SHORT PAPERS ON CHURCH HISTORY

CHAPTER 19

THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY VII

Hildebrand, a native of Tuscany, born in the early part of the eleventh century, had embraced from his boyhood the most rigid ideas of monasticism. Dissatisfied with the laxity of the Italian monks, he crossed the Alps, and entered the austere convent of Cluny, in Burgundy, then the foremost in numbers, wealth, and piety.

In the year 1049, **Bruno, bishop of Toul,** arrayed in all the splendour, and attended by the retinue, of a Pontiff elect arrived at Cluny, and demanded the hospitality and the homage of the monks. Bruno was cousin to Henry III, Emperor of Germany, and had been nominated by him to fill the vacant See of Rome. Hildebrand, the Prior of Cluny, soon acquired great influence over the mind of Bruno. He convinced him that he had made a false step in having accepted the appointment from the hands of a layman, and recommended him to lay aside the pontifical vestments which he had prematurely assumed, travel to Rome as a pilgrim, and there receive from the clergy and people that apostolical office which no layman had a right to bestow. Bruno consented. Hildebrand's lofty views of ecclesiastical dignity prevailed over the more genial mind of his new friend. He followed the advice; threw aside his robes, and taking the monk as his companion, he pursued his journey to Rome in the simple garb of a pilgrim.

The impression produced was great, and all in favour of Bruno. No sacerdotal or imperial display could have had the same power over the people. Miracles are said to have marked his way, and by his prayers swollen rivers sank within-their natural bounds. He was hailed with universal acclamations as Pope Leo the Ninth. Hildebrand was immediately rewarded for his services. He was raised to the rank of a cardinal, and received the offices of sub-deacon of Rome with other munificent preferments. From this time he was practically pope — the real director of the Papacy.

EXTREMES OF CHARACTER

Just at this point of our history we meet, through the subtlety of Satan, the most extreme and opposite of characters. Hildebrand's one object was to subdue the outer world the self-inflicted cruelties of others were to subdue the world within themselves.

Peter Damiano, bishop of Ostia, was severely ascetic. He wore sackcloth secretly, he fasted, he watched, he prayed, and, in order to tame his passions, he could rise in the night, stand for hours in a stream until his limbs were stiff

with cold, and spend the remainder of the night in visiting churches, and reciting the Psalter. The avowed object for which he so laboured was the restoration of the dignity of the priesthood, and a stricter church discipline. Such is the delusive power of the enemy within the church of Rome. But a monk, named

Dominic, was considered the great hero of this warfare against the poor unoffending body. Satan concealed from his dupe the difference between the body and the *deeds* of the body. Dominic wore next to his skin a tight iron cuirass, which he never put off, except to chastise himself. His body and his arms were confined by iron rings, his neck was loaded with heavy chains, his scanty clothes were worn to rags, his food consisted of the coarsest fare, his skin was as black as a negro's, from the effects of his discipline. His usual exercise was to recite the Psalter twice a day, while he flogged himself with both hands, at the rate of a thousand lashes to ten psalters. It was reckoned that three thousand lashes were equal to a year's penance; the whole Psalter, therefore, with this accompaniment, was equivalent to five years. In Lent, or on occasions of special penitence, the daily average rose to three psalters; he "easily" (?) got through twenty — equal to a hundred years of penance — in six days. Once, at the beginning of Lent, he begged that a penance of a thousand years might be imposed on him, and he cleared off the whole before Easter.

These flagellations were supposed to have the effect of a satisfaction for other men's sins — works of supererogation, which formed the capital for the sale of indulgences, which we shall hear of by-and-by. Death mercifully put an end to his pitiable delusions in the year 1062.

Take another example of ecclesiastical life, for Satan found something to suit every taste.

The worldly prelates were in the habit of riding forth attended with troops of soldiers, with swords and lances. They were surrounded with armed men like a heathen general. Every day royal banquets, every day parades; the table loaded with delicacies; the guests, their voluptuous favourites. Crime and licentiousness held revel in the palaces of the prelates. So great was the wickedness of Rome in the tenth century, that historians in general consent to draw a veil over it for the sake of our common humanity. Can our deluded countrymen who are hastening over to Rome, know, that within a period of a century and a half, about this time, so dreadful were the scenes of the Vatican, that "two popes were murdered, five were driven into exile four were deposed, and three resigned their hazardous dignity. Some were raised to the pontifical chair by arms, some by money, and some received the tiara from the hands of princely courtesans… It would be heretical to say that the gates of hell had prevailed against the seat and centre of Catholicism; but Baronius himself might be cited to prove that they had rolled back on their infernal

hinges to send forth malignant spirits, commissioned to empty on her devoted head the vials of bitterness and wrath."[122]

We now turn to the immediate object of our history — the career of Hildebrand, as Gregory the Seventh, from whose lips we shall hear an account of the infallible popes very different from the above.

GREGORY AND CLERICAL INDEPENDENCE

The day is yet future when man, the Antichrist of 2 Thessalonians 2 energized and led on by Satan will "exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped," but surely in the life and character of Gregory, we have a dark foreshadowing of that masterpiece of the enemy. Were it not for the proof and illustration of scripture which Hildebrand's designs afford, we would willingly pass over his history. No *silver line* of grace, no love human or divine, can be traced in a single act of his public administration; but with great swelling words of the most daring blasphemy he speaks of himself as the successor of St. Peter, the follower of Jesus, and the utterance of the mouth of God. At the same time it is evident to all that he was the very incarnation of antichristian pride, arrogance, and intolerance. His language sometimes borders on the assumption of divinity, and nearly approaches the blasphemy of the man of sin.

From the time he entered Rome as the companion of Bruno till his advancement to the pontifical chair — a period of twenty-four years — he was the ruling spirit in the Vatican; but he was in no haste for preferment. With more than human sagacity he was studying the condition and relations of Church and State; he was acquiring a knowledge of man and of the affairs of all Europe; he was maturing a lofty but daring scheme of a vast *spiritual autocracy in the person of the Pope.* All this appeared when he ascended the throne, and assumed in his own person the responsibility of the power which he had so long directed, though in an inferior station. His avowed object from the first was the absolute freedom and independence of the clergy from imperial and all lay interference of every description, whether to nominate or to consecrate an ecclesiastic; and, on the basis of this liberty, he boldly asserted that spiritual authority was higher and more legitimate than temporal. These proud pretensions led the church of Rome, in the person of her pontiff, to usurp dominion over the western empire, and over all the kingdoms of Europe, or rather of the whole world. Nothing more is wanted to confirm these assertions than the following Dictates.

---

[122] Sir James Stephen, *Ecclesiastical Biography,* vol. 1, p. 2; Milman, vol. 3, p. 103; Robertson, vol. 2, p. 515.

THE "DICTATES OF GREGORY"

The following are said to be some of Gregory's maxims; they will give the reader an idea of the man, and of the spirit of popery. "It is laid down that the Roman pontiff is universal bishop, that his name is the only one of the kind in the world. To him alone it belongs to depose or to reconcile bishops; and he may depose them in their absence, and without the concurrence of a Synod. He alone is entitled to frame new laws for the church — to divide, unite, or translate bishoprics. He alone may use the ensigns of empire; all princes are bound to kiss his feet, he has the right to depose emperors, and to absolve subjects from their allegiance. He holds in his hands the supreme mediation in questions of war and peace, and he only may adjudge contested successions to kingdoms — that all kingdoms were held as fiefs under St. Peter. With his leave inferiors may accuse their superiors. No council may be styled general without his command. The Roman church has never erred, and, as scripture testifies, never will err. The pope is above all judgment, and by the merits of St. Peter is undoubtedly rendered holy. The church was not to be the handmaid of princes but their mistress; if she had received from God power to bind and to loose in heaven, much more must she have a like power over earthly things."[123]

But while the *sovereign domination* of the church had long been the fond dream of Hildebrand, he saw that certain reforms were necessary to the accomplishment of his object; and to these he now addressed himself in all the energy and intrepid firmness of his character.

GREGORY AND REFORM

About the close of Gregory's first official year (March, 1074), he assembled a numerous council at Rome, for the purpose of declaring war against the two great vices of the European clergy, and the two great hindrances to his theocratic scheme, namely, *concubinage* and *simony*, or the marriage of the priests and the sale of benefices. Many who were favourable to reform thought the edict as to celibacy not only severe but unjust, because it applied equally to the most honourable marriages and the basest profligacy. It was resolved in council, without opposition: first, that priests should not marry, secondly, that those who were married should put away their wives, or renounce the priesthood; thirdly, that for the future no one should be admitted to holy orders who should not profess inviolable continence.

Many of the early fathers had endeavoured to establish the connection between celibacy and sanctity, and to persuade men that those who were wedded to the church should avoid the contamination of an earthly union. Several of the popes had also advocated celibacy; but, unless under the severest personal discipline or in the strictest monastic communities, it was little observed and probably never enforced beyond the bounds of Italy. But Gregory made his

[123] Robertson, vol. 2, p. 567.

voice to be heard and feared on this subject from the Vatican to the utmost limits of Latin Christendom. He wrote letters to all archbishops and bishops, princes, potentates, and lay officers of every degree, on pain of incurring severe punishment or eternal perdition, to cast out and depose, without mercy, all married priests and deacons, and to refuse their contaminating ministrations. These despatches were full of anathemas against all who resisted his decrees; and, assuming the place of God, he says, "How shall they obtain pardon for their sins who despise him who openeth and closeth the gates of heaven *to whom he pleaseth?* Let all such beware how they call down the divine wrath upon their own heads,… how they incur the apostolic malediction, instead of earning that grace and blessing so abundantly poured out upon them by the blessed Peter! Let them be assured that neither prince nor prelate shall escape the doom of the sinner who shall omit to drive out and expel, with inexorable rigour, all simoniacal and married priests, and all who shall listen to the call of carnal sympathy or affection, or shall from any worldly motive withhold the sword from the shedding of blood in the holy cause of God and His church, or shall stand aloof while these damning heresies are gnawing at the vitals of religion,… shall be regarded indiscriminately as accomplices of the heretics, as counterfeits and cheats."[124]

CELIBACY AND SIMONY

The promulgation of this edict produced, as may well be conceived, the greatest possible agitation and distress throughout the whole of Christendom. Up to this time, right or wrong, marriage had been the rule, celibacy the exception. And the injustice of the edict made it more intolerable, for it fell as severely on the most virtuous as on the most vicious, and stigmatized them all alike as guilty of concubinage. We must leave the reader to imagine the effect of such a decree on thousands and tens of thousands of happy families; details would fill a volume. It dissolved the most honourable marriages, rent asunder what God had joined together, scattered husbands wives, and children, and gave rise to the most lamentable contentions, and spread everywhere the direst calamities; wives, especially, were driven to despair, and exposed to the bitterest grief and shame. But the more vehement the opposition, the more loud the anathemas against any delay in the plenary execution of the pontiff's commands. The disobedient were delivered over to the civil magistrates, to be persecuted, deprived of their properties, and subjected to indignities and sufferings of various kinds. Part of one of his letters said on this point, "He whom flesh and blood moveth to doubt or delay is carnal; he is condemned already; he hath no share in the work of the Lord; he is a rotten branch, a dumb dog, a cankered limb, a faithless servant, a time-server, and a hypocrite."

But as none of the sovereigns of Europe were disposed to fight for the wives of the clergy, the pope soon had the matter all his own way, and many of the

---

[124] Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, vol. 4, p. 331.

lewd priests were not sorry to be delivered from the obligations of their evil ways.

Simony. The conflict arising from the twin law for the suppression of simony was more difficult to deal with; and, being protracted through many years, it involved both the **church and** state in many and great calamities.

THE SIMONIACAL HERESY

In the eleventh century the **feudal system** is said to have arrived at maturity, and the sin of simony — or the sale of ecclesiastical benefices — to have reached its evil height. At this period history informs us that, from the Papacy down to the lowest parochial cure, every spiritual dignity had its money-price and became an object of barter or sale. Even the bishopric of Rome had been so notoriously bought and sold about this very time, that there were three contemporary popes: Benedict IX held the Lateran; Sylvester III, the Vatican; and Gregory VI, Santa Maria. But so disgraceful were the contentions, and so fierce the actual warfare between the popes and their friends, that the Emperor Henry III was implored by the Italians to come to Rome and examine the conflicting claims of the three pontiffs. A council was held at Sutri, about the year 1044, when the most unheard of immoralities, and the most flagrant simony, were proved against the popes before Henry. Which of the three the high church now claims as the legitimate successor of St. Peter, we know not; but there can be no doubt that they were all the lineal descendants of **Simon Magus,** who thought that the gift of God might be purchased with money. Few, very few, were the true descendants of Simon Peter, who left all and followed Jesus.

The evil worked downwards, and every order of the clergy was affected, if not corrupted, by this prevailing sin. When the bishop found he had paid too much for his See, he naturally raised the price of the inferior stations in order to indemnify himself. Thus the great prelates of the church were engaged in the most degrading traffic and secularizing speculations. Nothing could be lower, and it opened the door of the church to the worst of men. Laymen, without education or religion; barbarians, without civilization, purchased holy orders, and forced themselves into the sacred ranks of the priesthood, and of course brought with them the worst wickedness of the world, and the greatest enormities of the heathen. Simony thus became the all-comprehending sin of that period, and every vice naturally sprang from it. But we will endeavour to ascertain its origin.

THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF SIMONY

So long as the church was poor, persecuted, and despised by the world, there were no purchasers for benefices. When a man lost his worldly status by becoming a Christian, and exposed himself to imprisonment and death, all trafficking in ecclesiastical preferments was unknown. But after the union of Church and State, and when the wealth of the world began to flow into the

coffers of the church, there was a great temptation to enter the sacred order for the privileges and immunities which it secured. Simony thus became the inevitable consequence of the rich endowment of the greater Sees.

In the early days of episcopacy the bishop was elected by the clergy and the people of his diocese, but in process of time episcopal elections became so important, that the lay-lords, and even the sovereigns, were tempted to interfere, and ultimately to establish and claim the privilege of positive appointment. Charlemagne himself set the example of advancing his natural sons to high ecclesiastical dignities. The privilege thus usurped was soon abused. The most important charges and offices were either bestowed on favourites, or publicly sold to the highest bidder, without regard for the interests of religion, sanctity of character, or even literary qualifications.

The universal feudal practice of making presents to the sovereign, or to the liege lord, at every act of promotion, was followed by the ecclesiastics. When a bishop or abbot died, it was usual, in the first place, to report the vacancy to the court, then the ring and the crosier of the deceased prelate or abbot were placed in the hands of the temporal superior. The bishop or abbot next appointed was bound by the general custom to present a gift or acknowledgement; this necessarily led to a transaction which assumed the character of a bargain and sale. The gift or offering, which at first was accepted as honorary and voluntary, was at length exacted as a price with unscrupulous rapacity. With this was connected the famous question of *investiture.* The ring, the symbol of his mystic marriage with his diocese; the staff, the sceptre of his spiritual sway. This *investiture* conveyed the right to the temporal possessions or endowments of the benefice. It presumed not to consecrate, but permitted the consecrated person to execute his office in a certain defined sphere, and under the protection and guarantee of the civil power.

Many of the Sees were endowed with sovereign rights and royalties within their respective provinces. Bishops and abbeys had grown into principalities and governments, and to these ecclesiastical princes the largest share in the offices and councils of state had been entrusted. In the feudal system, bishops had become in every respect the equals of the secular nobles. “In every city,” says Milman, “the bishop, if not the very first of men, was on a level with the first; without the city he was lord of the amplest domains. Archbishops almost equalled kings; for who would not have coveted the station and authority of a Hincmar, **Archbishop of Rheims,** rather than that of the feeble Carlovingian monarch?”[125]

But the superior clergy were in no respect behind the laity in the corrupt practice of selling the spiritual offices within their patronage. Bishops and abbots sold their churches, without shame or remorse, that they might repay

[125] *Latin Christianity,* vol. 3, p. 105.

themselves for their outlay. That which had been obtained by unworthy means was employed for unworthy ends. Such was the fearful state of things both in Church and State, and such the unhallowed motives of men for taking holy orders, when Hildebrand sent forth his famous decree against all simoniacal practices, and against the whole right of investiture by the temporal sovereign, prince, noble, or any layman.

GREGORY AND INVESTITURES

A.D. 1075

The formal inauguration of a bishop or abbot by the delivery of a ring and a staff had been customary with the emperors, kings, and princes of Europe, long before the establishment of the feudal system by Charlemagne, probably from the time of Clovis. And so far, if we bear in mind the relation of the Church to the State, and the original source of the privilege, it appears fair and right, though to a spiritual mind a most incongruous combination of temporal and spiritual powers, and ruinous to both. "When the early conquerors of the West," says Dean Waddington, "conferred territorial grants upon the church, the individuals who came to the enjoyment of them were obliged to present themselves at court, to swear allegiance to the king, and to receive from his hands some symbol in proof that the temporalities were placed in their possession. The same ceremony, in fact, was imposed on the ecclesiastical as on the lay proprietor of royal fiefs, and it was called *investiture*. Afterwards, when the princes had usurped the presentation to all valuable benefices, even to those which had not been derived from royal bounty, they introduced no distinction, founded on the different sources of the revenue, but continued to subject those whom they nominated to the same rank of allegiance, and the same ceremony of investiture, with the laity."[126]

In the first fervour of conversion, the conquerors, from Constantine downwards, had been in the habit of bestowing a share of their newly-acquired property upon monasteries and churches; but the gifts of the successive dynasties were moderate, compared with the imperial house of Saxony. Under the German emperors church property accumulated rapidly, and to an enormous extent. "In the eleventh and twelfth centuries," says Greenwood, "*freeholds in perpetuity* were possessed by the churches to a very great extent. The bishops and abbots were enriched, not, as heretofore, by gifts of single plots of ground, or farms, but by grants of whole cities and towns, by cantons and counties. Thus Otho I gave to the monastery of **Magdeburg** several boroughs, with their purlieus and the rural districts appertaining thereto. Otho II granted three boroughs out of the imperial domain to the church of Aschaffenburg, with all the lands appurtenant. The terms of the conveyance do not appear to have differed at all from those used in secular grants of the like nature. And in practice, notwithstanding the

---

[126] *History of the Church,* vol. 2, p. 70.

different character and calling of the grantees, the same ideas of the nature and requirements of the grant appear to have been entertained by the spiritual as by the lay vassal. Thus bishops and abbots buckled on armour, mounted their chargers, and marched to the field, at the head of their sub-vassals and tenants, in discharge of the feudal duties incumbent upon their lands, nor could the latter be easily moved at all till led into action by their lawful chiefs.

"The great ecclesiastics, so far from objecting to these unprofessional demands, entered heartily into the sport of war, and bore themselves in the field with a degree of martial prowess which might become the bravest of the lay chivalry."[127]

Such was the state of what may be called the christian constituency when Hildebrand issued his memorable edict against *lay investitures;* and such was the right or usage on the part of the crown of nominating and appointing to the greater ecclesiastical dignities and benefices. Hildebrand's scheme was to abolish entirely even the remotest claim of any interference, either for or against, on the part of the laity, in spiritual appointments, and to deprive the sovereign of the right of investiture, with which the law and custom of centuries had armed him, and which he regarded as the most precious prerogative of his crown. This was the question raised, the prize at issue, and the great battle to be fought, between the potentates of Europe and the meagre monk in the Vatican. Gregory now addressed himself to the contest, the greatest by far ever undertaken single-handed in any age.

GREGORY AND HENRY IV

The discerning eye of the vigilant pontiff had long watched the spirit and movements of all Christendom. He was well acquainted with the moral and political life, the strength and weakness, of all nations. He may be seen in the spiritual warfare temporizing with the strong, and bending all his strength against the weak. He speaks contemptuously of the feeble king of France, and claims tribute as an ancient right. Charlemagne, he says, was the pope's collector, and bestowed Saxony on the apostle. But to the dreaded William of England and Normandy his language is courteous. The haughty Norman maintained his Teutonic independence; created bishops and abbots at his will; was absolute lord over his ecclesiastical as over his feudal liegemen.[128]

In Spain and the northern nations Gregory was more assumptuous and successful, but it was against the empire that he concentrated all his forces, and resolved to measure the strength of the Papacy with the whole power of Henry. If he could humble the highest and proudest of monarchs — the successor of the Caesars — the victory would tell on all other sovereigns.

---

[127] *Cathedra Petri,* vol. 4, p. 274.
[128] *Latin Christianity,* vol. 3, p. 121.

The youth and inexperience of Henry, the demoralizing tendencies of his education, the revolt of the German princes, and the troubles that too often afflict a country during a minority, encouraged the daring priest in his bold designs. The decisions of the council, held in 1074, against the universal sin of simony, and the marriage of the clergy, were duly communicated to the Emperor. The crafty pope embraced the opportunity of assuming the greatest friendship for Henry. He admonished him as a father to return to the bosom of his mother, the holy Roman church, to rule the empire in a more worthy manner, to abstain from simoniacal presentations to benefices, and to render due allegiance to his spiritual superior.

The Emperor received the pope's legate courteously, commended his zeal for the reform of the church, and was altogether most submissive in his tone. But Gregory was not to be satisfied with unmeaning praise and apparent repentance. He now desired permission, as supreme arbiter of the affairs of Germany, to summon councils there, by which those accused of simony might be convicted and deposed. But neither Henry nor the bishops would grant leave to the pope's legates to assemble a council in Germany for such a purpose. The clergy dreaded his severe inquisition into their titles, and the Emperor dreaded having his own patronage curtailed. But the impatient zeal of the ambitious priest would brook no delay and submit to no opposition.

In the following year (1075) he convoked a second council at Rome, and proceeded to those measures which he had intended to accomplish by synods in Germany. At the head of his Roman clergy, men vowed to his cause by interest and pride, he determined at all hazards to strike at the root of all abuses comprehended under the odious name of simony. On this occasion he excommunicated some of the favourites of Henry; he deposed the Archbishop of Bremen, and the bishops of Strasburg, Spires, and Bamberg, besides some Lombard bishops, and five of the imperial court, whose assistance the Emperor had used in the sale of benefices. He also decreed that "whoever should confer a bishopric or an abbacy, or should receive an investiture from the hands of any layman, should be excommunicated." Henry again professed a measure of penitence, acknowledged the existence of simony, and his intentions in future to discourage it, but that he could by no means be induced to give up the power of appointing bishops and abbots, and the *investiture* so closely connected with that power. Gregory, on the other hand, exasperated by the king's disobedience, and by his appointing to the See of Milan and other bishoprics, without awaiting the decision of the apostolic See, sent him the most peremptory summons to appear in Rome, to answer for all his offences before the tribunal of the pope, and before a synod of ecclesiastics; if he should refuse or delay, he was at once to suffer the sentence of excommunication. The 22nd of February was the day appointed for his appearance.

"Thus the king," says Milman, "the victorious king of the Germans, was solemnly cited as a criminal, to answer undefined charges, to be amenable to

laws which the judge had assumed the right of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing by the last penalties. The whole affairs of the empire were to be suspended while the king stood before the bar of his imperious arbiter; no delay was allowed; the stern and immutable alternative was humble and instant obedience or that sentence which involved deposition from the empire and eternal perdition."

The Emperor, who was a high-minded prince and of an ardent temperament, being extremely indignant at this mandate, treated it as a wanton insult, and immediately called a convention of German bishops at **Worms.** His object was to depose the pope who had thus declared war, even to the death, against himself. These prelates, after passing many censures on the conduct of Hildebrand, pronounced him unworthy of his dignity, deposed him, and appointed a meeting for the election of a new pontiff. Gregory, on receiving the sentence by the king's messengers and letters, was not the least disturbed by such empty denunciations. In a full assembly of one hundred and ten bishops, he suspended the ecclesiastics who had voted and spoken against him. He then pronounced the excommunication of the Emperor, declaring "that he had forfeited the kingdoms of Germany and Italy, and that his subjects were absolved from their oath of fealty."

THE EMPEROR DEPOSED BY THE POPE

In the assembly Gregory thus spoke: "Now, therefore, brethren, it behoves us to draw the sword of vengeance; now must we smite the foe of God and of His church; now shall his bruised head, which lifts itself, in its haughtiness, against the foundations of the faith, and of all the churches, fall to the earth, there, according to the sentence pronounced against his pride, to go upon his belly, and eat the dust. Fear not, little flock, saith the Lord, for it is the will of your Father to grant you the kingdom. Long enough have ye borne with him; often enough have ye admonished him: let his seared conscience be made to feel!" The whole synod replied with one voice, "Let thy wisdom, most holy father, whom the divine mercy has raised up to rule the world in our days, utter such a sentence against this blasphemer, this usurper, this tyrant, this apostate, as may crush him to the earth, and make him a warning to future ages… Draw the sword, pass the judgment, that the righteous may rejoice when he seeth the vengeance, and wash his hands in the blood of the ungodly."

The formal sentence followed: the audacious priest, in the most blasphemous manner, identifies himself with the divine majesty, and utters the most solemn language in the foulest hypocrisy. After affirming, with a lying tongue, that he had been reluctantly compelled to ascend the pontifical throne, he said, "In full confidence in the authority over all christian people granted by God to the delegate of St. Peter, for the honour and defence of the church, in the name of the Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and by the power and authority of St. Peter, I interdict King Henry, son of Henry the Emperor, who, in his unexampled pride, has risen against the church, from the

government of the whole realm of Germany and Italy. I absolve all Christians from the oaths which they have sworn, or may swear, to him, and forbid all obedience to him as king… Because he has held communion with the excommunicated, and despised the admonitions which, as thou knowest, I have given him for his salvation… I bind him, therefore, in thy name, in the bonds of thy anathema, that all the nations may know, and may acknowledge, that thou art Peter, and that upon thee, as upon a rock, the Son of God hath built His church, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her."

Before the synod was prorogued, Gregory addressed letters to "all Christians," enclosing copies of the acts of the council, and commanding all men, as they desired to be numbered among the flock of the blessed Peter, to accept and obey the orders therein contained; more especially those which related to the deposition and anathema against the king, his "false bishops, and reprobate ministers." And after exhorting the people to resist Henry, even unto blood the lying priest dared to utter, "God is herein our witness that we are not moved by any desire of *temporal advantage* or by carnal respects of any kind, in reproving wicked princes or impious priests; but that all we do is done from pure regard for our high office, and for the honour and prerogative of the apostolic See," etc.

A GREAT CIVIL WAR

War was now openly proclaimed; the effect of these letters thrown broadcast into a kingdom already divided and among a people already discontented and accustomed to rebellion was immense. Both Church and State were rent in pieces some taking part with the king, others with the pontiff. A civil war broke out, which raged for seventeen years, throughout the Roman empire; bishop against bishop, the people against the people; "while," says one, "*the earth drank up the blood that was shed, and the grave closed alike over those who suffered and those who inflicted the misery.*" All Germany was in a state of distraction, dissension, and all but prostration.

The dukes of Swabia, taking advantage of the general feeling against Henry, and encouraged by the pope's legates, rose in arms against the sovereign to whom they had sworn fealty, and elected Adolphus as king. In the meantime, Hildebrand himself neglected none of his own means of warfare, a warfare in which he was deeply skilled. Great swelling words of most awful import were his weapons. The "name of God; the peace of God; the commands of God; the salvation of God; the keys of the blessed Peter; closing the gates of heaven; opening the gates of hell; eternal perdition," etc., were words which struck terror into every human mind, and the manacles with which he bound his slaves.

As this great struggle went on, the pope was gathering strength, Henry was losing it and felt it ebbing fast. His heart sank within him: everything seemed blasted by the curse of St. Peter; the princes revolted; the prelates and the

people renouncing their allegiance, and conspiracies arose on every side. Such was the evil influence of the pope, who now stepped forth in the full panoply of ecclesiastical, or rather of diabolical, power, to trample in the dust his own liege lord. Under all these depressing and crushing circumstances Henry came to an arrangement with the rebellious princes that the claims and wrongs of both parties should be submitted to the pope, who was invited to preside at a council to be held at Augsburg for that purpose.

HENRY SETS OUT FOR ITALY

The fallen Emperor was now caught in the toils of the enemy. The policy of Gregory had been successful. Having created a revolution, and caused much bloodshed between the princes of the realm and Henry, which he artfully shifted from the ground of individual or political grievance to that of religion, he now pretended to be a peacemaker. Hence such words of base hypocrisy as, “Deal gently with Henry, and extend to him that charity which covereth a multitude of sins.” We shall soon see the quality of Gregory’s gentleness and charity towards Henry.

The king’s cause was now desperate. Stripped of all power, even of the sign of royalty, and feeling that he had nothing to hope for from an assembly of his rebellious subjects and his avowed enemy, he resolved, as a last chance, to try and gain a personal interview with the pope, and throw himself as a penitent at his feet. With difficulty he collected from his few remaining friends sufficient money to defray his expenses to Italy. He left Spires in the depth of winter, with his wife and infant son, and one faithful attendant. But the Alps were still between them and Italy. And even nature now seemed to conspire with the pope against the fallen king. The weather was unusually severe. The Rhine and the Po were thickly frozen over, and the snow which covered the Alps was as hard and as slippery as ice. Besides, the passes were jealously watched by the Dukes of Bavaria and Carinthia, the enemies of Henry. Altogether a passage seemed impossible. But the effort must be made, however perilous. According to the agreement between Henry and the rival princes, or the states general, he must obtain absolution within a *year and a day* of the date of the papal anathema, or forfeit his crown and kingdom for ever; but if he could obtain absolution within that time, they would return to his standard and their allegiance.

The Alps must be crossed. The fatal day — the 23rd of February — was hastening on. Guides, well acquainted with the paths, were hired, something like a road was cut through the snow for the royal party. With great difficulty they reached the summit of the pass; but the descent was yet more hazardous. It looked like a vast precipice of smooth ice. But the difficulty must be overcome. The men crept down on their hands and knees, often slipping and rolling down the glassy declivities. The queen, her infant son, and female attendant, were drawn down by the guides in the skins of oxen, as in sledges. The horses were lowered by various contrivances; some, with their feet tied,

were allowed to roll down; but some were killed and few of them reached the reached the bottom in a serviceable state.

HENRY AT CANOSA

The unexpected arrival of Henry in Italy produced a great sensation. Princes and bishops assembled in great numbers, and received him with the highest honours. The Italians looked to him for a redress of their grievances. Those who had been excommunicated by Hildebrand looked eagerly for vengeance; and the Lombard nobility and the prelates hoped that he was come to depose the dreaded and detested Gregory. As he moved onwards the number of his followers gradually increased; but Henry could not pause to plunge himself into any new scheme; he could not imperil the throne of Germany; he must obtain absolution before the fatal 23rd of February.

In the meantime Gregory had set out for Germany, but the news of Henry's descent into Italy arrested his march. He was uncertain whether he had come as a humble suppliant, or at the head of a great army, and hastened to place his person in safety at **Canosa,** a strong castle in the Apennine mountains, belonging to his faithful friend and ally, the "great countess" Matilda.

Bishops and abbots who had fallen under the papal ban followed the king's example, and hastened to Canosa. With naked feet, and clothed in sackcloth, they presented themselves before the pontiff, humbly imploring pardon and absolution from the dire anathema. After a few days' penance in solitary confinement, and with scanty fare, he absolved them, on condition that, until the king should be reconciled, they were to have no intercourse with him. For Henry himself more humiliating terms were reserved.

On arriving at Canosa, the king obtained an interview with Matilda, the Marchioness Adelaide (his mother-in-law) and Hugh, abbot of Cluny, and engaged their intercession with the pope for a merciful consideration of his case. After many objections raised by the implacable pope, and pleas urged by Henry's friends, Gregory at length proposed, "that if he be truly penitent, let him place his crown, and all the ensigns of royalty, in my hands, and openly confess himself unworthy of the royal name and dignity." This demand seemed too hard, even to the ardent admirers of the pope, who entreated him "not to break the bruised reed;" and in condescension to their importunities, he promised to give the king an interview.

THE PENANCE OF THE KING

It was now towards the end of January; the year of grace was nearly expired; and Henry resolved to accept the pope's conditions. He was determined to do and to bear all, so that he might but disappoint the plottings of his rebellious subjects, and retain the empire.

"On a dreary winter morning," says Milman, "with the ground deep in snow, the king, the heir of a long line of emperors, was permitted to enter within the two outer of the three walls which girded the castle of Canosa. He had laid aside every mark of royalty, or of distinguished station; he was clad only in the thin white linen dress of the penitent, and there, fasting, he awaited in humble patience the pleasure of the pope. But the gates did not unclose. A second day he stood, cold, hungry, and mocked by vain hope. And yet a third day dragged on, from morning to evening, over the unsheltered head of the discrowned king. Every heart was moved, except that of the representative of Jesus Christ. Even in the presence of Gregory there were low, deep, murmurs against his unapostolic pride and inhumanity. The patience of Henry could endure no more. He took refuge in an adjacent chapel of St. Nicolas, to implore, and with tears, once again the intercession of the aged abbot of **Cluny.** Matilda was present; her womanly heart was melted; she joined with Henry in his supplications to the abbot. "Thou alone canst accomplish this," said the abbot to the countess. Henry fell on his knees, and, in a passion of grief, entreated her merciful interference. To female entreaties Gregory at length yielded an ungracious permission for the king to approach his presence. With bare feet, still in the garb of penitence, stood the king, a man of singularly tall and noble person, with a countenance accustomed to flash command and terror upon his adversaries, before the pope, a greyhaired man, of small unimposing stature, bowed with years."[129]

The terms imposed on Henry were characteristic of the unfeeling, inexorable, tyrant; he acted in this matter more like a fiend incarnate than a human being. Finding that the royal penitent was brought so low, that any terms would be accepted, he forced him to drink the bitterest dregs of humiliation. We need not trouble the reader with his lengthy stipulations. Such demands had never been made or heard of before in the annals of mankind. But his one grand object was the consolidation of his own elaborated scheme of papal authority. Having placed his foot on the neck of the greatest monarch in the world, he attempted the establishment of the pontiff's right, in the face of Europe, to judge kings, dispose of kingdoms, and absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance to excommunicated kings. This gave the pope enormous power over the whole outer world. It constituted rebellion against a lawful sovereign a sacred duty to the church and to God.

