their hands towards the Chair of Peter.

Francesco della Rovere came of a family in modest circumstances. Confided as a boy to the care of the Franciscan Friars, his gifts soon attracted the attention of his superiors. He

became popular as a professor in several Italian universities, even gaining the esteem of the Humanists, and was finally elected General of his order. No one could have expected that the worldliness, that was to reign for half a century, would make its entrance into the Curia under this man. But his sisters' numerous children, who all migrated to Rome, crowded round him and wrung one dignity after another out of their unworldly uncle. His efforts to raise his nephews and nieces to a position that would put them on a level with other noble families drew the Pope more and more into the vortex of Italian territorial politics, and even resulted in his entanglement in the conspiracy of the Pazzi in Florence, to which Lorenzo's brother Giuliano fell a victim.

Innocent VIII. owed his election as Pope to the influence of Giuliano della Rovere, the future Julius II., who was still obliged to curb his ambition. Giambattista Cibò, of Genoa, had not foreseen his destiny, and had spent his youth in a very worldly fashion. The malicious epigram that was made about him—

> "Eight boys, eight girls the Pope in sinful love
> Begat; thus Rome him 'Father' rightly calls"—

must indeed be discounted to a great extent; the only two children known to be his were

born before he became priest. Still it was an extremely unedifying spectacle that the Pope should give his son a splendid wedding feast in the Vatican, the same Pope who later kept the pretenders to the Turkish throne prisoners in the same palace, and allowed himself to be highly paid for his services as gaoler. Besides being deficient in higher culture, Innocent had not the energy, and perhaps not the desire, to check the evil that was gaining ground in the Curia; all the witnesses are unanimous that bribery and corruption held high revel under him.

This, however, is not the only reason why his pontificate enjoys such a sorry fame. In 1484 Innocent issued the famous Witchcraft Bull. Two German inquisitors, Heinrich Kramers (Institoris) and Jacob Sprenger, had addressed a complaint to Rome because their efforts to hunt down wizards and witches and bring them to justice had been opposed by the people. They added to their appeal a list of the chief demoniacal crimes. The Pope reproduced this statement in his Bull without questioning it. It would be unjust to reproach him for this; why should not Innocent share a belief held by thousands who were far wiser than he? Nor can he be blamed for regarding sorcery and witchcraft as deserving of the

severest punishment, and still less for supporting his officials in his capacity of supreme judge and safeguarding their authority. It is obvious also that the Bull must not be looked upon as an infallible doctrinal pronouncement—there was no question of such a thing at the time—nor may it be asserted that the Pope raised belief in witchcraft to a dogma. At the same time, this does not alter the fact that this Bull, just because it represented the unretracted judgment of the highest ecclesiastical tribunal, and because it led to the compiling of the "Witches' Hammer" ("Malleus maleficarum")—the abominable handbook for all trials for witchcraft during the next few centuries—was in the last resort the cause of terrible suffering, especially in Germany. But to make the Papacy quâ Papacy responsible for that is absurd.

As if Innocent had not filled up the cup, the nephew of Calixtus III., Roderigo Borgia, who had shamelessly bought the votes of his supporters, now ascended the papal throne under the name of Alexander VI. He had become Cardinal under his uncle, and had all the time led a life that set not only clerical but all morality at defiance. As Pope also he gave free rein to his sensuality. What does it matter that the worst things imputed to him are at-

tributable to exaggeration or—like his relations with his daughter Lucrezia—to invention? Even the believing Catholic historian has to call in the help of Providence in order to understand how the Church did not fall to pieces under such a rule of infamy. Those who do not adopt this attitude are content to remember that even the Papacy could not escape the curse of the "Herrenmenschentum" which sprang from abandonment to the delights of culture and absorption in the things of this world. It is one of the bitterest ironies of history that this vicegerent of God, who believed in nothing, except perhaps the devil, with whom, according to popular opinion, he had made a pact, should, by virtue of his office, have excommunicated Savonarola, the saintly Dominican who with his strange prophetic voice called Florence back from her frivolous enjoyment of life to piety and grave morals.

Julius II. and Leo X. were also, in Nietzsche's term, "Herrenmenschen"—a law unto themselves—and if art, like a sacrament, had not stamped their pontificate with an ineffaceable character, history would have judged them more harshly. Here, again, we must distinguish Giuliano della Rovere, the nephew of Sixtus IV., was an extraordinary man in every respect. It was no wonder that he, the most warlike of all

the Popes, who so often put his armour on over his priest's dress, and was always eagerly revolving new plans, was looked upon by his contemporaries as "terribile," *i.e.*, as a "superman." He can no more be judged by the standard of Christian morals than can any other of the great spirits of the Renaissance, and it were quite in vain to look for "religious points of view" in him. Only when we forget that Julius was Pope, do we get a correct idea of the greatness of this "old lion with the white mane," as Luther disrespectfully but appositely called him, and realise how far he towered above his crowned contemporaries, the Emperor Maximilian, Louis XII. of France, and others.

In the age of Machiavellianism it should cause no surprise that his policy was perfidious. He aimed higher than Alexander VI. and Cæsar Borgia, who played havoc with the nobility of Italy, and laid hands upon one domain after the other simply to increase the power of their house. By overthrowing Cæsar and adding his spoils to the papal possessions Julius became the founder of the modern States of the Church, though he was unable to establish them on firm foundations. With his diplomacy and his campaigns he entered the field of international politics. He was fighting for papal interests when he humbled proud Venice who, as Machia-

velli said, wished to make the Pope her chaplain. But he did not wish for the destruction of the Republic as did his allies, the Kings of Germany and France. On the contrary, it was in this very struggle—for which he was obliged to call in foreign help—that his honest hatred against "Barbarian rule" came to a head. He gave vent to this hatred shortly after by opposing French influence in Northern Italy through his alliance with Venice and the indispensable Spain. It was not without good reason that Francis I., then the Dauphin, said that he had had no more powerful adversary than Julius II.: in the vicissitudes of these wars, which sometimes brought him severe defeats and reduced him to great straits, the Pope showed himself capable of coping with the most difficult of situations.

He found himself in such a situation when the Emperor Maximilian and King Louis tried to drive him into a corner in Church matters. They brought up again the almost forgotten idea of a council, and caused an assembly to be summoned at Pisa in May, 1511, by a few cardinals who were devoted to their interests. At this council arrangements for a war against the Turks were to be concluded, and the reform of the Church in "head and members" was to be taken in hand once more. When at mid-summer the news came to Germany that the

Pope lay at the point of death, Maximilian seriously considered whether he would not himself take the tiara and so unite the Empire and the Papacy in one person. But Julius did not die. On the contrary, he succeeded in inflicting a signal defeat on his adversaries. In May, 1512, he opened the seventeenth ecumenical (or the eighteenth if the Council of Constance is counted) and fifth Lateran Council. Everything united to make this assembly triumphant. It is true that only Italians were present, but after a few months Julius obtained the recognition of his council by the great powers, including the Emperor. Thus Louis was isolated, and when the military events of the summer had broken the political supremacy of France in Italy, the way was clear for an attempt to strike a decisive blow in ecclesiastical matters also. The Pope decided that the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction should be solemnly proclaimed by the council. It was in the preparatory sitting that a speech was made, in the presence of Julius, to the effect that the Pope must be all in all "like a second God on earth." A few weeks later, in the night of the 20th–21st of February, 1513, he surrendered to a Power mightier than he, engrossed in ceaseless plans and vigorous action to the very end.

Nothing of the mature seriousness of Julius is to be found in the Medici who succeeded him. Leo X.'s philosophy of life is expressed in the saying "Fortune protects those who are born to great things." From a superficial point of view he was right. He was lucky: he reaped what his predecessor had sown. The brilliant success that he obtained in the abandonment of the Pragmatic Sanction by the French King himself, and in the conclusion of the Concordat of 1516, annulling all that had been achieved by the reform movement for the French Church, was due not to himself but to the fact that Francis I., menaced by England, thought it advisable to give way to the Pope. How short-sighted and how little interested in Church affairs Leo was is proved by the negotiations about the Concordat, which left far greater freedom to the Crown than the Pope ought to have allowed. He was satisfied with Francis's recognition of the council, which still continued to sit, and which, with an express reference to the Bull "Unam Sanctam," again gave expression in a particularly high-sounding manner to the papal claims to omnipotence. The Pope did not allow his god-like security to be disturbed by the storm which was brewing in Germany, and which was to bend those pretensions like a reed shaken by the wind. Even Roman Catholic

historians do not deny the fact that Leo's pontificate "was disastrous to the Papal See through the wholesale surrender to worldly tendencies, and to the dazzling new forms of civilisation, as also through the withdrawal of Church interests into the background." We must turn to Germany in order to be able to gauge the whole weight of the blame that rests upon Leo as the successor of St. Peter.

CHAPTER X

THE GERMAN REVOLUTION

FOR about a generation past Roman Catholic historians have been at great pains to set up against the dark and gloomy picture which Protestant historians are wont to draw of the German Church in the last half of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth, another picture in which the bright colours so predominate that it is often difficult to see any dark background. Even when they are willing to admit that all is not bright, they are persuaded that Luther's Reformation is the black spot that disfigures the picture. This reformation is stigmatised as an insurrection, a revolution, which choked up the source of good instead of helping it to flow, and fouled the fountain instead of cleansing it, as a sound reform would, from any impurities that might be visible to keen eyes. There may be a difference of opinion as to whether the

keen eyes, without Luther, would ever have been opened to the dangers of the Church, but it is quite certain that the storm which after 1517 swept over Germany with elemental violence, brought with it nothing of what had hitherto been understood by the word "reformatio." It was a "rebellio," as Leo XIII. rightly said in the Canisius Encyclical. Luther raised the standard of revolt against the one salvation-giving Church, and it would not be in harmony with his spirit to gloss over the fact. It is only on the question whether his revolt was productive of good or evil that opinions are divided, and will be divided to eternity.

There is, however, another question on which we can pass judgment. Even those who still look upon the Roman Catholic Church as the mother of the faithful cannot, if they have any feeling for the lessons of history, shut their eyes to the fact that, at this critical moment when it was more than ever a question of "to be or not to be," the appointed leaders were weighed and found wanting. Let us imagine a tribunal composed of all the great Popes of many centuries: would it not, if the Popes with whom we have just been dealing had appeared before it, have been forced to convict them of high treason?

We admire the fidelity with which the Germans clung to their Church, but we can also understand the wrath that filled the noblest in the land in face of the yearly increasing ruthlessness of the papal system of bleeding the country. It has been said, with good reason: "The haggling that was carried on in Rome over every kind of benefice reminds one, in its variety and openness, of the behaviour of men in a busy exchange." From the numerous examples afforded by the "presentation" to ecclesiastical positions, from the highest to the lowest, we select the best known. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the see of Mayence became vacant three times in ten years. Each time the vacancy was filled some 14,000 ducats had to be paid to Rome as confirmation dues—*i.e.*, £15,000, at least, in English money. When, in 1514, Albert of Brandenburg was confirmed in his appointment as Archbishop of Mayence and Magdeburg, and Administrator of Halberstadt, an additional charge of 10,000 ducats was demanded for the holding, illegal in itself, of the last-mentioned office together with the see of Mayence. Thus altogether about £25,000 was demanded. Nor was that all. It was the Curia, as has now been proved, which proposed to the Archbishop to cede to him

the sale, in his dioceses, of the indulgences for the finishing of St. Peter's, in order to enable him to pay off the debt of 29,000 florins which he had contracted with the Fuggers, the largest German bank and international business house, on the understanding that the net profits were equally divided between Rome and himself. Non-Catholics can remain indifferent to the dispute as to whether this affair is to be described as simony or not, in the canonical sense; it was, in any case, as Pastor honestly admits, "an extremely discreditable business on both sides."

If only it had not been a question of indulgences! Those who have any understanding of mediæval piety can appreciate the fact that the faithful believed fervently that they could obtain remission of punishment, both in this world and in the next, by good works of all kinds. That gifts of money should take the place of these good works was a convenience that was easy to understand so long as people knew that their money was helping on a good cause—the fitting out of a crusade, for instance. But that was by no means the case now; as a matter of fact the money drawn from the ever-increasing number of indulgences merely went to the insatiable Roman Curia. This was so well known that among

the "grievances of the German nation" which were discussed by the Diets this financial dependence was long a standing subject of deliberation. To this was added the knowledge of the complete indifference with which the Popes regarded religion and Church alike. Numberless men thought like Hutten, who wrote:—

> "The tradesman Julius cheats the credulous world:
> He locks up heav'n, which *he* possesses not.
> Sell what is thine, O Julius! Shameless 'tis
> To sell to others what thou lack'st the most."

Under Leo things became still worse. The extravagance of the Medici Pope, who threw away with both hands what his more prudent predecessor had collected, was boundless. The preparations for the wedding of one of his nephews cost, it is said, hundreds of thousands of pounds!

Luther was indeed right when he said in his eighty-first thesis that the barefaced sale of indulgences made it difficult even for the learned to uphold the reverence due to the Pope against his detractors, and still more against the keen objections of the laity. Whatever might be thought of the indulgence, the question could not but be asked (Thesis 86): "Why does the Pope, whose means are to-day much larger than

those of the richest merchant-prince, not build at least this one cathedral to St. Peter with his own money rather than with that of the faithful poor?" Those in Rome who knew the state of affairs in Germany were agreed that the bow must snap if it were bent further. Jerome Alexander, perhaps the shrewdest of all, told the Pope as early as 1516 that thousands in Germany were only waiting the word to cry out against Rome.

Leo did not care. He went hunting, amused himself with music, attended very unclerical plays and delighted in rich banquets, boisterous company, and doubtful jests. He did not for a moment realise the tremendous seriousness of what he himself called "monks' squabbles." What a world of difference between Luther and Leo! The one, sprung from the soil of Thuringia, conservative to the core, severs himself, step by step, gasping, with bleeding heart, from the Church to which he is bound by a thousand threads of belief and nationality; he breaks the yoke; erect, carrying his head high, the hero stands there, no saint, a heretic if ever there was one, and yet a man of childlike piety. The other, the son of lighthearted Florence, pampered and weakened from his youth by luxurious pleasures and humanistic trifling, the vicegerent of God, who is yet reported to have

said, "It is known on all sides how well the fable of Christ has served us and ours." How naïve must Luther's sensibilities have been when, in the autumn of 1520, with all he knew and after all his experience, he felt himself called upon to appeal to this Pope's conscience "simply out of honest anxiety and as in duty bound."

If further proof were needed of the complete indifference with which German affairs were treated by Rome, a glance at Luther's trial would be sufficient. The interview which Cardinal Cajetan had with Luther in October, 1518, on the occasion of the Diet at Augsburg, left no doubt as to what was to be expected from this "brute with the deep eyes and strange fantasies." In November Luther appealed to a general council. At Leipsic in the summer of 1519 he defended the thesis that the primacy of the Roman Church depended only on the "ice-like decrees of the Popes," while the text of Scripture and the authenticated history of more than a thousand years were against it. But the year 1519 passed without any serious action being taken against him. It was not till Dr. Eck, Luther's able and learned opponent—who looked upon him as a "heathen and a publican" after the Leipsic disputation—came to Rome and with his intimate knowledge of

the dangerous state of German affairs insisted on energetic measures, that the matter was taken in hand. And even then the Bull in which Luther was threatened with excommunication—the same that he consigned to the flames on December 10, 1520—was the result of a compromise.

It is true that the Curia could not do what it wished. It was too much mixed up with political intrigues to be able to act on definite principles. The necessity for considering the feelings of Frederick the Wise, the Elector of Saxony, was especially hampering. The first half of the year 1519 was taken up with the great question as to who should succeed Maximilian as Emperor, and for a time Frederick was the candidate supported by the Curia. The state of feeling in Germany also made it very doubtful whether Luther could be arraigned before a Roman court. However, for one who is interested in history from the point of view of the idea of the Papacy, all that is beside the mark. The Catholic historian is right when he speaks of the "inexcusable levity" of the Pope, who, "when Luther's case was before the Diet of Worms and numerous monks who sympathised with the Wittenberg professor were preparing to break their vows and marry, caused flippant plays in which this subject was represented—

nay, almost glorified—to be acted before him." During the Carnival there had been a continual round of festivities at the Castle of Sant' Angelo, and business was quite put on one side. At this very time the Bull issued on January 30th was made public in Germany—the Bull by which Luther and his followers were finally cut off from the Church. It is no wonder that Hutten wrote to Leo, "Thou must set bounds to thine insolence and put a curb on these childish, mischievous Bulls."

