

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

THE MIDDLE AGES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) *Spirit of Laws*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) CANTU; *loc. cit.*—

—Hallam, although not addicted to criticism or to investigation of original sources of history, because he regarded such labors as “not incumbent on a compiler,” *View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, chap. i., note 11, nevertheless hit upon truth when he said: “Italy supplied the fire from which other nations, in this first, as afterwards in the second era of the revival of letters, lighted their own torches. Lanfranc, Anselm, Peter Lombard, the founder of systematic theology in the twelfth century, Irnerius, the restorer of jurisprudence, Gratian, the author of the first compilation of Canon Law, the School of Salerno, that guided medical art in all countries, the first dictionaries of the Latin tongue, the first treatise on Algebra, the first great work that makes an epoch in Anatomy, are as truly and exclusively the boast of Italy, as the restoration of Greek literature and of classical taste in the fifteenth century.”—*Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries*, vol. i., c. 2.

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

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

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

(1) *History of Italian Literature.*

(2) *History of Verona.*

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

(4) *History of the Emperors.*

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

(6) *History of the Middle Age* (1890).

(7) *Manual of the History of the Middle Age, from the Fall of the Western Empire until the Death of Charlemagne* (Paris, 1837).

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

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

It is false that the Middle Ages were pre-eminently times of ignorance; that, as some have not hesitated to say, men had lost the faculty of reasoning. In this epoch flourished Abélard, Dante, Albert the Great, Thomas of Aquin. It is true that the hunting and soldiering barbarians at first disdained the peaceful triumphs of letters, and regarded the fine arts as a disgraceful inheritance of the people they had conquered; that, for a time, even the olden subjects—of the secular order—of Rome lost taste for the sublime and the beautiful. But then science found a friend in the sanctuary and in the cloister: and the clergy preserved, as a sacred deposit, the traditions of literature and art. As for moral science, have modern times surpassed Anselm, Lafranc, Peter Damian, or Peter Lombard? As for practical science, do we know much more than did our medieval ancestors? We will mention a few of the improvements and inventions which we owe to these compassionate men. I. The paper on which we write (linen) is, according to Hallam, an invention of the year 1100 (2); cotton paper was certainly used in Italy in the tenth century. II. The art of printing, or rather the *press*, was invented in 1436, either by Lawrence Coster, a chaplain in the Cathedral of Harlem, and a xylograph printer, or by the artisan Gensfleisch, called Guttenberg (3); but printing by hand was done in the tenth century. III. That music may be now called a science is due to Guido of Arezzo, an Italian monk, who, in 1124, determined the scale, hitherto uncertain.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

dotal word. At first each of these idioms was a mere dialect, that is, a vulgar speech, rude, ignoble, private, unfit for public use and for writing, not yet possessed of a life of its own, independent of the ancient mother's. And just as the fetus becomes a man, the human animal an infant, coming out into the light and entirely separating from the maternal body, so a dialect is transformed into an illustrious language, fit to signify ideal things, through the work of noble writers who divert it from popular usage, and introduce it into the forum, the temple, the schools, and into the conversation of the learned—who develop its scientific and aesthetic powers, and who give it a being entirely distinct from its progenitrix. The first of modern dialects to run this course was the Tuscan, or, to speak correctly, the Florentine, which afterwards became the noble language of Italy, just as the Castilian and the Picard became the national idioms of Spain and of France. The Tuscan was already conceived before 1200, when Folcacchiero and Ciullo d'Alcamo dictated their rude sonnets; it was born with Dante, who first initiated the speech of the Arno into the public life of civilization and of learning, and rendered it, so far as literature is concerned, not only Italian, but European." GIOBERTI; *Civil and Moral Primacy of the Italians*, Capolago, 1846, vol. ii., p. 275.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) *History of France, narrated to my Grandchildren*, 1872, vol. i., p. 236.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) MONTALEMBERT ; *loc. cit.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(5) WAILLY; *Elements of Palaeography*, vol. i. p. 304.

(6) *Historical Errors*, vol. xiv., p. 306, Paris, 1881.

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

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

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

CHAPTER II.

THE REVIVAL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE UNDER CHARLEMAGNE.

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

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

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

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

(2) At that time the year was calculated from Christmas day; but according to the present method of computation, the coronation of Charlemagne occurred in the year 794.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) This author was born (1520) in Istria, and hence his surname of Illyricus. He became a professor of theology at Jena, but is best known as the originator, and one of the four principal authors of the famous Protestant work, the *Centuries of Magdeburg*. The other "Centuriators" were Lejeudin, Fabert, and Wigand, but all worked under the supervision of Flaccius.

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

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

(1) *Discipline*, pt. III, b. 1, c. 29.(2) *Laws*, q. 4, art. 4.(3) *Roman Affairs*, b. 23.(4) *Life of Constantine and Irene*.(5) *Ibid.*(6) *Life of Charlemagne*.

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

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

(1) Y. 801.

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

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

(6) *Life of Leo. III.*

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

(7) *Catalogue of Writers.*

(5) *Compendium of Blondus.*

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

(1) *Chronicle of Albert of Strasburg.*

(2) *Conrad Vercer's Life of Henry VII.*

(3) *Saxon History*, b. vi., c. 16 and 17

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

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

(1) ADO of Vienne, at year 812.

(2) BLONDUS, PLATINA, and NAUCKER.

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

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

(1) VERCFR.

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

(3) AIMOÏN; b. v. 24 and 27.

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

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

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

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

(1) *Epist.* 396.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER III.

THE FABLE OF THE POPESS JOAN.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) *Insti.*, b. iv., c. 7, § 23.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(10) *Notes to Sigebert.*

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

(12) *Cenotaph, etc.*

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

(14) *Annals*, y. 853.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) *Canonization*, b. iii., c. 16, no. 3.

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

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

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

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

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

(1) *Epistle 35.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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