THE EFFECTS OF THE PAPAL POLICY

Gregory soon found that he had gone too far — that the humiliation at Canosa could never be forgotten and could never even sleep until it was revenged. Compassion as well as interest moved many princes and prelates to gather round the fallen king, now that he was released from the ban of excommunication. **Hildebrand** was generally hated because of his political tyranny, and dreaded because of his ecclesiastical censures. The revolted

---

[129] *Latin Christianity,* vol. 3, p. 168.

princes of Germany were secretly encouraged by the pope to dispute the possession of the throne with Henry, which increased his perplexity, and prevented him from turning his arms against Rome. He prayed that Henry might never prosper in war, and, in the name and with the blessing of the apostles, he bestowed the kingdom of Germany on the rebel, Rudolph, duke of Swabia. The pope even ventured to prophesy that within a year Henry would either be dead or deposed; and, as if he knew the end from the beginning, he sent a crown to the future king, with an inscription, signifying that it was the gift of Christ to St. Peter, and of St. Peter to Rudolph. But he was soon proved to be a lying prophet as well as a lying priest, and the remorseless fomenter of civil war.[130]

The king's strength gradually increased in spite of all the wicked and cruel plottings of Gregory. After years of the most terrible civil war and fearful bloodshed, the armies of Henry and of his rival, Rudolph, met once more on the bank of the **Ulster,** in October 1080. The engagement was long and obstinate, but the fall of Rudolph gave Henry the victory. He received his death-wound, it is said, from the lance of Godfrey, afterwards the first king of Jerusalem; a sabre-wound from another cut off his right hand. It is reported that the dying prince, looking on his dissevered hand, sorrowfully acknowledged, "With this hand I ratified my oath of fealty to my sovereign, Henry: the punishment is just, I have now lost life and kingdom." The king's adversaries being now discouraged and paralysed, he determined on turning his forces against his most formidable and irreconcilable enemy. He crossed the Alps, entered Italy, and encamped under the walls of Rome.

The city having been well provisioned, the walls strengthened, and the loyalty of the Romans secured by the wealth of Matilda, Henry was more or less engaged for three years in blockading and besieging Rome; but in the summer of 1083 he gained possession of the guilty city. Gregory took refuge in the strong castle of St. Angelo, and a few of his partisans in their fortified houses. Henry was willing to come to terms with Hildebrand, and to accept the imperial crown from his hands. But the pope would hear of nothing but unconditional submission. "Let the king resign his dignity, and submit to penance," were the only terms of Gregory. The clergy — bishops, abbots, and monks, and the laity, entreated him to have mercy on the afflicted city, and come to terms with the king.

But all attempts at negotiation were fruitless; the inflexible pope despised alike supplications and threatenings. The absolute submission of Henry, and satisfaction to the church, were the lofty demands of the imprisoned pope. But Henry was no longer the deserted, the broken-spirited, suppliant at his feet, as at Canosa.

---

[130] Robertson, vol. 2, p. 594.

HENRY AND BERTHA CROWNED

A.D. 1084

The Romans at length, weary of enduring the miseries of a siege, and no hope of relief from the Italian Normans, declared in favour of Henry. He was master of the greater part of the city. His first step was to place **Guibert the Archbishop of Ravenna** in the papal chair, as Clement the Third. He had been named by a synod of bishops as the future pope. Henry now received the imperial crown from Clement, with his Queen Bertha, and was saluted as Emperor by the Roman people.

The position of Gregory now seemed desperate. He was a prisoner, and might soon be given up to the vengeance of Henry. He could expect no aid from Philip of France. William of England was not disposed to embroil himself in the pope's quarrels. Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, alone could be relied on. She was the most powerful, wealthy, and zealous supporter of the interests of the church in that country. On the death of her mother and of her husband while still young and beautiful, the crafty pope persuaded her to settle all her possessions on the church of Rome; which were afterwards entitled the States of the Church. But Matilda's men and money were not sufficient for the pope's present necessity. In his great distress he entreated the help of Robert Guiscard, a great Norman warrior. He had been suspected as an accomplice of Cencius in his conspiracy against Gregory, and had been under the censure of the church for several years. But the pope was ready to release him from the ban of excommunication, and even to hold out the hope of the imperial crown if he would at once come to his aid. The great Norman accepted the pope's terms, and placed his ruthless sword at Gregory's service.

ROBERT GUISCARD ENTERS ROME

A.D. 1084

In order therefore to meet the pope's wishes, receive his blessing, and overthrow his enemies, Robert collected an army of 30,000 irregular infantry, and 6000 Norman cavalry, and put them in march for Rome. It was a wild and motley host, in which were mingled adventurers of many nations: some had joined his banner to rescue the pope, and others from love of war; even the unbelieving Saracens had enlisted in great numbers. Tidings soon reached Rome that an overwhelming force was advancing to the relief of the beleaguered forts.

Henry, apprehending no danger, had sent away a great part of his troops; and as the remainder were unequal to encounter this formidable host, he prudently withdrew his forces, assuring his Roman friends that he would soon return. He retired to Civita Castellana, where he could watch the movements of all parties.

Three days after Henry had left the city, the Norman army appeared under the walls. Alas, alas, for the inhabitants of that guilty city! A darker and heavier day than she had ever passed through was at hand; and all her calamities were traceable to the revengeful, implacable spirit of her high priest. But rather than yield to the temporal power, even the blood of Rome — his own city and capital — must flow. The dominion of the papacy over the kingdoms of this world was his one grand idea; and no adversity could induce him to yield one point of his lofty pretensions. He was as inflexible in a prison as in a palace. “Let the king lay down his crown and give satisfaction to the church” were the proud and disdainful words of Hildebrand, though a prisoner, and though both the clergy and the laity were beseeching him to come to terms with Henry. But he despised alike the murmurs, the menaces, and the supplications of all. He must have known the character of those murderous hordes that were at his gates, and what the consequences would be the moment they entered. But his mind was made up, and at any cost of human bloodshed and misery he inexorably pursued his imperious designs.

The Romans were unprepared for their defence, and scarcely made a show of resistance. The gate of St. Laurence was speedily forced, and the city was at once in their power. The first act of Robert, that dutiful son of the church, was to release the pope from his long imprisonment in the **Castle of St. Angelo.** The Norman formally received the pontifical blessing. Rising from the pope’s feet, thus blessed and edified — awful mockery and blasphemy! Robert let loose his ruffian bands on the unprotected flock of the so-called chief shepherd. For three days Rome was subjected to the horrors of a sack. The Normans and the infidel Saracens spread themselves over every quarter of the city. Slaughter, plunder, lust, and violence, were uncontrolled. On the third day, when the Normans were feasting and revelling in careless security, the inhabitants, driven to despair, broke out in general insurrection, rushed armed into the streets, and began a terrible carnage of their conquerors. Thus surprised, the Normans flew to arms, and immediately the whole city was one scene of wild and desperate conflict.

THE BURNING OF ANCIENT ROME

“The Norman horse,” says Milman, “poured into the streets, but the Romans fought at advantage, from their possession of the houses and their knowledge of the ground. They were gaining the superiority: the Normans saw their peril. The remorseless Guiscard gave the word to fire the houses. From every quarter the flames burst forth furiously: houses, palaces, convents, churches, as the night darkened, were seen in awful conflagration. The distracted inhabitants dashed wildly into the streets, no longer endeavouring to defend themselves, but to save their families. They were hewn down by hundreds.

The Saracen allies of the pope, who had been the foremost in the pillage, were now the foremost in the conflagration and the massacre."[131]

Gregory, it is said, exerted himself at this terrible moment, yet not, alas! to save his so-called flock from the cruelty of the Normans, but to save some of the principal churches from the general conflagration. Guiscard was at length master of the city, or rather of the ruins of Ancient Rome, but his vengeance was not yet appeased. Thousands of Romans were publicly sold as slaves, and thousands carried off as prisoners. It is supposed that neither Goth nor Vandal neither Greek nor German, ever brought such desolation on the city as this capture by the Normans. And be it carefully noted by the reader, as showing the real spirit of popery that the ferocious Guiscard was bribed by Gregory to become his ally, his deliverer, his protector, and his avenger. The miseries, massacres, and ruin of Rome were justly attributed to the obstinacy of the pope at that time, and have been ever since by all impartial writers. And no one was ever more fully persuaded of this fact than Gregory himself. He never trusted either his person or his fortunes even within the ramparts of St. Angelo after the departure of his Norman allies.

THE DEATH OF GREGORY

A.D. 1085

Covered with everlasting shame, branded with eternal infamy, and dreading to hear the reproaches which must have been cast upon him as the author of the late calamities he retired from the city of St. Peter, in company with his allies, while its ruins were still smoking, its streets lying desolate, and its once numerous inhabitants slaughtered burned, or carried into captivity. Faint and broken-hearted we doubt not — from pride awfully mortified — he first rested at the monastery of Monte Casino, then proceeded to the Normans' strong castle of Salerno. He never saw Rome again.

A numerous body of ecclesiastics, devoted to the promotion of the lofty pretensions of the degraded pope, followed him to Salerno. There he held a synod, and as if unmoved and unshaken by the horrors he had caused and witnessed, he thundered out again anathemas and excommunications against Henry, the anti-pope Clement, and all their adherents. But these were his last thunderpeals. Death was approaching rapidly. The great, the inflexible asserter of the supremacy of the sacerdotal order must die like other men. He called before him his fellow-exiles, made a confession of his faith — especially as to the eucharist, having been suspected of sympathising with Berengar's views — forgave and absolved all whom he had anathematised, with the exception of the Emperor and the anti-pope. With these he charged his followers to make no peace unless on their entire submission to the church.

---

[131] *History of Latin Christianity,* vol. 3, p. 197

A fearful tempest raged, it is said, as his friends hung over the dying pope. His last memorable words were, “I have loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile.” “In exile, my lord,” said a bishop of congenial feelings, whose priestly pride was not rebuked by that spectacle of mortality, “thou canst not die in exile! Vicar of Christ and His apostles, thou hast received from God the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession!” The daring breath of blasphemy thus closed, as it had surrounded, the life of the great churchman. But his departed spirit was far away from the flattery of his friends to be manifested before another tribunal. There all would be judged, not according to the principles of popery, but according to the eternal truth of God as it has been revealed unto us in the Person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ.

“Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him” is a word of sweetest assurance to the heart; for what must that word “blessed” mean, when used by God Himself! But oh! what of those who live and die without Christ! who will at last have to say, “The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved.” Oh! who can fathom the depths of misery — the eternity of woe, in these two words, “*not saved!*” “*not saved!*” What a text for a preacher! what a warning word for a sinner! May my reader lay it to heart, before laying down this volume, and may he carefully contrast the death of the great churchman with the death of the great apostle. “I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing.” (2 Tim. 4:7, 8) Even a false prophet was compelled to say, “Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.”

THE REMAINING YEARS AND DEATH OF HENRY

Having seen so much of the king in connection with the pope, we will briefly notice his end before commencing a fresh chapter.

He survived his great antagonist twenty-one years. On the 7th of August, 1106, Henry closed his long and agitated life, his eventful reign of fifty years. History is full of every incident of that great monarch’s life from his early boyhood till his death, but even an outline of his political life falls not within our plan. The contrast between the affections of his people and the enmity of the church is remarkable, and tells its own tale. Branded though he had been by the pope with the mark of the beast, he was greatly loved by the people. He had many faults very common to kings, but he had a large place in the hearts of his people. “At the news of his death,” says Greenwood, “their love overflowed in deep and bitter lamentations. A general cry was heard in the streets of the city of Liege; the court and the people, the widows and the orphans, the multitude of the poor and indigent of the city and country flocked to the obsequies of their sovereign, their friend, their benefactor. With uplifted voices they bewailed the loss of their father; dissolved in tears

they kissed his cold hands, they embraced the inanimate limbs, and could with difficulty be persuaded to give place to the attendants in waiting to prepare the body for burial. Nor could they be persuaded to quit the tomb; but for many days relieved each other day and night to watch and pray beside the place where they had laid him."[132]

Nothing could be more beautiful or touching than the testimony of these true mourners to the benevolence of the Emperor. But oh, how different, how sad, how sorrowful when we turn to the so-called church, the so-called representatives of the meek and lowly Jesus! The wrath of his papal adversaries seems to have been heated sevenfold when they heard of such honours being paid to the body of the excommunicated Henry. The young king, his son, Henry V, was threatened with the anathemas of heaven unless he caused the accursed remains of his father to be exhumed and deposited in some unconsecrated spot; or — inconceivable assumption and wickedness! — let the pope be applied to for a *post mortem absolution.* His faithful bishop Albert, who had given his sovereign decent burial in the church of St. Lambert, was compelled, as a penance for this act of gratitude and love, to disinter the body with his own hands, and have it conveyed to an unconsecrated building in an island on the Moselle. But these indignities thus heaped on the lifeless body of the late emperor produced a reaction. The young king, though he had been trained by **Pope Paschal II** to deceive his father and openly to rebel against him, became alarmed at this spiritual terrorism, gave orders for the body to be removed to Spires, and solemnly deposited in the tomb of his ancestors. The procession was followed by nearly the whole population. The service for the dead was performed with every ceremony and honour usual on such occasions.

Bishop Gibbard, one of the fiercest of the late Emperor's persecutors, happened to be from home at this moment, but the news of what had taken place brought him back in all haste. Boiling over with indignation, he caused the body to be once more exhumed, placed in unconsecrated ground, and imposed a penance on all who had attended the procession. But the voice of affection could not be silenced by the relentlessness of the bishop. The citizens in a body attended the corpse to its new resting-place with loud lamentations. "They reminded the bishop," says Milman, "how the munificent Emperor had enriched the church of Spires; they recounted the ornaments of gold and silver and precious stones, the silken vestments, the works of art, the golden altar-table, richly wrought, a present of the eastern Emperor Alexius, which had made their cathedral the most gorgeous and famous in Germany. They loudly expressed their grief and dissatisfaction, and were hardly restrained from tumult. But they prevailed not. Yet the bier of Henry was still visited by unbought and unfeigned witnesses to his boundless charities. At length, after

[132] *Cathedra Petri,* book 11, p. 606.

five years of obstinate contention, Henry was permitted to repose in the consecrated vault with his imperial ancestors."[133]

REFLECTIONS ON THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN HENRY AND GREGORY

We have thus given a more detailed account than usual of the struggle between Gregory and Henry, in order that the reader may have before him a fair specimen of the spirit and doings of popery in the middle ages. And be it known, its spirit never changes: its doings may, according to the power and opportunities of the reigning pope. As it was, so it is, and evermore will be the same. No language can exaggerate the blasphemy, cruelty, and tyranny of the papacy; and the same spirit pervades, more or less, every member of her community. For what, it may be asked, in plain terms, was the crime of Henry which brought upon him such unrelenting persecution during his life and after his death? The reader will remember that the dispute arose about *investitures*.

The traditional right of monarchs to have a voice in the appointment of the bishops and church dignitaries in their states had been recognized for centuries. They not infrequently nominated to the See of Rome as to the other bishoprics in their dominions. Even Hildebrand himself waited patiently till his own election received the legal ratification of the Emperor. But scarcely had he been raised to the pontifical chair, when he wrote an insulting letter to the Emperor, commanding him to abstain from simony, and to renounce the right of investiture by the ring and staff. Henry, in self-defence, asserted the prerogatives which his predecessors had exercised without question, especially since the days of Charlemagne. Gregory then thundered a sentence of excommunication against him, released his subjects from their oath of fealty, and pronounced him deposed for disobedience. Popery now threw off its mask, and the world was no longer in doubt of the aims and objects of the spiritual power. But so great was the ignorance of the period that the wildest pretensions found many supporters, and so superstitious were the people, that they were made to believe that all who took up arms against the excommunicated king, were to be regarded as the champions of the faith.

This was the head and front of Henry's offence against the papacy. This was the cause of so much human bloodshed and suffering: the inexorable priest would not yield a point, the Emperor fought for his traditional rights, and thus the great struggle continued until death closed the scene.

---

[133] *Latin Christianity*, vol. 3, p. 277.

SHORT PAPERS ON CHURCH HISTORY

CHAPTER 20

THE CRUSADES

The enemy now changes his tactics. The pope had gained little or nothing by his long wars with the empire, and the common sense of mankind had been insulted by his unexampled insolence. Means more plausible, more deceiving, more pious, must be devised. How can the spiritual power gain complete ascendancy over the temporal? was still the one question to be solved.

The evil genius of Rome presiding in her councils suggests a *holy war* for the purpose of rescuing the sepulchre of Christ from the hands of the unbelieving Turks. Pope Urban immediately embraced the suggestion, and became its champion. The whole Vatican agreed. It was perfectly evident that by these long expeditions to Palestine, the blood of Europe must be drained, its strength exhausted, and its treasure wasted. There was no thought of seeking to convert the unbelieving to the faith of Christ — the true mission of Christianity — but of weakening the power of the temporal monarchs, that the pontiffs might reign over them. The papacy is essentially infidel. "Marriage is honourable in *all*" — *in all*, says the word of God. No, said Gregory, it is concubinage in the priesthood — a soul-damning sin. But the word of God stands unchanged and unchangeable. *Marriage is honourable in all* — not in some only, but *in all;* and mark, *honourable,* in all. It was instituted by God Himself who "brought the woman to the man," sanctioned by Christ, and proclaimed "honourable in all," by the Holy Spirit. "Preach the gospel to every creature" is the Saviour's commission to all who own Him as Saviour and Lord. No, says Urban, slaughter the unbelievers without mercy. This is the work which God requires at your hand. Let the tares be torn up by the roots, and cast into the fire that they may be burned up. But this was not all. The power of the nations must be reduced that the pontiff may triumph over them. Results will soon show that such were the counsels of the evil genius of popery.

THE SACRED PLACES

From an early period pilgrimages to the Holy Land became a ruling passion with the more devout and superstitious. Jerome speaks of the crowds which from all quarters thronged the sacred places. But the supposed discovery of the real sepulchre, the disinterment of the true cross, the magnificent church built over the sepulchre by the devout Helena and her son Constantine, awakened in all classes a wild enthusiasm to visit the Holy Land. From this time (A.D. 326), the stream of pilgrimage continued to flow, and with increasing fulness, down to the period when Jerusalem was captured by the

Mahometans, under the **Caliph Omar,** in 637. The pilgrims had been protected and cared for by the way; they had only to encounter the privations and perils of a long journey. But under the Mahometan government they were prevented from entering the holy city, unless they purchased the privilege by paying tribute to the Caliphs. This being agreed to, the pious soon began to flock in undiminished numbers to perform their devotions at the holy sepulchre.

About the year 1067, a new race of conquerors gained possession of Palestine, who proved to be harder masters than the Saracens. These were the **Seljukians**, a tribe of **Tartars,** now familiarly known as the Turks. They came originally from Tartary. They had embraced the Mahometan religion, and were more fanatic Islamites than the Arabian followers of the 'prophet.' But with the intolerant zeal of recent converts to Islam they combined the tyranny and inhumanity of barbarians. Under these new lords of Palestine, the condition of the christian inhabitants and the pilgrims was greatly altered for the worse. In place of being treated as merely tributary subjects, they were despised as slaves, and the pilgrims exposed to severe persecutions.

PETER THE HERMIT

The feelings of European Christians were naturally excited by the reports of the cruelties and outrages to which their brethren in the East were subjected by the infidel possessors of the Holy Land; and this gave an appearance of justice to the idea of a religious war.

In the year 1093, **Peter**, a native of Amiens, as a pilgrim monk, visited Jerusalem. His spirit was greatly stirred by the sight of the indignities which the Christians had to endure. The blood of the martial Frank became as fire when he saw the sufferings and degradations of his brethren. He spoke to Simeon, the patriarch of Jerusalem, on the subject of their deliverance, but the desponding Simeon deplored the hopelessness of their condition, as the Greeks, the natural protectors of Christians in Syria, were too weak to render them any assistance. Peter then promised him the help of the Latins. "I will raise the martial nations of Europe in your cause," he exclaimed, and he believed his vow was ratified in heaven. When prostrate in the temple, he heard the voice of the Lord Jesus, saying to him, "Rise, Peter, go forth to make known the tribulations of my people; the hour is come for the delivering of my servants, for the recovery of the holy places." It was a convenient habit in those days, for monks in austere solitude with an excited imagination, to believe whatever they wished, and then to have confirmed by dreams and revelations whatever they believed.

Peter now believed in his own mission, and this was a great means of others believing it. He hastened to Rome. The pope, Urban II, was infected by his fervour, and gave full sanction to his preaching the immediate deliverance of Jerusalem. The hermit having now the sanction of both heaven and the pope,

he set forth on his mission. After traversing Italy, he crossed the Alps and entered France. He is described as short of stature, lean, dark complexion, but with an eye of fire. He rode on a mule with a crucifix in his hand, his head was bare, and his feet naked; his dress was a long robe girt with a rope, and a hermit's cloak of the coarsest material. He preached to high and low, in churches and on highways, and in the market places. His rude glowing eloquence was that which stirs the heart of the people, for it came from his own. He appealed to every passion; to indignation and pity, the pride of the warrior, the compassion of the Christian, the love of the brethren, the hatred of the infidel; to the foul desecration of the land which had been hallowed by the Redeemer's birth and life. "Why," he vehemently exclaimed, "should the unbelievers be allowed any longer to retain the custody of such christian territories as the Mount of Olives and the Garden of Gethsemane? Why should the unbaptized followers of Mahomet, those children of perdition, pollute with hostile feet the sacred ground which had been the witness of so many miracles, and still furnished so many relics which manifested superhuman power? Bones of martyrs, garments of saints, nails of the cross, thorns of the crown, were all lying ready to be gathered up by the faithful priesthood who would lead the expedition. Let the floors of Zion be purified with the blood of slaughtered infidels."[134]

When words and breath failed him, he wept, he groaned, he beat his breast, and held up a crucifix, as if Christ Himself were imploring them to join the army of God. The ravings of his frenzy had a prodigious effect on all classes and in all lands. Men, women, children, crowded to touch his garments; even the hairs which dropped from his mule were gathered up and treasured as relics. In a short time he returned to the pope, assuring him that everywhere his appeals had been received with enthusiasm, so that he had with difficulty restrained his hearers from at once taking arms and following him to the Holy Land. Nothing was now wanted but a plan, leaders, organization; and the pope boldly resolved to undertake this great work.

POPE URBAN AND THE CRUSADES

In March 1095, a council was summoned to meet Urban at Placentia, to consult about the holy war and other important matters. Two hundred bishops, four thousand clergy, and thirty thousand laity appeared; and, as no building was large enough to contain the vast multitude, the greater sessions were held in a plain near the city. Besides the project of the holy war, the pope embraced the favourable opportunity to confirm the laws and assert the principles of Gregory. And while at Placentia the final sanction was given to the two strongest characteristics in the doctrines and in the discipline of the Roman church — namely, transubstantiation and the celibacy of the clergy.[135]

---

[134] White's *Eighteen Christian Centuries*, p. 246.
[135] Waddington, vol. 2, p. 102.

In November of the same year, another council was summoned to meet the pope at Clermont in Auvergne. The citations to this council were urgent, and the clergy were charged to stir up the laity in the cause of the crusade. A vast assemblage of archbishops, bishops, abbots, etc., were drawn together, the towns and neighbouring villages were filled with strangers, while numbers were obliged to lodge in tents. The session lasted ten days; the usual canons being passed in condemnation of simony, etc., Urban ventured to advance a step beyond Gregory, by forbidding not only the practice of lay investiture, but that any ecclesiastic should swear fealty to a temporal lord — a prohibition which was intended entirely to do away with all dependence of the church on the secular power. Thus we see the crafty pope taking every advantage of his extreme popularity, and when the minds of all were engrossed with the greater subject of the holy crusade. No moment could be more favourable for the advancement of the great papal object of ambition, the acknowledged supremacy over Latin Christendom; or for the elevation of Urban himself over the rival Pope Clement, and the temporal sovereigns who supported him.

At the sixth session the crusade was proposed. Urban ascended a high pulpit in the market-place, and addressed the assembled multitudes. His speech was long and exciting. He dwelt on the ancient glories of Palestine, where every foot of ground had been hallowed by the presence of the Saviour, of His Virgin Mother, and other saints. He enlarged on the present condition of the sacred territory — possessed as it was by a godless people, the children of the Egyptian handmaid; on the indignities, the outrages, the tyranny which they inflicted on Christians redeemed by Christ's blood. Nor did he forget to speak of the progressive encroachments of the Turks on Christendom. "Cast out the bondwoman and her son," he cried. "Let all the faithful arm. Go forth, and God shall be with you. Redeem your sins — your rapine, your burnings, your bloodshed — by obedience. Let the famous nation of the Franks display their valour in a cause where death is the assurance of blessedness. Count it joy to die for Christ where Christ died for you. Think not of kindred or home; you owe to God a higher love, for a Christian every place is exile, every place is home and country." There was no passion which the self-seeking pope left unstirred. But his real design and one grand object was to dispose of unruly barons and obstinate monarchs by engaging them in a distant and ruinous expedition; and, in their absence, gather up into his own hand all the threads of this great movement and consolidate the lofty schemes of his predecessor and teacher, Hildebrand.

In conclusion, the blasphemous pope offered absolution for all sins — the sins of murder, adultery, robbery, arson — and that without penance to all who would take up arms in this sacred cause. He promised eternal life to all who should suffer the glorious calamity of death in the Holy Land, or even on the way to it. The Crusader passed at once into paradise. The great battle of the Cross and the Crescent was to be decided for ever on the soil of the Holy Land. For himself, he said, he must remain at home: the care of the church

detained him. Should circumstances permit, he would follow, but, like Moses, while they were slaughtering the Amalekites, he would be perpetually engaged in fervent and prevailing prayer for their success.[136]

The pope's speech was here interrupted by an enthusiastic exclamation from the whole assemblage, "God wills it — God wills it!" words which afterwards became the war cry of the Crusaders; and the whole assembly declared itself the army of God. The contagious frenzy spread with a rapidity inconceivable. "Never, perhaps," says one, "did a single speech of man ever work such extraordinary and lasting results as that of Urban II at the Council of Clermont." "It was the first blast of fanaticism," says another, "which shook the whole fabric of society from the extremities of the West even to the heart of Asia, for above two centuries."

Having now stated as clearly and as concisely as possible the ostensible causes of the Crusades, or rather the motives of the papacy, we need do little more than give the dates and a few particulars of each expedition.

THE FIRST CRUSADE

A.D. 1096

1. The **festival of the Assumption,** August 15th 1096, was fixed as the day on which the Crusaders should commence their march. Women urged their husbands, their brothers, and their sons to take the cross; and those who refused became marks for general contempt. Property of all kinds was sold to raise money; but as all wanted to sell and none to buy, it naturally fell to an exceedingly low price, and was bought up chiefly by the clergy; so that nearly the whole property of the country passed into their hands. Godfrey pledged his castle of Bouillon, in the Ardennes, to the bishop of Liege. The artisan sold his tools, the husbandman his implements, to raise the means of equipment. The fabulous splendour and wealth of the East were set before the imagination, already stimulated by the romantic legends of Charlemagne and his peers. Besides the religious enthusiasm which now animated all ranks, a variety of other motives were at work. For the peasant there was no opportunity to quit his depressed life, to bear arms, and forsake the service of his feudal lord. For the robber, the pirate, the outlaw, there was pardon and restoration to society; for the debtor there was escape from his obligations; and for all who took up the cross there was the assurance that death in the holy war would make them partakers in the glory and bliss of the martyrs. And so great was the excitement produced by this papal epidemic, that long before the time appointed for the commencement of the expedition, the impatience of the multitude was unable to restrain itself.

Early in the spring of 1096, Peter, the first missionary of the crusade, set out on his march for the East at the head of a wild and motley host. About sixty

---

[136] Robertson, vol. 2, p. 630; Milman, vol. 3, p. 233; Waddington, vol. 2, p. 77.

thousand of the populace from the confines of France and Lorraine flocked around the hermit, and pressed him to lead them to the holy sepulchre. He now assumed the character, without the abilities, of a general, and marched along the Rhine and Danube. **Walter the Penniless,** a poor but valiant soldier, followed with about fifteen thousand. A monk named Gottschalk pursued closely after Peter and Walter with about twenty thousand from the villages of Germany. A fourth swarm of about two hundred thousand of the refuse of the people, conducted by a Count Emecho, pressed upon their rear. These successive crowds now numbered fully three hundred thousand warriors of the cross, so-called. But it was soon manifest that another spirit animated them. Not one of them knew the cross, save as an outward idolatrous emblem. Old and infirm, women and children, and the lowest dregs of the idle populace, followed the camp of the Crusaders!

Nothing could be more melancholy and disastrous than the conduct and fate of these deluded swarms. Their wants and numbers soon compelled them to separate. They were without order or discipline, and most of them unprovided with either armour or money. They had no idea of the distance of Jerusalem, or of the difficulties to be encountered by the way. So ignorant were they, that, at the sight of the first city beyond the limits of their knowledge, they were ready to inquire if this was Jerusalem. In place of sobriety and order in their march, it was marked by murder, plunder, dissoluteness, and infamous habits of every kind. The inoffending Jewish inhabitants of the towns on the Moselle, the Rhine, the Maine, and the Danube, through which they marched were plundered and slaughtered as the murderers of Christ and the enemies of the cross. The population of Hungary and Bulgaria rose up against them because of their disorderly and plundering habits, and immense numbers of them were slain.

After repeated disasters and foolish adventures they reached Constantinople; but Alexius, the Greek Emperor more alarmed than gratified with his allies, had them speedily, if not treacherously, conveyed across the Bosphorus. A great battle was fought soon after, under the walls of Nicaea — the Turkish capital. The army of the Hermit was cut to pieces by Solyman, the Turkish Sultan of Iconium. Walter the Penniless was slain, with most of his followers their bones were gathered into a vast heap to warn their companions of the hopelessness of their enterprise. It is reckoned that in these ill-conducted expeditions three hundred thousand had already perished; some extend the number to half a million. Of those who had started under the guidance of Peter and his lieutenants, not more than 20,000 survived and these endeavoured to find their way back to their home but only to tell the sad fate of their companions who had died by the arrows of the Turks and Hungarians, or by want and fatigue. Hardly one of Peter’s army ever reached the borders of the Holy Land. Pope Urban lived to hear of the distresses and miseries of his own evil work, but died before the capture of Jerusalem.

THE SECOND DIVISION OF THE FIRST CRUSADE

In the meantime, while the poor, naked, deluded, plebeian multitude had been cut down, the aristocracy of the West had assumed the cross, encouraged each other, and were preparing to depart on the same holy mission. Of the chiefs it will be necessary to say a little, that we may have some idea how thoroughly the epidemic had affected all classes.

The most eminent was Godfrey of Bouillon, a descendant of Charles the Great. The first rank is assigned to him both in war and in counsel. He had accompanied William of Normandy, in his invasion of England; again, in the service of Henry the Fourth, he has the reputation of giving Rudolph his death-wound, which ended the civil war; and he was the first of Henry's army to mount the walls of Rome. He is represented by the chroniclers as remarkable for the depth of his piety and the mildness of his character in ordinary life; but wise in counsel, and bold as a lion in the battlefield. He was accompanied by his two brothers, Eustace and Baldwin; Hugh, brother of the King of France; the Counts Raymond of Toulouse, Robert of Flanders, and Stephen of Blois; and Robert Duke of Normandy, son of William the Conqueror. But so great and so general was the excitement, that nearly all the gallant chiefs of Europe were inspired with knightly courage and national rivalries, to distinguish themselves in this holy war.

Six hundred thousand men are supposed to have left their homes at this time, with innumerable attendants, women and servants, and workmen of all kinds. The difficulty of procuring subsistence for so many, led them to separate their forces and proceed to Constantinople by different routes. It was agreed that they should all meet there, and from thence begin their operations against the Turks. After a long and painful march, in which thousands perished, the survivors reached the Eastern capital. Alexius, though he would have been thankful for a moderate force from the West, to assist him against the Turks, who were dangerously near him, was astonished and alarmed at the approach of so many powerful chiefs and large armies. The peace of his borders had been disturbed by the thefts and unruliness of the promiscuous multitudes under **Peter the Hermit;** but he dreaded more serious consequences from the arrival of such formidable troops under Godfrey. Learning from one company that another would soon follow, he had them artfully decoyed across the Bosphorus, so that they might not be united in the neighbourhood of his capital. By this means, though not without threatened hostilities, the Crusaders had all passed into Asia before the feast of Pentecost.