In the Brief that accompanied the Bull the nuncios were exhorted to take energetic measures "against all stiff-necked Lutherans, even if they are clad in electoral dignity." Aleander, to whom this command applied in the first place, welcomed it, but, being an intelligent man, he must have questioned its practicability. The reports which he sent to Rome from Worms, and which are among the most interesting documents of the early Reformation period, are expressed in unmistakable terms. For Aleander, the struggle between Henry and Gregory was, compared with the present one, but "violets and roses" ("viole e rose"), mere child's play. He is sure of it; nine-tenths of Germany are shouting "Luther!" and the remaining tenth at least "Death to the Curia!" That is naturally not due to pure

enthusiasm for Luther's religious views, even on the part of the clergy. "All these are by no means moved because they have understood much of the principles of Luther's doctrine—for it is only his diatribes and Hutten's satires that make any impression on them—but, being already exasperated against the Roman Church, they entangle their faith in the passions which embitter them against Rome, and let it be swallowed up in their hatred." The man who wrote this knew that it was a question of war to the bitter end. He must also have gnashed his teeth at the thought that the first battle had been lost and in consequence the prospect of victory had become doubtful.

Leo died on December 1, 1521, before he had completed his forty-sixth year. The election of his successor, Hadrian VI. (1522–23), was due to embarrassment on the part of the Cardinals; the course of the Conclave gave cause for fear that they would not agree on an Italian. For this reason the Bishop of Tortosa, who was not present, was elected. He was a Dutchman by birth, who in his youth had been professor of philosophy and theology at Louvain, and then tutor to the future Emperor, Charles. When Charles went to Germany in 1520 he left Hadrian—who did not, as usual, change his name when he became Pope—as his regent in

Spain. It may reasonably be doubted whether the Cardinals had a clear conception of the import of their decision. Hadrian, the last non-Italian in the Apostle's Chair, was the exact opposite of his predecessor in every respect. Always serious-minded and almost ponderous, he regarded it as his mission to make an end of the misdoings of the Curia and to attempt a real reform in the Church itself. It was only, he said, in order to restore the degraded Bride of Christ to her purity that he had bowed his neck beneath the yoke of the papal dignity. The stress he laid on the religious element in the doctrine of indulgences made Cajetan fear lest the authority of the papal see might suffer. If we can imagine for a moment Hadrian as the successor of Julius II., he would indeed have been a Pope after Luther's own heart. It is true that Hadrian had already shown, when professor at Louvain, that he was quite averse to any doctrinal innovations, and since then Luther had changed. Hadrian felt the greatest hatred for the heretic, the "carnal man," who "ceaselessly indulged in wine and drunkenness" and "wished to introduce the unrestrained life of wild beasts."

For all his good-will he accomplished nothing. In Rome the opposition of his courtiers frustrated every attempt at reform, while in Ger-

many, those who had the ear and heart of the people were not to be satisfied by such reforms as the Pope had in mind and as Eck proposed in several memorials with special reference to German affairs. With a success unparalleled in those early days of printing, the words of the true reformer flew through the land "as if the angels themselves were messengers." Hadrian's elaborate brief to the estates of the German realm, summoning them to the fight against the "poison of heresy" and prophesying that the fate of Dathan and Abiram, Ananias and Sapphira, Priscillian and Vigilantius would overtake the "apostate monk," spoke to deaf ears. Far from being influenced by it, the Diet of Nuremberg decided, in January, 1523, that nothing was to be taught in the Empire but the true, pure, unalloyed gospel. There was absolutely no thought of carrying out the Edict of Worms.

Hadrian died in September of the same year, and was succeeded by Giulio Medici, the cousin of Leo X., under the name of Clement VII. (1523–34). A man of great gifts, equally well versed in natural science and the humanities, he seemed peculiarly fitted to take the helm at this dangerous time. Unfortunately, not only was he unable to make himself master of the complicated situation, but the measures he took

contributed to make it worse. At a time when the Church revolution in Germany should have occupied his whole attention, he threw himself into a politico-military undertaking for which he lacked the necessary resources. He wished to drive the Spaniards, whose influence he himself had helped to increase under Leo, out of Italy. The result was that he was besieged in the Castle of Sant' Angelo and compelled to witness the plundering of Rome, the worst that the Eternal City had experienced since the days of the Vandals. And at the same time he had quarrelled with the Emperor, whose support was indispensable to him in the German question. This unfortunate state of things drove him into the arms of Francis I. of France, and the understanding between the French king and the Landgrave Philip of Hesse very nearly forced the Pope into a political alliance with the Protestant prince, whose attitude in the religious question he attacked most bitterly.

The most cursory glance at these matters is sufficient to show on what a dangerous incline the papal policy was proceeding. The entrance into secular affairs had been its ruin, and Clement only involved it still further. He showed no understanding of the religious question. "To root out the poisonous growth with fire and sword" seemed to him the last word

of wisdom; and the best advice he could give Charles V. through his legates at the Diet of Augsburg was that the Emperor should confine his attention to the sovereigns, from whom he could squeeze a large sum of money, which, indeed, was absolutely necessary to fight the Turks. In this way he lost ground in Germany year by year. A few months before his death Wurtemberg also went over to the Protestants, whose unconditional submission had long been out of the question.

Added to that came the secession of England. In June, 1534, Henry VIII., in a royal edict, abolished the papal supremacy over England, and on November 9th—a few weeks after Clement's death—he had his edict confirmed by Parliament. The cause of this far-reaching step was the Pope's refusal to grant Henry a divorce from Katharine of Aragon, the aunt of Charles V. About this vexed question the most animated negotiations had been going on for years between the courts of England and Rome. The shifty behaviour of the Pope had certainly contributed much to incense the King. We know now for certain that the legate Campeggio, when he came to England in 1528 on a special mission, was empowered to make great advances, whereas Clement, on the other hand, was continually prevented from

coming to a decision by consideration for the Emperor. It would not have been difficult for him to put canonical considerations on one side if he had really wished, and he can hardly have had any religious scruples. Yet it may be asked whether he would have gained anything permanently by acceding to Henry's wishes. All that is known of the political and ecclesiastical history of England at that period points to the fact that the time was ripe for shaking off the Roman yoke. As a matter of fact, in spite of all the clerical reactions, there has never been any serious prospect of restoring the papal rule in England.

Meanwhile, the Emperor, yielding to the pressure of the Protestants, had, at and after the Diet of Augsburg, thrown out the suggestion that the religious question should be decided by a council, and at a meeting with the Pope had strongly insisted on this point. Clement firmly rejected this attempt at conciliation, and his opposition to it is easy to understand if we remember what a renewal of the efforts of the fifteenth-century councils would have meant for the Curia; for Charles naturally took it for granted that the council would not sit, like those of the Lateran, in dependence on the Pope. But the Emperor did not cease to demand a settlement of the

religious difficulty, and found more encouragement from Clement's successor.

Paul III. (Alexander Farnese, 1534–49) showed his inclination towards a policy of conciliation in his choice of advisers. Among them Gasparo Contarini, the Venetian Councillor, ambassador of the Republic to Charles V. and afterwards to the papal court, had the greatest influence for a time. Paul made him while still a layman a member of the Sacred College. He was a gentle, peaceably-minded man, of unimpeachable integrity, who for years had fought, both by his words and his writings, for reform—*i.e.*, for the remedying of the evils in the Church and Curia—and who unreservedly supported the attempts at an understanding with the opposing party. Such an understanding could not but be regarded as hopeless from the start.

With Luther of course it was out of the question; in his Schmalkaldic Articles he was again hotly attacking the Pope, who "had usurped his vain, devilish business with false, wicked, blasphemous, usurped power, to the ruin of the entire holy Church of Christ"; but there was hope with those who thought like Melancthon: "I, Philip Melancthon, consider these articles also right and Christian. But concerning the Pope, I hold that, if he will allow the gospel, we should, for the sake

of peace and the common unity of those Christians who are under him and will be in the future, admit his customary superiority over the bishops, 'jure humano' (by human right)." Contarini prevailed upon the Pope to summon a council at Mantua, to which the Protestants were invited; when this plan failed he was the life and soul of the negotiations for union that took place after 1540. In the most important of these, the discussion on religious matters at Regensburg (1541), he took part. He even thought that he could formulate the doctrine of Justification in terms equally acceptable to Catholics and Protestants; but in this he overstepped the limits of what seemed tolerable to others who had long since found themselves unable to share his optimism in judging the situation.

Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, the leader of the intransigeants of the Curia, was the very opposite of Contarini; passionate in his emotions and impetuous in his actions, stern towards himself and towards others, he had, first as Bishop of Theate (Chieti) in the Abruzzi, then as Archbishop of Brindisi, already striven to effect the most rigorous reform of Church life; he was the founder of the Theatines, that severely ascetic order of regular clergy, numerically small but efficient and influential,

which was mostly recruited from among the higher nobility. Contarini, whose knowledge of human nature was not equal to his generosity, helped Caraffa to enter the Sacred College, which he had vainly tried to do under Clement VII. He was then already more than sixty, yet his future still lay before him. His programme turned on two points: first, war to the knife against heresy, in accordance with the maxim, "Heretics remain heretics, and must be treated as such"; second, the revival and reorganisation of the forces with which the Church had won her victories in the Middle Ages. He caused the Roman Inquisition to be founded (1542), he suggested the creation of the Index of forbidden books (1548), he supported the efforts made to drive out all easy-going Humanism. No diplomatist, but a man of reactionary principles, he allowed no worldly considerations to influence his actions.

It was not to be expected that such a man would be interested in the still eagerly discussed idea of calling a general council. As a matter of fact, he kept completely in the background when the proposal was carried out, and, in December, 1545, that great assembly was opened at Trent, the decisions of which mark a new era in the development of the Catholic Church. When Paul III. died, in

November, 1549, Del Monte, the President of the council, was elected Pope after some delay. He occupied St. Peter's Chair for five years, under the name of Julius III. In obedience to the Emperor's wish he admitted Protestant theologians to the council, which had been reopened after an interval of four years. Caraffa had no influence over him, but all the same his time had come. He had nearly been victorious in the Conclave which, in order to escape from a difficult situation, elected Marcellus II. (Marcello Cervini) after the death of Julius. On the death of Marcellus, twenty-two days later, he attained his desire, when close upon seventy-nine years of age. He had not lifted a finger to become Pope; his election was such a surprise, not only to the Cardinals, but also to himself, that he was convinced that the Popes were appointed by God.

The few years of the pontificate of Paul IV. (1555–59) were of great importance, not on account of outward successes—on the contrary, the Pope's narrow-minded hatred of Spain and all that was Spanish plunged the Curia into great difficulties—but because the spirit of the counter-Reformation is stamped upon them with remarkable sharpness. Paul is said not to have missed a single sitting of the Holy

Office, the court that judged heretics. He watched with inexorable sternness over the execution of the sentences, and did not spare even clergy of high dignity if their orthodoxy appeared doubtful to him. The Index of forbidden books published by him made booksellers tremble for their trade. But the whole force of his vehemence revealed itself in the Bull in which he laid down the rules for deposing and punishing rulers who were heretics or friendly to heretics, and even considered the possibility of deposing a Pope who in the earlier days of his priestly career had entertained heretical ideas. He prohibited all translations of the Bible into the vulgar tongue. He never forgave King Ferdinand for helping to conclude the religious peace of Augsburg (1555), which he looked upon as an insult to the Church. At the same time the octogenarian devoted himself with feverish impatience to reform. The clergy and ritual were to be reorganised, art and learning were to be made wholly subservient to the Church. Throughout he asserted his sovereign independence; he expected nothing from the council, and for that reason did not summon it again. He was the best-hated man in Rome; in his eyes even the Jesuits failed to find favour, and yet the future lay with them.

CHAPTER XI

FRESH TROOPS

WHILE, after the Protest at Spires, the defection of Germany from Rome was making irresistible progress, several young men, mostly Spaniards, who were studying in Paris, formed a religious society with the idea of working, by God's grace, for their own salvation and that of their fellow-men. The Basque Inigo (Ignatius) Lopez de Recalde, called Loyola after the castle in which he was born, who was considerably older than the others and intellectually superior to them all, became their leader. After a troubled youth this brave officer had become a fervent votary of the Blessed Virgin and her Son; to them and to the Church he dedicated his life. Though the young men had wished originally to work among the infidels in Palestine, Ignatius soon saw that other methods of attaining their end were better suited to the conditions of the age.

He and his friends, therefore, who had meanwhile completed their studies and had met again on Italian soil, added to the three customary monastic vows a fourth, viz., to fight under the standard of the Cross, to serve only the Lord of Heaven and the Roman Pontiff, His representative on earth. Whatever the Pope commanded them for the saving of souls and the spreading of the faith, and into whatever countries he might send them, they would consider themselves bound to obey as far as lay in their power without hesitation or excuses. The "Company of Jesus" was the name which Ignatius, in obedience to God's declared will, as he himself said, gave to the little community that set itself to conquer the world afresh for the Catholic Church. The name of Jesuits, by which they became known, was one which they themselves disliked.

Rightly recognising the priceless value of the support which the Papacy might receive from these fresh troops, Paul III. confirmed the Order of the Society of Jesus on September 27, 1540. Julius III. considerably increased their privileges. The Jesuits were granted the rights of the Mendicant Orders and of the secular clergy, and, together with their goods, were exempted from all secular jurisdiction and taxation. They were therefore subject

to no one but their own superiors and the Pope. They were given the right of exercising all priestly functions even during an interdict, of absolving from all penances and sins, of commuting the vows of the laity into other good works, of dispensing themselves from fasts, from keeping the canonical hours and from using the breviary, as well as of acquiring churches and estates everywhere and of founding conventual houses. Moreover, their General, who was appointed for life, was given, besides extensive powers over the members of the Order, the right of sending them anywhere on any kind of mission, of appointing them as teachers of theology in any place, and of conferring academic degrees upon them. The Order has shown itself grateful and kept its vows; it has worked steadfastly to lay the Catholic world unconditionally at the feet of the Pope as the absolute and infallible master of Christendom.

The hatred of Paul IV. for the Spaniards had a disturbing influence on his relations with the Jesuits. When a Jesuit writer stated that the Pope had so furthered the cause of the Order that he might almost be looked upon as its founder, this was at best only a self-delusion on the part of that pious man. In point of fact Ignatius did not succeed in

gaining the confidence of the Pope, but he never departed from his dutiful attitude to him. The Pope doubted even the orthodoxy of Ignatius—whose extravagant mysticism for a time rendered him suspect to the Inquisition—and as a politician he did not trust him the width of the road. He even withdrew pecuniary support from the Order and thereby placed Ignatius in great difficulties. Yet even Paul could not do without the Fathers; and when he needed a particularly capable legate he sent the Jesuit Salmeron, while the chant of infallibility that Lainez, the successor of Ignatius, was constantly raising, sounded gratefully in his ear.

How valuable to the Papacy the support of the Society was to become was seen when Pius IV. (Medici, sprung from a plebeian Milanese family unrelated to the Florentine Medici, 1559–65) again summoned the council to meet once more at Trent (January 18, 1562—December 4, 1563). Even in the first sittings under Paul III. Lainez and Salmeron had taken part by order of the Pope; they had modestly taken their places among the "lesser" theologians; but Salmeron, a good speaker and well versed in theology, distinguished himself even then, for the wording of the doctrine of Justification accepted by

the council was his. The second session under Julius saw the two Jesuits again in their place, but they had little opportunity of distinguishing themselves. The third session, however, made up for this. In the interval Lainez had become General of his Order and Salmeron had gained high reputation as a theologian and writer. Outwardly their demeanour was as modest as ever; Lainez contented himself with the last place of those reserved for the heads of Orders, knowing, it is true, that he thus had the advantage of being able to speak last in the debate. He urged his views with incomparable dialectical skill, and what he said was always calculated to promote the triumph of the papal claim to universal power over the Church. But above all he kept on presenting in ever-fresh forms the idea that definitions in matters of faith must come from the Holy See, and the infallibility of the councils is but an emanation from the infallibility of the Pope.

The Pope, thanks largely to these efforts of the Jesuits, remained master of the council, the decrees of which he confirmed in a special Bull. In accordance with a resolution of the council he gave to the ecclesiastical censorship of books the form which, with small variations, it kept down to the time of Leo XIII. But

above all he formulated the vow which thenceforth every one holding office in the Church had to take, the "Professio fidei tridentina." In this confession of faith the vow of obedience to the Pope as successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Christ on earth was included, and the clergy were thus fettered more firmly than ever to the papalistic idea.

This idea itself took a specially high flight in the years following the Council. The reign of Pius IV. was only one of transition. Pius V. (Michaele Ghislieri, a Dominican, 1566–72) was called to continue his work. What we know of his life and piety makes it easy to understand why he was canonised. As Pope he remained the monk in whose eyes religious things came before all else, who continued in prayer for hours at a time, who took part in processions barefoot and bareheaded, who counted worldly honour and earthly possessions as nothing, who did not lift a finger to advance his relations, and looked upon the scandalous goings-on in Rome as an abomination in the Holy Place. That the blood of heretics is on his halo need not perplex the Church, for this blood was shed for the greater glory of God and of His holy will.