THE SIEGE OF NICAEA

The zeal and the indignation of the pilgrims were greatly excited when they saw the pyramid of bones which marked the place where Walter and his companions had fallen. Nicaea was besieged, and yielded in about five weeks, but they were greatly disappointed of their expected plunder. When the Turks

found that their position was no longer tenable, they secretly agreed to surrender the city to Alexius. The imperial banner was planted on the citadel, and the important conquest was guarded with jealous vigilance by the perfidious Greeks. The murmurs of the chiefs were unavailing, and after a few days' rest, they directed their march towards Phrygia.

The great battle of **Dorylium** was fought about a fortnight after the siege of Nice. Solyman rallied his Turkish hordes and pursued after what he called the western barbarians. He surprised and attacked them before they reached Dorylium. His cavalry is stated by the Christians to have numbered three hundred thousand. So fearful was the onset and so thick the poisoned arrows, that the Crusaders were overwhelmed. They were thrown into such confusion, that but for the personal valour and military conduct of Bohemond, Tancred, Robert of Normandy, and the timely help of Godfrey and Raymond, the whole army might have perished. At length the long contest was decided in favour of the Crusaders, and the camp of Solyman fell into their hands. Superstition affirmed that the victory was gained by heavenly champions, who descended to aid the Christians.

In a march of five hundred miles through Asia Minor, the army suffered severely. Hunger, thirst, the extremity of heat, the scarcity of food, the difficulty of the march, greatly thinned their ranks. Thirst was fatal to hundreds in a single day. Nearly all the horses died. And, to add to their confusion and dismay, disunion appeared among the leaders, even to open feud. But in spite of every difficulty, the great mass of the Crusaders, who survived these calamities, held on their way to Jerusalem. Baldwin, the brother of Godfrey, succeeded in getting possession of the town of Edessa, and founded the first principality of the Latins beyond the Euphrates.

THE SIEGE OF ANTIOCH

On the 18th of October, 1097, the “warriors of the cross” laid siege to Antioch, where the disciples were first called Christians, and which soon afterwards became the centre of the great apostle’s missionary labours. But how changed the spirit, object, and ways, of his so-called successor — of him who assumed the blasphemous title of the vicar of Christ but at whose door the guilt and bloodshed of this, the greatest of all popular delusions, for ever rests. Jezebel may still reign both in Church and State, and friends as well as foes must be sacrificed to gain her ends and gratify her ambition. But the day is fast hastening on when requisition shall be made for blood, and judgment adjusted according to the motives as well as the actions in guilt. The testimony thanks be to God, that went out from Antioch in the first century, is as plain and true now as it was then, and of equal authority over the heart and conscience, notwithstanding the ten thousand corrupt streams which professedly flow from the same fountain. It is with the apostles' doctrine, not the tradition of the Fathers that we have to do. In all ages the Christian’s creed

should be, the person of Christ for the heart, the work of Christ for the conscience, and the word of God for the path.

The **siege of Antioch** lasted eight months. The miseries endured during that period were frightful. For a time the luxuries of the soil and climate were enjoyed, even to excess, but the winter set in and their enjoyment was at an end. The heavy rains flooded their camp, and the winds demolished their tents. Famine and pestilence with their many consequences prevailed. The flesh of horses, dogs, and even of their slaughtered enemies was greedily devoured. At the beginning of the siege, their horses numbered seventy thousand, at the end they only numbered two thousand, and scarcely two hundred fit for service. At length however, help came, or they must have perished to the last man. Through the treachery of a Syrian officer in the city, who had the favour of the emir, and who commanded three towers, a gate was opened. The army rushed into the devoted city, shouting the Crusaders' war-cry, “God wills it!” and Antioch was once more in the hands of the Christians. But the victory was not complete. The citadel refused to surrender, and soon after this apparent victory, an overwhelming force of Turks appeared, under Kerboga, Prince of Mosul. For five-and-twenty days the Crusaders were again on the verge of complete destruction between Kerboga and the garrison of the fortress.

When the hearts of all began to sink, and a general indifference to life prevailed, a cunning monk of the name of **Bartholomew,** presented himself at the door of the council chamber, and declared it had been revealed to him from heaven in a dream, that under the great altar of the church of St. Peter would be found the spear which pierced the Saviour on the cross. The ground was opened, but after digging to the depth of twelve feet they had not found the object of their search. In the evening, bare-footed and in the penitent’s dress, Bartholomew himself descended into the pit; he soon came upon the head of a lance. The ring of steel was heard, it was the sacred weapon. At the first gleam of the holy spear the desponding Crusaders passed from despair to enthusiasm. A martial psalm was chanted by the priests and monks, “Let God arise, and let his enemies be scattered.” The gates of Antioch were thrown open, and the now fanatical warriors rushed forth, the holy spear being carried by the legate’s chaplain. The charge was irresistible; the Saracens fled before the unexpected attack, leaving behind them an immense mass of spoil. **Bohemond** was proclaimed Prince of Antioch, under conditions that he would accompany them to Jerusalem.

THE SIEGE OF JERUSALEM

A.D. 1099

In place of marching at once to Jerusalem, when so cheered and strengthened by victory, and their enemies over-awed, they idly spent their time, enjoying the luxuries of Syria, for nearly ten months, and, when marching orders were

given the following May, only a very small part of the once mighty host remained. Three hundred thousand, it is supposed, reached Antioch, but famine, disease, and the sword, had reduced their force to little more than forty thousand. The relics of the army moved off in the month of May. As they drew nearer the object of their long and perilous journey, and recognized the sacred places, such as Tyre, Sidon, Caesarea, Lydda, Emmaus, and Bethlehem, their enthusiasm knew no bounds. But when an elevation was reached which gave them a full view of the holy city, a cry of, "Jerusalem! Jerusalem! God wills it! God wills it!" burst forth. All threw themselves on their knees, and kissed the sacred ground. The scenes of gospel history filled their minds with enraptured delight. But Jerusalem was yet in the hands of the infidels, and they were unprovided with the necessary engines of assault.

The siege lasted forty days, but they were forty days of great suffering to the besiegers; especially from the fierce thirst produced by the midsummer sun of that parched country. The brook Kedron was dried up; the cisterns had been destroyed or poisoned; their provisions were exhausted; indeed, so great was their distress, they were on the point of yielding to despair. But, as on former occasions, relief was at hand. Superstition came to the rescue. Godfrey saw on the Mount of Olives a heavenly warrior waving his bright shield as a signal for another assault. With renewed military ardour they attacked the unbelievers, and, after a fierce struggle, they became masters of the holy city. Historians agree in saying, that on the 15th of July, A.D. 1099, being a Friday, at three o'clock in the afternoon, the day and hour of the Saviour's passion, Godfrey of Bouillon stood victorious on the walls of Jerusalem. He leaped into the devoted city, accompanied by Tancred, and followed by the soldiers, who filled every street with slaughter.

"The crusaders," says Robertson, "inflamed to madness by the thought of the wrongs inflicted on their brethren and by the obstinate resistance of the besieged, spared neither old man, woman, or child. Seventy thousand Mahometans were massacred; many who had received a promise of life from the leaders were slaughtered by the soldiery. The temple and Solomon's porch were filled with blood to the height of a horse's knee, and, in the general rage against the enemies of Christ, the Jews were burnt in their synagogue. Godfrey took no part in these atrocities, but immediately after the victory repaired, in the dress of a pilgrim, to the church of the holy sepulchre, to pour out his thanks for having been permitted to reach the holy city. Many followed his example, relinquishing their savage work for tears of penitence and joy, and offering at the altar the spoil which they had seized; but, by a revulsion of feelings natural to a state of high excitement, they soon returned to their savage work, and for three days Jerusalem ran with blood."[137]

[137] Robertson's *Church History*, vol. 2, p. 641. White's *Eighteen Christian Centuries*.

JERUSALEM IN THE HANDS OF THE CHRISTIANS

Jerusalem, which had been under the **Mahometan** yoke since the conquest of **Omar** in 637, was again in the hands of the Christians; and eight days after this memorable event the victorious chiefs proceeded to the election of a king. By the free and unanimous voice of the army, **Godfrey of Bouillon** was proclaimed the most worthy champion of Christendom and king of Jerusalem. But the humble and pious pilgrim, while he accepted the place of responsibility, refused the name and ensigns of royalty. How could he be called king and wear a crown of gold, when the King of kings, his Saviour and Lord, had worn a crown of thorns? He contented himself with the humbler title of Defender and Baron of the Holy Sepulchre.

Scarcely had Godfrey been seated on his throne, when he was again summoned to the field. A large force of Saracens from Egypt were hastening to avenge the loss of Jerusalem. But again the Crusaders were victorious in what is called **the Battle of Askelon.** Their position in the Holy Land being now considered secure, most of the army prepared to return to Europe. After ascending the hill of Calvary, amidst the loud anthems of the clergy, bedewing with their tears the holy ground, bathing in the Jordan, carrying with them palm-branches from Jericho, and relics innumerable, they bent their way homewards. Among those who returned was Peter the Hermit, who spent the remainder of his days in a monastery of his own founding, at Huy, near Liege, until his death in 1115.

Three hundred knights and two thousand foot-soldiers were all that Godfrey retained for the defence of Palestine. But the infant kingdom was soon to be assailed by a new enemy, and one with whom we are too well acquainted — *a voracious priest of Rome.* In the name of the pope, he was installed Patriarch of Jerusalem, and claimed such revenues and property for the Church that the State was left poor indeed. The pious Godfrey submitted; both he and Bohemond received investiture from the priest, and thus the sceptre of Jerusalem fell into his hands, or rather was seized by the ambitious pope. Wearied with all his labours, and feeling that his great work was now done, Godfrey was little disposed to fight against the priest, and so allowed him to usurp and place of jurisdiction, both in spiritual and temporal matters. The Greek Christians were persecuted by the Latins as schismatics; and, of course, the breach was widened between the East and the West.

After establishing the French language, and laying the foundation of a code of laws, afterwards famous under the name of the “Assizes of Jerusalem,” and holding his dignity for little more than a year, the brave and victorious Godfrey — the true hero of the crusade — died August 17th, A.D. 1100.

THE SECOND CRUSADE

A.D. 1147

Having thus given a somewhat minute and detailed account of the first crusade, we need do little more than give the dates, with a few particulars, of the following seven. The same unreasonable, and unscriptural, but exciting causes, and the same disastrous results, are apparent in each of the expeditions. They have been styled as so many faint and unsuccessful copies of the original.

The immediate descendants of the first Crusaders are described as giving way to a life of Syrian ease and luxury, and so becoming utterly depraved and effeminate. But, on the other hand, the Mahometans, having recovered from their sudden terror and consternation, collected large forces, and harassed the Christians with perpetual wars. In 1144 **Zenghis,** prince of Mosul, made himself master of Edessa. The inhabitants were slaughtered, the city plundered, and utterly destroyed. The exultation of the Mahometans was boundless, they threatened Antioch, and the courage of the Christians began to sink. With tears they now implored the help of the christian kings and the armies of Europe. The enemies of the cross are advancing, they cried; thousands of Christians have been massacred, and not one will be left alive in the Holy Land unless help come speedily.

The Roman Pontiff, **Eugene III,** favoured these petitions, and resolved to stir up a new crusade. The kings, princes, and people of Europe were summoned by the pope's letters to the holy war, but the *preaching* of the crusade over these countries he wisely delegated to the celebrated **St. Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux.** He was a man of immense influence, of saintly character, and of great reputation for working miracles. In the most glowing eloquence he pictured the sufferings of the Eastern Christians, the profanation of the holy places by the infidels, and the certain success of the armies of the Lord. Louis VII of France, his queen, and a vast number of his nobles, took the vow, and devoted themselves to the holy war. **Conrad III,** Emperor of Germany, after resisting for a time the appeals of St. Bernard, at length declared himself ready to obey the call to God's service. Many of the chiefs of Germany followed the Emperor's example in taking up the cross — as the phrase then was — but it was a cross without either truth or grace, the fearful delusion of Satan, and the wicked prostitution of that sacred symbol to the blinding and ruin of millions.

No sooner had these monarchs taken the vow than preparations for the expedition were urged on. Troops and supplies of every kind were collected; and in 1147 their mighty armies, composed chiefly of French, Germans, and Italians, and numbering over nine hundred thousand, moved forward in two columns towards Palestine. Proceeding, as they thought, and as Bernard had assured them, under the sanction of heaven, they expected the final blow

would now be given to the power of the Mahometans, that the kingdom of Jerusalem would be firmly established, and that peace would be secured to the Latin Christians. In some respects the second crusade differed from the first. *That* was the result of popular enthusiasm, *this* was a great European movement, headed by two sovereigns, followed by their nobles, and supported by the wealth and influence of nations; but they were equally unsuccessful with the army of Peter the Hermit. They were cruelly betrayed by the treacherous Greeks, who were more afraid of the Crusaders than they were of the Mahometans. The approach of a hundred and forty thousand heavy-armed knights, with their immediate attendants, in the field, besides the light armed troops, infantry, priests and monks, women and children — in all numbering nearly a million — so alarmed the effeminate Greeks, that the Emperor sent envoys, requiring them to swear that they had no design against the empire. But their terror took the form of hostility, and as the Crusaders entered the imperial territory, difficulties thickened on every side.

The history of the second crusade in the Holy Land is more pitiful, shameful, and disastrous than the first. In 1149 Conrad and Louis led back to Europe the few soldiers that survived. What had become of all the rest? Their bones were whitening all the roads and deserts over which they had passed. A million had perished in less than two years. Loud murmurs were heard against Bernard, as the priest by whose preaching, prophecies, and miracles, it had been chiefly promoted. But the crafty abbot convinced the people that he had been quite right in all he said, and that the failure of the expedition was a fit chastisement for the sins of the Crusaders. Thus we see that the only effect of the second crusade was to drain Europe of a great portion of its wealth, and of the flower of its armies, without bettering the condition of Christians in the East.

THE THIRD CRUSADE

A.D. 1189

In the year 1187 the far-famed **Saladin,** Sultan of Egypt, invaded the Holy Land at the head of a large army. His avowed object was to retake Jerusalem from the Christians. Having gained a great victory at Tiberias, he pushed forward his army to the walls of the Holy City, besieged it, and took its monarch prisoner. It was surrendered to Saladin on the 3rd of October. The cross was thrown down, relics were dispersed, the sacred places profaned, and the Mahometan worship restored. Yet the conduct of Saladin, though a conqueror and a Mahometan, was wholly free from that revengeful spirit which stained the character of the Franks under Godfrey. He spared the holy sepulchre, and allowed Christians to visit it for a certain payment. His generosity to the captives is celebrated by all writers. Thousands were set free without a ransom, and numbers received a passage to Europe at his own expense. Christians were allowed to remain in their homes on condition of paying tribute.

The news of these fresh calamities, and especially of the conquest of Jerusalem, excited the greatest indignation and alarm throughout all Christendom. Again the cry for help was heard from the Christians in the East to their brethren in the West. But at first they were dull of hearing. Only forty years had elapsed since the last expedition, and Europe had scarcely forgotten her misfortunes, or recovered from her exhaustion. But the cause was vigorously taken up by the pope, Clement III. The cardinals bound themselves never to mount on horseback "so long as the land whereon the foot of the Lord had stood should be under the feet of the enemy," and to preach the crusade as mendicants. The interest increased, though men at first hesitated to commit themselves to the enterprise. But the priest persevered, and the three greatest princes in Europe were influenced to receive the cross from the hands of the bishop; their subjects were taxed, under the name of "Saladin's Tithe," to defray the expenses of the war.

In the spring of 1189 the third crusade was commenced by **Frederick I** of Germany, surnamed Barbarossa; **Philip Augustus** of France; and **Richard I** of England, surnamed Coeur de Lion, or the lion-hearted prince. Barbarossa, now sixty-seven years of age, with his large army, traversed the provinces of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Greece, as the former pilgrims had done, and were again molested by the first two and betrayed by the last. Eighty-three thousand Germans crossed the Hellespont, and for a few days their march through Asia Minor was prosperous; but the guides and interpreters who were furnished by the Greeks had been bribed to deceive them, and after luring them into the desert, they disappeared. No markets could be found, horses died for want of food, and their flesh was greedily devoured by the soldiers. Still he was able to maintain discipline; and, though with greatly reduced numbers, he boldly attacked and defeated the Turks with great slaughter, while his son assaulted the city of Iconium and compelled the Sultan to surrender it. The army, refreshed with the provisions of Iconium, pressed onwards in the hope of speedily reaching the object of their expedition; but their great leader died the following year near Tarsus, and, Frederick the younger dying soon after, many of the survivors abandoned the crusade and returned to Europe. Sixty-eight thousand of the German army had perished in less than two years.

The English and the French armies reached Palestine by sea in the year 1190, and fought under the same banner. But after the reduction of Acre, Philip returned to Europe, leaving Richard to carry on the war. The valour of the "lionhearted" king has been so fully celebrated, both in English and Mahometan history, that, we need only add, he defeated Saladin at Askelon and, having concluded a peace securing certain privileges to the pilgrims in Jerusalem and along the sea-coast, he returned to England in 1194, though not without great difficulty and expense. Saladin died in 1195, while Richard was on his way home. It is reckoned that, in the expedition thus ended, more than half a million of professedly christian warriors perished. In the siege of Acre alone, one hundred and twenty thousand Christians, and one hundred and

eighty thousand Mahometans, perished. Such were the alleged holy wars of the hell-inspired councils of Rome.

THE REMAINDER OF THE CRUSADES

A.D. 1195-1270

The fourth crusade, which was commenced in 1195 by the Emperor Henry VI, was more political than religious. It had in view, not so much the deliverance of the Holy Land, as the destruction of the Greek empire. But after some successful engagements Henry died, and the Germans resolved to return home. Pope Celestine III, who had urged on the expedition, survived the Emperor only a few months. He died A.D. 1198.

To describe the **Fifth and Sixth Crusades** would involve much repetition, but the seventh and eighth deserve a few words.

Louis XI, king of France, who is commonly known by the name of St. Louis, believed that he was raised up from a serious illness by heaven to undertake the recovery of the Holy Land. Nothing could dissuade him from performing his vow. After four years' preparation he sailed to Cyprus in 1249, accompanied by his Queen, his three brothers, and all the knights of France. After a few thrilling successes and the taking of Damietta he was defeated and taken prisoner along with two of his brothers. The Earl of Salisbury, who had accompanied him, with almost all his English followers, perished. Pestilence and famine began to do their dreadful work among the Franks; the distress increased; the fleet was destroyed; and the Saracens, in vast numbers, were hovering around them. The liberty of the king was at length purchased by a large ransom and a truce was concluded for ten years. After quietly visiting some of the sacred places, he returned to France. But amidst all the labours of government at home the pious Louis never forgot his crusading vow. He was haunted with the idea that he had been entrusted by heaven with this great mission.

At length, on the 14th of March A.D. 1270, he entered upon his *second* and the **Eighth Crusade.** He was so weak that he could neither bear his armour nor remain long on horseback. But scarcely had he landed his army on the shores of Africa, than all his sanguine visions perished. The Sultan’s troops, the climate, the want of water and of food, began to produce their sad effects. His army was almost wholly destroyed, and Louis himself, with his son, John Tristan, sank and died in the month of August. The survivors returned to Europe; and thus terminated these holy wars, leaving the avowed object of the crusades as far distant as before the days of Peter the Hermit.

THE CHILDREN'S CRUSADE

A.D. 1213

Between the fifth and sixth crusades, about the year 1213, the excitement and madness of the time produced one of mere children. A shepherd boy named Stephen, near Vendome in France, professed to have been charged by the Saviour in a vision to preach the cross. He soon gathered other children around him by his wondrous revelations, and they commenced their journey, expecting to conquer the infidels by singing hymns and saying prayers. They passed through towns and villages, displaying banners and crosses, and chanting, "O Lord, help us to recover Thy true and holy cross." A similar movement originated in Germany about the same time. We are told that the numbers swelled as they went along, until about ninety thousand boys, about ten or twelve years of age, were ready to march to the Holy Land. But the whole band in a short time melted away. Many of the unfortunate children died through hunger and fatigue; others were betrayed by ship-masters, who promised to convey them to the shores of Palestine, but who are supposed to have sold them into slavery. Such was the insanity of those times, that, in place of preventing such a movement, the pope declared that the zeal manifested by the children put to shame the listlessness of their elders.[138]

REFLECTIONS ON THE CRUSADES

Many and varied are the opinions of historians as to the origin, character, and effects of the crusades. That they had an immense influence on the course of human affairs, especially in Europe and Asia, all are agreed. They were the means, under the overruling providence of God, of changing the whole structure of society in this and other countries. From the serf to the sovereign all experienced a great change. The social condition of the serf and the vassal was raised, the number and power of the feudal lords were diminished, and the strength of the sovereign increased. By the same means commerce was greatly improved, and the barons not a little impoverished. Many of them mortgaged their estates to wealthy citizens, which in course of time led to the establishment of the third estate in the realm — the Commons. The liberties of Europe, both civil and religious, had their rise in this class.

But the Papacy was the chief gainer by the Crusades. A vast accession of power, influence, and wealth, to the pope, the clergy, and the monastic institutions was the immediate result. And this was the one grand object of the papal policy. What Hildebrand fought for and saw in the distance, Urban seized and used with great craft and power. And this supremacy he obtained by means *apparently* good and holy, but *really* most subtle and Satanic. The theory was this: — "the Crusader was the soldier of the church, and this was his first allegiance, which released him from all other." Never was there a

---

[138] Robertson, vol. 3, p. 341.

more sweeping, levelling, unrighteous theory proposed to mankind. But in its apparent piety lay its deep subtlety.

When Urban placed himself at the head of the armies of the faith in 1095 he assumed to be the director of their movements, the dispenser of their blessings, their infallible counsellor and lawgiver. He preached that it was not a national war of Italy, France, or Germany, against the empire of Egypt, but a holy war of Christians against the Mahometans. No Christian was to go to war with another Christian, but all were to unite in a holy alliance against the common foe — the infidels. The privileges promised to all the soldiers of Christ were great and many, as may be seen by Urban's oration. They were assured of the immediate remission of all their sins, of the paradise of God, if they fell in battle, or if they died on their way to the Holy Land; and further, as to this life, the pope declared all temporal, civil, and social obligations dissolved, by taking the cross. Thus every tie was broken that binds society together, a new principle of obedience was substituted, and the pope became the liege lord of mankind.[139]

THE KNIGHTS TEMPLARS AND HOSPITALLERS

We may just notice, before leaving the subject, that during these wars of the Christians with the Mahometans, three celebrated military-religious orders were founded — Knights of the Temple of Jerusalem, Knights of the Hospital and Teutonic Knights. The principal duties of these knights, according to their founders, were to afford protection and assistance to the poor, the sick, and the wounded among the pilgrims, and to provide in every way for the defence of Jerusalem and the Holy Land. They soon became extremely popular. Many of the nobility of Europe accepted the cross and professed the vow of the knights of Palestine. Superstition enriched them, and, we need scarcely add, it also corrupted them; and their wealth excited the cupidity of others. After the Christians lost possession of the Holy Land, these knights were dispersed throughout several countries. The order of the Templars was dissolved by the Council of Vienne in the fourteenth century, and that of the Teutons in the seventeenth, by the German authorities. The Hospitallers obtained from Charles V the possession of the island of Malta, and are now known as the Knights of Malta.[140]

---

[139] Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. 3, p. 242.
[140] Haydn's *Dictionary of Dates*.

SHORT PAPERS ON CHURCH HISTORY

CHAPTER 21

HENRY V AND GREGORY'S SUCCESSORS

A.D. 1186-1122

Having thus given a consecutive history of the Crusades, which has led us on to the end of the thirteenth century, we must now return for a little to the point where we left off, and gather up the threads of our general history.

The long and wasting wars occasioned by the dispute between Gregory and Henry as to *the right of investiture*, utterly failed to bring that question to anything like a settlement. The successors of Gregory, deeply imbued with his spirit, endeavoured by every means to carry out his scheme. On the other hand, the new king Henry V was equally determined to oppose the papal demands, and also to recover all that his crown had lost by the spiritual tyranny of the popes. He invested bishops with the ring and crosier as his ancestors had done, and compelled the prelates of Germany to consecrate them. Anathemas and excommunications without number from popes and councils were fulminated against the rebellious Emperor, but he allowed them to roll peacefully over him. Thus the contest was continued, though with less bloodshed than in Gregory's time.

THE DONATION OF MATILDA

In the year 1115 "**the Great Countess**" Matilda of Tuscany died. Before her death, she had made over to the Roman See her vast possessions. The deed which she executed was entirely contrary to feudal law, but in full accordance with pontifical law. Thus a fresh subject of strife between the popes and the emperors sprang from this donation. Had the pope been allowed to take peaceable possession of her estates, he would have been like a king in Italy. But, however devoted the great woman was to the church of Rome and sincere in her gift, the deed was contrary to law and never fully took effect, although it ultimately contributed much to the temporal power of the popes. But details need not be given. The world was growing weary of the history of popes and antipopes, with factions, perjuries, and hypocrisies; of the monotony of bloodshed and devastation, which had lasted over half a century. All hearts yearned after peace, says one, and the love of battle had become extinct on both sides; the flame of civil and religious discord, which was kindled by Gregory and fanned by his successors, had been quenched in the floods of calamity. After many efforts peace was ratified between the pope's legates and the Emperor, in the year 1122, on the following conditions.

THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS

The pope **Calixtus**, though an inflexible asserter of the papal claims, seeing the general eagerness for peace, gave instructions to his legates to convoke a general council of all the bishops and clergy of France and Germany at Mentz, for the purpose of taking into consideration the re-establishment of concord between the Holy See and the Empire. When this celebrated treaty was reduced into form and had received the golden seal of the empire, the assembly adjourned from Mentz to a spacious meadow near the city of Worms. Here unnumbered multitudes assembled to witness the exchange of the ratified copies of the treaty which was to bring back civil and religious peace to all Europe. The ceremony concluded, according to the custom of the times, with a solemn mass and *Te Deum* by the Cardinal-bishop of Ostia, during which the legate communicated with the Emperor and in the name of the Pope imparted the kiss of peace.

This treaty has been received from that day until now as the fundamental assertion of the **papal and imperial rights.** Its stipulations were these:

"The Emperor gives up to God, to St. Peter, and to the catholic church, the right of investiture by **Ring** and **Crosier;** he grants to the clergy throughout the empire the right of free election, he restores to the church of Rome, to all other churches and nobles, the possessions and feudal sovereignties which have been seized during the wars in his father's time and his own, those in his possession immediately, and he promises his influence to obtain restitution of those not in his possession. He grants peace to the pope and to all his partisans, and pledges himself to protect, whenever he shall be thereto summoned, the church of Rome in all things."

"The pope granted on his part, that all elections of bishops and abbots should take place in the presence of the Emperor or his commissioners, only without bribery and violence, with an appeal in cases of contested elections to the metropolitan and provincial bishops. The bishop elect in Germany was to receive, by the touch of the sceptre, all the temporal rights, principalities, and possessions of the See, excepting those which were held immediately of the See of Rome; and faithfully discharge to the Emperor all duties incident to those principalities. In all other parts of the empire the royalties were to be granted to the bishop consecrated within six months. The pope grants peace to the Emperor and his adherents, and promises aid and assistance on all lawful occasions."[141]

So ended the contest which had wasted Germany by a civil war for fifty years, and Italy by the most disastrous invasions. And a moment's reflection, on the adjustment of the quarrel and the slight concessions on either side, will show the awful iniquity of those who prolonged the struggle. But neither Calixtus

[141] Milman, vol. 3, p. 320; Greenwood, book 11, p. 673.

nor Henry long survived the **Concordat of Worms.** The pope died in 1124, and the Emperor in 1125.

It will not be necessary to say much more on the events of this century. The great features by which it is marked are the crusades and their results, which we have already examined. But it may be well to notice briefly two or three remarkable men that appeared at this time, whose names are familiar amongst us to this day, and whose histories conduct us to the secrets and depths of the cloister. Besides, we learn more of the general state of religion, literature, and manners, from such individual histories than from mere abstract statements.

ST. BERNARD, ABBOT OF CLAIRVAUX

The most celebrated of these men is the famous **St. Bernard.** He is considered the brightest representative of the Roman Catholic religion which the church had seen since the days of Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and Gregory. For half a century he appears before us the leading and governing head of Christendom — the oracle of all Europe. The popes are lost sight of in the brighter light of the abbot. "He is the centre," says one of his biographers, "around whom gather the great events of christian history, from whose mind flow forth the impulses which animate and guide Latin Christendom, towards whom converge the religious thoughts of men. He rules alike the monastic world, the councils of temporal sovereigns, and the intellectual developments of the age. He is believed by an admiring age to have confuted Abelard himself, and to have repressed the more dangerous doctrines of Arnold of Brescia." To those who have read his life this picture will not appear overdrawn. But as throwing light on those times we would first notice his training.

Bernard was born of noble parentage in Burgundy. His father, Tesselin, was a knight of great bravery and piety, according to the ideas of religion prevalent at that time. His mother, Alith, was likewise of high birth, and a model of devotion and charity. Bernard, their third son, was born at Fontaines, near Dijon, in 1091. From his infancy he was thoughtful and devoted to religion and study. His pious mother died while he was yet a youth, leaving six sons and one daughter. He was then left free to choose his occupation for life. What shall it be? He had no great choice; it must either be a fighting knight or a fasting and praying monk. He resolved at length to retire from the world and devote himself to the monastic state. At the age of twenty-three he entered the monastery of Citeaux.

When his family first heard of his resolution, they were much opposed. His father, Tesselin, and his two brothers, Guido and Gerard, were following the great Duke of Burgundy to his wars, as military noblemen. But such was the force of Bernard's character that he influenced his brothers one after the

other, and his sister also, to take the vow; and the whole family in a short time disappeared within the walls of the convent.

ST. BERNARD AND MONASTICISM

As monastic Christianity or enthusiasm, in the theory of the Roman church, was at this time the only real christian perfection, we will present the reader of the nineteenth century with a few particulars of the system, that he may be able to judge for himself of the extreme blindness of even true believers such as Bernard, and of the awful perversion of the sacred name of Christianity. Were the proofs not unquestionable, the facts could not now be believed. The renunciation of the world, solitude, asceticism, stern mortification, was preached as almost the only safe path to heaven. The supposed merits of monkery, not the finished work of Christ, was the ground of admittance by St. Peter into the realms of glory. Hence it was that the more sincere the monk, the more he inflicted on himself every kind of torture and misery. This was the deception: “The more remote from man, the nearer to God, holiness was measured by suffering all human sympathies, all social feelings, all ties of kindred all affections, were to be torn up by the roots from the groaning spirit; pain and prayer, prayer and pain, were to be the sole, stirring, unwearying occupations of a saintly life.”

Surely this is the masterpiece of Satan, the deepest delusion of the counsels of hell. Let thy holy Bible be thy guide dear reader; and rest assured that all who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ *are*, not only *will* be, but *are* saved, and that all who truly believe will be careful to maintain good works, in virtue of the divine nature and the power of the Holy Spirit.

THE CISTERCIAN MONASTERIES

Stephen Harding, an Englishman, originally from Sherborne in Dorsetshire, was the abbot of the Cistercian monastery at Citeaux. He followed St. Benedict’s rule, with additional severities. They had but one common meal a day, and had been twelve hours at work before they received it. They never tasted meat, fish, or eggs, and milk only rarely.

It was usual when anyone wished to become a monk at Citeaux, says Bernard’s biographer, to make him wait for four days before he was taken to the chapter in presence of the assembled convent. After this he prostrated himself before the lectern, and was asked by the abbot what he wanted. He replied, “God’s mercy and yours.” The abbot bade him rise, and expounded to him the severity of the rule, and inquired of his intentions again; and, if he answered he wished to keep it all, the abbot said, “May God who hath begun a good work in thee Himself accomplish it.” This ceremony was repeated three days, and after the third he passed from the guest-house to the cells of the novices, and then at once began the year of probation.

The following was the ordinary routine in the monastery during Bernard's year. At two in the morning the great bell was rung, and the monks immediately arose from their hard couches, and hastened along the dark cloisters in solemn silence to the church. A single small lamp, suspended from the roof, gave a glimmering light, just sufficient to show them their way through the building. After prayer, or divine service they retired, and after a brief repose rose again for matins which took them about two hours; then other services, partly regulated by the season of the year — summer or winter; but they were employed in various religious exercises till nine, when they went forth to work in the fields. *At two they dined*, at night-fall they assembled to vespers; at six or eight, according to the season, they finished the day with compline, and passed at once to the dormitory.