Pius V. did much for the Church. It was under him that the resolutions of the Council

of Trent were first carried out in their entirety: at his command was issued the Roman Catechism, which became the religious handbook for the Catholic clergy of all lands; he caused the Roman breviary and missal to be published, and thus gave an uniform foundation both to public worship and to private devotion. But his heart—if we may speak of a heart in connection with things that so sorely wound our humane feelings—was really in the persecution of heretics. It was not for nothing that, before he became Pope, he had served the Inquisition for many years in various positions, and finally as Head of the Holy Office in Rome. His burning hatred of heretics consumed all else in him. As Pope also he waged a pitiless war against them wherever his secular arm could reach them. The last remnants not only of the reform movement in Rome and Italy, but also of the more liberal Catholicism, were rooted out by him. Under him died Pietro Carnesecchi; under him Bartolommeo Carranza, a Dominican like himself and Archbishop of Toledo, languished in the dungeons of the Inquisition. It was on apostate England, however, that Pius poured out all the vials of his wrath. The thought of the Catholics who had been driven thence never left him; he said once that he would willingly shed his life-blood

for them. He took vengeance by the thunderbolt of excommunication with which he thought to strike the maiden queen—a bastard in his eyes. We might well think ourselves back in the Middle Ages when we read the words with which the Pope uttered his sentence of deposition on the "sham queen" and freed her subjects from their oath of allegiance. The suspicion has even clung to him that he was no stranger to the attempts on Elizabeth's life. Undoubtedly he would have thought it a good work, if some one had made away with the heretic who, for him, personified the opposition to God and His gospel. But Pius is not less holy in the opinion of the Church because he gave way to such thoughts.

For us, however, who are not discussing holiness and unholiness, but are rather endeavouring to trace the working out of an idea, there is something else of more importance. The necessity for checking heresy brought the Papacy once more face to face with its apostolic mission. The command, "Feed My sheep," still sounded, with the same inflexibility as a thousand or fifteen hundred years ago. Pius V. devoted himself with disinterested faithfulness to this work and did not shrink from giving the sharpest provocation when there was question of asserting this idea.

He added the Protestant heresy to the Bull "In Cœna Domini" (*i.e.*, "at the Supper of the Lord"), the list, which had been drawn up centuries before, of all that was banned by the Holy See, and once more ordered it to be read aloud on Maundy Thursday, to remind princes and people afresh of their dependence on the Pope alone, in things both temporal and spiritual.

It cannot be denied that for a time things looked as if the idea of the Papacy were destined to a new birth. The community of interests out of which grew at that time a definite Catholic policy of which the Pope seemed to be the natural leader, made the Powers look more than ever to Rome. Under the successors of Pius V., who continued his policy, Gregory XIII. (Ugone Buoncampagni, 1573–85), Sixtus V. (Felice Peretti, 1585–90), and —after two Popes of no importance—Clement VIII. (Ippolito Aldobrandini, 1592–1605), not only did the threads of the ecclesiastical counter-Reformation meet in Rome, but Rome's influence is to be seen in all public State affairs. How eagerly did the Curia take part in those plans for the invasion of England which reached their culminating point in the Armada and came to an end with its destruction! How busily did it interfere in the complications in

France under Charles IX., Henry III., and Henry IV! His influence over the Powers of Southern Europe enabled Pius V. to stir up Christian feeling against the Turks, and Sixtus V. could dream of the possibility of conquering Egypt.

Yet we should be quite in the wrong if we assumed that, for the Powers, community of interests gave rise to any idea of dependence on the Papal See in the sense of the apostolic watchword once more taken up by Pius V. The hereditary devotion of the German and Spanish Hapsburgs proved this as little as the feigned submissiveness of Henry IV. when on his conversion to Catholicism (1595) he made his ambassadors accept in his stead the absolving blow of the papal rod. In reality this devotion very quickly came to an end even in Spain, and the French King never had any intention of directing his policy otherwise than in accordance with his own judgment and interests. Even Clement VIII. was obliged to fall back on the policy of "Do ut des," which was certainly a lapse from the ideal, but at the same time was the only way of attaining anything definite. Gregory XIII. had a medal struck to celebrate the massacre of St. Bartholomew (1572), Clement VIII. did not dare to oppose the Edict of Nantes (1598). He had

to come to terms with the King, for he needed his help; it was thanks to him that he succeeded in incorporating Ferrara—the Duchy of the House of Este—in the States of the Church.

The care of the States of the Church became an increasingly important point in the papal programme. The temporal power proved more and more dangerous for the representative of St. Peter, for the administration of the States cost much time and money, and always contained the germ of misunderstandings with the other rulers in Italy. For the historian of the Papal States or of Rome under the Popes this period offers a wide field. Pius V. had already tried to rescue the States from the decay to which they seemed doomed, but the Draconian and doctrinaire measures of the unworldly Inquisitor did more harm than good. Gregory XIII.—the same who won undying fame by his reform of the Calendar—did his best, but he was powerless against the brigandage that grew more daring than ever under the protection of the nobility, while money was always lacking for the public buildings and improvements which he began. There was no epoch-making Pope till Sixtus V. In his youth Felice Peretti had been a swineherd, then he went to the Franciscans, and since he had taken

Rome by storm in 1552 with his Lenten sermons he had been the darling of Ghislieri, who shortly after became Pius V. He ruled like a prince after the heart of Machiavelli, though a prince not of the Renaissance, but of the counter-Reformation. The people regarded him with awe. They credited him, like Alexander VI., with having made a compact with the Evil One, and destroyed his statue after his death. He watched over the public order with cruel severity and alrely succeeded in mastering the brigands. His brilliant and much-admired financial policy, which he placed under the protection of the Virgin and SS. Peter and Paul, filled his coffers, though he dipped freely into them to carry out great plans in great style. Rome owes him various agricultural improvements, especially the first steps towards draining the Pontine marshes, and the great water supply, the Aqua Felice, which had to be brought into the city from the Alban hills. Nor was Art idle under him, though the spirit of Sixtus IV., whose name he had taken, did not rest upon this Pope, still less that of Julius II. or Leo X. The obelisk in St. Peter's Square, surmounted by a cross, is a standing monument of the pseudo-improvement of the antique by a misunderstood Christianity.

There remains one more question, the most

important of all: What did these Popes do for the counter-Reformation itself? But this question is inseparably connected with another: What was their attitude to the Jesuits? The Order was not founded to fight against Protestantism; but, as things were, this necessarily became before long their most important task. The unshaken tenacity with which the first generations of the Order devoted themselves to it cannot be sufficiently admired. They saw at once that no success could be hoped for without a thoroughgoing change for the better within the Church itself, and, with a zeal that feared no obstacles, they set to work to bring about this change. The average ecclesiastic looked on with unfavourable eyes; the Jesuits attacked what was rotten too violently and broke too decidedly with ordinary routine Christianity not to meet with opposition. Their boundless belief in articles of faith which enlightened Catholics had long allowed to drop, the unyieldingness with which they insisted on blind obedience to the Church and her Head, made them very unpopular at first, especially with ecclesiastical politicians. On the other hand they were loved by the people, whose childlike minds they exactly understood, to whose consciences they appealed without laying too heavy a burden upon them, whom

they delighted by the imaginative richness of their worship and whose simple piety they fed with new and ingenious devices. The crown of their labours, however, was the capture of the schools and thereby of the power of influencing the coming generation.

Rome remained their centre, the Pope their chief protector. One of the most fruitful suggestions of Ignatius was the foundation of those clerical seminaries in Rome, where Catholic youths from countries which were either non-Catholic or threatening to become so, were educated, in order that later on they might work with absolute self-surrender to diffuse in their own lands the ideas imbibed in Rome. The model of these colleges was the Collegium Germanicum with its red coats, founded by Ignatius and reorganised by Gregory XIII. Gregory also transformed the Collegium Romanum, which likewise owed its inception to Ignatius, into the "Gregorian University," and it is still to-day the nursery of the Jesuit ultramontane spirit. Indeed, he had a hand in all the scholastic enterprises of the Jesuits.

As the Order was ruled at that time by a weak General whom Gregory himself had forced upon it, it is easy to understand that papal influence became greater than was consistent

with the ideas of its founder. Claudio Aquaviva, whose Generalship (1582–1605) marks the highest point of the first period in the development of the Order, restored the independence that, with all due submission to papal authority, was essential to it. This was the more difficult to accomplish in that the long existing antagonism to the Dominicans became an open hostility at this time, and the Dominicans in conjunction with the Spanish Government did their best to stir up mistrust against the Jesuits.

Apart from this they had a hard battle to fight under the despotic Sixtus V. The Pope considered it an act of high treason that the Jesuit Bellarmine should twist the theory of the universal dominion of the Papacy, which had been set forth by Pius V. and appeared self-evident to his successors, into the view that spiritual power alone belonged directly and immediately to the Pope as Pope, while temporal power, though of the most exalted kind, only belonged to him indirectly, just because of his spiritual power. He did not see that it was only a question of an extraordinarily skilful manœuvre which led to the same goal by a roundabout road without contradicting too flatly the modern conception of the State, and that in practice no Jesuit would ever think of

distinguishing between "direct" and "indirect." Clement VIII. soon learnt to appreciate the Order again. In the political intrigues that almost entirely filled his time the Jesuits proved themselves astute accomplices, never at a loss in their choice of means, always able to interpret custom and law in accordance with their highest ends. There was soon nothing of importance in which they did not play a leading part; by their adroit attitude at court and their methods in the confessional, so skilfully calculated to suit the weaknesses of the great, they were able to keep themselves in power.

Pope Paul V. (Camillo Borghese, 1605–21), who put Copernicus on the Index and governed the Church on the principles of Sixtus V., leant throughout on the Jesuits and supported them in difficulties. The bitterness of his feud with Venice, in which he resorted to the mediæval weapons of ban and interdict, was largely due to the fact that the Republic had driven out the Jesuits and the Pope was anxious to compel their return. Just at that time they were engaged in spreading everywhere, with their seductive dialectic, the dangerous doctrine of the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power, of princes to the Pope. Tremendous excitement was aroused by their

theories. The Spaniard Mariana's "De Rege," in which the lawfulness of killing tyrants was illustrated by the example of Clément, the assassin of Henry III. of France, was burnt by the hangman when Ravaillac's murder of Henry IV. in 1610 seemed to prove whither such views must lead. The same fate befell Suarez' "Defence of the Catholic Faith," which was aimed at James I. of England, and in which the Roman Catholic subjects of the king were incited to rebel against the Government. Paul V. recognised his own spirit in these theories and defended them warmly and even officially. He forbade the English Roman Catholics to take the oath of allegiance and said that the Lord of Hosts had judged the reprobate French King.

The Jesuits' greatest triumphs, however, were under Gregory XV. (Alessandro Ludovisio, 1621–23)—or perhaps it would be more correct to say under Ludovico Ludovisio. He it was who ruled in the name of the decrepit old Pope his uncle, and he had been brought up by the Jesuits. Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier, the great missionary, were canonised at this time, and, what was most important, the Congregation of the Propaganda, the centre of Roman Catholic missions to the heathen, was founded. Also, as if to illustrate in the most

drastic way Rome's claim to be the mistress of all culture and learning, Maximilian of Bavaria gave over the Heidelberg library, which he had captured, to the Pope, who had it placed in the Vatican under the name of "Bibliotheca Palatina."

Without the Jesuits the Papacy could certainly not have become once more a great power in the eyes of the nations, and yet Sixtus V. was inspired by the right feeling when he found himself unable to conquer his dislike to the Order. If we reflect upon the idea of the Papacy and upon the great men who embodied it, we feel loath to leave this Pope. He is the last for centuries who is really interesting. Not the least reason for this is that the Jesuits secured the chief part in guiding the destinies of the Church. The Black Pope gradually takes his place beside the white one, or, to use another metaphor, the Pope becomes more and more like the king in a game of chess. It is of course the soldier's first duty to protect the king, but the king has a very limited power of moving and he is only allowed to take part in the battle so long as he does not endanger the victory. The Pope remains the representative of Christ to whom the Jesuits have sworn to be faithful even unto death, but their General is the leader, and the "Company

of Jesus" is the guard. Will it be possible to avoid friction with such an arrangement, and will military subordination stand the test?

CHAPTER XII

DEFEATS

NO one can dispute the fact that the Popes of the counter-Reformation took their office as shepherds of souls seriously, often almost too seriously. We only realise what that means when we turn from Gregory XV. to Urban VIII. (Matteo Barberini, 1623–44), who reigned longer than any Pope since the time of Hadrian I. and Leo III. We breathe quite a different air. We feel as if we were in Florence or some other Italian princely court; the thought that we have to do with a Pope is the last that occurs to us. Urban VIII. busied himself with cannon and soldiers; he fitted up the rooms of the Vatican library as an armoury. In contrast to the pious exercises of his predecessors he composed verses and sought after wealth and splendour for his family, which he had raised to princely rank. Men used to say later of the bees in the

Barberini coat-of-arms that it was no wonder they were fat, for they had had their fill of honey for more than twenty years. The papal foreign policy changed also. The Emperor Ferdinand II. could never persuade Urban to look upon the Thirty Years' War as a religious war, though he himself waged it as such. Urban's anti-Hapsburg interests even led him to sympathise with Gustavus Adolphus, and it was indignantly said at the Curia that the King of Sweden showed more zeal for Lutheranism than the Holy Father for the one true faith. In these circumstances it might seem strange that this Pope should have given the Bull "In Cœna Domini" its final form, if we did not know that he was as proud of his position as any of his predecessors, though more from a personal point of view than as the successor of St. Peter. In the history of intellectual development he has no good name, for it was under him that the trial of Galileo took place.

His reign was not a happy introduction to the next hundred years. Viewed as a whole, they form no glorious page in the history of the Idea of the Papacy and of those who embodied it. We meet with neither great thoughts nor powerful personalities. It makes little difference whether the Popes are called Innocent or

Alexander, Clement or Benedict. An exception might perhaps be made in favour of Innocent XI. (1676–89), who at least created a definite impression, though it cost him his position as head of Catholic Christendom. The fact that he was Pope did not prevent him from giving his blessing to William of Orange, in the hope that his expedition to England would embarrass his hated foe Louis XIV. Ranke rightly draws attention to the fact that Rome was the centre of an alliance which had the aim and result of freeing Protestanism in Western Europe from the last and greatest danger that threatened it, and of permanently gaining the English throne for that form of belief. The spirit of the counter-Reformation had died out.

Generally speaking, we may say that the Popes were of no account in international politics. No one heeded the touching lamentation with which Innocent X. (1644–55) bemoaned the "serious hurt done to the Catholic religion and the papal rights" by the Peace of Westphalia. It was quite in vain that Clement XI. (1700–21) stigmatised the raising of the Elector of Brandenburg to the throne of Prussia as a "shameless crime against religion" degrading the sacredness of the royal dignity. No one took any notice

when the same Clement insisted that his Nuncios should be admitted to the negotiations for the Peace of Utrecht. The Holy See was bereft of Sicily, Sardinia, and soon after Parma and Piacenza, in spite of the Pope's protests; Austria and the Bourbons opposed him; the claims of Naples, which would fain have abolished all ecclesiastical privileges, not to speak of the Pope's, became peculiarly burdensome. In the year 1737 the Venetian Ambassador in Rome wrote to his Government: "I cannot deny that there is something unnatural in the sight of all the Catholic Governments in such disagreement with the Roman Court that no reconciliation can be imagined which would not vitally injure this Court. Whether it be due to greater enlightenment, as many say, or to the spirit of oppression of the weak, it is certain that the rulers are rapidly advancing towards depriving the See of Rome of all its temporal rights."

If this was true in secular politics, it was hardly less so in ecclesiastical. Here, too, the Pope's influence was everywhere on the wane. France especially was a source of difficulty. Louis XIV., the Most Christian King, had indeed Jesuit directors, and Mme. de Maintenon, a zealous proselytiser, was continually stirring him up against heretics. Nevertheless he was

always at war with the Curia. It was opposition to the Curia and not a fit of ecclesiastical liberalism that made him give his sanction to the Gallican ideas with which the French clergy were still imbued, and issue a royal edict (1682) to the effect that not only had the Pope no power in civil matters but also his spiritual authority was subordinate to that of the general councils, and even in matters of faith his decision without the assent of the Church was not inalterable. Innocent XI. caused the four articles in which the declaration of these "Gallican liberties" ("Libertés de l'église gallicane") was formulated to be burnt by the hangman, and Innocent XII. had the satisfaction of seeing the bishops obliged "to throw themselves at the feet of His Holiness and to confess their unspeakable grief" at having accepted the articles. Louis had left them in the lurch as soon as a temporary better understanding with the Curia made him think it advisable. If the articles were not formally withdrawn, there was no further talk for the time being of a Gallican Church independent of Rome.