But however severe we may think these practices and austerities to have been, they were far from satisfying the zeal and spirit of self-mortification of Bernard. He spent his time in solitude and study. Time given to sleep he regarded as lost, and was wont to compare sleep and death, holding that sleepers may be regarded as dead among men, even as the dead are asleep before God. He diligently read the scriptures; he strove to work out his own conception of perfect and angelic religion. He had so absolutely withdrawn his senses from communion with the outer world that they seemed dead to all outward impressions: his eyes could not tell him whether his chamber was ceiled or not whether it had one window or three. Of the scanty food which he took his unconscious taste had lost all perception whether it was nauseous or wholesome. He drank oil but could not tell it from water. And yet this deluded man, though we doubt not he was already saved through grace, was doing all this for salvation; and still, as a matter of course, he was not satisfied. He spoke of himself as but in his noviciate, others might have attained, he had but begun his sanctification.

BERNARD'S PROFESSION

A year has elapsed since Bernard entered Citeaux. His probation is ended; he now makes his profession. This ceremony was performed with great solemnity, and surrounded with all that could impart to it awe and majesty. The novice was called into the chapter, and, before all, made disposal of any worldly goods he might possess. His head was shorn, and his hair burnt by the sacristan in a piscine used for this purpose. Going to the steps of the presbytery, he then read the form of profession, made over at the sign of the cross and, inclining his body, approached the altar. He placed the profession on the right-hand side of it, which he kissed, again bent his body, and retired to the steps. The abbot, standing on the other side of the altar, removed from it the parchment, while the novice on his hands and knees implored pardon, repeating three times the words, "Receive me, O Lord." The whole convent answered with "Gloria Patri," and the cantor began the Psalm, "Have mercy on me, O God," which was sung through by the two choirs alternately. The novice then humbled himself at the abbot's feet, and afterwards did the same

before the prior, and successively before all the brotherhood — even before the sick if there were any. Towards the end of the Psalm, the abbot, bearing his crosier, approached the novice and made him rise. A cowl was blessed and sprinkled with holy water, and the abbot removing from the novice his secular garments, replaced them with the monastic dress. The "Credo" was said, the novice had become a monk, and took his place in the choir.[142]

BERNARD LEAVES CITEAUX

The arrival of Bernard, of his kindred, and his followers, at Citeaux, proved a turning-point in its history. The popularity of the small monastery was raised, and its dormitories were crowded. It soon became necessary to look out for the means of founding another. Bernard was selected by Stephen, the general of the Cistercian communities of France, as the head of the community. Twelve monks and their young abbot — representing the Lord and His apostles — were assembled in the church. Stephen placed a cross in Bernard's hands, who solemnly at the head of his small band, walked forth from Citeaux. After travelling northward for nearly ninety miles, they came to a valley in Champagne, called the Valley of Wormwood, but which now exchanged its name for that of Clairvaux — the Bright Valley. It was a barren solitude, for a time the hardships which the little community had to bear were excessive. A rude fabric to shelter them from wind, rain, heat, and cold, was raised with their own hands: — they were obliged to live on beech-leaves, nuts, roots, intermixed with coarse grain, until the Lord in mercy supplied their need from the compassion of the neighbouring peasants. Of course the supplies of money and corn were attributed to the miraculous intervention of St. Bernard, his piety, his prayers, and his prophetic visions. But the good Lord had pity and saved these poor deluded men from actual death by starvation.

William of Champeaux, bishop of Chalons, hearing that the life of Bernard was in danger from the extreme rigour of his mortifications succeeded in getting him away from Clairvaux for twelve months; and, compelling him to take proper food and rest, he saved him from a slow but certain suicide. In later years Bernard expressed disapprobation of such excess in mortification as that by which he had weakened his own body and impaired his own strength.

THE POWER OF BERNARD'S PREACHING

After this period, according to his biographers, the fame and influence of Bernard spread rapidly and widely. His health had suffered so much from ascetic practices that he could no longer labour in the field with his brethren for their daily subsistence; but he laboured with his pen, and his preaching retained all its impressive solemnity and persuasive eloquence. His pale face,

---

[142] These accounts are chiefly taken from *The Life and Times of St Bernard* by James Catter Morrison, M.A.

macerated form, and bodily weakness contrasted strangely with his powerful voice, his gushing flow of language, and the burning fervour of his pathetic appeals. When it was known that he was to preach in any given place, wives hurried away their husbands, mothers withdrew their sons, friends their friends, from the resistless power of the saintly abbot, lest they should renounce the world for the cloister. His reputation as a preacher and a writer soon spread over the whole of Christendom, and all the world began to ascribe the impression he produced to a divine power, and to endow him with the gift of working miracles.

The **"Bright Valley"** was soon beset by candidates for admission; the number of its inmates rapidly rose to seven hundred; and the number of monasteries founded by Bernard himself amounted to *one hundred and sixty*. These were scattered over France, Italy, Germany, England, Spain indeed over every country in the West. And, as might be expected, all looked back with superstitious reverence and affection to their founder. Clairvaux thus became a free and open court to which all might appeal without cost, and from which, it is said, all retired without dissatisfaction, whether justified or condemned. He knew how to address himself to persons of every class in a style most suited to their understanding, and thus exercised an immense influence over all kinds of men. His wondering disciples vied with each other in publishing abroad the wonders wrought by his hand or his prayers, until his every act became a miracle and his every word a prophecy. The Gospels contain not such countless miracles as the life of Bernard. He healed diseases by his touch, the bread which he blessed produced supernatural effects, and a blind man received his sight by standing on the same spot where the holy man had stood!

THE AGE OF MIRACLES AND VISIONS

To those who are at all acquainted with the spirit and temper of the mediaeval age, these groundless beliefs will excite no surprise; but to those who are only familiar with our own time it must appear strange that any one was found weak enough to believe them. And were it not for their *historical* value we should not think them worth transcribing. But they show, as nothing else can, the modes of thought and the measure of man's mental development at the time and on this ground we can understand and explain why such foolish tales and absurd fictions were received as the present revelation of God. The result was, as Satan designed even in the case of true Christians, that the word of God, which is the only standard of faith and practice, was completely set aside and the deceivers' lies believed. Good man and talented as Bernard must have been, he was deeply imbued with the superstitious credulity of his age. He believed with others that God had performed miracles by him. But all men in the twelfth century, and for several ages, both before and after, believed in miracles, visions, revelations, and the interference of both good and evil angels with sublunary things.

The effect of the monastic system on the people generally in the dark ages must account for their readiness to believe anything a monk said, especially about good or evil, heaven or hell. The silvery peals of the convent bells were constantly reminding the warlike lord and his vassals, of the heavenly occupation of the monks, which, to their superstitious minds, must have had a great effect. And we cannot wonder. There in the lonely valley, the solitudes of nature, stood the holy monastery. The prince, the peasant, and the pauper, may knock at its gates and find a shelter within its hallowed walls. Peace is promised in this life to all who enter, and heaven hereafter. The chorus-song of vigils and matins during the night must have appealed to the religious feelings of all around, and filled them with most holy awe and reverence for the unearthly people. Hence the monastery was looked upon as the gate of heaven, and all its inmates as the servants of the Most High. It was no doubt a great mercy at that time to the poor, and to the people generally, especially during the reign of feudalism.

THE DEGENERACY OF THE MONASTIC RULE

But before leaving the subject of the monasteries, having looked at them under the generalship of Bernard, it may be well to notice what they had become before his day, and what they were afterwards. Most of the old monasteries had become wealthy and suffered from the natural consequences. Some had altogether relaxed their discipline, had long renounced poverty, and disregarded their vow of obedience to the abbot or prior. They had fertilized their immediate territory; and, as though they had now but to enjoy the fruits of their toil, they sank to indolent repose, and idleness brought its ten thousand other sins. Milman speaks of monasticism as tracing the same cycle in all ages. This is so truly and so graphically described that we quote the passage entire. But we must add that he leaves out in this paragraph the fearful immoralities, dissensions, and insubordination, which were always the consequences of wealth.

“Now the wilderness, the utter solitude, the utmost poverty, the contest with the stubborn forest and unwholesome morass, the most exalted piety, the devotion which had not hours enough during the day and night for its exercise, the rule which could not be enforced too strictly, the strongly competing asceticism, the inventive self-discipline, the inexhaustible emulous ingenuity of self-torture, the boastful servility of obedience: then the fame for piety, the lavish offerings of the faithful, the grants of the repentant lord, the endowments of the remorseful king — the opulence, the power, the magnificence. The wattled hut, the rock-hewn hermitage, is now the stately cloister, the lowly church of wood, the lofty and gorgeous abbey; the wild forest of heath, the pleasant and umbrageous grove; the marsh, a domain of intermingling meadows and corn-fields; the brawling stream or mountain torrent, a succession of quiet tanks or pools, fattening innumerable fish. The superior, once a man bowed to the earth with humility, care-worn, pale, emaciated, with a coarse habit bound with a cord, with naked feet, is become

an abbot on his curvetting palfrey, in rich attire, with his silver cross borne before him, travelling to take his place amid the lordliest of the realm."[143]

A new order, a new institution, grew up under the hand of Bernard. Clairvaux was the commencement of a new era in the history of monasticism. Men of all ranks were attracted to the Cistercian order, notwithstanding the noted strictness of its discipline; and numbers of monasteries sprang up in the deserts after the pattern of Clairvaux. But all the power of Bernard could not prevent the most bitter jealousies and unseemly dissensions arising between the monks of the new and of the old orders, especially with the once celebrated monastery of Cluny, which had trained Hildebrand for the papal throne.

BERNARD LEAVES CLAIRVAUX

A.D. 1130

A great **schism** in the church, caused by two unprincipled popes, was the occasion of St. Bernard being drawn, reluctantly from his peaceful seclusion, and plunged at once into the affairs of the world. But, as an example of what was a common occurrence in connection with papal elections, we will give a few particulars. The reader will see and judge for himself of papal infallibility. Alas! few of the popes were outwardly decent.

When Pope Honorius II was dying, but before he had breathed his last, Cardinal **Peter Leonis,** a grandson of a Jewish usurer, made a bold effort to mount the chair of St. Peter. But the dying pontiff being brought to the window and shown to the people as still alive, Peter and his friends retired for the moment. Another party, determined to exclude Peter, and watching till the poor pope did die, at once proclaimed Cardinal Gregory supreme pontiff of the christian world under the name of **Innocent II.** The party of Peter at the same time went through the form of election with their pope, dressed him in the proper pontificals, and declared that he, under the title of Anacletus II, was the authentic vicar of Christ.

Rome, the scene of endless strife and warfare, was now filled with two armies of ferocious partisans. Devastation and bloodshed followed rapidly on their spiritual threats and curses. Anacletus, it is said, at the head of a mercenary band, began the attack by laying siege to the church of St. Peter. He forced his way into the sanctuary, carried off the gold crucifix, and all the treasure in gold and silver and precious stones. These riches led numbers to side with him. Besides he was rich and could afford to pay for followers. He assailed and despoiled the churches of the capital one after another. Innocent was soon convinced that Rome, in the present state of public feeling, could be no safe place for him. He determined to fly. His person was in danger. It was with great difficulty that he and his friends escaped in two galleys, and safely

---

[143] *Latin Christianity,* vol. 3, p.330.

reached the port of Pisa. From thence they repaired to France, and were received with open arms by the communities of Cluny and Clairvaux.

Bernard zealously espoused the cause of Innocent. His zeal drew him from his den. He travelled from sovereign to sovereign, from count to count, from monastery to monastery, until he could boast that Innocent was acknowledged by the Kings of France, England, Spain, the Emperor Lothaire, the more powerful clergy, and the religious communities throughout these countries. The powerful Duke Roger of Sicily alone adhered to Anacletus, which prevented Innocent returning to Rome. But death came to the relief of all parties. Anacletus died in his impregnable fortress of St. Angelo, in January 1138, having defied all his enemies for eight years. Innocent returned to Rome in May with Bernard by his side, and was duly acknowledged as supreme pontiff.

THE GREAT COUNCIL OF THE LATERAN

A.D. 1139

Innocent, now undisputed master of Rome, assembled at the Lateran a general council. Never had Rome or any other city of Christendom beheld one so numerously attended. A thousand bishops and countless ecclesiastical dignitaries were present. The speeches and the decrees image forth the Christianity of the times. The *feudal authority* of the pope was the great subject. He declared that, "Inasmuch as Rome is the metropolis of the world, from which all earthly power flows, so likewise the pontifical throne is the source of all ecclesiastical authority and dignity; and that every such office or dignity is to be received at the hands of the Roman pontiff as a fief of the Roman See, and held of him as the great *spiritual liege lord*."

As usual on such occasions, Innocent annulled all the decrees of his adversary Anacletus. *He* was consigned to the realms of Satan, and the prelates who had received schismatic consecration were degraded. They were summoned to appear before the revengeful pope. He assailed them with indignant reproaches, wrenched their crosiers out of their hands, stripped the palls from their shoulders, and took from them their episcopal rings. After this, as if to consummate the vilest hypocrisy, the "Truce of God" — a cessation of private feuds and conflicts — in its fullest extent was reenacted. But the canon which most interests us in that celebrated council was directed against a class of men, who before long will force themselves on our notice. "We expel from the church as heretics those who, under the semblance of religion, condemn the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, the baptism of infants, the priesthood," etc. This anathema, and those against whom it was hurled, are like the faint streaks of the dawn of the great struggle for religious liberty which resulted in the glorious Reformation.

The remainder of this wretched man's life was almost entirely spent in war, notwithstanding his re-enacting the "Truce of God." He actually headed, and led on an armed force against Roger of Sicily, the friend of Anacletus; but he fell as a prisoner of war into the hands of the Normans. Awestruck with their holy captive, they bowed before him obtained his blessing, and sent him home. Such was the superstition of the king, such the awful iniquity of the pope. But his life was ebbing fast, and soon he must stand before the tribunal of the Judge of all the earth. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (2 Cor. 5:10)

On the 24th of September, 1143, the pontiff breathed his last, amid the turmoil of popular revolution and strife, and **Celestine II** reigned in his stead.

BERNARD AND ABELARD

Before the death of Innocent, Bernard was called away from his peaceful retirement at Clairvaux, to make war against a new enemy of the church in the person of **Peter Abelard.** This new conflict arose out of the intellectual movements of the age, and marks a distinct epoch in the history of the church, of literature, of spiritual and of civil freedom. We will briefly notice what led to it.

Most of our readers are aware that the learning which had been accumulated in the Latin and Greek languages was almost entirely destroyed by the barbarians in the fifth century. What is called the literature of the ancients was almost wholly lost when the barbarous nations were established on the ruins of the Roman empire. For fully five hundred years gross ignorance prevailed. Any knowledge that remained was confined to the ecclesiastics; and they, during that period, were forbidden to study or copy secular learning. Nevertheless some of the monks, especially of the Benedictine order, collected and copied ancient manuscripts; and, says Hallam, "It is never to be forgotten that but for them the records of that very literature would have perished. If they had been less tenacious of their Latin liturgy, of the vulgate translation of scripture, and of the authority of the Fathers, it is very doubtful whether less superstition would have grown up; but we cannot hesitate to pronounce that all grammatical learning would have been laid aside. But among them, though instances of gross ignorance were exceedingly frequent, the necessity of preserving the Latin language, in which the scriptures, the canons, and other authorities of the church, and the regular liturgies were written, and in which alone the correspondence of their hierarchy could be conducted, kept flowing, in the worst seasons, a slender but living stream."[144]

Among these monks there must have been every variety of mind: some, no doubt, coarse, sluggish and mechanical; others, refined, active, inquiring,

[144] *Literature of Europe in the Middle Ages,* vol. 1, p. 4.

which could not be confined within the barriers of the established catholic doctrine, or submit to the power of the sacerdotal order. So it was; so it proved to be. The Reformer, the Protestant, sprang from the monastic order. There were many premature Luthers. In every insurrection, it has been said, whether religious or more philosophical, against the dominant dogmatic system, a monk was the leader, and there had been three or four of these insurrections before the time of Abelard. Gotschalk in the ninth century was scourged and imprisoned for his stubborn confidence in what was called *predestinarianism.* John Scot Erigena, a most learned monk from Ireland or the Scottish islands, was invited by **Hincmar,** Archbishop of Rheims, to oppose Gotschalk; but he alarmed the church no less than his antagonist, by appealing to a new power above catholic authority, human reason. He was a strong rationalist, but speculated largely in scholastic theology. Under the censure of the church he fled to England, and found a refuge, it is said, in Alfred's new university of Oxford.

THE DAWN OF LIGHT IN THE DARK AGES

During the latter part of eleventh century we meet with the famous names of Lanfranc, **Anselm,** and Berengar. A fresh impulse was given to intellectual activity by the labours of these and other eminent teachers. It was about this time that the old cathedral schools developed into seminaries of general learning, and these became the parents of our modern universities. This intellectual activity, following a long apathy, became so extremely attractive that thousands crowded to the lectures, and, like men long debarred from the tree of knowledge, too eagerly embraced what they heard. But it was a reaction against the dogmatic authority of the church, which taught men that it was henceforth possible to reason and inquire.

Peter Abelard was the most audacious, and by far the most popular, of all the lecturers on dialectics — professedly the science or art of discriminating truth from error by human reason. This remarkable man was born in 1079, near Nantes, in Brittany. His father, Berengar, was lord of the castle of Le Pallet, and although Peter was his eldest son, he early preferred "the conflicts of disputation to the trophies of arms," and, resigning the family inheritance of his brothers, betook himself to the life of a scholar. He was first a pupil of Rosellin, then of William archdeacon of Paris, and also of Anselm, theological lecturer of Laon. But the long and extraordinary history of this man we need not follow. It is a history of victories, crimes, and misfortunes. He was at once the representative and the victim of that scholastic theology which endangered the power and the constitution of the Roman church. He was the first instance of a man professing the science of theology without being a priest. Wherever he went, thousands of enthusiastic scholars surrounded his chair. "Crowds," says Bernard's biographer, "amounting to thousands, crossed high mountains and broad seas, and endured every inconvenience of life, to enjoy the privilege of hearing Abelard lecture." "His eloquence," says another, "was so fascinating, that the listener found himself irresistibly

carried away by the stream; arid if an opponent was hardy enough to stand up against him, the acuteness of his logic was as infallible as the torrent of his oratory had been, and in every combat he carried away the prize."[145]

Abelard wrote, as well as lectured, on many important subjects; but he was most unsound on the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. And yet in all Europe no champion of truth and orthodoxy could be found to meet in single combat this giant of heresy. Bernard of Clairvaux was at length appealed to. A letter from William, Abbot of St. Thierry, drew him from his cloister. The saint and the logician met at Sens in 1140. The King of France was present, with a great number of bishops and ecclesiastics. Abelard was surrounded with his disciples; Bernard with two or three monks. The one addressed the reason of the few, the other inflamed the hearts and passions of all classes. The one was supported by admirers; the other by worshippers. The one had been denounced as a heretic; the other had the reputation of being the most holy man of his age, above kings, prelates, and even the pope. Under such circumstances Abelard had no chance. He soon felt the power that was against him; and, before the incriminated passages were all read, he rose up and said, to the astonishment of all present, "I refuse to hear more, or answer any questions; I appeal to Rome;" and left the assembly.

It is said by some, in explanation of this unexpected conduct, that the ranks of hostile faces which he saw before him, not only quenched his enthusiasm but made him feel that his life was in danger. Hearing that a report of the council had reached Rome, and that he was condemned by the pope, he applied in his distress to the "venerable" Peter of Cluny, who, from pity for his misfortunes, gave him an asylum in his monastery, though he was opposed to his doctrines.

We may just notice in passing, that the well-known story of the sufferings of his beautiful **Eloisa** gave birth to a new idea of woman's place in society, without which no true civilization could have taken place. Up to this period the church had avowedly looked with disdain on woman, because she had been first in the transgression. But the touching story of the misfortunes of Eloisa led to the elevation of woman to her proper place in the social circle.

The fallen and broken-hearted Abelard, after spending about two years in the solitudes of Cluny, receiving many kindnesses from its charitable abbot, and satisfying his ecclesiastical judges with the humility of his repentance, ended his agitated life in the year 1142. His principles lived in many of his disciples; one deserves a special notice.

---

[145] *Life and Times of Bernard,* Morrison, p. 290; *Eighteen Christian Centuries,* White, p. 266.

ARNOLD OF BRESCIA

Although Arnold passed as a disciple and a faithful follower of Abelard, it is evident from all we can gather that he was a man of another order. There is reason to believe that he was a sincere Christian, and possessed many of the elements of a reformer, though in an age unripe for reformation. Besides he was too political — too great an admirer of the old Roman Republic — to be used of God in laying a solid foundation for the reformation of His church. He was honoured with martyrdom, but it was more for his advocacy of civil liberty than for his preaching subjection to Christ and the word of God. Nevertheless he commands our respect and gratitude, as an early sower of the seeds of the great Reformation.

Arnold was born at Brescia in Lombardy — probably about the year 1105. At an early period in his history he separated himself from the secular clergy, embraced the monastic life, and began to preach unsparingly against the corruptions of both the clergy and the monks. He seems to have been possessed of an inward conviction that he had a divine commission to preach against the pride, luxury, and immorality of the priesthood, from the pope himself down to the lowest rank in the church; and to this mission he boldly and fearlessly devoted all his strength. Possessed, according to all accounts, of the most vigorous and awakening style of address, combined with an eloquence which was singularly copious and flowing, he mightily moved the masses wherever he preached. “His words,” says Bernard, “are smoother than oil and sharper than swords.” His great idea was, the complete separation of Church and State. The old papal edifice — the hierarchy, which had been rising into such vast proportions ever since the days of Constantine, and which, under Gregory VII, aspired to govern the whole world, and to bind all the nations of the earth as so many fiefs of St. Peter — he boldly maintained should be utterly demolished and swept from the face of the earth. He used as his text, what many have done since, though not knowing its spiritual import, “My kingdom is not of this world.” Ministers of the gospel, he argued, should have no power but for the spiritual government of the flock of Christ, and no riches but the tithes and the free-will offerings of the faithful. The immense evils and discords that arose in the church, he affirmed, were mainly owing to the vast riches of the pontiffs, bishops, and priests.

While there was a great deal of truth in much that he said he blended, in the most painful way, his love of old Roman liberty and the lowly religion of Jesus — the rigid monk and the fierce Republican. “If poverty was of Christ,” he would exclaim, “if poverty was of His apostles, if the only real living likenesses of the apostles and of Christ were the fasting, toiling, barely-clad monks, with their cheeks sunk with the famine, their eyes on the ground, how far from the apostles, how far from Christ, were those princely bishops, those lordly abbots, with their furred mantles of scarlet and purple, who ride forth on their curvetting palfreys, with their golden bits, their silver spurs, and holding their courts like kings!” Consistently with this, he also taught the

people “that the temporal sovereign is the proper fountain of honour, of wealth, of power, and to that fountain should revert all the possessions of the church, the estates of the monasteries, the royalties of the popes and the bishops.”[146]

ARNOLD’S PREACHING

To these new and dangerous doctrines the people of Brescia listened with the greatest ardour. He unfolded to them the dark pages of ecclesiastical history, over which we have just been travelling. The whole city was in a state of the greatest excitement. Nor can we wonder at the enthusiasm of the populace, when they heard that the riches of the clergy should return to the laity, and that, in future, their pastors were to be supported by the voluntary contributions of their flocks. He would be a bold preacher who dared to arouse the people to fanaticism with such appeals and proposals in the nineteenth century: what must he have been in the twelfth in the midst of darkness, ignorance and superstition? Such a man was the premature reformer of Brescia, and, being a stern monk of blameless life, unquestioned as to his orthodoxy, and having full sympathy with popular religion, his power was resistless. The great object of his efforts was the complete overthrow of sacerdotal power — the temporal supremacy of the pope. He thus dared to lay his hand on the great papal scheme of universal dominion, and for a moment it tottered to its base. The pope was driven from his throne the Republic proclaimed, the standard of liberty raised, the separation of the spiritual and temporal powers published, and the government of priests abolished. But the enthusiasm of the citizens was evanescent, without unity, and of short duration. The soil was not yet prepared for the growth of liberty. The iniquity of the anti-christian system was not yet full. Jezebel’s thirst was not yet quenched with the blood of the saints of God. Millions more must perish before she receives her deadly wound. This we shall soon see.

Arnold was no longer safe in Italy. The resentment of the clergy he found to be stronger and deeper far than the favour of the populace. He escaped beyond the Alps, and ultimately found a safe and hospitable shelter in Zurich. There the forerunner of the famous Zwingle was allowed for a time to lecture, and the simple people long retained the spirit of his doctrines. But such a man must not be allowed to live anywhere. Bernard was watching his every movement. He urged the pope to extreme measures; he wrote angrily to those who gave him a shelter, warning them to beware of the fatal infection of heresy. He sharply rebuked the diocesan bishop of Zurich for protecting him. “Why,” he says, “have you not long since driven Arnold away? He who consorts with the suspected becomes liable to suspicion; he who favours one under the papal excommunication contravenes the pope and even the Lord God Himself. Now therefore that you know your man, drive him from among you; or, better still, chain him down, that he may do no more mischief.”

---

[146] *Latin Christianity*, vol. 3, p. 333.

After various fortunes, such as are common to that class of men, and such as we need not here trace, Arnold returned to Rome. Here he was allowed to remain for some time because of the feebleness of the pontiff and the troubled state of the city; but when Pope Adrian ascended the throne of St. Peter, the days of Arnold were numbered.

THE MARTYRDOM OF ARNOLD

A.D. 1155

The new pope was an Englishman of great ability; and the only one, it is said, that ever sat on the papal throne. He was originally a monk of St. Albans, but obliged to leave his home because of the severity of his father. After travelling for some time on the continent, and studying divinity and canon law with great ardour and success, and rising from rank to rank in ecclesiastical orders, he was at length raised to the highest order of ecclesiastical greatness by the name of **Adrian IV.** His English name was Nicolas Breakspeare.

An opportunity now presented itself to get rid of the bold reformer. The Emperor Barbarossa was on his way to receive from the hands of Adrian the imperial crown. He sent forward an embassy of three cardinals to meet the Emperor, and to request as the price of his coronation the surrender of Arnold of Brescia into his hands. To a man who thought so little of human life as Frederick, it seemed but a light thing indeed, and he compelled the friends of Arnold to deliver him up into the hands of the papal emissaries. No time was now to be lost, lest his friends should hear of it and attempt to rescue him. The church took upon itself the summary condemnation and execution of the rebel, without employing, as usual, the temporal sword. Before break of day the officer of the pope had imbrued his hands in the blood of his victim; his dead body was burned to ashes, and the remains cast into the Tiber, lest the people should collect and worship the relics of their martyred friend. The clergy triumphed in his death, but his memory lived in the minds of the Romans. “And in the ashes of Arnold’s funeral pile,” says Milman, “smouldered for centuries the fire, which was at length to blaze out in irresistible violence.”

Bernard, the great antagonist of Abelard and of Arnold, had passed peacefully away at Clairvaux in the year 1153. The saint, the philosopher, and the reformer, are gone — gone to another world; gone to be judged, not by papal decrees, but by the throne of eternal righteousness and immaculate holiness. Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the work which He finished for lost and guilty sinners, is the alone ground of pardon and acceptance in God’s sight. There is no purgatory but the precious blood of His cross. But, what a mercy, that blood can make the vilest clean! “Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.” Nothing short of the blood of Jesus can make a soul whiter than snow and fit for heaven. All other means are but a mockery, a delusion of Satan which only deepens and perpetuates the

guilt of the soul. “The blood of Jesus Christ, God’s Son, cleanseth us from all sin.” Salvation is by faith alone without works of law. We must be grafted into the true vine before we can bear fruit to God. Christ is the only fruit-bearer; believers are branches. “He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.” Apart from a true and living faith in Christ, there is no pardon, no salvation, no happiness, and no heaven; “but blessed are all they that put their trust in Him.” (Ps. 51:7, 12; 1 John 1:7; 2:6)

We now return to our history, and first we would notice —

THE MEETING BETWEEN ADRIAN AND FREDERICK

Were it not for a circumstance which we consider purely childish, the meeting between Adrian and Frederick might have been passed without a notice, so little does it concern the history of the church. But it concerns the history of the papacy, and we think it right to note everything which manifests its true spirit while in the Thyatiran period. Besides, the most trifling incident sometimes reveals the most deeply seated purpose, and betrays the most unyielding determination.

The ready grant of Arnold’s blood had not removed from the dark mind of Adrian all suspicion as to Frederick’s intentions. The negotiations, however, were at length satisfactory, and Adrian rode to the camp of Frederick. He was courteously received by some of the German nobles and conducted to the royal tent. The pope remained in his saddle, expecting the Emperor to come and hold his stirrup while he dismounted. But he waited in vain; Frederick made no advance, and the pope alighted without his assistance. This neglect of homage to the supreme pontiff was considered a great insult and indicative of hostilities. Most of the cardinals fled in alarm, but the intrepid Nicolas Breakspeare remained. Frederick pleaded ignorance of the custom; but the pope refused to be reconciled or give him the kiss of peace until he had humbled himself and gone through the ceremony. The haughty German said he must consult his nobles. A long discussion ensued. Adrian maintained that it had been the custom since the days of Constantine the Great, who held the stirrup for Pope Sylvester. This assertion was utterly false; as the first act of such homage had occurred about fifty years before by Conrad, the worthless and rebellious son of Henry IV. But that was a small matter to the papal party, if an emperor was to be humbled and the pope exalted. Alleged precedents were produced in order to prove that the practice had existed for eight hundred years; and consequently, “as the Emperor had declined the honours due to the apostles Peter and Paul, there could be no peace between the church and the empire till he had discharged that duty to the letter.” Such was the blasphemous assumption of these wicked men. They urged their pretensions to the homage of mankind by representing themselves as in the place of the apostles — of Christ — of God Himself. As the evidence appeared in the pope’s favour and Frederick did not mind much how it went, he allowed himself to be persuaded that the precedents were true, and that he ought to do

homage to the pope. Accordingly on the following day, like a dutiful son of the church, the Emperor dismounted as Adrian approached, took his bridle in hand, and held his stirrup when he alighted. Outward amity was now restored, and the spiritual father and the obsequious son advanced towards the holy city and proceeded with the coronation.

After a reign of about four years, and, we may add, of ceaseless strife and bloodshed, Adrian died in 1159. He was preparing for the open declaration of war, and the excommunication of the Emperor, when death put an end to the conflict. So most of these men lived and so they died, at open war with the temporal power. **Frederick Barbarossa** is spoken of as the mightiest sovereign who had reigned in Europe since Charlemagne. He entered on the third Crusade, as we have seen, in 1189, and died, or was drowned, in the stream Saleph near Tarsus, in 1190.

SHORT PAPERS ON CHURCH HISTORY

CHAPTER 22

THE ENCROACHMENTS OF ROME IN ENGLAND

A.D. 1162

We now approach a period in our history which must awaken a peculiar interest in the mind of the English reader. The **Anglo-Saxon** was giving place to the Anglo-Norman rule both in Church and State. The whole condition of the country was either changed or changing. But the Italian priest was far from being satisfied with the footing which he had under the reign of the Normans. The blooming vineyard of Naboth was coveted, and must be possessed by fair means or foul. England, with all its pride and wealth and power, must be reduced to a state of subserviency to the Roman See. This was her settled purpose, and necessary to the carrying out of her scheme. We will first notice the position of the antagonists, and then the nature and end of the fierce struggle.

During the reign of **Alexander III,** an able, subtle, and vigilant pontiff, a great contest arose in England between Henry II and Thomas a Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, which drew away and absorbed the whole mind of Europe for many years. It resembled in its main features the long war between Henry IV and Gregory VII, only, if possible, pursued with greater bitterness and obstinacy, and ending more tragically. A more violent collision between the spiritual and the temporal powers had not occurred since the days of Constantine. The personal character and the position of the leaders, no doubt, gave a world-wide interest to the conflict. But it was much more than personal: the whole question of the power of Rome in England, the prerogative of the Sovereign, and the responsibility of the subject, was involved in this new war. Henry, of true Norman blood, was determined to be the king, and to govern his subjects according to the laws and customs of the realm; Becket, a violent churchman, was equally determined to maintain, according to the infallible decrees of Rome, that the hierarchy is a separate and privileged *caste* in the community, entitled to exemption from trial by civil process, and subject only to its own jurisdiction.

The English reader of the nineteenth century may well be surprised to hear that a decree from the Vatican, sent by the pope's legate, for the purpose of changing the laws and customs of England, should be for a moment listened to, far less yielded to. But this was the way then; and the mightiest monarchs in Europe were made to bow in ignominious submission at the feet of the pontiff. But why this dreadful slavish fear of Rome? Because of the ignorance and superstition of the people generally. "The Romish system, with all its

insolent pretensions, was still shrouded in a blood-red halo of superstitious reverence, which scared away thought, or quenched it in the fear of death temporal and eternal." The cunning priest could pretend to shake the keys of St. Peter in the face of his opponent, and threaten to lock him out of heaven and to lock him up in hell, if he did not obey the church. It was their avowed sanctity and their wicked perversion of scripture that gave them such power over the ignorant and superstitious.