The French clergy gave the Curia constant trouble on another point also. The second half of the seventeenth century was filled with the so-called Jansenist disputes, *i.e.*, with the move-

ment started by the Dutch theologian Cornelius Jansenius, or, to be more precise, by his book on the theology of St. Augustine, published after his death (1640). In this work the doctrines of the absolute corruption of human nature, of the bondage of the human will, of the irresistible action of Divine grace, and of predestination, were expounded in the words and in the spirit of the great Father. At a time when the Jesuits were teaching very much the opposite, this revival of an inward piety that did not shrink from sounding the depths of religion could not fail to make a deep impression. A number of learned men, who were also able writers and closely connected with the Cistercian convent of Port Royal des Champs, near Paris, and with its pious Abbess Angélique Arnauld, banded themselves together to propagate these serious ideas in opposition to the superficiality of Jesuit morals and religion. They even took the aggressive. It was Jansenism that inspired the celebrated "Lettres provinciales" (1661), in which the mathematician Blaise Pascal pilloried Jesuitism before the educated world.

But the Jesuits were under the protection of the Holy See. In 1642 they had procured from Urban VIII. a Bull censuring the "Augustinus Redivivus," though only in general terms. Innocent X. condemned as heretical (1653) a

number of propositions drawn from Jansenius's book, and when the Jansenists contended that these propositions did not express their opinions, Alexander VII. (1656) ruled that they did. This encroachment of the doctrinal authority of the Pope—who did not seem called upon to decide a simple matter of fact—aroused widespread indignation. As things turned out, the Curia under Clement IX. (1668) condescended to retract on this point, though it maintained the condemnation of the propositions. It seemed almost as if the dispute were ended by this compromise, when the publication of a New Testament with Jansenistic notes by the Oratorian Paschasius Quesnel stirred it up afresh. The book soon obtained a large circulation, and as at the same time a critical edition of St. Augustine's works issued by the Benedictines proved that Jansenius was right in claiming that his ideas were Augustinian, the result was a further strengthening of the feeling against the Jesuits and the Curia. The Jesuits then induced Clement XI. to issue the Constitution "Unigenitus" (1713), in which a hundred and one propositions from Quesnel's New Testament were condemned, because susceptible of Jansenistic interpretation. The French clergy were divided into "Constitutionalists" and "anti-Constitutionalists."

Finally the Curia succeeded, by granting the much desired cardinal's hat to the ministers of Louis XV., in obtaining the recognition of the Bull as a law of the realm.

This was the last success gained by the Curia —or by the Jesuits—for a long season. The Society of Jesus was on the high-road to power when their long-maintained caution deserted them and they became over-confident. Complaints of their theatrical method of education, of the superficiality of their teaching, and of the unscrupulousness of their morality grew louder and louder. Moreover, great indignation was aroused by the ease with which the Jesuit missionaries accommodated themselves to heathen customs, and especially by the commercial spirit that characterised their undertakings. Finally, they ruined their cause with the Pope by their refractoriness in India and China to the papal decrees.

Benedict XIV. (Prospero Lambertini, 1740–58), who had most to suffer from this insubordination, had thought, towards the end of his life, of reforming the Order by force. He was, indeed, a wonderful Pope. It has been well said that with him the spirit of enlightenment took possession of the Papal See; though, of course, not in an anti-ecclesiastical form. Benedict showed an understanding for the needs of his

time in so far as they were consistent with the traditions of his apostolic office. As sovereign he looked after the welfare of his subjects, he encouraged agriculture and industries and reduced the burden of taxation. Himself a man of letters, he regularly frequented the society of scholars, enlarged the Vatican library, and founded academies of Archæology and Church History. As head of the Church he cut down much that had grown rank under the Jesuits, and interested himself in the education of the clergy. In politics he was moderate; he showed an accommodating spirit as regards the limits of the spiritual and temporal spheres of power, and succeeded in maintaining peaceable relations even with the Protestant rulers. Frederick the Great spoke of him with marked respect, and even if there was irony in Voltaire's dedication of his "Mahomet" to the Pope, the very fact of the dedication proves that attention was paid to Benedict by the advanced men of his day. If we add that the Pope, while leading an irreproachable life, was a cheerful and amiable companion—many of his witticisms sound somewhat strange in the mouth of the representative of St. Peter—we get a picture that is almost unique in the history of the Popes. "Though all truth," is one of his sayings, "is locked up in my breast I must confess that I cannot find the key to it."

We can understand that such a Pope was not after the Jesuits' own heart. They exerted all their influence in the Sacred College when Benedict's successor was to be elected, and Clement XIII. (Carlo Rezzonico, 1758-69) was a mere creature of the Order. No reforms were to be expected from him; when Louis XV. tried to obtain one from Ricci, the General of the Jesuits, he made the famous reply: "Sint ut sunt aut non sint" ("As they are or not at all"). Then the temporal powers began the fight on their own account. In Portugal the despotic minister Pombal took advantage of an attempt against the King's life—fathered on the Jesuits without demonstrable justification—to drive the Order from the country (1759). In France the bankruptcy of the firm of La Valette in Martinique—financed by the Jesuits—and the ensuing scandal and trial made them impossible (1764). The remaining Bourbon States—Spain, Parma, Naples—and also Milan and Venice, followed suit. Clement tried to protect the Order by inflicting the Interdict on its persecutors, but in vain. He complained in powerless wrath that "the Vicar of Christ was treated like the lowest of mortals."

His successor was the last Clement, for he would indeed be a bold man who should take the name after him. Clement XIV. (Lorenzo

Ganganelli (1769–74), who was elected after a long Conclave, had been the candidate of the Bourbon courts. Like a prudent man, who had said once, "I sleep quietly because I know that my thoughts sleep with me," and who, as the French ambassador opined, always appeared to be on the side of the person to whom he was speaking, he had made no definite promises; but his remark that a Pope could break up the Order, in spite of the Jesuits' assertion to the contrary, might be considered sufficient guarantee. However, he waited four years before making up his mind, under increasing pressure, to this momentous step. On July 21, 1773, he signed the Brief "Dominus ac redemptor noster" ("Our Lord and Saviour"), which was made public on August 16th. An attentive study of this carefully drawn up document, remarkable for its length, shows that there is no question of a condemnation of the Order on principle. On the contrary, the alleged ground for the dissolution of the Order was that it no longer produced the rich fruits and the great benefits which had been expected at its foundation and which it had really produced in its early days. Attention was drawn to the divisions it had caused in the various States and even in the Church, to the teaching of its members, which was dangerous to sound faith and good morals,

and to their unspiritual greed after worldly possessions. It was stated to be impossible for the Church to attain true and lasting peace as long as the Society of Jesus remained in existence.

From the Catholic point of view it can always be truly objected against this Brief that, in spite of its show of absolute papal authority, it was but a measure of convenience; the reasons alleged justify only a censure and not the dissolution of the Order. The non-Catholic who is interested in the history of the papal idea must on no account leave out of consideration the fact that the dissolution of the Order was directly opposed to the interests of the Papacy. That the precariousness of the measure did not make itself felt, as must have been the case in normal circumstances, was due to the French Revolution, which swept like a tidal wave over the whole Catholic world and even submerged the Barque of Peter. No steersman, however skilful—not even the must astute Jesuit—could have saved it from this disaster.

The vacancy after Clement's death lasted for more than four months. Pius VI. (Angelo Braschi, 1775–99) could not be elected till he had reassured the Bourbon courts on the Jesuit question. If he could have had his way

he would have instantly withdrawn his predecessor's edict. However, he had to content himself with granting a semi-official protection, so to speak, to the dispersed Order. Besides, his attention was absorbed by the dangerous turn which Church affairs had taken in Germany and Austria.

The German Church had been for nearly two centuries under the influence and finally under the domination of Jesuitism, but about the middle of the eighteenth century a reaction set in. It soon attained formidable proportions, aided as it was by the so-called "Enlightenment" in philosophy, literature, and history. This liberal Catholicism was strongly represented at the courts of the great bishops and archbishops, who, by appointing liberal-minded professors to their seminaries, ensured that the clergy should be made acquainted with the advance of learning. The natural result was a weakening of that antagonism to Protestantism which the Jesuits had made so acute, and the gradual emancipation of the Protestant subjects even of the spiritual princes. A still more important consequence was a lessening of papal authority: episcopalistic ideas sprang up everywhere, and beside Gallicanism we find clearly expressed the "natural rights" theories of men like Hugo

Grotius and Pufendorf, and the doctrine of the omnipotence of the State.

The last-mentioned ideas are to be found in a concentrated form in a work on the "State of the Church and the Legitimate Power of the Roman Pontiff," written in Latin by the suffragan bishop of Treves, Nicholas von Hontheim, and published under the pseudonym of Justinus Febronius, in 1763. The author indicates on the title-page the object of the book, viz., the reunion of the different confessions, and for the attainment of this object he recommends a return to the constitution of the Primitive Church. This was, indeed, a Utopia, but Febronius supported it by an exposition based on wide reading in Dutch, French, and German, and made a very impressive defence of the episcopalistic system. The eager reception of the book was immediately noted by the Curia, and in 1764 it was already on the Index. Clement XIII. endeavoured, without result, to make Joachim Philip of Treves take measures against his suffragan. Clement XIV. was engrossed by the Jesuit question, but Pius VI. took up the matter again, and in 1778 Clement Wenzel of Treves, influenced by ex-Jesuits, obliged the almost octogenarian author to retract.

But the matter was by no means ended by

Hontheim's submission. On the contrary, it was soon seen that the Febronius affair was likely to have after-effects on ecclesiastical politics that would be very unpleasant for the Curia. In the year 1785 Pius VI., by agreement with Charles Theodore of Bavaria, established a nunciature at Munich. Bavaria, which was then very scattered, including, besides Old Bavaria and the Upper Palatinate, the Palatinate proper also, and the Duchies of Berg and Jülich, had no independent bishop of its own, but was under the ecclesiastical sway of sovereign bishops like those of Cologne and Salzburg. This measure, therefore, was as comprehensible as the fact that the bishops expected from it a curtailment of their privileges, since the Nuncio, if he were on good terms with the Government, could easily usurp the jurisdiction himself. The Archbishops of Mayence, Treves, Cologne, and Salzburg therefore made the Nuncio question an opportunity for testing and defining the rights of the Pope. In the so-called "Punctation" of Ems (1786) they reduced the primacy of the Pope, as Febronius had done, to what it had been during the early centuries of Christianity, and demanded the complete independence of the bishops under the protection of the Emperor, in all questions affecting the national Churches.

It is impossible not to sympathise with these demands. Had they been made good, Tridentine Catholicism would have been rooted out. In view of all the enlightenment shown in the government of the spiritual princes, we would fain dismiss the doubt whether they were really in earnest in their attempt to shake off the yoke of Rome. Unfortunately, however, it is only too evident that they were inspired to a great extent by selfish considerations, and we are justified in asking whether the result would not have been merely a change of masters for the Church. The lesser bishops who kept apart, if only because they had not been invited to do otherwise, were not, perhaps, wholly wrong when, like the Frankish bishops in the time of the Pseudo-Isidore, they preferred the rule of Rome to that of their powerful colleagues. In any case it all came to nothing. The Archbishop of Mayence, desiring from the Curia the confirmation of a coadjutor who was indispensable to him for political reasons, very soon withdrew, and the whole thing went to pieces in consequence. Pius had an easy victory. The archbishops submitted unconditionally to his Brief of simple condemnation of their attempt (1789). Then came the storm of the Revolution, and, when it had swept past, the

sovereign spiritual princes were gone, and with them the plan of forming a German national Church.

The Emperor Joseph II. had held out to the archbishops the prospect of his "entire co-operation and support to the fullest extent of his imperial duty as Defender of the Church." In reality he did nothing, because from the standpoint of his belief in the absolutism of the State he regarded any independent Church government as harmful. In continuation of the reforms begun under Maria Theresa, the Emperor had turned the Austrian Church upside down, and, completely withdrawing it from Roman influence, had subordinated it to the State. He had also taken into his own hands the regulation of the education of the clergy, of divine service, and of monastic life. However excellent this legislation was in certain points—it included the Charter of Tolerance for the Protestants (1781)—it had yet one fundamental defect: it showed no understanding for the Church as set apart to nourish and carry on the religious life of the nation, and it therefore wounded religious feeling. But it was taken in hand with great energy, and seemed likely to meet with success.

The Pope, highly disturbed, decided, in order

to avert misfortune, upon an unusual step. He journeyed to Vienna, and there experienced the bitterest disappointment. Though Joseph at least kept up appearances towards the Holy Father, his minister, Count Kaunitz, did not consider even that necessary, and abruptly declined any negotiation with the Pope. Completely unsuccessful, Pius returned across the Alps, and it was but small consolation to him that the faithful, more because of the unusual sight of a Pope than out of religious feeling, accorded him many an ovation, both at Vienna and on his journey. Relations between the Emperor and the Pope became so strained that Pius, in naïve misunderstanding of the real situation, uttered threats of excommunication; his letter was returned to him with the request that he would punish the insolent man who had dared to write it in the Pope's name. It was gratifying for him that the Emperor's reforms in Belgium, which at that time belonged to Austria, and was a lost province in any case, were a miserable fiasco. But, on the other hand, Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany by virtue of the Austrian secundogeniture, supported by his metropolitan, Scipione Ricci, who took a warm interest in Church affairs, dealt quite as ruthlessly with the papal prerogatives as his imperial

brother, whose edicts he maintained when he succeeded him on the throne.

Yet what was all this compared with the great sorrow that came to the Church and her Head from France, the emancipated daughter? The sound that had been growing ever louder and shriller in the ears of the Pope since the opening of the new era in 1789, was the cry, raised years before by Voltaire and now repeated by thousands and thousands: "Écrasez l'infâme!" It was the Church that they meant, at first only as the clerical organisation which had been vowed to destruction because of the moral corruption of the high and the superstition of the low, but soon the *religion* of the Church was attacked, and finally Christianity itself. To begin with, the Pope kept silence on the Civil Constitution of the Clergy passed by the National Assembly in July, 1790, and signed by the King under compulsion in August. But when the number of the clergy who refused to swear allegiance to the new constitution increased, and tens of thousands preferred to go into exile rather than bow to the revolutionary rule, Pius fulfilled his duty as Vicar of Christ and successor of the apostles: he condemned the Constitution. The Paris mob burned the Pope "in effigie" and his Encyclical "in natura,"

and the National Assembly seized Avignon, which had belonged to the Papacy since the fourteenth century.

And now events crowded thick and fast. The refusal of the Pope to allow the emblem of the new Republic to be publicly displayed in his capital, even by the French embassy, the popular tumult to which a secretary of this embassy fell a victim, and many other things, embittered the political relations between France and the Holy See. Then the Pope joined the First Coalition of the Powers against France, and this at last gave Bonaparte the welcome opportunity of advancing on Rome. Negotiations and attempts at conciliation cost only money, land, and men; by the Peace of Tolentino (1797) Avignon was finally, and Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna were temporarily, lost to the Papacy. New tumults in Rome led to the declaration of the Republic in February, 1798. The sick old Pope was dragged away to the Dauphiné, where on August 29, 1799, he died. Thus the century ended with the severest defeat. The temporal power of the Church seemed at an end, the rock of Peter was tottering, and the words "Feed My sheep" were drowned in the storm of the Revolution.

CHAPTER XIII

RECONSTRUCTION

IN a report of the Bavarian Government at Innsbruck to the ministry in Munich, made in 1808, it is stated that "amid constant struggles against the secular power and the spirit of the century the Papacy in its present form is advancing to its fall," and that "a division of the two powers which should rule over the citizens of a State is no longer conceivable, but that everything points to the most complete concentration of the supreme power." The course of events in the time of Napoleon seemed to justify this view.

It is true that the First Consul did not oppose the return to Rome of the new Pope, Pius VII. (Barnabà Luigi, Count Chiaramonti, March 13, 1800, to August 20, 1823), who had just been elected at Venice, and that he showed him much consideration both in the negotiations regarding the reorganisation of the French

Church and on later occasions. This was of course not due to religious veneration nor even to personal regard for him, but solely to reasons of policy; so long as the "little coronation bottle," as Lafayette put it, "had not been broken over his head" Bonaparte needed the Pope. Hardly had Napoleon become Emperor and—a little later—King of Italy, when he changed his tone. He used the squabble which now arose as a pretext for declaring Rome an imperial city (May, 1809), for uniting the rest of the States of the Church with France, and for causing the Pope, who excommunicated the authors of and participators in this act of sacrilege, to be seized in the night of the 5th and 6th of July and taken to Savona, near Genoa.

As Pius continued to oppose the ecclesiastical measures of the Emperor, he was compelled in May, 1812, to cross the Alps like his predecessor. He was so ill that the last sacraments were administered; but even that made no difference in the rough way in which he was treated. Arrived at Fontainebleau, he agreed, under great pressure, in January, 1813, to terms that menaced the sovereignty of the Papal See, only to retract them a few weeks later, tortured with the keenest remorse. Meanwhile the great turn-

in Napoleon's fortunes had begun. The reverses of 1813 obliged the Emperor to adopt a more conciliatory tone towards the Pope. In March, 1814, Pius, who was then again at Savona, was released, and on May 29th he re-entered Rome. The people greeted him with shouts of joy: life under the Pope's rule was easy, and no one wept over the fall of the French, who, in spite of the short time they had been in possession, had brought many noteworthy improvements in government, coupled, indeed, with no small burden of taxation.