THE ENGLISH LAW AND CUSTOM

From the earliest period, the kings of England were acknowledged both by clergy and laity to have the fullest power in matters pertaining to the external government of the church. Whether touching the property and the endowments of the churches, or the persons of the clergy, the authority of the crown was, by law and custom of the realm, supreme. Edward, the Anglo-Saxon king, told the clergy that "they wielded the sword of St. Peter, he the sword of Constantine." And of **William the Conqueror,** his biographer says, "All affairs, ecclesiastical as well as secular, were made dependent on his pleasure." But during the twelfth century the country was gradually sinking into a state of deplorable subjection to the Roman See.

At the same time, we must not forget that, although the progress of the church was towards Rome, God in His infinite mercy over-ruled the temporal power of the clergy and the great ecclesiastical establishments of the monks for the protection and blessing of the poor in the land. He ever thinks, blessed be His name, of "the poor of the flock." By the Norman conquest of England, a foreign hierarchy as well as a foreign nobility had been introduced; but the lower offices generally were filled with Saxons, whose language and feelings were in sympathy with the native population. This gave them an immense power over the popular mind. They were looked upon as the true shepherds of their flocks, and the guides and comforters of the distressed. The Normans, whose language and feelings were still foreign, were hated as their oppressors and spoilers. The English had been sacrificed by William to supply the liberal grants of lands and places of honour, which he bestowed upon his followers, and thus the Saxons, in their turn, were compelled to become the servants or dependents of their conquerors. Whatsoever a man sows that shall he also reap. His sin is sure to find him out. But the feeling of personal wrong was another thing, and sure to mingle in every fresh conflict between the races. This is manifest in the great struggle between the Norman king and the English primate, and may assist us in our judgment of its important results. But we must first notice that which immediately led to the dispute.

THE INTRODUCTION OF CANON LAW INTO ENGLAND

After repeated attempts and repeated failures, on the part of the pope, to introduce a legatine power into England, it was so far accomplished during the troubled reign of **Stephen,** A.D. 1135. This was an entirely new thing in

this country, and a most daring thing on the part of Rome. But as it forms a distinct and important epoch in the history of the English church, we must carefully mark the change. And here, to ensure accuracy, we will quote a few passages from our legal historian, Thomas Greenwood, barrister-at-law, book 12, vol. 5.

"The publication and adoption of the Isidorian Decretals changed the order and distribution of the ecclesiastical powers. Every function of church management became vested in the clergy, or, which was the same thing, in the Pope of Rome as their supreme head. The authority of the state in all matters even remotely connected with the life and conversation, temporal or spiritual, of churchmen, was vehemently denounced and repelled: their possessions were pronounced sacred and inalienable; their duties subject to no censorship but that of their official superiors, their persons exempt from secular jurisdiction or punishment; all interference on the part of prince or secular person in the appointment of bishops, priests, or spiritual incumbents was declared to be of the nature of simony. Although these principles of church legislation had been in few instances fully developed in practice, they had been received without contradiction, and partially adopted by the clergy of France, Italy, and Germany. In Normandy a complete separation of the secular and ecclesiastical jurisdiction had already taken place. In England, however, as yet the only canons known to clergy or laity were those enacted by the national church herself, with the assent and concurrence of the sovereign… The exertions of the Romanizing bishops of England, subsequent to the conquest, were steadily directed to the introduction of the more important articles of the Isidorian code; more especially to the emancipation of church property and endowments from its dependence upon crown or secular ordinance, and of the persons and causes of clerks from the interference of the king's judges…"

"The earlier ordinances of **William the Conqueror** for the separation of the ecclesiastical from the lay tribunals were never carried out to the extent of exempting churchmen from responsibility to the law. But it is also true, that both the Conqueror and his successors, down to John, endeavoured to steer a middle course between canonism and prerogative. In their solicitude to stand well with the court of Rome, they often took steps which endangered the safety, but certainly never shifted the ancient basis, of the law of the land, or the rights of the crown. In the bitter quarrel between Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury and Henry I, the latter stoutly maintained his right to determine which of the two rival pretenders to the papacy the clergy of his dominions should recognize. And when Anselm, without the king's consent, insisted upon transferring his spiritual allegiance to Urban II in preference to his rival Clement III, Henry bluntly informed him that 'he knew of no law or custom which entitled a subject, without the king's license, to set up a pope of his own over the kingdom of England; and that any man who should presume to take out of his hands the decision of that question would have as good a right to take the crown from his head!'"

"The struggle between Henry and Anselm was long and obstinate. The bishop fled to Rome; the king seized the temporalities of his See. While the contest was still undecided, a papal officer appeared on the coast announcing himself as legate of the court of Rome, entrusted with a *legatine power* over *all England from the pope.* But the king held it to be a special prerogative of his crown to accept or reject at pleasure such interferences with the ordinary course of ecclesiastical government by a foreign prince; and the legate was sent away without having been admitted to the presence of the king. About fifteen years afterwards, the same pope made a second attempt to introduce a legate-extraordinary into the kingdom, but with no better success… A third attempt of the same pontiff was equally unsuccessful. It was indeed, by this time, pretty well understood that the law and custom of England repudiated the legative commission, as an illegal interference with the ordinary course of church government, which the common law had placed under the superintendence of the sovereign."

But after the death of the wise and able Henry I, which took place in 1135, the crafty and persevering pope — **Alexander III —** was more successful. In the reign of Stephen, a feeble monarch, a legate from Rome made his way into our island. The Anglican prelates fully understood the drift of the movement; and a synod held in London protested, in the face of the legate, against the presumption of a foreign priest in taking the presidential chair above archbishops, bishops, abbots, and the assembled nobility of the whole realm of England. The protest, however, remained without effect. A timid and time-serving spirit was creeping into the heart of the Anglican church. The prevailing ignorance of the mass of the people, the secular character of the clergy, the miserable state of the whole country, during the reign of Stephen, afforded a favourable opportunity for the systematic encroachments of the Romanizing party upon the prerogative of the crown and the liberties of the national church. The Anglo-Norman bishops at the time were barons rather than prelates, their palaces were castles, their retainers vassals in arms: almost all were wearing arms, mingling in war, and indulging in all the cruelties and exactions of war. Such were the prelates of England when Henry II ascended the throne in 1154. The opposition of Becket to this rich and powerful king, throws a clearer light on the secular ambition of Rome than any of the conflicts we have yet recorded.

THOMAS A BECKET AND HENRY II

The birth and parentage of **Becket** are unknown. The obscurity of his origin was probably concealed by his biographers. But some say that he was born about the year 1119. According to du Pin he commenced his studies in London and finished them in Paris, the best school for Norman French.

Soon after his return to England, he was strongly recommended to **Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury,** who employed him in the management of his affairs. Becket was now on the high road to preferment.

Theobald, who suspected that the young king Henry was tainted with his father's opposition to the pretensions of Rome, was anxious to place near his person one who might counteract this perversity. The sagacious primate had discerned in his archdeacon, not only great abilities for business, but the elements of a lofty, a determined, and devoted churchman. Through his recommendation Becket was raised to the dignity of chancellor. "He was now the second civil power in the realm, inasmuch as his seal was necessary to countersign all royal mandates. Nor was it without great ecclesiastical influence, as in the chancellor was the appointment of all the royal chaplains, and the custody of vacant bishoprics, abbacies, and benefices." But as Thomas a Becket has come down to us in school and storybooks of English history, as a saint and a martyr, let us briefly glance at him, in the first place, as a man of the world.

THOMAS A BECKET AS CHANCELLOR

A.D. 1158

By the affability of his manners, the apparent pliancy of his disposition, the acuteness of his senses, and the attractions of his person, he soon gained the confidence and affections of the king. He made him his constant companion in all his amusements and pleasures; but it was in the graver affairs of government that Henry derived great advantage from the wisdom and prudence of his chancellor. His abilities, it is said, as an accomplished courtier, as a superior military leader, and as a practised statesman, were unrivalled. To the reader of the present day, an ecclesiastic, who held a number of clerical benefices, being a brave military general, sounds unaccountably strange. But such was the far-famed saint. One of his biographers remarks, "In the expedition made by King Henry to assert his right to the dominions of the Counts of Toulouse, Becket appeared at the head of seven hundred knights who did him service, and foremost in every adventurous exploit was the valiant chancellor. At a period somewhat later, he was left to reduce certain castles which held out against his master, and often distinguished himself for valour and personal prowess: he returned to Henry in Normandy at the head of twelve hundred knights and four thousand horsemen, raised and maintained at his own charge." Another observes, "Who can recount the carnage, the desolation, which he made at the head of a strong body of soldiers? He attacked castles, razed towns and cities to the ground, burned down houses and farms without a touch of pity, and never showed the slightest mercy to any one who rose in insurrection against his master's authority."[147]

Grave and serious churchmen, even in those days, would no doubt mourn over such things in the Archdeacon of Canterbury; but the practice was too common to excite much surprise. Secular dignity, alas! had become the grand

[147] Milman, vol. 3, p. 450.

object of ambition with nearly all the clergy, so that many more would be found to admire the course of Becket, than to grieve over it. His wealth, magnificence, and power, exceeded all precedent. He was king in all but name. The world, it was said, had never seen two friends so entirely one. But like the friendship of the world, or of two selfish, ambitious, unscrupulous men, it lasted just as long as it served their interests. This we shall now see and in a way which has been seldom witnessed.

THOMAS A BECKET ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

A.D. 1162

About a year after the death of Theobald, Becket was by the King named, Archbishop of Canterbury and primate of all England. Before his elevation to the throne, he had feigned to be wholly devoted to the interests of his royal master, but from the moment that his election had been made known to Alexander III, and especially after their meeting at the **Council of Tours,** his whole heart and soul became completely changed towards his sovereign. He returned from Tours to Canterbury, the professed, the inflexible, vassal of Rome, an enemy to his king and the laws of his country. Such was, and is, and ever must be, the spirit of popery. The intentions of the King to limit the growing power of the church were well known to Becket, who had presided in his privy council. But these intentions must be opposed at all costs; and thus the battle began.

The pretensions of the sacerdotal order as a separate caste of mankind, from the highest to the lowest, had become extremely perplexing to the civil government, and a great obstruction to its administration. The church demanded complete exemption from the control of secular law. It was boldly maintained, that the persons and property of the clergy should be placed beyond the reach of the ordinary tribunals, responsible only to their own superiors, and directly subject in life and property to the decrees of Rome. But lawlessness leads to violence; and the result of this papal aggression in England was a fearful increase of crime, to the imminent peril of the life and property of the subject. “For example,” says our barrister, “it was proved that, since the commencement of the reign of Henry II, no fewer than a hundred murders had been committed by clerks in orders with almost absolute impunity. Rape, arson, robbery, theft, were excused or sheltered under the frock of the priest or the cowl of the monk; no penalties known to the canon law existed adequate to the repression and punishment of crimes of so deep a dye, and King Henry was at length driven to put the significant question, ‘Whether the ancient laws and customs of the realm were to be observed or not.’”

The King, determined to bring these great questions to an issue, summoned a parliament at Westminster, and demanded a plain answer to his question. The answer given by the clergy to the King’s question was that the ancient laws

and customs of the realm ought to be observed and kept, "saying always the privileges of their order." This reply, although it had the appearance of an evasion, was really a refusal. The King, in a state of great consternation, broke up the assembly, left London, and began to deprive Becket of his power, and of the privilege and honour of educating his son. The bishops taking alarm, knowing the pride and power of Henry, entreated their primate either to withdraw or change the offensive answer. But he at first declared that if an angel from heaven should counsel such weakness, he would hold him accursed. He at length, however, yielded: some say through the influence of Pope Alexander, as Henry had threatened not to pay Peter's pence. And thus, all through the long quarrel, the pope sided with the king when he needed money, and with Becket when he could do without it.

THE CONSTITUTIONS OF CLARENDON

But, having received an answer in the affirmative from the hierarchy, the king summoned a great council of the realm to **Clarendon,** a royal palace near Salisbury, to ratify the concession. The King's object was peace. The law of the land was everywhere set at defiance by the church, the exercise of justice interrupted, and the country threatened with an internecine war. The King had the laws and customs drawn up in due legal form to be signed by the lay barons and bishops, in the hope of settling the contest between the crown and the church. Whether from fear of the King's rage, or from policy, or treachery, it is difficult to say; but the archbishop took the oath and signed the celebrated **"Constitutions of Clarendon."** He was followed by the rest of the bishops. They thus escaped out of the hands of the King and the barons. But it is perfectly plain that Becket never for a moment intended to obey the laws which he had so solemnly sealed and sworn to keep to the King's honour. He knew his remedy for the basest perjury. Not a moment was to be lost; he made known to the pope what he had reluctantly done; and within a month he received a formal condemnation of the "*Constitutions*," with letters "absolving him from all engagements contrary to the canons, and a mandate to all the bishops and prelates of the kingdom without scruple to break through any promises of the like nature they might have contracted."

Could perjury be more deliberate, or dissimulation more coolly perpetrated? And that by one who stood highest in the church and nearest to the person of his royal master? The heart sickens as the pen transcribes such daring unblushing wickedness. Surely there is no iniquity so great as that which cloaked itself under the name of Jesus, and of Christianity. Such revelations give us the most distressing ideas of the evil spirit of popery. The worst of crimes towards both God and man are justifiable if they further the worldly power and greatness of the church. When, and in what circumstances, we may ask, with such double dealing before us, is the real papist to be trusted? Thankful we are that we are not his judge, but God will judge mankind. "Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given

assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead." (Acts 17:31)

The archbishop, who had won the confidence, and made himself familiar with every feeling of the King's heart, kept the pope fully informed of all that passed between them, so that he well knew when to humour the King and when his zealous minister. But surely this is the basest of all treachery on the part of a servant, and the most unrighteous conduct on the part of his spiritual guide. But no man can serve two masters. He must be traitor to one; and so it was in the case before us; and one of the darkest complexion on record. No sooner had the primate appended his seal to the "Constitutions of Clarendon," than Alexander had notice both of his repentance and his renunciation. "The poison was no sooner swallowed than the antidote was at his lips."[148]

THOMAS A BECKET OPPOSES THE KING

War was now publicly declared between the prerogative of the crown and the pretensions of the church. The same battle which was fought between Henry IV of Germany and Gregory VII, was to be fought over again on English ground by the King and the archbishop. Becket resigned the chancellorship and returned the seals of his office. He withdrew from the pleasures of the court, the chase, the banquet, the tournament, the war, and the board of council; and became all at once an austere and mortified monk. He wore a monk's frock, a haircloth shirt, and flogged himself with an iron scourge. All his fine establishments were broken up; he fasted on bread and water, lay on the hard floor, and every night with his own hands he washed the feet of thirteen beggars. This assumed unapproachable sanctity was his strength for battle. Secular hands may not touch the holy man of God — the Lord's anointed high priest. Becket knew his man; he had studied every fold of his character.

Henry was astonished, uneasy, disappointed. He had raised his favourite minister to the still higher position of Archbishop of Canterbury, that his services might be more effectual against the Romanizing party in England. It was no question, be it observed, as to the proper legal privileges of the church of England; Henry had shown no disposition to encroach upon them. But the church had shown, through the instructions of the pope, the most resolute purpose to encroach on the liberties of the crown and the whole people of England. And the King knew no man in all his dominions so able to contend in talent and acuteness with the emissaries of Rome as his gay chancellor and boon-companion.

Now, he thought, we have one at the head of the Church, as well as the State, who will do good battle for the liberties of the crown and the people of his

---

[148] *Cathedra Petri*, book 12, vol. 5, p. 219. See also a full account of the whole contest in Milman's *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. 3, pp. 434-528. The former may be considered the constitutional, the latter the historical, view of the long quarrel.

native land. But it was not for these worthy objects that Becket had accepted the ring and crosier. From the moment that he touched his episcopal crucifix, he was the sworn vassal to death of the Roman See, and the avowed enemy of every man and principle that opposed the interests of the chair of St. Peter. And Henry soon found that his able and pliant chancellor, "from whom he had expected support and victory, had turned against him with the most ruthless animosity, and pushed the pretensions of Rome to a pitch they had never reached before."[149]

THE PERPLEXITY OF THE KING

It is not difficult to suppose with what feelings the proud and injured Plantagenet received the news of his primate's behaviour. Besides possessing wealth and power above any monarch of his time, he was a man of great ability, decision, and activity. After various but fruitless attempts to bring the refractory priest to repentance, orders were given that he should be tried as a traitor. Becket, knowing the temper and power of Henry, reasonably concluded that his best chance of personal safety lay in immediate flight. He was received by the King of France, not as a fugitive, but as a distinguished guest worthy of all honour. The archbishop was now proclaimed a traitor; his personal friends and relations and friends were banished; and severe measures were adopted to prevent communications with his partisans in England. Becket, in retaliation, excommunicated all his opponents. And thus the storm and strife raged for seven long years; during which time, many sovereigns, popes and anti-popes, prelates and dignitaries of every kind, were mixed up with it. But into that maze of falsehood, treachery, and unrighteousness, we must not follow.

Having examined with some care the great questions of Church and State — and not without a measure of national interest — which led to this unseemly contest, we feel that our work is done. The details of these seven years would be tedious and unprofitable to read, and most painful to write. The worst passions of our fallen human nature were abundantly displayed. Besides, such disputes can have no termination unless it be in the death of the priest or the submission of the King. According to papal principles the priest can never be wrong and can never yield.

This was Becket's ground, and he inflexibly maintained it. But at last, through the intercession of the French king and the pope, he was allowed to return from his exile. The sincerity of Henry he much doubted, but his return he considered a glorious triumph over the King. He was as haughty and unyielding as ever. He demanded the immediate restitution of the estates of his See, and peremptorily refused to absolve the bishops and others whom he had excommunicated.

---

[149] White's *Eighteen Christian Centuries,* p. 275.

As from the beginning of the strife, his bearing was insulting and defiant. The conduct of Becket since his return was detailed to Henry by the bishops who implored his protection for themselves and the clergy of the realm. One of them incautiously said, “So long as Thomas lives, you will never be at peace.” The King’s mind was greatly troubled and sought relief. Chafed to madness by the unconquerable firmness and arrogance of Becket, the secret wish of his heart burst from his lips — “I am an unhappy prince: will none revenge me on a single insolent priest, who gives me so much trouble, and endeavours by every means to make void my royal authority?”

THOMAS A BECKET ASSASSINATED

A.D. 1171

It is by no means certain that there was any deadly purpose in the mind of the King when he uttered these hasty words, but those around him put their own interpretation upon them. Four knights, chamberlains of the King, fierce and warlike men, resolved on the desperate service. Reginald Fitz-Urse, William de Tracy, Hugh de Morville, and Reginald Brito, disappeared from the court, then at Bayeux. Fearing the intention of the absent knights, the King despatched with all speed the Earl of Mandeville with orders to arrest the primate, and to recall the four knights. But the murderers hurried across the channel, and before the King’s messengers could overtake them, the archbishop was assassinated.

The particulars of this dark deed of blood are well-known to most of our readers, and need not be dwelt upon here. But we may add, as well-authenticated history, that it does not appear that the four knights had deliberately determined on the murder of the primate without first endeavouring to obtain a promise of obedience to the King, and to absolve the bishops. Hence they entered his chamber unarmed. But their imperious demands, and his haughty defiant answers, roused the worst passions of those feudal lords, who had a strong sense of the subject’s allegiance to the sovereign. They became furious, rushed out and called for their arms. The gates were closed behind them. It was some time before they could break in. Every one knew what must follow. The archbishop might have escaped but he would not; the victory was already his, it would be greater if he were martyred. The bell was toiling for vespers. He walked into the church in solemn state with his crosier carried before him. The noise of armed men was heard in the cloister; the affrighted monks fled. “Where is the traitor?” shouted one, no answer. “Where is the archbishop?” “Here I am,” he answered. Again the knights demanded the absolution of the bishops, and an oath of allegiance to the King. He refused. A fierce altercation followed, which ended in blows, and the archbishop was slain at the altar. The murderers fled, first to Rome to do penance, then to Jerusalem, where, according to the pope’s orders, they spent the remainder of their days in penitential austerities.

THE HUMILIATION OF HENRY II

The King was greatly troubled on hearing the appalling news of the sacrilegious murder. A feeling of horror ran through Christendom, and the King was branded as an irreligious tyrant, and Becket was worshipped as a martyred saint. His death was attributed to the King's direct orders. For three days and nights the unhappy monarch shut himself up in solitude, and refused all food and comfort, till his attendants began to fear for his life. At the close of his penance he sent envoys to the pope to clear himself of all participation in the crime. Alexander was so indignant at first, that he would listen to nothing, or even permit the execrated name of the King of England to be uttered in his presence. He threatened to excommunicate the King by name, and to pronounce with the utmost solemnity an interdict on all his dominions. "Mediators, however, were always to be found," says Greenwood, "for a proper consideration at the papal court. Certain cardinals were cautiously sounded, and found not inaccessible to the arguments with which the envoys were, as usual, abundantly supplied. Thus introduced, the pope permitted himself to be propitiated." Terms of reconciliation were talked of, but the pope had now his foot on the King's neck and he was determined to have papal terms before he relieved him. His personal triumph over the headstrong King was as complete as could be desired.

Two cardinals were despatched by Alexander with legatine power to meet Henry in Normandy, inquire more fully into the whole case, and substantiate the **King's penance.** Henry swore on the Gospels that he had neither commanded nor desired the death of Becket, that he had not grieved so deeply over the death of his father or his mother; yet he confessed that words uttered in his anger against that holy man might possibly have led to his death; for which cause he was prepared to do penance as the pontiff might see fit to exact. The Holy See then demanded and Henry stipulated: "1. To maintain two hundred knights at his own cost in the Holy Land. 2. That within three years he would take the cross in person, unless released by the Holy See. 3. To abrogate the Constitutions of Clarendon, and all bad customs introduced during his reign. 4. That he would reinvest the church of Canterbury in all its rights and possessions, and pardon and restore to their estates all who had incurred his wrath in the cause of the primate. 5. That he and his son Henry the younger, would hold, preserve, and keep the crown of England faithful to Pope Alexander and his successors, and that they and their successors would not regard themselves as true kings until they — the pope and his successors — should have acknowledged them as such." Having duly sealed and attested the formal deed, the King was reconciled to the pope in the porch of the church, on May 22, 1172; but he was not yet out of the hands of the inexorable priests; his degradation was not yet complete.

The clergy preached from their pulpits, and the people were ready enough to believe, that certain family trials which befell the King about this time were the judgments of God for the persecution of His saint. The people were also

led to believe that the saint had been fighting the battles of the poor against the rich- especially of the poor and oppressed Saxons against the cruel and avaricious Normans. Depressed by misfortunes, accused of complicity with the murderers, and haunted by superstitious fears, the unhappy prince was prepared to make a full atonement for his sins. Nothing short of a public humiliation, he was assured, could appease offended heaven and the martyred saint. The scenes of Canosa must be enacted over again. Such is the true spirit of the relentless priesthood of Rome. If they cannot shed the blood of their victims, they will force him to drink the bitterest dregs of humiliation.

THE PENANCE OF HENRY AT THE TOMB OF BECKET

A.D. 1174

About three years after the death of Becket, the King visited his tomb at Canterbury. When he came within sight of the church where the archbishop lay buried, he alighted from his horse, and for three miles walked in the habit of a pilgrim with bare and bleeding feet along the rough road. He threw himself prostrate before the tomb of the now canonised saint. After lying in that position for a considerable time he prayed to be scourged by the monks; an operation which they were not unwilling to perform. So, from one end of the church to the other, the pride of the monks was gratified, by each one inflicting a few stripes on the back of the haughty Norman. He then passed all that day and night without any refreshment, kneeling upon the bare stones.

The triumph of the spiritual over the temporal power, in the person of the King, and well nigh over the law of the land, was complete. And thus the ambitious purposes of the papacy were better served by the death of their champion than they could have been by a prolongation of his life.

REFLECTIONS ON THE CLOSE OF THE GREAT STRUGGLE

By way of helping the reader to form a fair judgment on this long and bitter contest, we offer a few reflections. Nothing, we believe, can give the protestant reader so just an estimate of the real spirit of popery as a history of its ambitious designs, and its unscrupulous means of attaining them.

If we inquire, What was the real object of the great and tragic struggle, what answer can be given? Was it for the spiritual liberties of the church of God, that she might be privileged to worship and serve Him according to the teaching of His holy word? Had the primate or the pope in view, the civil and religious liberties of individual Christians, or the welfare of mankind at large? Or did they even raise the voice of remonstrance against the King or his court for their open and flagrant violation of the laws of God, and warn them of judgment to come? All who have taken pains to examine the details of the controversy must admit, however sorrowfully, that none of these worthy objects had any place in their thoughts. Their object was one, and only one *priestly power!* Every thing — truth, Christianity, the peace of the church,

the peace of the nation, to say nothing of the glory of Christ, or the realities of eternity — all were sacrificed on the altar of the deified claims of the clergy. Becket was the representative of these claims. He demanded for the persons and property of the clergy an absolute inviolable sanctity. "From beginning to end," says Milman "it was a strife for the authority, the immunities, the possessions of the clergy. The liberty of the church was the exemption of the clergy from law; the vindication of their separate, exclusive, distinctive existence from the rest of mankind. It must be acknowledged by all, that if the King would have consented to allow the churchmen to despise all law — if he had not insisted on hanging priests guilty of homicide as freely as laymen — he might have gone on unreproved in his career of ambition; he might unrebuked have lived in direct violation of every christian precept of justice, humanity, conjugal fidelity, extorted without remonstrance of the clergy any revenue from his subjects, if he had kept his hands from the treasures of the church."

Such is the solemn and weighty judgment of a church dignitary, who will not be accused of prejudice against his own class, but whose criticisms are considered most valuable and just, as his history is in other respects most reliable.

We not only agree with all the Dean says but would add that no language, however weighty and solemn, could adequately express the depths of evil which were sheltered and propagated by the papal system. We speak not thus, be it observed, of the Catholic church, or rather of the church ecclesiastically considered as distinct from the papacy; but of the secular ambition and unscrupulous policy of the popes, especially from the time of Hildebrand. But there have been, notwithstanding, during the darkest period of her history, many dear saints of God in her communion, who knew nothing of the evil ways of the bishop of Rome and his council. This the Lord Himself intimates, in His address to Thyatira. "But unto you I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira, as many as have not this doctrine, and which have not known the depths of Satan." Here we find a believing remnant connected with a system which is characterised by "the depths of Satan." (Rev. 2:24)

Before taking our leave of this already long story, we would further add, that the tragic **death of Becket** was immediately and diligently improved by the disciples of his school. Biographies and memoirs of the martyr, we are informed, were multiplied and scattered abroad with surprising industry. The strong element of idolatry, which has ever been in the church of Rome, now became manifest in England. Pilgrimages to the tomb of the martyr for the remission of sins became fashionable; and the saint himself became an object of popular devotion. Pilgrims from all parts flocked to his shrine, and enriched it with the most costly gifts and offerings. A large trade was done in articles said to have been in contact with his person, and were now invested with miraculous virtue. As many as one hundred thousand pilgrims were registered on one occasion in Canterbury. Even Louis VII of France made a

pilgrimage to the wonder-working tomb, and bestowed on the shrine a jewel which was esteemed the richest in Christendom. But **Henry VIII** dared to pillage the rich shrine, ordered the saint to be raised, his bones to be burnt, and his ashes to be thrown to the winds.

SHORT PAPERS ON CHURCH HISTORY

CHAPTER 23

THE THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME

We are now crossing the threshold of the thirteenth century. The great actors and the stirring times of the twelfth have passed away. The reflection is a solemn one. Beyond the line that separates the two states of being, it is well that we cannot pass. And were it not that the agitation of the twelfth century is really though remotely connected with the great Reformation of the sixteenth, it would possess but little interest to us in the nineteenth. But in these men and their times, we see the great currents of human thought and feeling which had their rise in the monastery, and their results in the civil and religious liberty which we now enjoy under the good providence of God.

A new generation, another class of men, now occupy the ground. The popes, the primates, the emperors, the monks the philosophers, the demagogues, with whom we had become familiar, have made room for others. But whither are they gone? Where are they now? We only ask the question that we may be led to improve our own day and our own precious opportunities — that we may not have to lament with the prophet of old, “The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved.” (Jer. 8:20)

The right time has come, we believe, when the witnesses for God and His truth should have a special place in our history. They come prominently before us from the close of the twelfth century. But first of all it may be well to place before our readers certain theological definitions and usages of the Roman church at this time, for we shall find that by these the witnesses were judged, and the papacy gained its power over the lives and liberties of the saints of God.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS

In the New Testament, where all is plain and simple, we only read of two sacraments, or divine institutions, as connected with a saved people — baptism and the Lord’s supper But in both the Greek and Latin churches the number had been greatly increased and variously stated by different theologians. It was no longer a question of divine revelation, but of the human imagination. Some speak of as many as **twelve sacraments;** but in the Western church the mystical number of seven was ultimately established, as corresponding with the idea of the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Ghost. And these were —

baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, ordination, and matrimony.[150]

Thus was the snare laid for the feet of the true followers of Christ. It mattered not how sincerely a man believed and obeyed the word of God, if he disregarded the sacraments of the church and her numerous ceremonies, he exposed himself to the charge and the consequences of heresy. On the other hand, it mattered nothing though the word of God was utterly despised, if obedience to the church was professed. But for all who followed the Lord according to His word escape was impossible. The net was widely spread.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION

To attempt an enumeration of all the additions made to the outward observances of religion would be hopeless. Many new rites, ceremonies, usages, holidays, and festivals were added from time to time, both by the pontiffs publicly and by the priests privately. But no priestly invention ever made such way, or produced such an impression on the popular mind, as transubstantiation. The dogma nowhere occurs in the writings of either the Greek or Latin Fathers. The first trace of it is to be found in the eighth century. In the ninth, a period of great darkness, the monk Pascasius seems to have given form and definiteness to the monster superstition. In the eleventh, it was strongly opposed by Berengar of Tours, and ably defended by Anselm of Canterbury. It continued to be a subject of contention among the doctors till the fourth Lateran council, which was held in the year 1215. It was then placed among the settled doctrines of the church of Rome. By a canon of that council it was affirmed, that when the officiating priest utters the words of consecration, the sacramental elements of bread and wine are converted into the substance of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. "The body and blood of Christ," they say, "are contained really in the sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine; the bread being transubstantiated into the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine into His blood, by the power of God, through the officiating priest. The change thus effected is declared to be so perfect and complete, that the elements contain Christ whole and entire — divinity, humanity, soul, body, and blood, with all their component parts."[151]

From that period, the consecrated bread of the Eucharist received divine honours. Important changes also were introduced about the same time in the manner of administering the sacrament. The consecrated wine, it was said, was in danger of being profaned by the beard dipping into the chalice, from the sick not being able to swallow it, and from children being likely to spill it. So the cup was withheld from the laity and the sick; and infant communion discontinued altogether, at least by the Latins: the Greeks retained it and still practise it.

---

[150] See J.C. Robertson, vol. 3, pp. 259-272.

[151] Gardner's *Faiths of the World,* vol. 2, p. 905. See also an able essay on this subject, Edgar's *Variations of Popery*, pp. 347-388.

The most dreadful **superstitions** naturally followed the establishment of the doctrine of transubstantiation. At a certain part of the mass service the priest elevates the host the consecrated sacramental wafer — and at the same instant the people fall prostrate before it in worship. On some occasions, the wafer is placed in a beautiful casket, and carried in solemn procession through the streets, every individual, as it passes him, bowing the knee in token of adoration. In Spain when a priest carries the consecrated wafer to a person who is supposed to be dying, he is accompanied by a man ringing a small bell; and at the sound of the bell all who hear it are obliged to fall on their knees and remain in that posture as long as they hear its sound. The priests make the people believe that the living God, in the form of bread, resides in that casket, and may be carried from place to place. Surely this is the consummation of all iniquity, idolatry, and blasphemy; and the exposing of everything sacred to the ridicule of the profane. It was conceived and cradled in a time of great ignorance, depravity, and superstition.

Such was and is the daring wickedness of the **Popish priesthood;** such the pitiful but guilty blindness of the Romish church! Yet God has suffered it a thousand years; but a day of reckoning will come when He will judge the secrets of men's hearts, not by the standard of a Roman ritual, but by the gospel of Jesus Christ our Lord. "For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to Me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." (Rom. 14:11, 12)

MARY-WORSHIP

The worship of the Virgin Mary originally sprang from the ascetic spirit which became so prevalent in the fourth century. Before this period, there is no trace of the worship of Mary. About the same time — the close of the fourth century — it was discovered and circulated that there were in the temple at Jerusalem virgins consecrated to God, among whom Mary grew up in vows of perpetual virginity. This new doctrine led to the veneration of Mary as the very ideal of the celibate state, and sanctioned the profession of religious chastity. Soon after this it became customary to apply to the virgin the appellation, **"Mother of God;"** which gave rise to the Nestorian controversy. But, in spite of all opposition, Mary-worship prevailed; and, in the fifth century, images and beautiful paintings of the virgin, holding the infant Jesus in her arms were placed in all the churches. Thus introduced she rapidly rose into an object of direct worship; and Mariolatry became the ruling passion of the Romish church. The daily office for Mary, and the days and festivals which had been dedicated to her honour, were confirmed by Urban II in the Council of Clermont, A.D. 1095.