The rapid recovery of the Papacy from its unparalleled defeat will always remain an astonishing fact. If, with Ranke, we look upon the period of the Restoration as a reaction of Germany and the North against the revolutionised Romance nations, it is not very clear how the Papacy could hope for special advantages from this reaction. But the solidarity of throne and altar which is to be traced at that time behind every measure for the restoration of what had been destroyed or shaken, had a determining influence on the relations of the States with Rome. In fact, the diplomats of the Vienna Congress showed themselves imbued with unlimited respect for the oldest and most legitimate of monarchies—for as such they regarded the Roman See.

The Papacy was therefore once more firmly established, the States of the Church being restored to it by the Act of Confederation of June 8, 1815, though without the town of Avignon and with some small concessions to Austria.

Pius alone would have been unable to do much with the gift. He cannot be better described than in the words of Napoleon: "He is a lamb, truly a good creature, an angel of goodness." His horizon was narrow in both religious and worldly matters, but not so narrow that he could not gauge the value of a faithful servant. The confidence which, in spite of all attacks, he reposed to the day of his death in the Marquis Ercole Consalvi, to whom he owed his election and whom he immediately made a cardinal and his Secretary of State, was not only rather touching from a human point of view, but was also noteworthy historically on account of the exceptional importance of that minister. Consalvi stands in the front rank of the diplomatists of the Reaction as much by his qualities as a statesman as by his successes. Quite at the beginning of the reign of Pius he had concluded with the French Republic the Concordat (1801) which restored the Catholic Church in France, and at the same time made her completely

subordinate to the Pope by abandoning the principles of Gallicanism. As Nuncio in Vienna he had looked after the interests of the Curia and had been successful in his efforts to restore the state of affairs of the pre-Revolution period by concluding Concordats with the Catholic Powers in which all aspirations after the creation of a national Church were repressed. Where, however, as in the Protestant parts of Germany, wholly new conditions were created by the secularisation (1803) of the spiritual princedoms, he managed to obtain the greatest possible advantage for the Church. At the same time he endeavoured to improve the economic condition of the papal territories entrusted to his care by a system of administration approaching as nearly as possible to the modern conception of the State. He failed, however, to prove that this last remnant of the temporal power of the Pope was anything but an anomaly among the other States.

Still, however highly we may rate Consalvi's work, the sway over the minds of men which the Papacy had lost during the Revolutionary period was not to be won back by good administrative methods. Other forces were needed for that. The restoration of the Society of Jesus was perhaps the most important act of the reign of Pius VII. The

Pope had hardly settled down again in Rome when by the brief "Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum" ("the care for all the churches") of August 7, 1814, he revoked the decree condemning the Society which his predecessor, Clement XIV. "of happy memory," had issued. Like him, he made his ordinance binding for all time, declaring, moreover, any attempt to alter it null and void. In contrast with Clement, Pius speaks of the great results obtained by the Order, and says that he would be guilty of a grave crime if he were to reject the aid of the strong and experienced mariners who volunteer to rescue the Barque of Peter from the winds and waves. From his point of view he was undoubtedly right, and those in power shared it to a great extent. The following remarks of Victor Emmanuel I., who re-admitted the Jesuits as early as 1815, have been handed down to us. "I am persuaded that the Jesuits are alone able to defy a revolution. As I am resolved to use my last man and my last coin to crush the Revolution, it follows that I give the Jesuits liberty of action in my territories."

Nor was it only the rulers' and the statesmen's fear of the Revolution that cleared the way for Jesuitism and papalism; almost more important was the change in the atti-

tude of poets and thinkers. From the beginning, the French and German Romanticists had seen in the Revolution the working of that force which always desires evil and does good. According to Saint-Martin it had expelled the contagium from mankind, in which contagium he certainly included the Church and Crown. For Novalis anarchy was the condition that produced Religion, who, after the destruction of everything positive, raises her glorious head as a new founder of the world. Thinkers came more and more to see, with him, salvation in an "enduring Church, gathering into her lap all souls that thirst after spiritual things, and once more pouring forth abundant blessings on the nations." Novalis prophesied in his time that the Society of Jesus, "which now (1800) slumbers wretchedly on the borders of Europe, will spread thence with new power over its old home"; he held in readiness the bolt of excommunication which the Popes of the nineteenth century have repeatedly hurled against progressive philosophy and science.

Papalism soon found a classical exponent in literature. It fell to the lot of Count Joseph de Maistre, who was closely connected with the Jesuits, to show the world in his book "Du Pape" (1819), what it possessed in the Pope and how salvation was only to be

hoped for from Rome. De Maistre is an absolutist to the core; a government that is not a monarchy, and, if a monarchy, not a despotism, is no government; that is as true of temporal as of spiritual governments, of kings as of the Pope. But secular sovereignty has an inherent limitation; it has not the promise of righteousness, though it strives to rule righteously. Self-help is, in face of this, impossible—revolution out of the question. The infallible Pope, who as Vicar of Christ is inherently righteous, is the true mediator between prince and people, and princes have no reason to oppose his interference, for it is only great offences that call forth the censure of the Pope. The echo which these statements found in Germany is best shown by the words of the editor of the translation set on foot by Friedrich August Schlegel: "Without the Pope there can be no Christianity, and the order of society is inevitably injured in its most vital part." In Italy Carlo Fea again asserted that the Pope was above kings even in secular matters. It is significant that the prudent Consalvi refused the Imprimatur to Fea's work.

After the death of Pius, Consalvi's part was played out. With Leo XII. (Annibale della Genga, September 28, 1823 to February 10, 1829)

the party of the "Zelanti" (*i.e.*, zealots, intransigeants) came into power—the party which had always been irritated by the rule of the "liberal" or, better perhaps, opportunist Secretary of State. Fea's book was now printed, and the Dominican Anfossi's views on secularisation, which Consalvi had likewise kept back, also saw the light. This indicated the programme of the party, as did also the first Encyclical of Leo (April 5, 1824). This letter condemned not only the Bible Societies already stigmatised by Pius VII. (June 4, 1816) as a "horrible invention that undermined the foundations of religion," but also "Tolerantism" or "Indifferentism," *i.e.*, the doctrine that men might join any religious sect without prejudice to their salvation. Leo was, it is true, wise enough to have himself initiated into the secrets of statecraft by the dying Consalvi, but neither he nor his advisers were capable of carrying on what the great Cardinal had begun. So the openings silted up, a government of reckless reaction replaced a skilful and prudent administration, and the more the liberal movement began to make itself felt, the tighter the reins were drawn. The Pope ruled in frivolous Rome with a harshness that recalled Calvin. "Other Popes also," says Ranke, who was then searching for documents

in Rome, "have made themselves hated, but they always had a few followers. Leo XII. was hated by all, from the prince to the beggar; no one was friendly to him." And when he died in the midst of the Carnival festivities popular wit expressed itself thus: "The Holy Father inflicted three ills upon us—he accepted the crown, he lived long, and, by his death, he spoilt the Carnival."

The election of Pius VIII. (Francesco Xaverio Castiglioni, March 31, 1829 to November 30, 1830) was the result of a compromise with Austria and France. This good man, who in his sentimental scrupulosity hesitated to confer the title of Doctor of the Church on St. Bernard of Clairvaux, because he also belonged to the Castiglioni (Chatillon) family, did not reign long enough to make an impression. His successor, Gregory XVI. (Bartolommeo Cappellari, February 2, 1831 to June 1, 1846), however, was a hierarch of the old school, who tried to do honour to the famous men who had borne his name. He was born well back in the eighteenth century (1765), and had, at the age of eighteen, entered the strict Order of the Camaldolites. In the same year in which the imprisoned Pius VI. ended his sorrowful life, Cappellari, then called Father Mauro, wrote a book in honour of the "Triumph of the

Church and the Holy See over the attacks of Innovators." In 1823 he became General of his Order; in 1826 Prefect of the Propaganda. What he had written as a young man he endeavoured to realise as Pontiff. He was a man of no inconsiderable ability, and was said to be learned not only in scholastic philosophy but also in science and history. It is perhaps due to his great interest in geometry that the names of Copernicus and Galileo were removed from the Index in his reign. But he was also the sworn foe of everything modern. To the great joy of artists and all romantically inclined Catholics and Protestants, he resolved that his Rome should remain the city of ancient and mediæval times—the Rome that ever conquered the world afresh with her incomparable attractions. Other countries might be cut up by railway lines; they were not tolerated in the States of the Church any more than lighting by gas. In the government reaction boldly raised its head. All critics are unanimous that the rule of the Secretary of State, Lambruschini, was gradually leading to utter ruin. Gregory himself seems to have had a feeling that things could not go on as they were. He is said to have declared: "The civil administration of the Roman States needs a great reform, but I was too old when they

elected me Pope; I did not expect to live so long, and had not the courage to begin the work. For he who begins must also carry it through."

No signs of such weakness were visible in the old Pope's government of the Church in general; on the contrary Gregory's numerous Encyclicals and Briefs breathe the unbending spirit of the successor of St. Peter who is fully conscious of his high office. It is true that we do not know how far his pen was guided by the Jesuits, who had a new Aquaviva at that time in the person of the Dutchman, John Philip van Roothaan (1829–53). In any case the pontificate of Gregory shows an increase of Jesuit influence all along the line. The Pastoral Letter of August 15, 1832, is a manifesto of this influence. With its condemnation of liberty of conscience and of the press, it is perhaps the most important, at all events the most characteristic, precursor of the Encyclical and Syllabus of 1864. Under Jesuit influence ultramontanism once more stretched out its claws towards Germany. At that time the light of Wessenberg and Spiegel, of Hermes and Baader went out, and that of Droste and Dunin, Görres and Jarcke shone brightly forth. New stars pointed the way across the Alps to Rome, where the Collegium Germanicum—

re-established in 1818—received a yearly increasing number of red-coated pupils, and where Giovanni Perrone taught the standard papal theology in the Gregorian University, restored to the Jesuits in 1824. The year 1835, in which Gregory XVI. condemned the writings of Georg Hermes, professor at Bonn, as those of a "teacher of error," was an "annus nefastus, a year of misfortune for Catholic theology in Germany.

Had the Bourbons remained in power in France the success of the Romanist movement would have been even more rapid. The Concordat of 1801 was on the high-road to giving place to that of 1516, and to the abandonment of the last remains of the Gallican Articles. The Jesuits were everywhere active. Then came the July Revolution, and with it a new wave of disaster for the Society. With a heavy heart Gregory found himself obliged to advise the General to dissolve the French division of the Order. He also had to see the Abbé Lamennais, who had been convinced by the study of De Maistre that in the Pope was summed up the collective intelligence of humanity, and who was to have received a cardinal's hat in recognition thereof, advance, under the influence of the Revolution and the Bourgeois monarchy, to such radical views as left at last no room for

either Pope or Church. On the other hand Lamennais' pupil, the Dominican Lacordaire, became a new advocate of papalism. But the distrustful Curia soon took offence at the burning eloquence with which he preached, from the pulpit of Notre Dame, the reconciliation of Romanism with the principles of modern culture. Satisfaction at the increasingly visible advance of the Jesuits in Belgium and Ireland, however, afforded some compensation for this, while the spread of Roman Catholicism in England, where it had been given free play since the Act of Emancipation of 1829, awakened bold hopes in Rome.

During all this time the revolutionary movement had been smouldering in Italy. It was not only directed against the reactionary native Governments, but aspired also to free Italy from the foreign domination of Austria. At first it was the much persecuted Carbonari (charcoal-burners, so called because of their secret rites), and, after the middle of the thirties, the "Young Italy" of Giuseppe Mazzini, that strove for the "Risorgimento" (resurrection), with the motto of "Unity, Freedom, Independence." Though these men saw no hope except in the complete abolition of the papal rule, others hoped for a happy future from the reform of the Papacy and its reconciliation with the

modern spirit. In the midst of an ever-increasing circle of like-minded men the refined and sensitive Antonio Rosmini worked towards his ideal of cleansing the Church, of raising the priesthood, and inaugurating a religious Papacy, to which he would certainly have given the leadership even in secular affairs. With all the enthusiasm of the dreamer, Vincenzo Gioberti publicly advocated a confederacy of Italian States with the Pope at its head as Doge and Gonfaloniere, the arbitrator and peacemaker for all Europe, the teacher and educator of the world, the spiritual father of the human race. As a sober politician Cesare Balbo tried to reduce this dream to what he considered possible, recommending a Lombard Confederation with Sardinia at its head; but he also only looked upon Sardinia as the sword, the heart of Italy was the Pope.

There came a time when these "hopes of Italy" seemed likely to be fulfilled—the first years of the pontificate of Pius IX. (June 16, 1846 to February 7, 1878). Giovanni Maria, of the noble family of the Mastai-Ferretti, born on May 13, 1792, at Sinigaglia, had made his way rapidly: under Leo XII., who loved him for his amiability, he was made Archbishop of Spoleto, in 1832 he became Bishop of Imola, in 1840 Cardinal. As no one wished for a Pope

belonging to the "fossilised" party of Gregory, or for an avowed champion of liberty, Mastai, who was pliant and eloquent, and who could be relied upon to make reforms without going too fast, seemed very suitable. As a matter of fact the new Pope showed himself ready to adopt liberal ideas, though the reactionary followers of Gregory in the Sacred College gave him no peace; in March, 1848, he made offers of a kind of constitution, and the people were jubilant. But the enthusiasm died away very quickly when Pius, instead of putting himself at the head of the national movement after Charles Albert of Sardinia's declaration of war against Austria, announced in an Encyclical on April 29, 1848, that he could not fight against a Catholic Power. His popularity was immediately at an end. The Mazzinists gained the upper hand in Rome, the noble-mined Pellegrino Rossi, who was familiar with the ideas of Gioberti and Rosmini, and who had been made a minister by the Pope in September, fell a victim to the knife of a revolutionist on November 15th, as he was going to a sitting of the Chamber. Pius himself was hard pressed in the Quirinal; the bullets even fell into his anteroom. On November 24th he fled secretly to Gaëta in the Neapolitan territory The Republic was proclaimed in Rome on February 9, 1849.

Meanwhile the Austrians had succeeded in suppressing the rising in North Italy. The victories of Radetzky at Custozza (July 25, 1848) and Novara (March 23, 1849) led to the abdication of Charles Albert; Lombardy and Venetia were reunited to Austria. This and the aversion of the Powers to a centralised republic stood the Pope, who had called Austria, France, Spain, and Naples to his help, in good stead. France was entrusted with armed intervention; Marshal Oudinot defeated Garibaldi, and on July 14th the papal Government was restored. Pius did not return to Rome till April 12, 1850; his heart was hardened against liberalism.

Pious but superstitious, ignorant though not untalented, he seemed predestined to be the tool of the Jesuits. For many years the Order had put forth all its energies to secure throughout Catholic Christendom the acceptance of the doctrine of the universal episcopate and infallibility of the Pope. "Before 1848," writes the Old Catholic von Schulte, who can speak from his own experience, "the Pope was only mentioned in schools when absolutely necessary. Before 1848 I never heard a sermon about the States of the Church or anything similar. But since 1848 more sermons have been preached about them in many places than about the gospel." In England, where since 1853 an

organised hierarchy once more existed, people began to talk about "devotion to the Pope." "The sovereign Pontiff," said the Oratorian Faber in a sermon, "is the third visible presence of Jesus Christ among us, the visible shadow that proceeds from the invisible Head of the Church in the Blessed Sacrament." The Latin countries went even further than Germany and England. It is enough to recall what occurred in France and the language of the agitator Louis Veuillot, whose journal, the *Univers*, became the mouthpiece of ultramontane aspirations. Peculiar zeal was shown by the Jesuits, under the leadership after 1853 of the Belgian Pierre Jean Beckx, the "black Pope." The *Civiltà Cattolica*, founded in Naples in 1850 and shortly after transferred to Rome, became the principal organ of their new journalism, intended for the laity as well as the clergy. This paper soon won the special favour of the Pope, who found in it sentences like the following: "When the Pope thinks, it is God who thinks in him."

The solemn proclamation by the Pope, in St. Peter's on December 8, 1854, of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, *i.e.*, the definition as an article of faith of the doctrine that Mary was conceived without inheriting the guilt of Adam or any sinful

tendency whatever, marked an important advance in the triumphant march of papalism. The Pope, who from his youth had been a fervent worshipper of the Mother of God, may well have regarded this proclamation as a peculiarly important duty. To those who conducted affairs in the Quirinal and the Vatican it was at least equally important as a feeler for what the Catholic world would accept from the Pope unsupported by a council. The Jesuit Schrader rightly says: "The independent definition of a dogma includes at the same time, not indeed explicitly and formally, but none the less undoubtedly and positively, another dogmatic decision, viz., that of the disputed question whether the Pope is in his own person infallible in matters of faith, or whether he can claim this infallibility only at the head of a council." As a matter of fact the Catholic world had already been so skilfully prepared that no opposition worth mentioning was made, and thus the justice of the second claim was tacitly acknowledged.