Reverence for the blessed virgin was now an established doctrine and practice in the church of Rome, and has so continued down to the present day. Romanists may affect to deny that they honour Mary with the worship due to God only, but in their books of devotion prayers to the virgin occupy a

prominent place. No prayer, we believe, is in more constant use than the "Aye Maria," or **"Hail Mary,"** which, after quoting a passage from the salutation of the angel Gabriel to the virgin, adds these words, "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now, and in the hour of death, Amen." Again, in another prayer, the virgin is thus addressed, "We fly to thy patronage, O holy Mother of God, despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin." Another runs thus, "Hail, holy Queen, Mother of mercy, our life, our sweetness, and our hope! to thee we cry, poor banished sons of Eve, to thee we send up our sighs, mourning, and weeping in this valley of tears, turn, then, most gracious advocate, thine eyes of mercy towards us," etc. She is also called, "Ark of the Covenant," "Gate of heaven," "Morning Star," "Refuge of sinners," and many other such terms, which plainly show the idolatrous place which Mary occupies in the devotions of the Romish church.[152]

The **Rosary,** that is, a series of prayers, and a string of beads by which they are counted — consists of fifteen decades. Each decade contains ten Ave Marias, marked by small beads, preceded by a Pater Noster, marked by a larger bead, and concluded by a Gloria Patri. The Romish Breviary also, the great universal book of devotion, of which every priest must read a portion each day in private under pain of mortal sin, uses the following strong language as to the virgin: "If the winds of temptation arise, if thou run upon the rocks of tribulation, look to the star, call upon Mary. If thou art tossed on the waves of pride, of ambition, of distraction, of envy, look to the star, call upon Mary. If anger or avarice, or the temptation of the flesh toss the bark of thy mind, look to Mary. If disturbed with the greatness of thy sins, troubled at the defilement of thy conscience, affrighted at the horrors of the judgment, thou beginnest to be swallowed up in the gulf of sadness, the abyss of despair, think upon Mary — in dangers, in difficulties, in doubts, think upon Mary, invoke Mary." So completely did the worship of Mary become the worship of Christendom, that every cathedral, almost every spacious church, had its "*Chapel of our Lady.*"

It is surely more than evident from these quotations, that Mary is addressed as not only an intercessor with her Son but the first and highest object of worship. And these are calm and sober specimens compared with the wild language of a chivalrous adoration, which is to be found in hymns, psalters, and breviaries. The attributes of Godhead are assigned to her, and she is represented as the **Queen of Heaven,** and sitting between cherubim and seraphim. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception was the natural result of this growing adoration of Mary. It has been re-asserted as an article of faith in the Romish church by the present pope and generally accepted.

---

[152] For details see "Mariolatry," Gardner's *Faiths of the World,* vol. 2, p. 372. Butler's *Lives of the Saints,* October 1 — the great Roman Catholic book on this subject.

SAINT-WORSHIP

The origin of saint-worship may be considered as coeval with that of Mary-worship, and the fruit of the same soil. Indeed it is the same thing; only Mary is raised high above all the host of saints and martyrs because of her peculiar sanctity and her great influence in heaven.

The veneration that was paid in the early ages of Christianity to those who had faithfully witnessed and suffered for Christ, no doubt led to the practice of invoking the saints, and imploring the benefit of their intercession. A pardonable affection became a superstitious veneration, and ended in a positive adoration. The step between veneration and adoration is easy and natural, though not always observable. Hence the importance of the apostle's warning, "Little children, keep yourselves from idols." According to this word it would appear, that all who have not the Person of Christ before them, as the one all-governing object of the heart have an idol. The apostle has just been speaking of our wondrous place and blessing in Him; as he says, "We are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." Having eternal life in Him, and being identified with Him as to our position before God, surely He ought to be our one object. Any other is an idol. And the best of Christians are in danger of paying too much homage to some favourite teacher or leader. How will all this compare with John's epistle in the last great day? The Lord keep us from undue veneration for the creature, whether living or dead!

A great and influential system arose out of these small beginnings, through the subtlety of the priesthood, which ultimately brought enormous wealth to the church. **Pilgrimages** with their atonement money and free-will offerings are parts of the system. At an early period it was customary to perform religious services with peculiar sanctity at the graves of the saints and martyrs. But as the darkness thickened and the spirit of superstition increased, this was not enough. In the fourth century splendid churches were built over their once humble burial-places; and even some supposed relic of the saint was enshrined in the building erected to his honour. It was usually affirmed that the body of the miracle-working saint was buried under the high altar; and that there was a special efficacy in the intercession of such saints. This drew myriads to their shrines; some to see wonders done, others to have miracles wrought in their favour, or receive good to their souls. Pilgrimages soon became the most popular kind of worship, and as the worshippers were lavish with their oblations — their hearts being warm and tender- it was greatly encouraged by a sordid priesthood. During the sixth century an incredible number of temples arose in honour of the saints, and numerous festivals were instituted to keep up the remembrance of these holy men.

According to Milman and others, so popular did saint-worship become, that they were in danger of being overlooked because of their multiplicity, or rather, infinity. "The crowded calendar knew not what day it could assign to

the new saint without clashing with, or dispossessing, an old one. The East and the West vied with each other in their fertility. But of the countless saints of the East, few comparatively were received in the West; and the East as disdainfully rejected many of the most famous, whom the West worshipped with the most earnest devotion. Still the multiplicity of the saints bears witness to the universality of the idolatry." Rivalry of church with church, of town with town, of kingdom with kingdom, of order with order, kept up a state of excitement for centuries, in order to attract the concourse of worshippers to the shrine of their patron saint. The fame of some new celebrated saint, such as St. Thomas of Canterbury, drew away, for a time, the traffic and profit from other places. Hence the necessity of creating some fresh excitement by fresh discoveries of that which would turn the tide in favour of the new shrine. Even while we write — September, 1873, most sorrowful to say, nearly a thousand pilgrims from England are on their way, not with naked feet as of old, to Paray-le-monial, in France; there to bow down before the shrine of the **"Sacred Heart,"** in honour of the blessed Mother, Margaret Mary Alacoque. This is a surprise to all, and awakens deep thoughts in many minds as to its real object in the mind of the papacy. Professedly of course it is for the good of the pilgrims' souls, the honour of the saint, and the triumph of the church. If we go as far back as the days of Origen, who was the first to inculcate saint-worship or to the shrine of Martin of Tours, which was the most popular in the fourth and fifth centuries; and come down to the present day, we have about fourteen hundred years of saint-worship and pilgrimages both in the Greek and Latin churches. No wonder that the Mahometans concluded that all Christians were idolaters.

Most of us have been familiar with the names of what may be called *universal saints,* such as the early fathers and the **patron saints of kingdoms;** but to discover on a closer search the extent of this idolatry is truly appalling. Throughout the extent of Roman Christendom there is to every country community, and individual, an intercessor with Christ, who is the One Great Intercessor between God and man. Many Catholics chose their patron saint from their birthday — the saint's day on which they were born. The saint is regarded as the peculiar protector of the individual, community, or country; so that scarcely less than divine power and divine will are assigned to the patron saints. The argument is that having been human, and still possessed of human sympathies, they are less awful, more accessible, than Christ, and may exercise their influence with Him for the benefit of the places and companions of their earthly sojourn. They are represented however as being changeable, and easily offended. Fruitful harvests, victory in war, deliverance in affliction, safety in travelling, and the like mercies, are attributed to their prayers; but, if there should be calamities, the saint is supposed to be offended, and must be appeased. More honour must be paid to his shrine, and more costly offerings must be laid upon his altar.

RELIC-WORSHIP

The history of relic-worship being similar in its character to that of saint-worship, a brief notice will be sufficient. Its origin is the same. The passion, the weakness, it may be, of our nature, for cherishing memorials of beloved ones, was used by the enemy to betray Christians into the most degrading kind of worship. If it was argued, our fondness for the memorials of human affection be so excusable, and so amiable, "how much more so of objects of holy love, the saints, the blessed Virgin, the Saviour Himself!" But however specious such reasoning may be, it is neither fair nor true. The deep delusion, the Satanic power, and the terrible wickedness of relic-worship, lies mainly in the fact, that the church of Rome maintains *that there is an inherent indefeasible power in relics to work miracles;* and as such they are used and devoutly worshipped, from the pope down to the lowest in her communion.

As early as the days of Constantine, reverence for the **relics of saints and martyrs** had assumed the more definite form of positive adoration. The Empress Helena, mother of Constantine, in her superstitious zeal to do honour to the places in Palestine which had been hallowed by the life and death of the Saviour, erected splendid churches over the supposed places of His birth, His death, and ascension. During the necessary excavations the Holy Sepulchre, it was affirmed, came to light; and in the sepulchre were found the three crosses and the tablet, with the inscription originally written by Pilate in three languages. The news of this wonderful discovery rapidly spread all over Christendom, and created great excitement. As it was doubtful to which of the crosses the tablet belonged, a miracle decided the claims of the true cross. Singularly enough, the nails of the Saviour's passion were also found in the holy sepulchre. These precious treasures, we need scarcely say, proved inexhaustible capital for the traffic in relics. Parts of the true cross were made into crucifixes for the rich, and parts were enshrined in the principal churches both in the East and the West. So rapidly did the wood of the cross vegetate, said the wits, that it soon grew into a forest.

The passion for relics, which had been increasing every century, was greatly nourished by the crusades. Many saints before unknown, and relics innumerable, were then introduced to the Christians of the West. Passing over the vast quantity of old bones of reputed saints and other smaller relics, which were brought from the East, and became an important branch of traffic, we notice two or three of the most famous. And chief amongst these was the **"holy vessel" —** a green glass cup, said to be an emerald — brought from Caesarea, and venerated as having been used at the last supper. Another relic of great fame was the **seamless coat** of our Lord said to be found at Argenteuil in 1156; and also the *holy coat,* said to have been presented by the Empress Helena to the Archbishop of Treves.

We need only further add as a practical illustration of relic-worship, that in holy week every year the pope and cardinals go in procession to St. Peter's at

Rome, for the purpose of adoring the three great relics. When performing the ceremony they kneel in the nave of the church, and the relics, which are exhibited from the balcony above the statue of St. Veronica, consist of a part of the wood of the true cross, one half of the spear that pierced the Saviour's side, and the holy countenance. This latter relic is a piece of cloth on which our Lord is said to have miraculously impressed His countenance, and which was brought to Italy for the cure of the Emperor Tiberias when afflicted with leprosy. The ceremony takes place in solemn silence. Outwardly no act of worship is more profound in the Roman Catholic church. Could folly, we may ask, or absurdity, or human weakness, or Satanic power, be carried to a greater height? For men of education, and, in many cases, men of cultivation and piety, to bow down in profoundest adoration before a piece of rotten wood, a broken spear, and a painted rag, can only be accounted for on the principle of the most solemn judicial blindness. Gross darkness has long settled down on both priest and people through their deliberate concealment of the word of God and quenching the light of the Holy Spirit. And this must always be the case, more or less, whether for Catholic or for Protestant, when God and His word are disregarded, as saith the prophet, "Give glory to the Lord your God, before he cause darkness, and before your feet stumble on the dark mountains, and while ye look for light, he turn it into the shadow of death, and make it gross darkness." (Jer. 13:16)

PURGATORY

Augustine, bishop of Hippo, is said to be the first who suggested the doctrine of a middle state, but his opinions are vague and uncertain. It was not formally received as a dogma of the church of Rome until the time of Gregory the Great, A.D. 600. He has the reputation of being the discoverer of the fires of purgatory. In discussing the question of the state of the soul after death, he distinctly says, "We must believe that for some slight transgressions there is a purgatorial fire before the day of judgment." But as the growth of this doctrine for hundreds of years is extremely difficult to trace, we will refer at once to the decrees of the Council of Trent, the great and undisputed authority on the subject.

"There is a purgatory," says the Council, "and the souls detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful but especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the Mass. This holy council commands all bishops diligently to endeavour that the wholesome doctrine concerning purgatory, delivered unto us by venerable fathers and sacred councils, be believed, held, taught, and everywhere preached by Christ's faithful… In the fire of purgatory the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country, into which nothing that defileth entereth… The

sacrifice of the Mass is offered for those that are deceased in Christ, not entirely purged."[153]

Roman Catholic writers attempt to support this dreadful dogma from various passages of scripture, but chiefly from the Apocrypha and tradition. With the two latter we have nothing to do. Anything men please may be proved from such uncertain sources; but nothing can be more daring, and at the same time more futile, than their misapplication of scripture on this subject. Take two texts as an example: 1. "Thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." (Matt. 5:26) Here the Catholics are inconsistent with themselves; for if venal sins are forgiven in purgatory, the passage speaks of the uttermost farthing being paid. Surely we cannot speak of a debt being forgiven, and at the same time paid to the last farthing. 2. "Quickened by the Spirit, by which [clearly, 'by which Spirit'] also he went and preached unto the **spirits in prison."** (1 Peter 3:18, 19) This passage can have no reference to the supposed prison of purgatory, for those who are guilty of mortal sin do not go there. And, strangely inconsistent according to the Douay version of the passage, the antediluvians were "incredulous," unbelievers, guilty of mortal sin. And, as we have seen in our extracts, purgatory is only for "those that are deceased in Christ, not entirely purged." The passage also teaches that Christ did not preach in *person.* He preached by the Spirit in Noah to the antediluvians who are *now* in prison. So little to the point are the texts alleged in favour of purgatory, that thoughtful Roman Catholics endeavour to support the dogma by the authority of the church alone.

There is much vagueness with Romish writers, and even with the Council of Trent, as to **where** purgatory is, and **what** it actually is. The general opinion seems to be that it is under the earth, and adjoining to hell — that it is a middle place between heaven and hell, in which the soul passes through the fire of purification before it enters heaven.

But how material fire can purify a spirit, Catholic writers have been careful enough not to define. Those in the middle state, says the Council of Florence, A.D. 1439, are in a place of torment, "but whether it be fire, or storm, or anything else, we do not dispute." Still the general voice seems to be that it is a prison, in which the soul is detained, and tortured as well as cleansed, and that, not by mental anguish or remorse, but by a real fire, or what fire produces. And yet so varied are the opinions of their best theologians, that some have represented the torments as a sudden transition from extreme heat to extreme cold. But the vague speculations of Augustine, and the adventurous dogmas of Gregory, were soon authenticated by dreams and visions. In the dark ages there were many travellers to those subterranean regions, who inspected and reported the secrets of purgatory. Take one report as an example, and that the mildest and the least offensive we can choose.

---

[153] Paul's Council *of Trent, p.* 750. See also, for details, Milner's *End of Controversy*, Letter 43.

THE REGION OF PURGATORY

"Drithelm, whose story is related by authorities no less than Bede and Bellarmine, was led on his journey by an angel in shining raiment, and proceeded in the company of his guide towards the rising sun. The travellers arrived at length in a valley of vast dimensions. This region, to the left, was covered with roasting furnaces, and, to the right, with icy cold, hail, and snow. The whole valley was filled with human souls, which a tempest seemed to toss in all directions. The unhappy spirits, unable in the one part to bear the violent heat, leaped into the shivering cold, which again drove them into the scorching flames which cannot be quenched. A numberless multitude of deformed souls were in this manner whirled about and tormented, without intermission, in the extremes of alternate heat and cold. This, according to the angelic conductor who piloted Drithelm, is the place of chastisement for such as defer confession and amendment till the hour of death. All these, however, will at the last day be admitted to heaven; while many, through alms, vigils, prayers,. and especially the Mass, will be liberated even before the general judgment."[154] Any one may see at a glance the intention of this vision. It is skillfully drawn up, so as to act powerfully on the fears of the serious, to increase the power of the priesthood, and to secure large legacies for the church.

And is this the place, we may ask, to which holy mother church sends her pious and penitent children? Yes, and it is only the justified that go there. Those who die under the guilt of mortal sins go straight to hell, over the gloomy gates of which is written, "There is no hope." How dreadful the thought of purgatory must always be to every devout mind! As an illustration of this, we may mention that we happen to know at this moment a young lady who has lately embraced the Catholic religion, or, as the term is, "gone over to Rome." She is rigidly devoted to the church, fresh in her first love, but evidently winces at the thought of purgatory. "I believe I shall go there," she will say; "I hope to go; for as I cannot pretend to be good enough to go straight to heaven when I die, I must pass through purgatory, but I may not be more than five hundred years there." There is no doubt of her being a true Christian, and justified from all things, but such is the blinding power of Satan through the papal system. We can only rejoice that ere long they will be happily undeceived, according to many portions of the word of God; such as — "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light."… " Absent from the body, present with the Lord."… " Today shalt thou be with Me in paradise."… " Having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better."… " The beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom."… " Thy sins, which were many are forgiven." (Col. 1:2; 2 Cor. 5; Luke 23; Phil. 1; Luke 16:22)

---

[154] Edgar's *Variations of Popery,* p. 455.

It is perfectly plain from these passages, and many others that might be quoted, that the same moment the soul of the believer leaves the body it is present with the Lord in the paradise of God — surely the happiest place in all heaven. What then can be the object of the Romish church so to pervert scripture — so to deny the efficacy of the blood of Christ, which is said to cleanse the believer from all sin? To answer this question, the mind must comprehend and grapple with the very depths of Satan.

THE USES MADE OF PURGATORY

Historically, the use which has been made of this Satanic superstition by the Romish priesthood has been to act upon the fears and affections of mankind. What would the young lady referred to above, or her fond parents, not give to save her five hundred years' torment in that dreadful abode? Praying souls out of purgatory, by Masses said on their behalf, became a source of untold treasure to the church. With a rich man dying, who could not take his wealth with him and who dreaded the torments of purgatory, the priest could make his own terms. Besides, out of this superstition arose the scandalous traffic in papal indulgences to mitigate the pains of the middle passage.

But there is yet another point of wickedness connected with this dogma, which we wonder the heart of man or of Satan could ever have conceived, and that is the **priest's authority** over his victim after he is dead and buried. He makes the departing soul believe that it will still be dependent on his influence, his intervention; that he has the key of purgatory, and that his doom hangs upon the word from the priest's lips. Surely these are the depths of Satan — we tremble as we seek to penetrate them. But lies they all are; and the most fearful blasphemy for any man to say that the keys of heaven, hell, and purgatory have been entrusted to

"Fear not," said the blessed Lord to John; "I have the keys of hell [hades] and of death." He only has power and authority over the unseen world, but scripture makes all plain to faith, that God "hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son." Here it is plainly taught that the believer is not only pardoned and saved, but that he is *now* delivered from the whole realm of darkness, and *now* translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son. The language need not be mistaken; "Who hath" — not who will, or who can — but "Who hath:" it is true now, and the truth is to be enjoyed now. There is no power but in the hands of the risen Lord, and no purgatory but His precious blood, unless it be the washing of water by the word also. "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." (Rev. 1:17, 18; Col. 1.13; Ps. 51:7, John 13, 15; 1 John 5)

The Greek Abyssinian, and Armenian churches **reject the doctrine of purgatory** in name, but hold it substantially. Prayers and masses are said for the dead, and incense burned over the graves of the deceased.[155]

EXTREME UNCTION

Like every false system, popery is glaringly inconsistent with itself. Falsehood, the mother of lies, is written upon her forehead, though there may be many honest and godly hearts in her communion. How unlike the perfect unity of divine truth! Though written by so many different persons, on so many different subjects, under so many different circumstances, and in so many different places and ages of the world, yet we have a perfect whole. Who can fail to see the glories of the cross, the riches of divine grace the lost condition of the sinner, and his full salvation, ail through scripture; for example, in Abel's lamb, Noah's ark, and in the cleansing of the leper? But in passing from one sacrament to another of the Romish system we find the flattest contradictions. Thus it is with purgatory and extreme unction. If there be any truth in extreme unction, purgatory is a mere delusion. There can be no such place, and no need for such a place. The declared object, and the effect of the sacred oil according to the **Council of Trent,** is to wipe away the remains of sins. The heretic who despises it must go straight to the depths of hell. Thus it is administered.

"The priest, having entered the house, shall put over his surplice a violet-covered stole, and present the cross to the sick person, to be devoutly kissed. Prayers having been recited, and holy water sprinkled, the priest dips his thumb in the holy oil, and anoints the sick, in the form of the cross. Beginning with the sense of sight, he anoints each eye, saying, 'The Lord, through His holy unction, and His most gracious compassion, forgive thee whatever sins thou hast committed by seeing.' After this manner there are seven annointings, one for each of the five senses — eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, and the other two are the breast and feet." After many prayers and crossings and the ceremony of burning the cloth which wiped the oil off the different parts of the anointed body and the priest's thumb, the dying man or woman is pronounced in a fit state to pass with safety to the port of eternal happiness.

This sacrament is never administered while there is any expectation of recovery to health. It is called **extreme** because it is the last to be administered. By means of this so-called infallible sacrament for the dying, one would naturally expect that purgatory would receive very few subjects from the church of Rome, so that it must be peopled by Protestants who despise the priestly ointment, or by those in the Romish communion who were disqualified to receive the sacrament. But there is great variety of opinion amongst Romanists on this subject. Some think that every soul without exception, from the pope downwards, however saintly the life may have been,

---

[155] Gardner's *Faiths of the World,* p. 721. Milman, vol. 6, p. 428.

or however properly the last sacrament may have been administered, must pass through purgatory — that no soul can pass direct from earth to heaven. They argue that, as no man has complete control over his thoughts, foolish and even sinful thoughts may pass through his mind during the administration of extreme unction, or immediately after it; therefore the soul must pass through the realm of purgatory on its way to heaven. Of course the sin may be so small that the detention may be very short. But even a Gregory or a Bernard must be purified by the fires of purgatory. Alas for the children of Rome! we would exclaim, they must all be the slaves of the prince of purgatory before they can taste the liberty and happiness of heaven. How dreadful, how gloomy, the thoughts of death must ever be! How different from the thoughts and feelings of the great apostle, when he said, "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." If he lived, he lived Christ; he enjoyed the fullest and sweetest fellowship with Him: if he died, he made a gain upon that… "Having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better." Besides, the word of God is positive as to all believers in Christ Jesus — "Absent from the body, present with the Lord." (Phil. 1: 21-23; 2 Cor. 5:8)

The allusion in the New Testament to the ancient practice of **anointing** has given the Catholic writers great boldness in pressing the necessity of this sacrament. But they carefully overlook or conceal the fact, that scriptural anointing was for the miraculous healing of the body, and the lengthening of the days of the living. Romish unction is for the soul — a permanent sacrament for the conveyance of grace, the pardon of sin, the attainment of salvation, in the hour of death. Apostolic unction was for the recovery of health; extreme unction is the last preparation for death. "And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." (Mark 6:13; James 5:14, 15)

It is not difficult to see how superstition would use such passages for the accomplishment of its own ends; but it is perfectly plain that the original anointing was used for the recovery of health in particular persons, and continued while the gift of healing and the power of working miracles remained, which probably scarce survived the apostolic age. And extreme unction, in its present form, was unknown in the church during the first eleven centuries of her history. It was established during the reign of ignorance and priestcraft in the twelfth century, and ultimately received the stamp of the great seal of the Council of Trent.

AURICULAR CONFESSION

The sacraments of the church of Rome being considered necessary to spiritual life, and at the disposal of the priesthood, necessarily gave them enormous power. But none of its many sacraments tended to increase the influence of

the priests, or to enslave and lower the morality of the people more than auricular **confession.** From the Emperor to the peasant the whole heart of every man and woman belonging to the church of Rome was laid open to the priest. No act scarcely a thought, at least in the dark ages. was kept a secret from the father confessor. To conceal or disguise the truth was a sin to be punished with the most humiliating penance, or, it might be, with the pains of hell for ever. Before a power so arbitrary, so irresponsible, so dreaded who did not tremble? The priests thus became a kind of spiritual police, to whom every man was bound to inform against himself. They knew the secrets of all persons, of all families, of all governments, of all societies, and, of course how to rule and lay their plans so as to accomplish whatever they pleased. The conscience, the moral as well as the religious or spiritual being of man, were in their power. It was like the seal and consummation of all wickedness and blasphemy. Fathers and sons, mothers and daughters, masters and servants, were all under their secret, but real supervision and control.

The power thus gained in the confessional was exercised for the alleged good of the church — sometimes on granting delaying, or refusing absolution, as the case might be. All depended on the ends to be gained by the church: the most selfish, cruel, and unprincipled use has often been made of information thus religiously given. We refer especially to the long protracted cases of dispute and discipline, which never could be settled until the church had gained the day. Excommunication was a real thing in those days, and the pope a real antagonist. When Hildebrand thundered a sentence of excommunication against Henry, released his subjects from their oath of fealty, and pronounced him deprived of his throne, he found it a vain thing to fight against the pope though he was at that time the greatest sovereign in Europe. He was forced to yield; and in the most degraded condition, barefoot, and shivering with cold, he humbly supplicated the inexorable monk to remove the censure of the church, and reinstate him on his throne. The awful sentence of excommunication cut the offender off, whatever his rank or station, and as salvation was considered an utter impossibility beyond the pale of the Romish church, there was no hope for any one dying under this sentence. Even the body might be denied a resting-place in consecrated ground, but the soul would be the prey of demons for ever.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CONFESSIONAL

The history of this innovation is not easily traced, neither is it necessary for our purpose. The question of private confession, and of priestly absolution, had often been discussed by the theologians, but no definite law on the subject was laid down by the church till the beginning of the thirteenth century. In the year 1215, under the pontificate of Innocent III, the practice of auricular confession was authoritatively enjoined by the fourth Council of Lateran upon the faithful of both sexes at least once a year. From that time, down to the present day, it has been considered a positive divine ordinance in the church of Rome. It is also practised in the Greek and Coptic churches.

The principal passages of scripture adduced by Romanists on this subject, are — "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed."… " Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." (James 5:16; John 20:23) The first of these passages evidently refers to the mutual confession of faults on the part of Christians; and the second to church discipline, but neither certainly to the secret confession of sins into the ear of a priest, with the view of receiving absolution. The duty, or privilege, of confession must be admitted by all, Protestants as well as Catholics; but the question is, to whom ought we to confess? To a priest, or to God? Numerous passages might be quoted, from both the Old and New Testaments, to prove that confession of sin is to be made to God. Take one from each. "And Joshua said unto Achan, My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the Lord God of Israel, and make confession unto him; and tell me now what thou hast done; hide it not from me."… " If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (Joshua 7:19; 1 John 1:8, 9)

But the **form of confession** prescribed by the Romish church to be used by every penitent at the confessional will best show us its real character. He must kneel down at the side of his confessor, and make the sign of the cross, saying, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, "I confess to Almighty God, to the blessed Mary, ever virgin, to blessed Michael the archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter, and Paul, to all the saints, and to you, my ghostly father, that I have sinned exceedingly, in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault." At this point of the ceremony the penitent specifies his several sins in their details, without evasion or equivocation; the most indelicate or the most diabolical are poured into the ear of the priest, whatever he may be. We know what many of them have been. When the priest has satisfied himself with details, the penitent goes on — "Therefore I beseech the blessed Mary, ever virgin, the blessed Michael the archangel, blessed John Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints, and you, my ghostly father, to pray to our Lord God for me. I am heartily sorry, purpose amendment for the future, and most humbly ask pardon of God, and penance and absolution of you, my ghostly father."[156]

The penitent is now in the hands, and entirely at the mercy of the priest. He may prescribe the most unreasonable penance, or delay his absolution until his own evil ends are gained. But there we must leave them, and briefly notice, under the head of Roman Theology, the kindred dogma of

[156] Gardner's *Faiths of the World,* vol. 1, p. 582. Milman, vol. 6, p. 361.

INDULGENCES

The system of papal indulgences, which gradually rose to such heights and ultimately produced such effects, demands a careful though brief notice. It has ever been the practice of the evil genius of Rome to introduce by small beginnings the greatest evils that characterize her history. Imperceptibly, the thin end of the wedge is introduced by the presiding spirit of her policy, but when fairly introduced, the whole machinery of Rome is employed to drive it home. By an apparent respect for the memory of the dead, and a proper regard for the tokens of their affection, the sin of saint and relic worship was introduced, which resulted in the most positive and confirmed idolatry. And so with the whole system of indulgences. The ecclesiastical corruption, once admitted, remained, increased, and spread from age to age until all Christendom was overrun with its wickedness, and the moral and religious sense of mankind so insulted by the infamous traffic in indulgences, that a protest was raised and the Reformation followed.

The chief feature in the new doctrine of indulgences was the discovery of a resource or treasury in the church, by the application of which sins were remitted, without the painful or humiliating process of penance, and without the observance of the sacraments. It was alleged by the deep contriver of this sweeping dogma, that there was an infinite treasure of merit in Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the other saints, which was more than sufficient for themselves. Although the Saviour Himself was said to be the source of all merit, the merits of the saints were also much spoken of, and this gave rise to the new idea of works of **supererogation.** By their works of penance, and by their undeserved sufferings in this world, they had done more than was necessary for their own salvation, and by these works of supererogation, with the superabundant merits of Christ, a treasury was formed, of which the pope possessed the keys, and which he could apply for the relief of offenders, both in this life and in purgatory. The power of the keys was thus substituted for the efficacy of the sacrament.

This is the popish theory of indulgences, but its antiscriptural character betrays its author. It is glaringly antiscriptural, as it promises remission of sins without repentance; and, even on Catholic ground, its wickedness is manifest. It supersedes the penitential exercise of the individual; it dissolves the whole discipline of the church; it offers for a sum of money the pardon of all sins committed, a license for sins to be committed; it gives a written guarantee of deliverance from the pains of purgatory, and from hell itself. It encourages the most flagrant iniquity with the profession of Christianity, indeed by this dogma morality was severed from religion. Could even papal depravity go farther? Men emboldened to let loose the reins of vice, to follow at large their own evil ways, and then purchase eternal forgiveness, without any conditions of repentance, for a piece of money! What a day of reckoning awaits the Jezebel of Rome, and all the children of her seduction! The Lord preserve His people from her seductions now!

History places the first formal indulgence issued by the church of Rome in the early part of the eleventh century, but the system was brought into its fullest operation by the crusades. Pope Urban II, at Clermont, in the year 1095, proclaimed a plenary indulgence and remission of sins for all who should share in the **holy war.** It became customary after this period to grant indulgences of lesser degrees. Absolution from a hundred years or more of purgatorial pain might be purchased from a bishop, by repairing or enlarging a church, by building a bridge, or enclosing his forest; and also for extra religious duties, such as reciting a certain number of prayers before a certain altar, pilgrimages to relics, and the like. The pope, according to the theory of the vatican, is the sovereign dispenser of the church's treasury, and this power he dispenses to bishops in their respective dioceses. The pope may grant indulgences to all Christians; the bishop's power is limited to his own diocese.

HISTORY OF INDULGENCES

Thus the system of indulgences prevailed more and more extensively as time advanced; and although, in consequence of its glaring abuses, some of the ablest of the schoolmen did not hesitate to express their objections to the trade that was carried on in the sale of indulgences, others wrote in favour and men generally were unwilling to suffer a long course of severe penance, of unpleasant austerities, when they could obtain immediate absolution by **pecuniary payments,** or so much almsgiving to churches or churchmen. From the earliest period it was the practice of the church of Rome to impose painful works or sufferings on offenders when these were discharged or undergone with humility they were called *satisfactions;* but when the penance was shortened or entirely remitted because of some consideration in money or good works, this was called an *indulgence.* The price was regulated according to the nature of the crime and the circumstance of the purchaser.

The following curious event, as quoted by Milner from Burnet, will give the reader a better idea of the extent of this remarkable trade than anything we could say on the subject, and this happened at a time when, owing to the Reformation, the sale to a great extent, had decreased. "Burnet informs us, that the scandalous sale of pardons and indulgences had by no means so completely ceased in popish countries as is commonly taken for granted. He says, that in Spain and Portugal there is everywhere a commissary, who manages the sale with the most infamous circumstances imaginable. In Spain the King, by an agreement with the pope, has the profits. In Portugal the King and the pope go shares.

"In the year 1709 the privateers of Bristol took a gallion, in which they found five hundred bales of bulls — or printed pardons in the name of the pope — for indulgences… and sixteen reams were in a bale, so that they reckon the whole came to three millions eight hundred and forty thousand. These bulls are imposed on the people and sold, the lowest at three ryals, a little more than twenty pence, but some were as high as about eleven pounds of our

money. All are obliged to buy them against Lent. Besides the account given of this in the cruising voyage, I have a particular attestation of it by Captain Dampier."[157]

But the reader will be better prepared for this almost incredible statement if we are spared to continue our history to the period of its occurrence. In the meantime enough has been said to give him a correct idea of the foundation, character and effects of the traffic. The sacrament of matrimony will come so fully before us in its workings, that we need not now give it a separate paper. So we shall leave for the present the painfully interesting subject of Roman theology, or alas! alas! papal Christianity, and return to our general history.[158]

---

[157] Milner, vol. 3, p. 439.

[158] For full details by Catholic writers on the sacraments, see Paul's *Council of Trent*, Donovan's *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, Milner's *End of Controversy;* and for rather sharp criticisms on these doctrines, see Edgar's *Variations of Popery;* as also the general histories.