The well-known Encyclical "Quanta cura" ("With what care") of December 8, 1864, comes under the same head. It contains variations of what had already been said in previous Encyclicals of Gregory XVI. and of Pius himself, with a strong emphasis on the theory that

obedience is due to the judgments and decisions of the Holy See not only in matters of faith and morals but also in questions of law and discipline, since refusal to yield such obedience is contrary to the Catholic doctrine "of the power divinely granted to the Roman Pope by the Lord Christ Himself to tend, to guide, and to rule the whole Church." In order to prevent all doubt as to the particular applications of this principle a "statement of the chief errors of our time" was added to the Encyclical. In the eighty clauses—carefully grouped into ten sections—of this document—which has become famous under its Latin designation of "Syllabus" —all the achievements of modern times in the direction of freedom of religion and conscience are passed in review, and the statement culminates in the condemnation of the following proposition: "The Roman Pope can and ought to reconcile and adapt himself to progress, to liberalism, and to modern culture." The whole significance of this Syllabus can only be rightly appreciated when it is read in the light of the numerous Jesuit publications of the time.

The theory that "the abolition of the temporal power of the Holy See will conduce in the highest degree to the freedom and welfare of the Church" is also among the errors condemned by this document, which proves how

strong was the Pope's self-confidence. This very question was becoming ripe for decision, though not in the sense of Pius.

While still at Gaëta the Pope had appointed as Secretary of State Giacomo Antonelli, a man who belonged to a family of doubtful reputation in Sonnino,* a haunt of robbers, and was not burdened with many scruples. Antonelli had been at the head of the March Ministry and had resigned with his colleages when Pius refused to ally himself with Sardinia. He understood the signs of the times and followed his papal master into the reactionary camp. The government of the Papal States was now in his hands, and he only allowed the Pope to see the working of it when he pleased. His system of police and his dishonest administration increased the revolutionary feeling, the strength of which was also augmented by the course of events in Italy.

The progress of Nemesis is easy to follow. The war of France and Sardinia against Austria follows the alliance between Victor Emmanuel and Napoleon III. arranged by Count Cavour at Plombières. In a few months Lombardy is lost to the Empire, the plan—considered as late as the Peace of Zürich (November 10, 1859)—of an Italian confederation with the Pope at its head has been thrown overboard; the Sardinian

troops enter Tuscany, Parma, and, greeted by the shouts of the insurgent population, Romagna; Garibaldi's volunteers break up the kingdom of Naples, and Victor Emmanuel is proclaimed King of Italy (March 17, 1861). The Pope-King ("il papa re") sees his possessions reduced to a third of what they were, and is not even sure of keeping that. It is discussed in numerous pamphlets whether it were not better to end his rule altogether. How, asks Lagueronnière, can the head of the Church, who excommunicates heretics, and the head of a State, whose duty is to uphold freedom of conscience, be one and the same person? Let the Pope be guaranteed the possession of Rome and the heritage of St. Peter, give him a considerable sum for his expenses of ceremonial and defence, so that he may stand free as the head of two hundred million Catholics, but take from him the temporal sovereignty. Others advise him to leave Rome and take up his residence at Avignon, Malta, Bamberg, or even Jerusalem. Others again still dream of reforms or adopt Cavour's idea of a free Church in a free State.

All this Pius heeds not. Failing temporal help, perhaps Heaven will favour him. At Whitsuntide, 1862, he assembles his Cardinals and hundreds of his bishops for a meeting

of protest; they declare unanimously that the Pope's temporal power may not be touched. The Pope canonises the twenty-six martys who perished in the great persecution in Japan (1597), and in his address to the Cardinals declares that he hopes thereby to gain new intercessors with God. France and Italy remain unmoved. Napoleon presses his protection on the Pope and French troops occupy Rome, which is threatened by Garibaldi. In the Convention of September, 1864, the Emperor tells Victor Emmanuel that he is ready to withdraw his men within two years, if the King will protect the Holy City. The Pope is not consulted. Then the Austro-Prussian War breaks out. Austria is crushed, Italy, the ally of Prussia, gains Venice, Garibaldi again advances against Rome and is once more driven back with the aid of the French. But the star of France too grows dim. The German victories in the summer of 1870 free Italy from the necessity of considering the Emperor, and on September 20th the red white and green flag waves on the Capitol. In the plebiscite of October 2nd only a few voices are raised against the incorporation of Rome with Italy, and on June 2, 1871, the King is able to enter his new capital. By that time the Guarantee Law had already been passed (May 13th), allowing

the Pope complete freedom in the exercise of his spiritual authority, a generous civil list, and the entire disposal of the Vatican, the Lateran, and Castel Gandolfo on the lake of Albano. For Pius the law did not exist; he preferred to play the part of the prisoner in the Vatican.

At the very time, however, when the papal kingdom came to an end, the Vatican itself had been the scene of the greatest ecclesiastical triumph. Two days before the publication of the Encyclical "Quanta cura" Pius had given his Cardinals the first intimation that he intended to use the extraordinary means of a general council to meet the extraordinary needs of the Church. It is a disputed question who suggested this to him, and possibly he thought of it himself. But for one who remembers the utterances of the *Civiltà Cattolica* there can be no doubt that, although no particular subject for discussion was mentioned, the "extraordinary needs" meant only the establishment as a dogma of the universal episcopate of the Pope and of his infallibility—in the sense of the Encyclical and the Syllabus. The announcement of a council caused general surprise and evoked the most varied expressions of opinion. It was also soon seen that the party in favour of infallibility must be pre-

pared for great opposition: in England, France and not least in Germany, where Döllinger took the lead, numerous writers set to work to warn men against the enormity that Rome was planning.

In the Bull "Æterni Patris Unigenitus" ("The only begotten [son] of the Eternal Father"), which on St. Peter and St. Paul's Day, 1868, summoned the council for December 8, 1869, nothing was said, naturally enough, of any such desire to formulate a dogma. Allusion was only made in general terms to what "in these troublous times was to be carefully tested and established with a view to the honour of God and the safety of the faith, the beauty of divine worship and the eternal salvation of mankind, the discipline and education of the secular and regular clergy, the observance of the laws of the Church and the improvement of morals, the education of the young, the peace and unity of all." As "the chief pastor endowed with the supreme power" the Pope felt it his duty to make the summoning of the council known to schismatics and heretics. So the Protestants also had the honour of being exhorted in a special letter "to consider seriously whether they were on the road pointed out to us by Christ the Lord, and to beg the Lord of Mercy to

bring them back into the bosom of the holy mother."

"Everything was ready, nothing was lacking," writes Perrone in his pamphlet on the definition of infallibility. And yet there are many still living who remember what tremendous efforts were needed to smother the fierce opposition that broke out in the council, when it became evident after a few weeks at what the Pope and his paladins were aiming. It must not be forgotten that this opposition came from the most intellectual of the bishops, and that behind these bishops stood the Catholics of all the leading countries from the intellectual point of view. On the other hand, it was mockingly said of the Spaniards that they could be talked into believing that the Blessed Trinity consisted of four Persons; and the hundreds of Italians were pledged to papalism from the beginning. The fact that every bishop had the right of voting made it unnecessary to weigh the importance of individual votes. The struggle lasted for months. The position of the opposition became critical; they could no longer avoid seeing that they were in conflict with the personal wish of the Pope, who now said openly that he regarded tradition as embodied in himself. We must not overlook the highly creditable fact that the bishops persisted in their opposi-

tion to the very end; Ketteler's prostration at the Pope's feet will always remain a memorable episode. No one who knows what Roman Catholicism is would expect Roman Catholic bishops to throw their "non placet" in the face of the Holy Father in a matter that concerned him so nearly. They acted not only correctly but from conviction, when they took their leave before the decisive sitting.

On July 18, 1870, the day before France declared war on Prussia, Pius proclaimed in the Constitution "Pastor Æternus" ("The Eternal Shepherd") that his doctrinal decisions were infallible, and that he himself was the absolute master of the Church. Five hundred and thirty-five prelates assisted at the solemn act, only two unknown bishops daring to vote against it. The Constitution deals in four chapters with the primacy of the Apostle Peter, then with the continuation of the primacy in the bishops of Rome; it establishes the nature of the Primate's power over the Church as being regular and direct without detracting from episcopal rights, and finally treats of the Pope's authority on questions of dogma. The crucial passage runs as follows:—

"In faithful adherence to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, to the glory of God our Saviour, for the

exaltation of the Catholic religion, and for the salvation of the Christian peoples, with the assent of the Sacred Council, we teach and declare as a dogma revealed by God: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks "ex cathedra"—*i.e.*, when, in the discharge of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine touching faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church—is, in virtue of the divine assistance promised to him in St. Peter, endowed with that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be provided in defining doctrine touching faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves, and not because of the assent of the Church, irreversible. And if any man, which God forbid, should presume to oppose this our definition, let him be accursed."

It must be noted in this definition that only such of the Pope's decisions "ex cathedra" are to count as infallible as have reference to faith and morals, and then only when they apply to the whole Church, with an anathema against those who disagree. It follows that the programme supported by the Jesuits and clearly enunciated by the Pope in the Encyclical of 1864 was only partially carried out. The

Encyclical had termed opposition to papal decisions in questions of law and discipline a sin and prejudicial to the Catholic faith, and these very questions had been treated in great detail in the Syllabus. An article in the *Civiltà Cattolica* not long before the meeting of the council had mentioned as a probable subject for discussion the adoption of the Syllabus as an article of faith, and this plan had been approved by the Curia. The failure to carry out this scheme—a failure that has not been remedied to this day—leaves a distinct gap in the system that was in other respects so brilliantly successful at the council.

The Vatican Constitution indeed quotes the words, "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep," and deduces therefrom the transmission of the "rights of the chief Pastor and Master over the whole flock" to St. Peter and his successors. But the articles of the Constitution always keep within the limits of spiritual power, and inferences in the sense of the mediæval papal theories can only be made from them in a round-about way through Bellarmine's doctrine of the indirect power of the Pope in secular affairs. Indirect inferences, however, lend themselves but ill to dogmatisation. If we consider finally that a few weeks after the definition of the Pope's infallibility and universal epis-

copate the Italian papal kingship was carried to its grave, it is not too much to assert that the Vatican decrees form the most effectual barrier against the papal pretensions to temporal authority. Yet "Feed My sheep" remains the watchword.

CHAPTER XIV

THE FUTURE IN THE LIGHT OF THE PRESENT

WITH the glorification of Pius IX. in the Vatican and the entrance of Victor Emmanuel into the Quirinal, the history of the Papacy comes to an end. What follows belongs not to the past but to the present. If, for this reason, we cannot describe it historically, there is nothing to prevent our considering it critically. Nay, this is even necessary, if the axiom that we study history in order to learn from it is to be respected in this instance. Nor shall we be forbidden to cast an inquiring glance into the future.

Such an examination shows us first of all the great increase in power and consideration gained by the Papacy since 1870. It must be borne in mind that not till then did the generation which received its education in the middle of the nineteenth century come to full maturity. Only then did the papalistic views—a reaction

from the progressive and revolutionary ideas of the early part of the century—which had been implanted in the mind of Roman Catholic youth as a precious possession and had developed there, come to expression. The best proof of this is the way in which the different countries received the Vatican decrees. They met, indeed, with strong opposition that in many cases developed into insubordination; but even the Old Catholic movement has kept within such narrow limits that it cannot be said to have done Roman Catholicism any injury worth mentioning.

In Germany especially there has been such a revival of Romanism as had not been witnessed since the days of the counter-Reformation. To this revival was due the formation of the "Centre" party which once more revived the Prusso-German Church controversy, the "Kulturkampf" ("Culture Struggle"), as it is called—a name that does not seem to describe it at all and yet expresses the whole point of the conflict. It may be doubted whether Bismarck was always right in his treatment of questions affecting the internal affairs of the Church. But there is no possible doubt that every sentence of his great fighting speeches bears witness to his profound understanding of the real aim of the party inspired by papalism,

the party which he described in one of his striking expressions as a breaching-battery against the State. He also showed a thorough understanding of the Papacy, when he termed it "a political power that has interfered with the greatest resolution and success in the affairs of this world, that aims at such interference and has made it part of its programme." In his speech in the debate in the Prussian Upper House on the Falk Laws, March 10, 1873, he explained in a masterly fashion "the immemorial struggle between the royal power and the priesthood," and illustrated it by the relations between Empire and Papacy in the Middle Ages. Every one, he then contended, who has even a superficial insight into history must know from official documents quoted and criticised times without number that this struggle must be judged like any other: "it has its alliances, its treaties, its pauses, its truces." It will nevertheless remain a dark spot in the history of the new Empire that its founder was obliged to make use of his historical knowledge by showing consideration for the Catholic party, whose support a change of domestic circumstances had made indispensable. Even Bismarck had to make peace with the Pope.

In his Canossa speech of May 14, 1872, the

Iron Chancellor attributed the necessity for maintaining diplomatic relations with the papal see to the difficult situation of the Empire owing to "the influence, so unusually wide for a foreign sovereign," which "the Head of the Catholic Church exercised in Germany." The behaviour of Pius IX., who disregarded the most elementary principles of statesmanlike courtesy, was not calculated to make these relations easier; nor was his refusal to accept Count von Hohenlohe as Prussian Ambassador at the Curia, nor his arrogant letter of August 7, 1873, to the Emperor William, in which he made the bold assertion that all baptized persons belonged in some measure to the Pope, or finally the interference with the laws of the State, based on his apostolic office of Chief Pastor, which he permitted himself when he declared the Prussian "Kampf" laws invalid in the Encyclical "Quod nunquam" ("What never") of February 5, 1875. Only after the death of Pius on February 7, 1878—the first Pope who reigned for more than the traditional twenty-five years of St. Peter—was there a possibility of new developments.

Leo XIII. (Gioacchino Vincenzo Count Pecci, born March 2, 1810, at Carpineto, near Anagni) was elected Pope on February 20, 1878. He

had not been one of his predecessor's favourites, and it was not till 1876, after the death of Antonelli, who had been his enemy from the beginning, that the Cardinal was called to Rome from the little see of Perugia. Pecci had been one of the first pupils of the Collegium Romanum in its new Jesuit period and had followed the advice of Father Roothaan in forming his little library. He was a great reader: Thomas Aquinas rejoiced his heart and soon also Pope Benedict XIV., from reading whose works he first got the idea that it was impossible to overcome the modern world without entering into its thoughts. His ideal of ecclesiastical policy he found in Leo XII., whose name he had taken. He learned to adapt himself to circumstances: when Perugia became incorporated in the kingdom of Italy, Pecci succeeded in keeping on good terms with the new Government. His election to the Papacy proved the best that could be imagined. He was granted a quarter of a century in which to make brilliant use, as Head of the Church, of his unusual diplomatic ability, his remarkable skill in administration, and his width of outlook.

The numerous Encyclicals, in which the Pope gave his directions to the Catholic world, bear witness to the universality with which he

handled and discussed every subject in any way connected with his apostolic office:—

The Dangers of Socialism,	"Quod apostolici," December 28, 1878.
The Labour Question,	"Rerum novarum," May 15, 1891.
and Christian Democracy.	"Graves de communi," January 18, 1901.
The Source of Civil Authority,	"Diuturnum illud," June 29, 1881.
The Christian State,	"Immortale Dei," November 1, 1885.
Freedom and Law,	"Libertas," June 20, 1888.
and The Duties of Christian Citizens.	"Sapientiæ Christianæ," January 10, 1890.
The Revival of Learning,	"Æterni Patris," August 4, 1879.
The Study of the Scriptures,	"Providentissimus Deus," November 18, 1893.
and Religious Education.	"Militantis ecclesiæ," August 1, 1897.
The Divine Redeemer,	"Tametsi futura," November 1, 1900.
The Holy Ghost,	"Divinum illud," May 9, 1897.
and The Sacrament of the Altar.	"Miræ caritatis," May 28, 1902.
Missions,	"Sancta Dei," December 3, 1880.
and The Missionaries Cyril and Methodius.	"Grande munus," September 30, 1880.

The Church as the Mother of Civilisation,	"Inscrutabili Dei," April 21, 1878.
The Unity of the Church,	"Satis cognitum," June 29, 1896.
and Community of Faith.	"Præclara gratulationis," June 20, 1894.
Christian Marriage,	"Arcanum illud," February 10, 1880.
and Christian Life.	"Exeunte jam," December 25, 1888.