SHORT PAPERS ON CHURCH HISTORY

CHAPTER 24

INNOCENT III AND HIS TIMES

A.D. 1198-1216

During the reign of this great pope the Roman See rose to its utmost height. The thirteenth century is commonly distinguished as the noon-day of **pontifical glory.** We have seen the dawn of papal assumption, or rather the first streaks of dawn, in the bold conceptions of Innocent I and Leo the Great in the fifth century. Gregory the Great in the seventh, and Nicholas and John in the ninth centuries, did much towards laying the foundations of the great papal scheme; but it was Gregory VII that raised the superstructure. The one grand object of this bold, ambitious, unscrupulous priest was to restore to papal Rome all that imperial Rome had lost; and thus to set the chair of St. Peter above all other thrones. But the daring pope perished in the desperate struggle. Rome was taken, as we have seen; Hildebrand was compelled to flee, and died in exile at Salerno. For more than a hundred years after his death, no pope filled the chair who could complete the work which he had begun. But in the beginning of the thirteenth century the superior genius of Gregory was surpassed by Innocent. The bold schemes which the former had planned were fully executed by the latter. No doubt the conjunction of many circumstances was favourable, and the powers of his mind were adapted to the accomplishment of his grand object, so that he fully obtained what had haunted the imagination of popes for ages — "sacerdotal supremacy, regal monarchy, and dominion over the kings of the earth." The crowned priest of Rome now moved with a masterly hand, and with unwearied application, the whole machinery of popery, that he might maintain and consolidate the absolute sovereignty of the Roman See. But here, on this summit, we must pause a little for reflection. Let us endeavour to ascertain the mind of God on this great religious system, not merely the testimony of history.

THE BABYLON OF REVELATION 17

It has been our desire from the commencement of this work, to study history from a scriptural point of view; but more especially in the light of the epistles to the seven Apocalyptic churches. The evils which were only budding then are now full-blown. In Pergamos, we have Balaam teaching "to commit fornication;" and in Thyatira, we have Jezebel introduced, who imposed idolatry by force. But these and many other evils we shall now find concentrated in the cup of the false **woman of Revelation 17.**

There can be no question, we think, as to what is meant by the symbol here used. Not only a woman, but a licentious woman, and enthroned amidst the corruptions of the seven-hilled city. “And here is the mind that hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth.” Here we have a material point — that which has always characterized Rome, both in prose and poetry; as one has said, speaking of Arnold of Brescia, “In the service of freedom, his eloquence thundered over the seven hills.” Every reader knows what city the historian means by this description. But the word of God is perfectly plain to “the mind that hath wisdom.” Rome is clearly indicated, and her religious corruptions are symbolized by “the mother of harlots.” But why, it may be asked, is she called Babylon? The term is applied *figuratively,* we believe, just as Sodom and Egypt are applied to Jerusalem. “And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified.” (Rev. 11:8) Besides, the literal Babylon, the Chaldean capital, was built upon a plain — the plain of Shinar.

These points being fairly disposed of, and Rome fully identified, we accept Revelation 17, 18 as descriptive of the papacy. The character, conduct, relationships, and final judgment of this spiritual Babylon, are here set before us, not by the partial or imperfect pen of history, but by the Spirit of Truth who sees the end from the beginning. The papal system as a whole is looked at morally from God’s point of view. This is an immense point gained to the man of faith. We will now briefly examine some of its more prominent features.

1. **She is seen in vision as “seated upon many waters.”** This is explained by the angel in verse 15 to mean, “Peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.” The figure implies that this false woman, or the corrupt religious system of Rome, exercises a soul-ruining influence over all these multitudes, nations, and tongues. But God sees it all marks it all: her evil history is written in heaven.

2. **She is represented as having intercourse of the most seductive, licentious character with all classes.** “With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication.” What a state of things for that which professedly bears the fair name of Christ! The term **“fornication,”** as here used, means, we have no doubt, the seducing power of the Romish system in drawing away the affections from Christ, who is the only true object of faith for the heart. The priest comes in between the heart and the blessed Lord; the Bible is concealed; the mind of God is unknown; the people are intoxicated with her exciting falsehoods; and worship they know not what. The whole earth is corrupted with the wine of her fornication. But her end, her fearful end, speedily draws near, “For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. Reward her even as she rewarded you, and

double unto her double according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled fill to her double."

3. **She is next seen as ruling and directing the civil power.** "And I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads, and ten horns." Whether it be the resuscitated Roman empire (Rev. 13), or the different kingdoms which arose from the ruins of its imperial unity, or all governments and principalities of the earth, the woman swayed her sceptre, or rather her blood-stained sword, over them all as her divinely given domain. The purple of the Caesars was claimed by the popes, the imperial eagles were exchanged for the cross-keys, and his Holiness proclaimed a **universal monarch.** And this new mistress of the world was not so in name only. She clothed with new power her ancient name. Rome imperial never inspired such terrors by its arms, as Rome papal by her anathemas. "Christendom," as one has said, "through all its extended realms of mental and moral darkness, trembled while the pontiff fulminated excommunications. Monarchs quaked on their thrones at the terror of papal despotism, and crouched before his spiritual power like the meanest slave. The clergy considered the pope as the fountain of their subordinate authority, and the way to future promotion. The people, immersed in gross ignorance and superstition, viewed his supremacy as a terrestrial deity, who wielded the temporal and eternal destinies of man. The wealth of nations flowed into the sacred treasury, and enabled the successor of the Galilean fisherman and head of the christian commonwealth, to rival the splendour of Eastern pomp and grandeur."[159] The *extent* of her dominions too far exceeded the widest conquests of the empire. Many nations that had escaped the iron grasp of Rome imperial were held beneath the yoke of Rome papal. This we have seen in our history of the religious wars of Charlemagne. Some have reckoned them as Ireland, the north of Scotland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Prussia, Poland, Bohemia, Moravia, Austria, Hungary, with a considerable part of Germany. These, we are told, were gathered as sheep into the fold of the shepherd of Rome by such missionaries as Boniface; but in God's account they were enslaved by the tyranny and usurpation of the great corruptress.

4. **But there is more than her sitting by the many waters and sitting on the beast. She is full of idolatries and the uncleanness of her fornication.** "And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of the abominations and filthiness of her fornication." In spite of all her outward glory — that which the world counts precious and beautiful, she is in God's sight as a licentious woman with a gorgeous cup full of all abominations. We have already seen her tenacious love of images, which is here referred to by the term "abominations."

---

[159] Edgar's *Variations of Popery,* p. 157.

5. **Her great, flaunting, and exclusive pretensions to the truth of God.** "And upon her forehead was a name written Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of harlots and Abominations of the Earth." This is the gravest and weightiest of Rome's sins; the awful counterfeit of Satan, and the basest of all her hypocrisies. Of the true, the heavenly mystery we thus read, "This is a great mystery," says Paul, "but I speak concerning Christ and the church." (Eph. 5:32) But in place of subjection to Christ and faithfulness to Him she — like an abandoned shameless woman — corrupts by her foul embrace the great ones of the earth. Nor is this all. She is a mother — the mother of harlots, she has many daughters. Every religious system in Christendom, that tends in any measure to lead souls away from Christ, to engage their affections with objects that come between the heart and the Man in the glory, is related to this great parent of spiritual iniquity.

6. **Her insatiable thirst for the blood of God's saints.** "And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration." This strange sight — a woman — a religious community, professing to be the true spouse of Christ, drunken with the blood of the martyrs, the saints of God, fills the mind of the apostle with great amazement. Nor need we wonder. But we shall soon have to see this strange sight, not in vision only but in unprecedented reality. Innocent III was the man who declared war on the peasants of the south of France, and turned the sword of the notorious **Simon de Montfort** against the well-known **Albigenses** and **Waldenses,** and that under the pretence of doing the will of Christ, and acting by His authority.

From verse 7, we have the explanation which the angel gives of the vision, and the awful doom of Babylon from the hand of both man and God, down to the close of chapter 18. But as we are not interpreting, we need not pursue the solemn theme of these chapters any farther. We can now tread in the dark blood-stained footsteps of the historian in the light of holy scripture.[160]

INNOCENT AND THE KINGS OF THE EARTH

The different features or characteristics of Babylon which the Spirit of God has distinctly shown us in these chapters, and which are most hateful to Him, we shall find most fully displayed in the history of this pontiff. But both reader and writer have to watch against the spirit of Babylon creeping into our own hearts. We are not to suppose that it is confined to popery, though there it is publicly enthroned and will be publicly dealt with in judgment. Unless we are gathered around the rejected Jesus, and walking with Him in the fellowship of His sufferings and in the hope of His glories, we are in danger of being caught in the snare. Men, christian men, too often connect the present enjoyment of prosperity and pleasure in the world with the name and sanction of Christ. This is the very essence of Babylon — the unhallowed mixture of

[160] For full details see *Lectures on the Apocalypse* by W. Kelly.

Christ and the world, of heaven and earth. He who professes faith in a rejected Christ, and yet has his heart in the world that rejected Him, is deeply imbued with the spirit of Babylon. It is like one truly espoused to the Prince of heaven, and yet listening to the flatteries and accepting the favours of the prince of this world. And do we not see, alas! everywhere, the indulgence of worldly desires with the profession of the name of the Lord? This is the inconsistency, the confusion, which is so offensive to God, and which He will judge in so awful a manner. May the Lord keep us from ever seeking to mingle the cross and the heavenly glory of Christ with this present evil world.

The spirit of popery is all for this world with the highest pretensions of being all for Christ. “I sit a queen,” she says, “and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow.” Dominion has ever been her one desire — dominion over Church and State, over sea and land, over the souls and bodies of men, with power to open and shut the gates of heaven and hell as she pleased. So thought Innocent, and so he acted as we shall now see.

Lothario de’Conti was the original name of Innocent. He was of the house of the Counts of Segni, one of the great Roman families. Under the tuition of his two uncles, the Cardinals of St. Sergius and St. Paul, the great natural abilities of Lothario gave promise of that kind of distinction which his friends and relatives most desired. He afterwards acquired great fame for learning in the schools of Rome Bologna, and Paris, but canon law was his favourite study. At the death of Celestine III he was duly elected to the vacant chair, and consecrated February 22nd, 1198, at the early age of thirty-seven. The cardinals saluted him by the name of Innocent in testimony of his blameless life.

INNOCENT’S VIEWS OF THE POPEDOM

A few extracts from the inauguration sermon, and other writings of Innocent, will give the reader the best idea of popish, or Babylonish pretensions. The unmeasured assertion of his dignity, with the loudest protestations of humility, betrays the real spirit of the pope. Thus he spoke out: “Ye see what manner of servant that is whom the Lord hath set over His people; no other than the vice-gerent of Christ, the successor of St. Peter. He is the Lord’s anointed; he stands in the midst between God and man; below God, above man; less than God, more than man. He judges all, he is judged by none, for it is written, ‘I will judge.’ But he whom the pre-eminence of dignity exalts, is lowered by his office of a servant that so humility may be exalted, and pride abased; for God is against the high-minded; and to the lowly he showeth mercy: and he who exalteth himself shall be abased.” He also discovers the popedom in the Book of Genesis. “The firmament,” he says, “signifies the church. As the Creator of all things hath set in the heavens two great lights, the greater to rule the day, the lesser to rule the night, so also hath He set up in the firmament of His church, two great powers: the greater to rule the souls, the lesser to rule the bodies of men. These powers are the pontifical and the royal: but the moon, as

being the lesser body, borroweth all her light from the sun; she is inferior to the sun both in the quantity and quality of the light she sends forth, as also in her position and functions in the heavens. In like manner *the royal power borrows all its dignity and splendour from the pontifical, so* that the nearer it approaches the greater light, the more are its rays absorbed, and its borrowed glories eclipsed. It was moreover ordained that both these glories should have their fixed and final abode in this our land of Italy, inasmuch as in this land dwelleth, by and through the *combined primacy of the empire and the priesthood,* the entire foundation and structure of the christian faith, and with it a predominant principality over both!"[161]

The reader will have no difficulty in gathering from these statements, though clothed in metaphor, the high pretensions of the papal scheme, as matured in the mind of this celebrated pontiff. He unmistakably affirms, that all earthly dominion is simply derived from the pope; that all kings and princes of this world are his subjects and servants; and that universal dominion is his.

INNOCENT AND THE CITY OF ROME

Like a wise man, he commenced his great life-work by reforming his own household. Rigid simplicity was established in the place of courtly luxury. The multitude of nobles and highborn pages who lately thronged the palace were dismissed, but with handsome presents which retained them as friends, and secured their services on occasions of high ceremony. The citizens, who were clamorous for the donative with which they had been usually gratified at the commencement of every new reign, he did not forget, and thus secured the favour of the multitude. He combined with the boldness of Gregory VII the politic caution and patience of Alexander III He knew the Romans and how to manage them. They have the worst character of any people in history. Hear the evidence of St. Bernard in writing to the pope, "Why should I mention the people? The people is Roman. I have no shorter nor have I any clearer term to express my opinion of your parishioners. For what is so notorious to all men and ages as the wantonness and haughtiness of the Romans? A race unaccustomed to peace, habituated to tumult — a race merciless and untractable, and to this instant scorning all subjection when it has any means of existence… Whom will you find even in the vast extent of your city who would have you for pope, unless for profit or the hope of profit? the promise of fidelity, to have the better means of injuring those who trust them? They are men too proud to obey, too ignorant to rule, faithless to superiors, insupportable to inferiors, shameless in asking, insolent in refusing; importunate to obtain favours, restless while obtaining them, ungrateful when they have obtained; grand, eloquent, and inefficient; most profuse in promise, most niggardly in performance; the smoothest flatterers, the most venomous detractors. Among such as these you are proceeding as their pastor, covered with gold and every variety of splendour. What are your sheep looking for?

---

[161] *Cathedra Petri,* book 13, p. 363.

If I dared to use the expression, I should say that it is a pasture of demons rather than 'sheep.'"[162]

Such, as witnessed by the highest authority, was the character of the people whom the new shepherd of Rome had around his person, and whom he had to watch over. But his mind was not to be dismayed, even by the exhaustive style of St. Bernard; with great energy, prudence, and skill, he began his successful reign.

Next to the affairs of his own household, those of the city had his immediate attention. His first object was to abolish the last vestige of **imperial sovereignty** in Rome. This was a bold step, but he had smoothed his way by silently and skillfully distributing money throughout the thirteen quarters of the city. Hitherto the prefect of Rome had held his office under the Emperor, he was the representative of the imperial authority. But Innocent influenced him to reject the imperial and submit entirely to the papal power. He took from his hand the secular sword, the ancient emblem of his power, and substituted a silver cup in its place, as the symbol of peace and friendship. He absolved him from his oath of allegiance to the German emperors, compelled him to take a strong oath of fidelity to himself, and to receive investiture from his hands. Thus was the last link broken of the imperial power in Rome.

In like manner the new pope persuaded the senator, or representative of the legislature, to resign, in order that he might substitute another in his place, whom he bound by an oath to himself as sovereign. The judges, officers, and all the citizens were required to swear obedience to his spiritual majesty, and acknowledge the exclusive sovereignty of the Holy See.

INNOCENT AND THE KINGDOM OF SICILY

But the imperial city, at this moment, was surrounded by many dangerous neighbours. How to rid himself of these was now the first and important question with Innocent. The fairest provinces of central and southern Italy, even up to the gates of Rome, and the kingdom of Sicily, were under the galling yoke of fierce German adventurers. It happened in this way.

Henry VI. Emperor of Germany, surnamed the Severe, in the year 1186 married Constant, legitimate heir to the crown of Sicily, with the lordship of all the Norman provinces in southern Italy.

The evident advantage of this union to the Emperor, and the equally evident danger to the papacy, alarmed the reigning pontiff, Lucius III; and led him to take steps to prevent the marriage, but dying suddenly, nothing was accomplished. His successor, Urban III, also failed to break the engagement and the marriage was celebrated on the 27th of January, 1186. But as usual, a pretender to the crown of Sicily was found and supported by the papacy,

---

[162] Waddington, vol. 2, p. 158.

which led to a cruel and desolating war of several years' duration. Henry invaded the Italian territories for the avowed purpose of putting himself in possession of his wife's inheritance. The expedition was completely successful. Province after province fell into his hands, and in a short time the whole of southern Italy and the kingdom of Sicily submitted to the merciless tyrant, the treacherous husband of Constantia. Before leaving the conquered territories, says Greenwood "All the great military commands were bestowed on the most distinguished officers of his army. Castles, lands, revenues, powers of the largest and most indefinite kind, were showered upon the mob of adventurers and mercenaries, whose only object was plunder, and whose rapacity was unchecked by the remotest regard for the rights or the welfare of those whom they were appointed to govern."

Philip, Henry's brother, **duke of Swabia,** was entrusted with the government of central Italy, including the estates of the Countess Matilda, and the duchy of Tuscany. Markwald, a knight of Alsace, the Emperor's favourite, was made duke of Ravenna and Romagna. Conrad of Lutzenburg a Swabian knight, as duke of Spoleto, possessed that city and its domain. Thus were the pontifical states enclosed by a hostile chain of fortresses on all sides. Communication with the outer world was well nigh cut off. But the master-hand that was required to direct and control the different garrisons was suddenly withdrawn.

Henry died at Messina on the 28th of September, 1197 rather more than three months before the accession of Innocent.[163]

We have thus rapidly referred to the military occupation of the country when Innocent took into his hands the reins of government. For fuller details the general histories may be consulted. But as our object in this chapter is to show how completely the ecclesiastical power triumphed over the civil, we have felt it necessary to show the strong position of the latter. And now the problem is to be solved. How can a single man, by a single word, overthrow the physical force of the empire, and compel both prince and people to submit to a spiritual despotism? The unseen power, we doubt not, is from beneath. The blending of the *lamb and the dragon,* or the man of sin, in one power, or system, proves its origin. (Rev. 13: 11-18)

INNOCENT AND THE STATES OF THE CHURCH

The death of Henry, the jealousies and rivalries of the German chiefs, the exasperated state of the Italians, prepared the way for the full exercise of Innocent's great powers of administration. The cruelties of the Emperor Henry to his Italian subjects had ripened the whole country for revolt. They only awaited a deliverer from the German yoke. That deliverer was Innocent. He summoned **Markwald,** the most formidable of imperial lieutenants in command, to surrender to St. Peter all the estates of the church. Markwald

[163] *Cathedra Petri,* book 13, chapter 1, p. 339.

paused: though he was a bold and ambitious man, and possessed of great wealth and power, he wished to avoid an open contest with the pope. He was conscious of his danger from the people's hatred of the foreign yoke; and endeavoured to draw him into an alliance with many fair promises of great service to the church. But the pope was firm and withstood all his offers whether of money or of service. He demanded the immediate unconditional surrender of all the territories of the church. Markwald refused. The people rose to assert the papal claims. The war began. The German banners were torn down, city after city rose in rebellion, and cast to the ground everything German. Markwald, insulted and burning with rage, "revenged himself by sallying forth from the gates of Ravenna, ravaging the whole region, burning, plundering, destroying homesteads and harvests, castles and churches. Innocent opened the papal treasures, borrowed large sums of money, raised an army; hurled an excommunication against the rebellious vassal of the church, in which he absolved from their oaths all who had sworn allegiance to Markwald."[164]

The fall of Markwald filled the others with consternation They proposed terms of peace and offered to pay tribute, but Innocent would agree to no compromise. He claimed possession of the patrimonial domains without reserve, declared himself heir to the Countess Matilda's donation, and sovereign of the duchy of Tuscany. But no event, consequent on the decease of the Emperor was more important to the papacy than the faithless conduct of the Empress Constantia. Immediately after the death of her husband, though left the natural guardian of the realm, she separated herself from the German cause, and returned to Sicily with her infant son Frederick. She espoused the interest of her native land, threw herself and her son into the arms of the Holy See, caused him to be crowned in Palermo, and requested the pontifical investiture of the kingdom for her son as a fief of the papal See. Innocent saw his own strength, her weakness, and made his own terms. The Empress and her son were required to acknowledge the absolute feudal superiority of the pope over the whole kingdom of Naples and Sicily, and pay a large annual tribute. The German warriors were compelled to retire to the castles on the mainland; but only to brood over their present defeat and their future revenge.

The **conquests of Innocent** had been rapid and were apparently complete. In less than one year after his accession to the papal throne, he was virtually king of Sicily, and master of his own large territories. By means of his legates, he made his presence to be felt, and enforced obedience, throughout his newly acquired dominions. But, as ever, the beast on which the woman rode became most refractory. The territories, forts, citadels, and revenues, that had been recovered from the Germans, were claimed by the Papal See as her possessions. But as these demands were both unjust and illegal, resistance on the part of the citizens and the imperial governors was the natural

[164] Milman, vol. 4, p. 19.

consequence, and for years Sicily and her provinces was a scene of anarchy, violence, bloodshed, and ceaseless intrigues. And yet, at this very moment, Innocent reminded those cities which objected to surrender to him the full benefit of their hard-won deliverance, of the awful nature of the power they dared to oppose. Their lack of confidence in him was a crime against the Lord Jesus Himself whose successor he was, “one in whom there was no sin at all, neither was any deceit found in his mouth.” Could blasphemy be more daring, more barefaced? Could there be a more wicked attempt to unite the dragon and the lamb?

INNOCENT AND THE EMPIRE

Before the close of the eventful year over which we have been travelling, Constantia, the Sicilian princess and the German Empress, died. On the 27th of November, 1198, she breathed her last. Her death, it is supposed, was hastened by her maternal solicitude for her infant son, Frederick. He was then about four years old, had been crowned king of Sicily, and was heir of the empire. In her last will she bequeathed him to the guardianship of the pope as his liege lord, and provided that thirty thousand pieces of gold should be paid yearly to the pope for his pious protection of her son, and that all his other expenses were to be charged on the revenue of the country.

But the tranquillity of Rome was not secured by its great successes. The civil war, with all its horrors was renewed. The pontiff lost no time in making known, in loftiest phrase to the nobles of Sicily his accession to the government as regent, and commissioned his legate to administer the oath of allegiance. Markwald, in the meantime, hearing of the death of the Empress, resumed the title of Seneschal of the Empire, and, by a document which professed to be a will of the late Emperor, laid claim to the regency of Sicily during the minority of the young king. In support of these claims he had assembled a large force of adventurers, besieged and obtained possession of the papal city, Germano, and had almost become master of the great monastery of Monte Casino, which was defended for eight days by a garrison of the pope; but a fresh supply of troops and provisions from Rome strengthened the position of the warrior monks, and compelled the great duke to raise the siege. According to the best authorities, Innocent now assumed the most warlike attitude. He issued a proclamation, summoning the whole realm of Naples and Sicily to arms. He assembled troops from Lombardy, Tuscany, Romagna, and Campania, paying them from the papal treasury. Markwald and all his accomplices were excommunicated in the most solemn manner every Sunday, with quenched candles and tolling bells — bell, book, and candle. The whole kingdom was ravaged, laid waste, and distracted by the armies of the pope and the soldiers of the empire. But the death of the rebel chief, Markwald, in the year 1202, relieved the pope of his most powerful and most successful antagonist.

We now turn for a little to observe the working of that same powerful mind in the complicated affairs of the empire.

An infant Emperor, now an orphan; a vacant throne, fiercely contested by rival princes; opened up a still wider field for **papal ambition.**

The immediate object of Innocent's policy was to separate the kingdom of Sicily from the empire. While both remained in the same hands, a sovereign more powerful than himself might be placed on the Sicilian throne. The possibility of a neighbour so dangerous must be removed. The contest then raging for the possession of the crown gave him the desired opportunity. The troops, being required at home, were withdrawn from Sicily, Apulia, and Capua. The garrisons being thus reduced, the German dominion was overthrown, the countries separated from the empire, and the papal authority established by force.

Immediately after the death of Henry, his brother, Philip, duke of Swabia, took possession of the imperial treasures, declared himself regent of the realm, and protector of the interests of his young nephew. And so far he seems to have acted from a right motive. But an infant Emperor was contrary to German usage, and unsuited to those troublous times. An adverse party speedily arose, and strongly opposed the election of the child as king. The adherents of the house of **Hohenstaufen** entreated Philip to become the representative of his family, in opposition to the other candidates for the crown. He consented, and was chosen defender of the kingdom by a large body of princes and prelates assembled at Mulhausen.

The party opposed to the Swabian family was headed by Adolphus, of Altena, archbishop of Cologne. This faction was chiefly composed of the great prelates of the Rhine. Such was the principal occupation of prelates and clergy in those days. They were determined to raise up an antagonist to the house of Hohenstaufen. After several princes had refused to become candidates for the imperial dignity, the churchmen turned their thoughts to the house of **Saxony,** the irreconcilable adversary of the house of Swabia. Their choice fell on Otho, the second son of Henry the lion, duke of Saxony.

In consequence of his father's family having fallen under the ban of the empire, and being banished from Germany, he was brought up at the court of England. His mother, Matilda, was sister to King Richard Coeur de Lion. The young knight had shown signs of valour such as Richard admired, and he created Otho first Count of York and Poitou. Well furnished with English gold, and a few followers, he set forth, reached Cologne, where he was proclaimed Emperor, and champion of the church.

PHILIP AND OTHO

Philip was twenty-two years of age, Otho twenty-three. "In personal character," say the chroniclers, "in wealth, and in the number of his

adherents, Philip had the advantage. He was praised for his moderation and his love of justice. His mind had been cultivated by literature to a degree then very unusual among princes, and his popular manners contrasted favourably with the pride and roughness of Otho. But Otho was the favourite with the great body of the clergy, to whom Philip was obnoxious, as the representative of a family which was regarded as opposed to the interests of the hierarchy."[165]

But what, the reader may be supposed to inquire — what of the young Frederick who had been crowned and anointed, and to whom both princes and prelates had sworn allegiance. and over whose rights the pope was handsomely paid to keep watch and ward? The only answer to this inquiry is to be found in the secret but perfidious policy of Innocent. His one grand object in allowing, if not in creating, this great national quarrel for the imperial crown, was the humbling of the haughty house of Swabia, and every subordinate consideration must be sacrificed to the limitation of that power. But the elastic conscience of the papacy never was at a loss for an apparently pious reason for the perpetration of the greatest wickedness, or the most faithless and treacherous conduct. Innocent could not deny, and therefore makes a show of lofty equity in admitting, the claims of Frederick. This was the dragon's voice. He admits the lawfulness of his election, and the oath of allegiance taken by the nobles of the empire. But, on the other hand, he discovers that the oath was exacted by the father before the child was a Christian by baptism. He decreed that a child of two years old, unbaptized, was a *nullity:* therefore their oaths were null and void and all obligation to the young heir was entirely set aside.

What a character, we may exclaim, for posterity to contemplate! He who assumed to be "the representative of God's eternal and immutable justice upon earth, absolutely above all passion or interest," now absolves the whole constituency of Germany from the most solemn oath of fealty to the legitimate heir of the kingdom. In place of maintaining the rights of his ward — to whom he wrote when he accepted the charge, "that though God had visited him by the death of his father and mother, he had provided him with a more worthy father — His own vicar on earth; and a better mother — the church" — rebuking the rival parties, and persuading them to peace, we see him fomenting the animosities of both, we see justice, truth, righteousness peace, and every claim of humanity all wantonly sacrificed in the hope of increasing and consolidating the papal power. The **crafty pope** kept behind the scene, but stirred up and fed the flame of contention, knowing that both parties would be compelled, from the loss of blood and treasure, to lay their cause at his feet, and then he could come forward as the sovereign director of kings, and dictate his own terms. These convictions are fully borne out by the following judgment of Dean Milman: "Ten years of strife and civil war in

[165] J.C. Robertson, vol. 3, p. 292.

Germany are to be traced, if not to the direct instigation, to the inflexible obstinacy of Pope Innocent III."[166]

THE CIVIL WAR IN GERMANY

Richard, king of England, and **Philip Augustus,** king of France — who warmly espoused the cause of Philip — spared no amount of flatteries and professions to win over the pope to the party of their respective candidates. But he delayed, having too many objects in view to be straightforward. In the meantime war broke out along the Rhine. Philip, at the first, gained great advantages, he advanced almost to the gates of Cologne, but a powerful army of Rhenish prelates and Flemish nobles caused him to retreat. The largest and most powerful part of the empire acknowledged and supported the cause of Philip; the clergy and the Count of Flanders stood almost alone on the side of Otho.

It was a civil war of the most ferocious and barbarous lawlessness. At the end of the first year, fortune favoured the cause of Philip. The death of Richard, in 1199, had deprived Otho of his most powerful ally. John, who succeeded him, was not disposed to part with his money for such a distant and uncertain game. The war might now have terminated with a fair show of honour, even to Otho; but papal vengeance against the hated house of Hohenstaufen was not yet full. The pope openly avowed the cause of the usurper, Otho; and for nine long dreary years, with but short intervals of truce, Germany was abandoned by the tender shepherd of the Tiber to all the horrors of a civil war. But the deceitful underhand policy of Innocent became apparent to all. His suffering flock accused and reproached him as the guilty cause of all their misery, as having provoked, inflamed, and kept up the disastrous strife, for the gratification of his own malicious purpose of ruining the royal house of Henry the Severe. It required all his wits, with the help of Satan, to acquit himself of the charge.

But the war had done its work — its dragon work. "It was a war, not of decisive battles, but of marauding, desolation, havoc, plunder, wasting of harvests, ravaging open and defenceless countries — war, waged by prelate against prelate, by prince against prince; wild Bohemians, and bandit soldiers of every race, were roving through every province. Throughout the land there was no law; the roads were impassable on account of robbers; nothing was spared, nothing sacred, church or cloister." Such, and worse, was the civil war in Germany. Yet the unrelenting mind of the wretched man continued to thunder his anathemas against Philip; declared all oaths which had been taken to him null and void, and showered privileges and immunities of all sorts on the bishops and the monastic societies who espoused the party

---

[166] *Latin Christianity,* vol. 4, p. 33.

of Otho. But the thunders of the Vatican became unavailing, and the strength of Philip increased year by year.[167]

The course of events could not fail to tell even on the inflexible mind of Innocent. He was threatened with the humiliation of a total defeat. At the close of ten years the cause of Otho was hopeless. But how can the pope forget his vows of implacable enmity against the house of Swabia, or struggle out of his vows of perpetual alliance with the house of Saxony? He must find some holy and pious reasons for abandoning the cause of Otho, and espousing the cause of Philip. He found great difficulty in covering the shame of this debasing position. But Philip made such ample professions and promises to the pope by his ambassadors, that he saw it to be his duty to receive back his penitent son, and absolve him from the censures of the church. The papal legate proceeded to Metz, and there proclaimed him the victorious Emperor.

THE DEATH OF PHILIP

Peace now seemed to be secured on all sides. Philip had obtained the highest object of his wishes. A proposal of marriage between Otho and Beatrice, the daughter of Philip, had been sanctioned by the pope, under the pretence of healing the long-standing feud between the houses of Swabia and Saxony. But uncertain is the tenure of all human greatness and human glory. On the 21st of June, 1208, the Emperor Philip, one of the ablest and mildest of his race, was basely assassinated by the Count Palatine of Bavaria for some private offence. The country was paralysed by the news of this terrible crime. The execration of mankind pursued the murderer; his castle was levelled with the ground, and the assassin put to death with many wounds.

Innocent now retraced his steps. The crime of the Bavarian relieved him from the humiliation of his apostasy. He hastened to write to the German princes, charging them to acquiesce in the manifest declaration of divine providence in favour of Otho. He used every means in his power to prevent a fresh election, and to unite all parties in his support; and he warmly exhorted Otho to moderation and conciliation. On both sides there was an ardent desire for peace, and Otho was now undisputed Emperor.

The following year, 1209, he proceeded to Italy, to receive the imperial crown. He was attended by the princes, prelates, and nobles of the empire, with a numerous army of military dependents. Their march was a succession of festive receptions. The cities opened their gates to welcome the champion of the church, and the Emperor chosen by the pope. **Innocent and Otho** met at Viterbo. “They embraced, they wept tears of joy, in remembrance of their common trials, in transport at their common triumph.” But the pope did not forget the prerogative of his pontifical throne. He demanded security that Otho would surrender, immediately after his coronation, the lands of the church, and yield every pretension to the long-disputed inheritance of the

[167] J.C. Robertson, vol. 3, p. 297. Milman, vol. 4, p. 51. Neander, vol. 7, p. 236.

Countess Matilda. But so good, so humble, so submissive was Otho, as he was kneeling for the diadem, that his heart was grieved at the apparent suspicion of his loyalty by his holy father. “All that I have been,” he exclaimed, “all I am, all I ever shall be, after God, I owe to you and the church.”

THE APOSTASY OF OTHO

The imperial crown was now on the head of Otho. Not only was he crowned by the hands of Innocent in St. Peter’s, at Rome, but he was raised to that dignity by the artful and cruel policy of the apostolic See. But the deceiver was deceived; the traitor was betrayed. Scarcely was the ceremony of the coronation completed, when the mask of obedience under which Otho had veiled his real intentions was thrown off. The effect of the **iron crown** was irresistible. He felt himself a new man, in a new position, and bound to maintain the prerogatives of his crown against the encroachments of the spiritual power. From that hour the Emperor and the pope were implacable enemies. Such was the disappointment, as overruled by the righteous government of God, of the unscrupulous pontiff. Satan may rule, but an all-wise God overrules. “Be not deceived,” says the apostle; “God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.” (Gal. 6:7) Innocent had taught his nominee to deceive, and now he must eat the bitter fruit of his own teaching.