In addition to these, there were his utterances on the cult of the Virgin, the Rosary, the Sacred Heart, and other matters connected with Catholic worship and societies, and, finally, numerous letters to the bishops and the faithful of the various countries. All these subjects are treated with wonderful sureness of touch, and such felicity of expression that the writings are a pleasure to read. It is true that, even with a magnifying glass, it would be impossible to find any novelty of thought. But who would think of looking for that in the public utterances of a man who made it his boast that he carried on the oldest of traditions? If any one imagines that Leo could have differed from his predecessors' views on any essential point, he has read the history of the Papacy to no purpose.

Something there is, certainly, in the oft-

repeated title of "the Pope of peace." Leo was much more careful than his predecessors —in this he resembled Consalvi—to take unfavourable circumstances into consideration, to eliminate the impossible from his plans, and by careful calculation to attain the possible. He announced his programme in a letter to Nina, his Secretary of State, who in August, 1878, took the place of the prematurely deceased Franchi: it was a question of making a place for the Church and the Pope in the midst of modern society, of destroying prejudices against the Church and silencing the accusations against her. Such a programme implied no small amount of self-denial and much adaptability to circumstances. Leo proved that he had these qualities in a high degree. Sweet words flowed like honey from his lips. His masterpiece was the Encyclical "Præclara gratulationis" of June 20, 1894, in which he offered "greeting and peace in the Lord to all rulers and nations of the earth," in the fulness of his gratitude for the demonstrations and good wishes recently showered upon him on the occasion of his sacerdotal jubilee. As "Vicar of the Almighty here on earth" the Pope pours out the same love on all and has but one wish—that the time may not be far distant when the words of Jesus in His

high-priestly prayer will be fulfilled: "I pray that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us," and when the promise will come true that "there shall be one fold and one shepherd." In a truly paternal manner he exercises even now this office of pastor. His pen is "dipped in goodwill, love, and yearning." Are not the Protestants, like the Eastern Catholics, but erring sheep? To these words of peace the Greek Patriarch turned a deaf ear, and harshly accused the Roman Church of arrogance, because she persisted in her innovations and stood in the way of the reunion of the Churches. Moreover the Protestants were not likely to forget that the same Pope in the Encyclical "Sancta Dei" (December 3, 1880) had termed the Evangelical missionaries "messengers of the Prince of Darkness."

It was Leo's endeavour to convince the different Governments of the necessity of joint action on the part of Church and State, and he continually impressed on the peoples the necessity of obedience to the powers ordained of God, especially in the Encyclical "Diuturnum illud" (June 29, 1881), in which he set forth with dazzling sophistry the divine origin of the State. A careful reader will not be deceived by it: every line breathes the conviction

that the Church is supreme over the State, in accordance with the oft-misused principle that "we ought to obey God rather than men." How far Leo extended the limits of obedience to the Church, especially to the Holy See, is seen clearly enough in the Encyclical "Sapientiæ Christianæ" (January 10, 1890), which treats of the duties of Christian citizens. At the same time it is indisputable that the Pope was in earnest in his efforts to reassure the States as to the encroachments of the Church.

As regards Italy his position was peculiarly difficult. It was out of the question for a Pope who had grown up under Leo XII. and Gregory XVI., and had passed the best years of his manhood under Pius IX., to accept the new position of the Papacy created by the monarchy, and especially by the Law of Guarantees. Granted his point of view, it is worthy of all honour that Leo thought of forming an Italian Confederation, on Gioberti's plan, which he himself would have joined as the sovereign of Rome and Central Italy. Finding no support for this scheme either in Italy or abroad, he had to content himself with preparing for some future change in opinion by strengthening the organisation of the clergy and continuing to work upon the mind of the laity.

After Italy, Germany at first claimed his special attention. Paradoxical as it may sound, it is none the less true that Leo genuinely admired the German Empire and its great statesman, for the good reason that there, under Protestant auspices, something was being achieved, politically and socially, from which even a Pope might learn, and from which Leo actually did learn. The good wishes for Germany's power and greatness that he expressed so warmly and so eloquently in his letter to Bismarck of 1885, in which he thanked him for giving him the office of arbitrator in the Caroline Islands question, and which he followed up by conferring the Order of Christ on the heretical Chancellor, sprang from honest conviction. The adjustment of the dispute on Church politics was also really due to him, and it cannot be said of the peace concluded in 1887, that it endangered the interests of the Empire. Personal goodwill also inspired the exhortation to the German Catholics to maintain a friendly attitude towards the Government on the Septennate question (January 21, 1887). This the "Centre" party regarded as an encroachment of the Pope's, while Leo tried to justify his interference by the bold argument that moral and religious considera-

tions were bound up with the matter in question.

The limits set to the papal power by the Vatican decree were a hindrance in dealing with the French Catholics also. From the beginning, Leo had thought to gain the confidence of the Government by unreservedly acknowledging the Republic as the divinely ordained form of government for present-day France, and the maintenance of this confidence became the capital point of his policy when the rapprochement of Italy and Germany in the Triple Alliance of 1883 barred his way to success. But he had no luck: the earnest Catholics, headed by the clergy, refused to take the field for the Republic and remained refractory, although Leo and the faithful Lavigerie continued their conciliatory efforts undismayed. An even severer blow came to the Pope from the superstition of these Catholics—a superstition which he certainly shared—when Leo Taxil audaciously made the term "synagogue of Satan," which the Pope had applied to the Freemasons, the theme of a clever literary hoax, reviving all the devilment of bygone times, and thoroughly befooling Pope and Church for more than a decade.

It was also not without anxiety that Leo

followed the mighty growth of Catholicism in North America. He was not unaware that the constitution of the United States, so absolutely unlike that of any European country, put the separation of Church and State on quite a different footing from that to which he was accustomed, and he was therefore ready to listen to the suggestions of the bishops. But the danger of a withdrawal of the Catholic Church in America from the centre in Rome appeared to him greater than the advantages to be expected from independence of government, and an eager interest in modern ideas, and he therefore condemned the so-called Americanism (January 22, 1899).

The attitude of Leo to the American question showed with special clearness that even so sagacious and far-seeing a Pope as he, was unable to adapt himself to the requirements of a new age. But the same was true on all sides. In spite of his honest attempts, the Pope could not free himself of the old idea that the Church must keep men in leading-strings; the best proof of this is his Encyclical on the Labour Question ("Rerum novarum," May 15, 1891) Men of learning cherish his memory because he "opened the treasures of his archives with a liberality that has seldom been equalled

and never surpassed, wisely recognising that nothing can serve the Church so well as the whole truth." But in his Encyclical on the philosophy of St. Thomas ("Æterni Patris," August 4, 1878), Leo commanded that "the golden wisdom" of Aquinas "should again be taught and spread as widely as possible, for the defence and adornment of Catholic doctrine, for the good of society, and for the growth of all the sciences." All his writings exhale the atmosphere of the Middle Ages; it was only in that air that the Pope could breathe freely, the climate of modern times was too bracing for him.

The peculiar fascination of the aged Pope's personality might well give rise to an exaggerated estimate of his historical importance. Hundreds of thousands of men, religious and irreligious, believers and unbelievers, have carried away ineffaceable impressions of his kindly eyes and his winning smile from the time of his Jubilees which, as so often happens with old men, acted on him like an elixir. The sight of this delicate white-robed form being borne through a crowd hoarse with cheering or bowed in prayer, might well call to the mind of some who "languished in error far from the Bride of Christ," or who were even "tainted with the pestilential miasma of unbelief," the words:

"My sheep hear My voice"; or these again: "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring and they shall hear My voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." We must read Leo's most comprehensive Encyclical, the great dissertation on the unity of the Church ("Satis cognitum," June 29, 1896), quietly to ourselves, if we would realise the full meaning that these words of Christ in St. John's Gospel had for him, who believed himself to be the divinely ordained Vicar of Christ and the successor of His chief apostle.

At the present time much is being said and written about the future of the Papacy. The contradiction between the idea and its realisation in the world, is too evident for some attempt not to be made at adjustment. A distinction is often drawn between the spiritual, the political, and the royal Papacy; the royal Papacy, it is said, has disappeared, the political Papacy is doomed to decay, and only of the spiritual Papacy is it prophesied that it will continue. Yet we may ask whether this distinction does not divide what is really indivisible, and whether the Pope has not a three-fold office like the Christ of Protestant dogma. That the temporal power of the Pope is at an end, is admitted even by thoughtful

Catholics. But it does not necessarily follow that an end has come to that idea of the papal kingdom to which the temporal power was but an appendage, developed in the course of its history. For the Papacy, religion and politics are indissolubly united. That Pius the Good has succeeded Leo the Wise is no proof to the contrary. The spirits of the great Popes still walk the world to-day, and they will continue to walk as long as there is a Roman Catholic Church. Of this Church, in continuation of the passage we quoted in the introduction, Macaulay wrote:—

"She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

This prophecy of the unending future of the

Church and of the Papacy—so inseparably bound up with her destiny—is remarkable for more than mere brilliancy of language. Its explanation is to be found in the imperative craving of the human soul to see and grasp amid the flux of history one thing at least, that is firm, enduring, eternal. Therein lies its significance, since history is the outcome of human souls and their needs. And yet, at the same time, the idea is only a result of our human point of view. Macaulay and all those who judge as he does, whether influenced by religious or merely by romantic feelings, take in their short-sighted view the strongest thing yet known to mankind for something eternal. But even in the period of history which we know, what are two thousand years?

Once more we look back into the past. We have watched the Church come into being and with her the Papacy. There was a time when neither the one nor the other existed. That was the time when Jesus walked in Galilee with His disciples, and Peter answered in the name of all: "Thou art the Christ of God" (St. Luke ix. 20). Jesus did not then think of either Church or Papacy, but rather that the Son of Man must suffer many things. He told his disciples a parable concerning all those who count upon abiding existence and a never-

failing future in this world—the parable of the rich man. The ground had brought forth plentifully, and he pulled down his barns and built greater, and said to his soul: "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" This is a prophecy which is eternally and universally true. It will be fulfilled even in the Papacy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THERE is no comprehensive modern history of the Papacy. The last attempt at one in four volumes by the Old Catholic Josef Langen — *Geschichte der römischen Kirche* (Bonn, 1881–1893)—only goes as far as Innocent III. General surveys are given in: W. Wattenbach, *Geschichte des römischen Papsttums, Vorträge* (2nd impression, Berlin, 1876); Ign. v. Döllinger, *Das Papsttum* (a revised version of Janus, *Der Papst und das Konzil*), edited, after the author's death, by J. Friedrich (Munich, 1892); R. Schwemer, *Papsttum und Kaisertum* (Stuttgart, 1899). Detailed accounts of certain periods are to be found in: Leop. v. Ranke, *Die römischen Päpste in den letzten vier Jahrhunderten* * (10th edition, Leipzig, 1900, 3 vols.); Ludw. Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters* † (Freiburg, 1899–1906, 4 vols. at present published, going up to Leo X.); Fr. Nielsen, *Geschichte des Papsttums im 19. Jahrhundert* ‡ (trans. from the Danish, 2nd edition, Gotha, 1880, 2 parts); A. J. Nürnberger, *Zur Kirchengeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Mainz, 1897–1900, 3 vols.). The connection of the Papacy with the city of Rome is especially considered in F. Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter* § (5th edition, Stuttgart, 1903,

* *The History of the Popes during the last Four Centuries.* English translation by Mrs. Foster, revised by G. R. Dennis (London, 1908, 3 vols.).

† *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages.* English translation edited by F. I. Antrobus and R. F. Kerr (London, 1891, &c.; 7 vols. now published).

‡ *The History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century.* Translated into English under the direction of A. J. Mason (London, 1906, 2 vols.).

§ *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages.* Translated into English from the fourth German edition by Mrs. G. W. Hamilton (2nd edition, London, 1900, &c. In progress).

8 vols.); Alf. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom* (Berlin, 1867, &c., 3 vols.); Hartmann Grisar, *Geschichte Roms und der Päpste im Mittelalter* (Freiburg, 1898 ff, 1 vol. at present issued). A history of the Papal States has been written by M. Brosch (Gotha, 1880–1882, 2 vols.). From a polemical point of view, *Das Papsttum in seiner sozial-kulturellen Wirksamkeit* (4th edition, Leipzig, 1902, 2 vols.), by Paul Count von Hoensbroech, is important. Two other German works may also be mentioned: Albert Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Leipzig. 4 vols. at present issued: vol. i., 4th edition, 1904; vol. ii., 2nd edition, 1900; vol. iii., 3rd and 4th editions, 1906; vol. iv., 1903); Johannes Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform* (Berlin, 1903). The subject is treated in an original manner by Baldassare Labanca, *Il papato. Sua origine, sue lotte e vicende, suo avenire* (Turin, 1905; the last part has been translated into German by M. Sell, Tübingen, 1906, under the title of *Die Zukunft des Papsttums*). A selection of the most important papal monuments in the original has been brought out by Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus* (2nd edition, Tübingen, 1901), and a *Statistik der Päpste* by Prince Z. V. Lobkovitz (Freiburg, 1905).

[To these may be added the following well-known English works: H. H. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity, including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V.* (9 vols.); J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*; M. Creighton, *A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome (1378–1527)* (6 vols.); W. Barry, *The Papal Monarchy from St. Gregory the Great to Boniface VIII. (590–1303)*; Cardinal Wiseman, *Recollections of Four Popes (Pius VII., Leo XII., Pius VIII., Gregory XVI.), and of Rome in their Times;* also the *Cambridge Modern History*, especially the volumes on *The Renaissance*, *The Reformation*, *The Wars of Religion*, *The Thirty Years War*, *The Age of Louis XIV.*, *Napoleon*, *The Restoration*, and *The Growth of Nationalities*.—Translators.]

LIST OF THE ROMAN PONTIFFS.

(As in the Registers of the Roman Church.)

ST. PETER, PRINCE OF THE APOSTLES, 41–65–67.

Pontiff	A.D.
Linus.	67
Cletus.	79
Clement I.	91
Evaristus.	100
Alexander I.	109
Sixtus I.	119
Telesphorus.	128
Hyginus.	138
Pius I.	142
Anicetus.	157
Soter.	168
Eleutherius.	177
Victor I.	190
Zephyrinus.	202
Callistus I.	218
Urban I.	222
Pontian.	230
Anterus.	235
Fabian.	236
Cornelius.	251
Lucius I.	253
Stephen I.	254
Sixtus II.	257
Dionysius.	259
Felix I.	269
Eutychian.	275
Caius.	283
Marcellinus.	296
Marcellus I.	307
Eusebius	309
Melchiades.	310
Silvester I.	314
Mark.	336
Julius I.	337
Liberius.	352
Felix II.*	355
Damasus I.	366
Siricius.	384
Anastasius I.	398
Innocent I.	402
Zosimus.	417
Boniface I.	418
Cœlestine I.	422
Sixtus III.	432
Leo I. (the Gt.)	440
Hilary.	461
Simplicius.	468
Felix III.	483
Gelasius I.	492
Anastasius II.	496
Symmachus.	498
Hormisdas.	514
John I.	523
Felix IV.	526
Boniface II.	530
John II.	532
Agapitus.	535
Silverius.	536
Vigilius.	537
Pelagius I.	555
John III.	560
Benedict I.	574
Pelagius II.	578
Gregory I. (the Great).	590
Sabinian.	604
Boniface III.	607
Boniface IV.	608
Deusdedit I.	615
Boniface V.	619
Honorius I.	625
Severinus.	640
John IV.	640
Theodore I.	642
Martin I.	649
Eugene I.	655
Vitalian.	657
Deusdedit II.	672
Donus I.	676
Agatho.	678
Leo II.	682
Benedict II.	684
John V.	685
Conon.	686
Sergius I.	687
John VI.	701
John VII.	705
Sisinnius.	708
Constantine I.	708
Gregory II.	715
Gregory III.	731
Zachary.	741
Stephen III.†	752
Paul I.	757
Constantine II.	767
Stephen IV.	768
Hadrian I.	771
Leo III.	795
Stephen V.	816
Paschal I.	817
Eugene II.	824
Valentine.	827
Gregory IV.	827
Sergius II.	844
Leo IV.	847
Benedict III.	855
Nicholas I. (the	858
Hadrian II. [Gt.)	867
John VIII.	872
Marinus I.	882
Hadrian III.	884
Stephen VI.	885
Formosus.	891
Boniface VI.	896

* Pope during exile of Liberius. † Steph. II. (752) died before consecr.

LIST OF THE ROMAN PONTIFFS

Pontiff	A.D.
Stephen VII.	896
Romanus.	897
Theodore II.	897
John IX.	898
Benedict IV.	900
Leo V.	903
Christopher.	903
Sergius III.	904
Anastasius III.	911
Lando.	913
John X.	914
Leo VI.	928
Stephen VIII.	929
John XI.	931
Leo VII.	936
Stephen IX.	939
Marinus II.*	943
Agapitus II.	946
John XII.	955
Leo VIII.	963
Benedict V.	964
John XIII.	965
Benedict VI.	973
Benedict VII.	974
John XIV.	983
John XV.	985
Gregory V.	996
Silvester II.	999
John XVII.†	1003
John XVIII.	1003
Sergius IV.	1009
Benedict VIII.	1012
John XIX.	1024
Benedict IX.	1033
Gregory VI.	1045
Clement II.	1046
Damasus II.	1048
Leo IX.	1049
Victor II.	1055
Stephen X.	1057
Nicholas II.‡	1059
Alexander II.	1061
Gregory VII.	1073
Victor III.	1086
Urban II.	1088
Paschal II.	1099
Gelasius II.	1118
Callistus II.	1119
Honorius II.	1124
Innocent II.	1130
Cœlestine II.	1143
Lucius II.	1144
Eugene III.	1145
Anastasius IV.	1153
Hadrian IV.	1154
Alexander III.	1159
Lucius III.	1181
Urban III.	1185
Gregory VIII.	1187
Clement III.	1187
Cœlestine III.	1191
Innocent III.	1198
Honorius III.	1216
Gregory IX.	1227
Cœlestine IV.	1241
Innocent IV.	1243
Alexander IV.	1254
Urban IV.	1261
Clement IV.	1265
Gregory X.	1271
Innocent V.	1276
Hadrian V.	1276
John XX. (XXI.)	1276
Nicholas III.	1277
Martin IV.*	1281
Honorius IV.	1285
Nicholas IV.	1288
Cœlestine V.	1294
Boniface VIII.¶	1294
Benedict XI.	1303
Clement V.	1305
John XXII.	1316
Benedict XII.	1334
Clement VI.	1342
Innocent VI.	1352
Urban V.	1362
Gregory XI.	1370
Urban VI.	1378
Clement VII. (Avignon).	1378
Benedict XIII. (Avignon).	1394
Boniface IX.	1389
Innocent VII.	1404
Gregory XII.	1406
Alexander V.	1409
John XXIII.	1410
Martin V.	1417
Eugene IV.	1431
Nicholas V.	1447
Callistus III.	1455
Pius II.	1458
Paul II.	1464
Sixtus IV.	1471
Innocent VIII.	1484
Alexander VI.	1492
Pius III.	1503
Julius II.	1503
Leo X.	1513
Hadrian VI.	1522
Clement VII.	1523
Paul III.	1534
Julius III.	1550
Marcellus II.	1555
Paul IV.	1555
Pius IV.	1559
Pius V.	1566
Gregory XIII.	1572
Sixtus V.	1585
Urban VII.	1590
Gregory XIV.	1590
Innocent IX.	1591
Clement VIII.	1592
Leo XI.	1605
Paul V.	1605
Gregory XV.	1621
Urban VIII.	1623
Innocent X.	1644
Alexander VII.	1655
Clement IX.	1667
Clement X.	1670
Innocent XI.	1676
Alexander VIII.	1689
Innocent XII.	1691
Clement XI.	1700
Innocent XIII.	1721
Benedict XIII.	1724
Clement XII.	1730
Benedict XIV.	1740
Clement XIII.	1758
Clement XIV.	1769
Pius VI.	1775
Pius VII.	1800
Leo XII.	1823
Pius VIII.	1829
Gregory XVI.	1831
Pius IX.	1846
Leo XIII.	1878
Pius X.	1903

* Marinus I., II., were also called (Martinus) Martin II., III.

† John XVI. (997) Antipope. ‡ Benedict X. (1058), Antipope.

¶ Boniface VII. (974), Antipope.

INDEX

ABELARD, 103
Acceptation of Mayence, 139
Adalbert, Archbishop, 77
Advocate of Peace (*see Defensor Pacis*)
Aeterni Patris Unigenitus, 243
d'Ailly, Pierre, 130
Aistulf, 51
Aleander, 168
Albert II., 148
Albertus Magnus, 118
Alexander II., 76–7
,, III., 106–8
,, IV., 121
,, V., 133
,, VI., 153–4, 205
,, of Hales, 118
,, Jerome, 165
Alfonso I. of Portugal, 108
America, Catholicism in North, 260–1
Anacletus, 103
Anfossi, 227
Angelo, Michael, 146
Anicetus, 19
Antonelli, Giacomo, 239, 253
Aquinas, Thomas, 118–9, 125
Aquavava, Claudio, 194
Armada, Spanish, 188
Arnold of Brescia, 104–5
Art in Rome, 144–7
Augsburg, Diet of, 166, 173–4
Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, 43
Augustinus Redivivus, 204
Aurelian, Emperor, 26
Auvergne (*see* William, Count of)
Avignon, Papal residence at, 127–30

BALBO, Cesare, 233
Bâle, Council of, 138–9
Barbarossa, Frederick, 104
Barberini, Matteo, 199
Beckx, Pierre Jean, 236
Bellarmine, 194
Benedict XIII., 131–3, 136
,, XIV., 206–8, 253
Bernard of Clairvaux, 103, 105, 117, 228
"Bibliotheca Palatina," 197
Bismarck, 250–2
Bonaventura, 118
Boniface VIII., 123–6
,, IX., 130–1

Books, Index of Forbidden, 177, 179
Borghese (*see* Paul V.)
Borgia, Lucrezia, 154
Borgia, Roderigo (*see* Alexander II.)
Brandenburg, Elector of, 201
Bruno, Bishop, 70
Byzantium and the Papacy, 46–7

CÆRULARIUS, Michael, 72
Cajetan, Cardinal, 166, 170
Calixtus I., 19–20
,, II., 96–8
,, III., 150–3
Campeggio, Cardinal, 173
Candidus, Cardinal, 83
Cappellari (*see* Mauro)
Caraffa, Giovanni Pietro, 176–7
Carnesecchi, Pietro, 186
Carranza, Bartolommeo, 186
Catechism, Roman, 186
Cavour, Count, 239
Celibacy of Priests, 81
Chalcedon, Council of, 35
Charlemagne, 54–7
Charles Albert of Sardinia, 234–5
,, of Anjou, 120–1
,, Theodore of Bavaria, 213
,, V., Emperor, 173–4
,, VI. of France, 131
Civiltà Cattolica, 236, 242, 247
Clairvaux (*see* Bernard, Abbot of)
Clémanges, Nicholas de, 131
Clement I., 15
,, III., 92
,, V., 127–31
,, VII., 171–3
,, VIII., 188, 195
,, IX., 205
,, XI., 201–2
,, XIII., 208, 212
,, XIV., 208–9, 212
Clement Wenzel of Treves, 212
Clermont, Assembly at, 102
Collegium Romanum, 193, 230–1
Confession at Easter, 111
Congregation of the Propaganda, 196
Conrad III., 104
Consalvi, Marquis Ercole, 222–3
Constance, Council of, 134
Constantine, Donation of, 31, 53–4, 117, 143
Constantinople, Founding of, 28
Contarini, Gasparo, 75–6
Copernicus, 229
Cornelius, Bishop, 21
Crusades, the, 102, 114
Curia, the, 100
Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, 22–6

DAMASUS, Bishop, 30–1
Damiani, Peter, 74
Decius, Emperor, 21
Decretum Gratiani, 106
Defence of the Catholic Faith Suarez's, 196

Defensor Pacis, 126–7
De Rege, Mariana's, 196
Deusdedit, Cardinal, 78
Diether, Archbishop, 149
Dionysian Controversy, the, 25–6
Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, 14
Döllinger, 243
Dominus ac redemptor noster, 209–10
Dual Popes, 130–2
Du Pape, de Maistre's, 225–6

Eck, Dr., 166
Encyclicals of Leo XIII., 254–8, 261–2
Erfurt, Synod at, 81
Eugenius III., 105
 „ IV., 139–40

Faber, 236
Falk Laws, 251
Fea, Carlo, 226–7
Febronius, Justinus, 212–3
Felix II., 38
Ferdinand II., 260
Firmilian, Bishop, 24
Forchheim, Assembly at, 91
Forli, Melozzo da, 145
Formosus, Pope, 63
Fra Angelico, 143
Francis I. of France, 172
 „ Xavier, 196
Franciscans, Order of, 116, 121–22
Franco-Prussian War, 355–7, 405
Frederick I., 105–8
 „ II., 109, 112–5
 „ III., 148–9
 „ the Wise, 167
Freemasons, 260
Freytag, Gustav, 54
Funds and taxes, 100–1

Galileo, 200, 229
Gallican liberties, 203
Garibaldi, 235, 241
Gelasius I., 37
Gerson, Jean Charlier de, 130–1
Gioberti, Vincenzo, 233
Godfrey of Lorraine, 75
Golden Bull of Eger, 109
Gregory I., 39–43
 „ II., 47
 „ III., 47–9
 „ VII., 74, 78–95
 „ IX., 113–8
 „ XI., 130
 „ XII., 133–6, 138–90
 „ XV., 196, 228–9, 237
Grotius, Hugo, 211–2
Guiscard, Robert, 75, 92–3
Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, 200

Hadrian IV., 105–6
 „ VI., 169–71
Hase, Karl, 56
Hemmerlin, Canon, 137
Henry III., 70, 76
 „ IV., 70, 76–7, 82–90, 189, 196

Henry V., 96–8
,, VIII., 173
Hermes, Georg, 231
Hermit of Amiens, 102
Hesse, Philip, Landgrave of, 172
Hildebrand (*see* Gregory VII.)
Hincmar, Archbishop, 61–3
Hippolytus, Bishop, 20
Hohenlohe, Count von, 252
Honorius I., 45–6
,, III., 112–3, 116
Hontheim, Nicholas von, 212–3
Hugo, Abbot, 67
Humbert, Cardinal-Bishop, 73
Huss, John, 135

IGNATIUS, Bishop of Antioch, 14
,, de Recalde (*see* Loyola)
Index of Forbidden Books, 177–9
Indulgences, 162–4
Infallibility of doctrinal decisions, 245–7
Influence, political and secular, 201–3
Innocent I., 32
,, II., 100
,, III., 108–12
,, IV., 116, 120
,, VIII., 146, 151–2
,, X., 201, 204
,, XI., 201
Inquisition, founding of Roman, 177
Investitures struggle, 81 ff.
Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, 17
Italian Revolution, 232–4

JANSENIST disputes, 203–5
Jesuitism, 181–5, 192–8, 205–11, 224, 230–1, 235
Joachim Philip of Treves, 212
John, King of England, 110
,, XI., 64
,, XII., 64
,, XXII., 128
,, XXIII., 133–6
,, of Jandun, 126
Joseph II., 215–6
Julius, I., 31
,, II., 117, 146, 151, 154–7
,, III., 178, 181
Justinian, 38, 118

KAUNITZ, Count, 216
Ketteler, 245
Kramers, Heinrich, 152
"Kulturkampf," 250

LACORDAIRE, 232
Lagueronnière, 240
Lainez, 181
Lambruschini, 229
Lamennais, Abbé, 231–2
Langenstein, Henry of, 130
Lateran Councils, 99, 108–12, 157
Lavigerie, 260
Lenten Synods, 81, 91
Leo I., 32–7
,, III., 46, 55
,, IV., 58–9
,, VIII., 66
,, IX., 71–2, 75
,, X., 146–7, 154, 158–9

Leo XII., 226, 228
,, XIII., 161, 164–6, 169, 252–63
Leopold of Tuscany, 216
Lettres provinciales, 204
Liberius, Bishop of Rome, 30
Liutprand, 47–9
Lombards, the, 45–7, 51–2
Lorenzo the Magnificent, 145–146
Lothair of Lorraine, 60
,, Supplenburg, 103
Louis I., 58
,, XIV., 201–2
Louis, Saint, of France, 121
,, of Bavaria, 127–8
Loyola, 180, 196
Lucius II., 103
Luther, Martin, 165–9
Lyons, Council of, 116

Macaulay, 7, 264
Maintenon, Mdme. de, 202
Maistre, Count Joseph de, 225–226
Majolus, Abbot, 67
Malleus Maleficarum, 153
Manfred, 120
Mantua, Council at, 176
Map, Walter, 101
Marcellus II., 178
Mariana, 196
Marozia, 64
Marsilius of Padua, 126
Martel, Charles, 48–50
Martin I., 45
,, V., 136–9
Matilda of Tuscany, 76, 92
Mauro, Father, 228–9
Maximilian, Emperor, 156–7
Mazzini, 232
Medici, The, 145–6
Mendicant Orders, 116
Money-collecting, 128–30
Mommsen, 43

Nantes, Edict of, 189
Napoleon I., 219–22
,, III., 239, 241
Nepotism, 129
Nicæa, Councils of, 27, 33, 72
Nicholas I., 59–63
,, V., 143–4, 149–50
Nina, 256
Nogaret, William de, 125
Norbert of Xanten, 103
Normans, Relations of the Papacy with, 81

Octavian, "Patrician," 64
Odilo, Abbot, 67
Otto I., 64–5
,, III., 68–9
Oudinot, Marshal, 235

"Pallium" fees, 101
"Papal Trinity," 133
Pascal, Blaise, 204
Paschal Controversy, 18–9
Paschal II., 95–6, 107
Pastor Æternus, 245
Paul, St., 17
Paul II., 144, 150
,, III., 175–7, 181

Paul IV., 178–9, 182–3
„ V., 195–6
Pelagius II., 40
Pepin, 50–2
Perrone, Giovanni, 231, 244
Peter, St., 9–11, 16-7, 23–5
Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, 30
Peter's Pence, 101
Philip the Fair, 123–6
Pisa, Councils at, 132–3, 156–9
Pius II., 144, 150
„ IV., 183
„ V., 185–8, 194
„ VI., 210, 212–6
„ VII., 219–24, 227
„ VIII., 228
„ IX., 8, 223–48, 252
„ X., 264
Plombières, Alliance of Victor Emmanuel and Napoleon III. at, 239
Polycarp, 18–9
Portugal, Kingdom of, 108
Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, 138, 147, 157–8
Propaganda, Congregation of the, 196
Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, 61–2
Pufendorf, 212

Quanta Cura, 237
Quesnel, Paschasius, 205
Quod nunquam, 252

RADETZKY, 235
Ranke, 7, 75, 221, 227
Raphael, 117–8
Ravaillac, 196
Recalde, Lopez de (*see* Loyola)
Reformation, 160 ff
Regensburg, Council at, 176
Regino, Abbot, 60
Reinald of Dassel, 107
Risorgimento, Italian, 232–4
Roland, Cardinal (*see* Alexander III.)
Rome, Synod at, 48, 75
Roncaglia, Plain of, 105
Roothaan, 230, 253
Rosmini, Antonio, 233
Rossi, Pellegrino, 234
Rothe, Richard, 59
Rovere, Francesco della, 150–1
„ Giuliano della (*see* Julius II.)
Rudolf of Swabia, 91–2

ST. BARTHOLOMEW, Massacre of, 189
Saint-Martin, 225
Salmeron, 183
Sardica, Synod of, 31
Schlegel, Friedrich August, 226
Schulte, 235
Senatrix of Rome (Theodora), 64
Septimius Severus, Emperor, 20
Sicily, 112, 120
Siegfried, Archbishop of Mayence, 81, 85
Sigismund, King, 134–6
Simonists, Humbert's treatise against, 73
Siricius, Bishop of Rome, 32

Sixtus II., 21
„ IV., 144–5, 150
„ V., 188, 190–1, 194, 197
Society of Jesus, 181
Soter, Bishop, 14–5
Spires, Protest at, 180
Sprenger, Jacob, 152
States of the Church, 190
Stephen I., 21–2
„ III., 51
Suarez, 196
Sutri, Synod at, 70
Swords, Doctrine of two, 117
Sylvester I., 30
„ II., 69
"Synagogue of Satan," 260

TAXATION, 128–30
Taxil, Leo, 260
Templars, Condemnation of the, 128
Theodosius, 28–30
Theodora, 64
Theodotus, 25
Thessalonica, Attitude of, to Rome, 34
Thirty Years' War, 200
Tolerance, Joseph II.'s Charter of, 215
Transubstantiation, Doctrine of, 111
Trent, Council of, 183, 185
Tribur, Diet at, 88
Triple Alliance, 260

Unam Sanctum, Bull, 124, 126, 158
Unigenitus Constitution, 205
Univers, 236
Urban II., 95, 102
„ IV., 121
„ VI., 130
„ VIII., 199–201

LA VALETTE, 208
Valla, Laurentius, 143–4
Valentinian III., 33–5
Venice, Meeting of Alexander III. and Frederick Barbarossa at, 107–8
Veuillot, Louis, 236
Victor I., 19, 25
„ II., 95
„ IV., 107
Victor Emmanuel I., 224, 239–41
Vienna, Concordat concluded at, 149
Vigilius, Pope, 38
Vogelweide, Walther von der, 129

WESTPHALIA, Peace of, 201
William of Auvergne, 67
„ „ Orange, 201
Witches Hammer, 153
Worms, Concordat of, 96–8
„ Diet of, 167–8
Wyclif, John, 135

ZACHARIAS, Pope, 50
Zelanti, 227
Zephyrinus, Bishop, 19
Zürich, Peace of, 239