The unusual strength and numbers of Otho’s army which accompanied him, and now lay encamped under the walls of Rome, were regarded with great jealousy by the inhabitants. The quarrels, which had become customary on such occasions, were renewed with great fierceness. Many of the Germans were slain, and a number of their horses were killed — so they said, at least. But it was enough. Otho’s smothered ambition was now kindled into a flame of indignation. He withdrew in wrath from the city. He demanded compensation. Innocent refused. The troops were distributed over the patrimony of St. Peter to the great damage of the people and the increasing alarm of the pope. The Emperor was requested to withdraw his soldiers from the neighbourhood of Rome, but he declared they would remain until the provisions of the country were exhausted. He enriched himself by the plunder of pilgrims whom his soldiery intercepted on their way to Rome. He marched into Tuscany, took possession of the cities on the frontier of the territory of the Countess Matilda, seized towns and fortresses which the pope had lately occupied; estates and dignities within the pontifical claims he bestowed upon his favourites, and the most formidable of the pope’s adversaries, Count Diephold, he invested with the duchy of Spoleto. Success inflamed his ambition, he contemplated the invasion of Sicily, and seizing the young Frederick, the last of the house of Hohenstaufen.

He who had proclaimed himself infallible was in despair. After all his labours, all his sacrifices, all his treacheries, he had raised up to himself a more formidable antagonist, a more bitter foe, than any of the Swabian family had

ever been. The most earnest appeals to his gratitude, the most solemn admonitions, and the loudest thunders of excommunication, were alike disregarded by the headstrong pupil of Richard Coeur de Lion.

THE FALL OF OTHO

Otho had now been three years absent from Germany three years of unwonted peace in that country — their hands had become strong. The kindred of the young Frederick became anxious for his safety. He was now about eighteen years of age. The pope was quietly consulted. He turned round, saw good reason to take active measures against Otho, and to assume the most friendly disposition towards Frederick. There were many difficulties in the way, because of the occupation of Otho; but two brave and loyal Swabian knights accomplished the dangerous expedition, and Frederick was safely conducted from his sunny Palermo to the colder regions o£ Germany, where he was welcomed with open arms to resume his ancestral throne. But the cause of Frederick against Otho was really won by Philip Augustus of France.

Between the two rivals for the empire there was no great battle. France had all along been the steady friend of the Swabians, as England had been of the Saxons. Philip entered into a close alliance with Frederick. The Count of Flanders, the princes of the lower Rhine, and the king of England, entered into league with Otho. At the head of a large army he advanced, under the impulse of vindictive passion, towards the frontiers of France. He regarded Philip as the real author of all his misfortunes. But his vigilant adversary was ready to receive him. On the 27th of July, 1214, a great battle was fought at the village of **Bouvines,** not far from Lille. Philip Augustus was victorious over the last of the Othos and his allies. He survived his fall about five years, which he was allowed to spend in monastic penance without being formally deposed.

The following year **Frederick II** was crowned at Aix-la-Chappele, and in the enthusiasm of the moment, he, with many others, made a vow to go in person on a crusade to the Holy Land. This rash promise was the occasion of troubles which he little expected, extending over his long reign of thirty-five years.

INNOCENT AND PHILIP AUGUSTUS

We have seen the interference of Innocent in the elevation of three emperors to the throne of Germany, and the policy he pursued in order to obtain more temporal power for the Roman See, and a more extensive dominion over the minds and ways of all mankind. We now follow him to the kingdom of France, there to witness an expression of the same pontifical power, but on other grounds, and for other objects. He now comes before us as the protector of innocence against wrong, the preacher of christian morals, and the maintainer of the sanctity of the marriage bond. We are willing to allow that in his contest with Philip he may have been actuated by a right motive; but his

outward conduct is marked by the same dictatorial spirit that has hitherto characterized his reign. He assumes to himself the high function of the supreme direction of all human affairs; as arbiter in the last resort, whether it be a contested throne, or the holy sacrament of marriage. But our main object, under this heading, is to give the reader an example of a whole kingdom being laid under the papal ban. It is difficult in our own days to believe the awful consequences of such a thing.

A remarkable circumstance in connection with the **second marriage of Philip** furnished Innocent with the desired opportunity to chastise and humble the ally and supporter of the house of Swabia. On his return from the crusade in 1193, he was attracted by the fame of the beauty and virtues of Ingeburga, or Isamburga, sister of the king of Denmark. The hand of the king of France was readily accepted, the dowry fixed. She arrived in France under an escort of Danish nobles, and the king hastened to meet her at Amiens. The day after their marriage the royal pair were crowned; but during the ceremony of the coronation Philip was observed to shudder and turn pale. It was soon found that he had conceived an unconquerable aversion for his new queen. As no real cause could be found for such a change in the king, it was popularly ascribed to witchcraft, or diabolic influence. She is described as of gentle manners, very beautiful, and sincere as a Christian. Philip proposed to send her back at once to Denmark, her attendants refused the disgraceful office; and she herself was determined to remain in France.

The king was now in a great difficulty. He applied for a divorce, but knew that, unless a dissolution of the marriage could be obtained in due form, he would have no peace. The genealogies of the royal houses were traced, and, as it was found by the bishops devoted to the king that the royal pair were within the forbidden degrees, therefore the clergy of France, with the Archbishop of Rheims at their head, pronounced the marriage null and void. When the sentence was explained to Ingeburga, who could scarcely speak a word of French, her feelings of indignation were expressed by exclaiming, “Wicked France! Rome! Rome!” Her brother took up her cause, and appealed to the aged pope, Celestine; but he was unequal to contend with the powerful king of France, and no decided step was taken during the remainder of his pontificate. In the meantime Ingeburga was shut up in a convent, and Philip married Agnes, the beautiful daughter of the duke of Meran. His affection for Agnes was as intense as his hatred of Ingeburga. The former was introduced on all occasions to grace the royal circle; the latter was dragged from convent to convent, or rather from prison to prison.

Such was the state of things in France when Innocent espoused the cause of the repudiated princess of Denmark. He first wrote to the bishop of Paris, then to the king himself. After enlarging on the sanctity of marriage, he admonished the king to put away Agnes and to restore Ingeburga. The king haughtily declared that the affair of his marriage was no business of the pope’s. But

Philip had soon to feel the power and the terror of the papal thunders, and as they had never before been felt in France.

THE POPE'S LEGATE IN FRANCE

Peter, Cardinal of St. Mary in the Via Lata, was sent as legate into France, with authority, in case of the king's obstinacy, to lay his dominions under the papal ban. But the command to put away his beloved Agnes, and to receive again the hated Ingeburga, the king treated with contempt and defiance. The pope was inflexible. "If, within one month," he wrote to the legate, "after your communication, the king of France does not receive his queen with conjugal affection, you shall subject his whole realm to interdict — an interdict with all its awful consequences." A council was held at **Dijon,** messengers appeared from the king, protesting in his name against all further proceedings, and appealing to Rome. But the orders to the legate were peremptory. The interdict was proclaimed with all its appalling circumstances. It is thus described: — "At midnight, each priest holding a torch, were chanted the psalm for the miserable, and the prayers for the dead, the last prayers which were to be uttered by the clergy of France during the interdict. The cross on which the Saviour hung was veiled with black crepe; the relics replaced within the tombs; the host was consumed. The cardinal, in his mourning stole of violet, pronounced the territories of the king of France under the ban. All religious services from that time ceased; there was no access to heaven by prayer or offering. The sobs of the aged of the women and children, alone broke the silence. The interdict was pronounced at Dijon. Only the baptism of infants, and extreme unction to the dying, were allowed by the church, while the realm lay under the curse of the papal ban."

For the **guilt of the sovereign** the whole nation must suffer, reasoned the pope, in order that his heart might be softened, either by pity for the misery of his people or by fear of their discontent; and in those days of superstition the misery was extreme; for death at such a time would be thought eternal perdition. "Oh how terrible," exclaimed an eye-witness, "how pitiable a spectacle it was in all our cities! To see the doors of the church watched, and Christians driven away from them like dogs; all divine offices ceased; the sacrament of the body and blood of the soul was not offered; no gathering together of the people, as wont at the festivals of the saints; the bodies of the dead not admitted to christian burial, but their stench infected the air, the loathsome sight of them appalled the living: only extreme unction and baptism were allowed. There was a deep silence over the whole realm, while the organs and the voices of those who chanted God's praises were everywhere mute."[168]

---

[168] See *Latin Christianity,* vol. 4, p. 67.

THE RAGE OF THE KING

Philip Augustus was a proud, haughty, arbitrary prince, not accustomed to brook encroachment quietly. He broke out into paroxysms of fury; he swore by the sword of Charlemagne that he would rather lose half his dominions than part from Agnes of Meran. He threatened the clergy with the last extremities if they dared to obey the pope. Ingeburga was seized, dragged from her cloister, and imprisoned in the strong castle of Etampes. But the wrath of the king would not prevail over the stern decree of the pope. The barons, whose power he had reduced, cared not to rally round him; the people were in a state of pious insurrection. They had assembled round the churches, forced the doors; they were determined not to be deprived of their religious services. The king became alarmed at the mutinies among the people, and promised to obey the pope.

A deputation was sent to Rome. The king complained of the harsh proceedings of the legate, but declared himself ready to abide by the sentence of the pope. "What sentence?" sternly exclaimed his holiness; "he knows our decree; let him put away his concubine, receive his lawful wife, reinstate the bishops whom he has expelled, and give them satisfaction for their losses. Then will we raise the interdict, receive his sureties, examine into the alleged relationship, and pronounce our decree." The answer went to the heart of Agnes, and drove the king to madness. "I will turn Mahometan," he exclaimed. "Happy Saladin, he has no pope above him." But the haughty Philip must bow. The affections and religious feelings of all classes were with the clergy. He summoned a parliament at Paris; it was attended by all the great vassals of the crown. "What is to be done?" demanded the king, with his beautiful Agnes by his side. "Obey the pope, dismiss Agnes, receive back Ingeburga;" was the crushing reply. Thus he who had doubled France in extent by the sharpness of his sword, and the prudence of his policy; he who had raised the crown to something like independence above the great feudal lords; must now drink the dregs of humiliation in the presence of the nobles of France **at the bidding of the pope.**

The scene was overwhelming. Agnes had declared that she cared nothing for the crown, that it was her husband she loved; a stranger, the daughter of a christian prince, young and ignorant of the world, she married the king; and had borne him two children. Sever me not from my husband, was her touching appeal. But the inexorable decree had gone forth; "Obey the pope, dismiss Agnes, receive back Ingeburga." The king at last agreed to a reconciliation with Ingeburga. She was brought in; but the sight of her so aroused the king's aversion that negotiations were almost broken off. At last he mastered himself for the moment and bowed to the papal sentence. He swore to receive and honour her as queen of France. At that instant the ringing of bells proclaimed that the interdict which had weighed so heavily on the people for upwards of seven months was taken off. "The curtains were withdrawn from the images, from the crucifixes, the doors of the churches

flew open, the multitudes streamed in to satiate their pious desires, which had been suppressed during the period of the interdict."

Rome has accomplished her object; she has triumphed over the greatest king in Christendom, the word of God is fulfilled; "The woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth." Universal dominion over the bodies and souls and affairs of men was her unquenchable desire, her unceasing aim. And beyond this display of power we cannot suppose that Rome had any higher object in view, as she had sanctioned in Philip's great predecessor more outrageous conduct.

The distressed king now separated himself from his broken-hearted Agnes. She soon after died of grief, having given birth to a son, to whom she gave the significant name of Tristan — the son of my sorrow. Ingeburga was received with outward honour, but was in reality a state prisoner; nothing could ever induce Philip to live with her as his wife, though he consented to her living in the palace. Fresh quarrels between France and England diverted the mind of Innocent from the neglected queen, and opened up a more inviting field for his active and ambitious mind. We will now turn to home scenes for a little.

INNOCENT AND ENGLAND

Richard the Lion-hearted, it will be remembered, was the great supporter of Otho, the papal claimant of the empire. England at that time was in close alliance with the See of Rome. After the death of Richard his brother John, the youngest son of Henry II, was raised to the vacant throne. According to our present laws of succession his nephew, Arthur, duke of Brittany, the only son and heir of his elder brother, Geoffrey Plantagenet, would have been king. But crowns at this time were as much elective as hereditary.

The whole reign of John — 1199-1216 — is a history of weakness and violence, of wickedness and degradation, of the most cruel, sensual, and faithless of monarchs. But the hand of the Lord is most manifest in the affairs of England at this time. Never had a viler prince worn a crown; yet God in His mercy, and in His care for England, overruled his many faults for the benefit of the church and the people of England. We speak of course in general terms. But from this reign may be dated England's wholesome dread of popery, and her enthusiasm for civil and religious liberty. Disastrous to the last degree as was the reign of John; humiliating to the king and to the nation; yet the united voice of history affirms that it was then that the foundations were laid of "the English character, the English liberties, and the English greatness; and to this reign, from the attempt to degrade the kingdom to a fief of the Roman See, may be traced the first signs of that independence, that jealousy of the papal usurpations, which led eventually to the Reformation." The overruling hand of God, in His special care of England, has been manifest in all her revolutions ever since. Scarcely any benefit resulted to either

Church or State in France from the pope's interference with Philip, excepting that they were made to feel the awfulness of the papal power. But no Magna Charta was signed, no House of Commons arose.

One of John's first and great scandals, reveals in the clearest light the unprincipled character of Innocent's policy. John had been married twelve years to a daughter of the Earl of Gloucester before he came to the throne. After that, aspiring to a royal connection, he sought a dissolution, and the obsequious Archbishop of Bordeaux dissolved the marriage bond. He suddenly became enamoured with a lady who was the betrothed bride of the Count de la Mark, carried her off, and was married to her, while his own wife was living. But what will the pope now say about the holy sacrament of matrimony — he whose horror of such connections has been so inexorably displayed in the case of Philip and Agnes? Fast and thick we may expect his thunderbolts to fly at the adulterous king; but no! no censure is uttered from Rome against either the king or the archbishop. He confirms the dissolution of the marriage in the face of God, the church, and the world. Such was the glaring wickedness of "his holiness, his infallibility." But why show such partiality to John? He was the supporter of Otho, and the enemy of the house of Swabia.

But if the pope was quiescent, the world was scandalized. Such an outrage on a great vassal was a violation of the first law of feudalism. The **barons of Anjou**, Touraine, Poitou, Maine, were eager to avenge the indignity offered to Hugh de la Mark, and from that day they held themselves absolved from their fealty to John. They appealed to Philip, king of France, for redress. Philip Augustus felt his strength, and summoned the English king to answer in his courts of Paris for the wrongs done to the Count de la Mark. John appeared not; this led to a ruinous war, and to the loss of immense territories in France to England. In a few months Philip wrested from John the great inheritance of Rollo — the great Anglo-Norman dukedom, which in the days of his father Henry II was equal in the extent of its territories, its revenues, its forces, its wealth, to the whole of that over which the French monarch swayed his sceptre.[169]

JOHN AND THE PAPACY

We now leave the civil, and turn more directly to the **ecclesiastical history** of affairs in England at this interesting moment.

We have seen the pope overlooking the gravest immoralities in John, on account, as we suppose, of his being the partisan of Otho, and the ally of the Holy See, but John was now guilty of crimes which his Holiness could not overlook. His matrimonial irregularities, however criminal, might be allowed to pass without censure; but his disposal of sees, his taxation of monasteries,

[169] For details, see the civil and general church histories. We have followed chiefly names already and frequently quoted.

his interference in the appointment of a primate, brought him into direct collision with the papacy, and involved him in a fierce contention with his ally Pope Innocent.

Immediately after the death of Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury, the younger monks hastily elected their sub-prior, Reginald, to the vacant See. But, soon finding that they had acted imprudently, they applied to the king for leave to proceed in a fresh election. The choice of a bishop was really in the hands of the sovereign, though nominally it might be in the hands of the clergy. Such was the Anglo-Norman system. The king recommended one of his chief councillors, John de Grey, bishop of Norwich, who was accordingly chosen, invested with the temporalities of the See, and sent to Rome for confirmation. The pope now saw his opportunity, and eager to extend his power in England disallowed both elections, Reginald and **John de Grey,** and commanded the election of Stephen Langton, an Englishman by birth, a learned prudent man, and of excellent character. A more fit person, as it happened, could not have been named by the pope; but his action was in defiance of the privilege claimed by the monks, the suffragan bishops, and the king himself. In vain did the representatives of Canterbury and the king's commissioners urge the necessity of the royal assent. Innocent ruled otherwise. He constituted them a chapter by "the authority of God and the Apostolic See." The monks were now between two tyrants — the spiritual and the temporal. Twelve were under oath to the king not to elect any one but the bishop of Norwich; the pope commanded them to elect Langton, on pain of excommunication and anathema. Overcome by this awful menace, the chapter yielded to the spiritual tyrant, proceeded to elect Stephen, and on the 17th of June, 1207, the pope consecrated him Archbishop of Canterbury.

Such an interference with the rights of the established church and the prerogative of the crown was wholly new in England. Had John been a popular prince and surrounded by the strength and sympathies of his insulted people, he might have laughed to scorn the daring presumption and menaces of a foreign priest, but the folly and unpopularity of the king gave the pope the opportunity he desired. The **monks of Canterbury,** on their return from Rome, were impeached of high treason; and were in consequence expelled from their residences, and their property confiscated. But the king's fury knew no bounds; he dispatched a troop of horse to drive the monks out of the country, and, in case of resistance, to put them to death. The orders were executed in the temper they were given. The soldiers broke into the monastery with drawn swords; the prior and monks were ordered to leave the kingdom, and threatened, if they resisted or delayed, to see their monastery set on fire, and themselves thrust back into the flames. Many of them fled and found an asylum in Flanders. The king also indulged in the most insulting and stinging language to the proud and passionate pontiff; protesting that he would never accept Stephen Langton as primate, that he would maintain the right of the bishop of Norwich, and, in case of the pope's refusal, he would cut off all

communication between his dominions and Rome. But the pope proceeded with no less energy than John, only with a calmer dignity.

In the course of some further exchange of letters the pope enlarges on the learning and piety of Langton, and exhorts the king to abstain from taking up arms against God and His church; but, as John made no concession, Innocent commanded the bishops of London, Worcester, and Ely, to lay the whole kingdom under an interdict. When the bishops delivered their message, the king's anger broke out in wild oaths and blasphemies. He swore that if either pope or prelate should lay the kingdom under an interdict, he would drive the bishops and clergy out of the kingdom "without eyes, ears, or noses, to be the scarecrows of all nations." The prelates withdrew, and, when at a convenient distance from John, published the interdict.

ENGLAND UNDER THE BAN

In a moment all divine offices throughout the kingdom ceased, except the rite of baptism and extreme unction. "From Berwick to the British Channel," says one account of this fearful malediction, "from the Land's End to Dover, the churches were closed, the bells were silent; the only clergy who were seen stealing silently about were those who were to baptize new-born infants, or hear the confession of the dying. The dead were cast out of the towns, buried like dogs in some unconsecrated place, without prayer, without the tolling bell, without funeral rite. Those only can judge the effect of a papal interdict who consider how completely the whole life of all orders was affected by the ritual and daily ordinances of the church. Every important act was done under the counsel of the priest or the monk. The festivals of the church were the only holidays, the processions of the church the only spectacles, the ceremonies of the church the only amusements. To hear no prayer nor chant, to suppose that the world was surrendered to the unrestrained power of the devil and his evil spirits, with no saint to intercede, no sacrifice to avert the wrath of God; when no single image was exposed to view, not a cross unveiled: the intercourse between man and God utterly broken off; souls left to perish, or but reluctantly permitted absolution in the instant of death." And from other quarters we learn that, in order to inspire a deeper gloom and fanaticism, the hair was to be left uncut and the beard unshaven; the use of meat was forbidden; and even the ordinary salutation was prohibited.

Such was the state of our own country, England, for at least four years. The public misery was great and universal; but neither the misery of the subject, nor the religious privations of the Christian, moved the obdurate heart of the king or the pontiff. The triumph of the shepherd of Rome over a great kingdom was far more to be desired than the welfare of the flock. The prelates who published the edict with other rich bishops fled the kingdom; "there they lived," says the historian, "in abundance and luxury, instead of standing up as a defence for the Lord's house, abandoning their flocks to the ravening wolf." The vindictive tyrant John seemed to defy and treat with

insolent disdain the awful effects of the edict on his suffering subjects. He revelled in his vengeance against the bishops and priests who obeyed the pope. He confiscated the property of the superior clergy and monasteries throughout England; and compelled the Jews to yield up their wealth by imprisonment and torture. This state of things had lasted nearly two years when another bull was issued.

The crafty pope had narrowly watched the effect of the first; and seeing that John was losing his friends and becoming more unpopular, he published the sentence of excommunication against the name and person of the sovereign. Still the profligate habits of John were such that, while he defied the pope and the hierarchy, he at the same time alienated the affections of all orders in the country. Again the pope saw his opportunity, and issued another bull yet more appalling. The subjects of John were absolved from their allegiance and commanded to avoid his presence. But with that stoical indifference to human suffering which he uniformly manifested, he determined that both himself and the nation should brave the full vengeance of Rome. The papal thunders seemed wasted on the unfeeling and irreligious king; and had he managed his nobles and people wisely, the greatest of the popes and the heaviest of his bolts must have been ineffectual on the people of England. But the rapacity, barbarities, and outrageous conduct of the king estranged all classes. Disaffection grew into murmurs almost into revolt. Innocent, observing this leaven of disaffection working so effectually in England, prepared to launch his last and most dangerous thunderbolt against the contumacious sovereign. "The interdict had smitten the land the excommunication had desecrated the person of the king there remained the act of *deposition* from the throne of his fathers, which was now pronounced. That John, king of England, be deposed from the royal crown and dignity; that his subjects be dissolved from their oath of allegiance, and be at liberty to transfer them to a person worthier to fill the vacant throne."[170]

The **throne of England** was now publicly and solemnly declared vacant, by the decree of the pope, and the king's dominions the lawful spoil of whoever could wrest them from his unhallowed hands. Such was the power of the popes in those days, and such the terror of his thunders. He struck great nations with his anathemas, and they fell before him as if withered and blasted; he hurled great kings from their thrones, and compelled them to bend before the tempest of his wrath, and humbly obey the mandate of his will. All, without exception, in Church and State, must accept his own terms of reconciliation, or die without salvation and be tormented in the flames of hell for ever. The haughty and able Philip Augustus of France was tamed into submission in a few months; while the weak and contemptible John disregarded his fulminations for years, but it was only to receive a heavier blow at last, and submit to a deeper humiliation. We shall now see how this

[170] Greenwood's *Cathedra Petri*, book 13, p. 582; Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. 4, p. 90; Waddington's *History of the Church*, vol. 2, p. 167.

was accomplished; and, in the plot, the reader will also notice the deep cunning and deceitfulness of the pope. We have no difficulty, throughout this affair, in seeing the depths of Satan.

THE CROWN OF ENGLAND OFFERED TO FRANCE

The papal sentence of deposition against the king of England having been publicly and solemnly promulgated, **Philip of France** was delegated to execute the decree. The legates placed in his hands a formal commission, directing him by apostolic authority to invade England, depose the king, and take his crown; and it is observed by the historian, that the legates and prelates feigned the most wondrous zeal and earnestness in the whole affair; while it was altogether the merest artifice. Nothing was farther from Innocent's mind than to unite the two crowns on one head. This would have strengthened France, not the Roman See. Philip had not forgotten the insolence of the pope in interdicting his kingdom, and excommunicating himself; but his hatred of John, his love of enterprise, and the pope's treachery, completely blinded him. He counted on the truthfulness of the pope, but he made a ruinous mistake. Not a moment, however, was lost by Philip in collecting a numerous fleet and army for the invasion of England.

The pope at the same time published a crusade all over Christendom against the impious king John, promising to all who should take part in this holy war the remission of sins and the privileges of crusaders. But the fallen king was not wanting either in vigour of subtlety. He assembled a large fleet at Portsmouth, and an army on Barham Downs, near Canterbury. He assumed the aggressive: but he soon discovered that in his large army there were not many to be relied upon. Maddened with passion, he threatened to become a Mahometan and seek an alliance with the Caliph; but at this moment the spirit of the impatient king underwent a sudden revolution. From the height of defiant rage he fell to the lowest depths of prostration and fear.

ENGLAND SURRENDERED TO ROME

As it was not the interest or the intention of his Holiness to allow matters to be carried to extremities, the vigilant pope saw his time was come to interfere. Two legates, Pandulph and Durand, were sent over with the final **demands of Innocent to John.** They assured him that the King of France was ready to invade England with a great host and a powerful fleet, and that he would be accompanied with the archbishops, bishops, and clergy, whom John had banished; that they would transfer their allegiance to his rival Philip, and place the crown upon his head. With many such-like statements, they terrified the king, who lost all self-possession, and threw himself and his kingdom into the hands of the legates without reserve. With a meanness of spirit almost exceeding belief, and an abject submission which knew no bounds, he laid his crown at the feet of the haughty legate, resigned England and Ireland into the hands of the pope, swore homage to him as his liege lord, and took an oath of

fealty to his successors. The terms of this remarkable oath are rather long and wordy, but the following is the substance of it, as given in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica.*

"I John, by the grace of God King of England and Lord of Ireland, in order to expiate my sins, from my own free will and the advice of my barons, give to the Church of Rome, to Pope Innocent and his successors, the kingdom of England and all other prerogatives of my crown. I will hereafter hold them as the pope's vassal. I will be faithful to God, to the Church of Rome, to the pope *my master*, and to his successors legitimately elected. I promise to pay him a tribute of 1000 merks,[171] to wit, 700 for the kingdom of England, and 300 for the kingdom of Ireland." This memorable submission took place on the 15th of May, 1213, in the fourteenth year of his reign, at the house of the Templars, not far from Dover.

This oath was taken by the King kneeling before all the people, and with his hands held up between those of the legate. The attesting witnesses were, one archbishop, one bishop, nine earls, four barons. Having then agreed to install Langton in the primacy, he received the crown which he had been supposed to have forfeited. The wary and politic Pandulph, having received the fealty of the King of England, and **eighty thousand sterling** as compensation for the exiled bishops, hastily gathered up his charter and his money-bags, and hurried to rejoin the banished prelates in Normandy and divide the money. He next hastened to the camp of King Philip Augustus, and finding the army on the point of embarkation for England, he coolly informed the King, "that there was now no further need for his services; and that in fact any attempt to invade the kingdom, or to annoy the King of England, must be highly offensive to the holy See, inasmuch as that kingdom was now part and parcel of the patrimony of the church: it was therefore his duty to dismiss his army, and himself to return home in peace." When Philip discovered that he had been so thoroughly duped, he broke out in a storm of indignant invectives against the pope. "He had been drawn into enormous expense; he had called forth the whole strength of his dominions, under the delusive promise of a kingdom and the remission of his sins; all this he had done at the earnest entreaty of the pope. And was all the chivalry of France, in arms around their sovereign, to be dismissed like hired menials when there was no more use for their services?" But the King's fury was met by a cool repetition of the order, "Desist from hostilities against the vassal of the Holy See."[172]

Philip's disappointment and mortification were great; but not daring to offend the pope and unwilling to disband his army without attempting some enterprise, he made a descent on Flanders. Ferrand, the earl, though a peer of France, having entered into a secret league with John, gave Philip a fair

---

[171] An old Scotch silver coin, worth about 13s. 6d. This was to be paid yearly, besides Peter's pence.

[172] *Cathedra Petri,* book 13, p. 588.

pretext for turning his arms against his revolted vassal. But the fleets of England joined the Flemings, and the attempted conquest of Flanders ended in disgraceful defeat. The English captured three hundred vessels, and destroyed about a hundred more: whilst Philip, finding it impossible to prevent the rest from falling into the hands of the enemy, set fire to them himself, and thus abandoned the enterprise. Such was the heavy loss and discomfiture of Philip through the deep laid plot of Innocent.

MAGNA CHARTA

John having thus triumphed over his bitter enemy, and secured the alliance of the Holy See, continued the same cruel and tyrannical measures which had hitherto rendered him odious to his subjects. His long misgovernment, and his reckless indulgence in excesses of every vicious habit, had exhausted the patience of all classes both in Church and State. A general desire was expressed for the privileges and the control of settled law.

The story of **Magna Charta** is so truly English, so well known, and so intimately connected with church, as well as civil history, that we must give it a brief notice in our "Short Papers." Besides, it is said by historians, that no event of equal importance occurred in any other country of Europe during the thirteenth century; and that the results of no single incident have ever been so enduring or so widely spread as those of the meeting of the barons at Runnymede and the summoning of the burgesses to Parliament. While monarchy was making such rapid strides in France, a counter-balancing power was formed in England by the combination of the nobility and the rise of the House of Commons.

Archbishop Langton, whom Innocent had raised to the primacy, in order by his means to maintain all the exorbitant pretensions of Rome over England, was himself an Englishman, and on all occasions showed a sincere regard for the interests of the kingdom to the utter disappointment of the pope. Having found amidst the rubbish of an obscure monastery a copy of the charter of Henry I, he conferred privately with the barons, and exhorted them to have it renewed. Those of the barons who had felt deeply the degradation which John had inflicted on the whole kingdom by his abject submission to the pope, received the document with loud acclamations, and took a solemn oath to conquer or to die in the defence of their liberties. After several conferences and delays forty-five barons, armed in mail, well mounted on their war-steeds, and surrounded with their knights, servants, and soldiers, presented a petition to the King, praying him to renew and ratify the charter. John at first resented their presumption in a furious passion, and swore "that he would never grant *them* liberties which would make himself a slave." But the barons were firm and united, and the court of John rapidly diminished. He eventually submitted and agreed to a friendly conference. The barons named **Runnymede** as a proper place for meeting. It was a meadow situated between Staines and Windsor; the ground is still held in veneration as the spot

where the standard of English freedom was first unfurled. On the 15th day of June, 1215, both parties met there; the King signed the charter — the great charter of the liberties of England.

THE RAGE OF INNOCENT

Among the witnesses to that signature was **Pandulph,** the haughty legate. He saw it was a deadly blow to the papal power in England. Innocent was soon in possession of the startling news. His infallibility shuddered with alarm; he raged, he swore, as his manner was; he knit his brow, as the historian says, and broke out into the language of astonishment. "What! have the barons of England presumed to dethrone a king who has taken the cross, and placed himself under the protection of the apostolic See? Do they transfer to others the patrimony of the Church of Rome? By St. Peter we cannot leave such a crime unpunished." The great charter was declared null and void, the King forbidden under pain of excommunication to respect the oath which he had taken or the liberties he had confirmed. But the spiritual censures, the annulling edicts, were now received by the barons with utter disregard.

War broke out; and to the still deeper disgrace of John, who had no army of his own, he brought over from the continent bands of adventurers and freebooters promising them the estates of the English barons as rewards of valour. At the head of these mercenary troops with the aid of two warlike bishops, **Worcester** and **Norwich,** he traversed the whole country from the channel to the Forth. He let loose his ferocious hordes like wild beasts upon his unhappy realm. The barons had made no preparations for war, not suspecting the introduction of a foreign army. Here again we see the depths of Satan; he is ever ready to give to another what power he has over the nations, provided he to whom he gives it subjects himself entirely to his will. "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." (Matt. 4:8, 9) It was much the same to John whether he became a vassal of the pope, Mahomet, or Satan. For a short time he was undisputed master of the field. The whole land was wasted with fire and sword. Plunder, murder, torture, raged without control. Nothing was sacred, nothing was safe. Nobles and peasants fled with their wives and families when it was possible. The blood-stained assassins of the King and the pope passed through the country with the sword in one hand and the torch in the other; when a cry rose to heaven, "Oh, unhappy England! Oh, unhappy country! May God have mercy on us, and may His judgments fall on the King and the pope."

The judgment was not long delayed. Neither heaven nor earth could tolerate their cruelties and tyrannies any longer. The pope died on July 16th, 1216, at the age of fifty-five; just a year, a month, and a day, after the signing of Magna Charta. John survived him only a few months. He died on the 12th of October, 1216, in the forty-ninth year of his age, and the seventeenth of his reign. It is supposed that he died from fright accompanied by drunkenness. As he was returning from one of his scenes of slaughter, the royal waggons were

crossing the sands of the Wash, from Norfolk into Lincolnshire, when the tide rose suddenly and all sank in the abyss. The accident filled the King with terror; he felt as if the earth was about to open and swallow him alive. He drank copiously of cider, which, with fear and remorse, closed the days of the meanest and most despicable tyrant that has ever sat on the throne of England. The names of other kings, whose vices are black enough to call forth the execrations of posterity, are often surrounded with such a **halo of talent,** either in the senate or the field, as to mitigate the severity of the sentence. But King John dies: his character stands before us unredeemed by one solitary virtue.[173]

[173] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 8, p. 721; d'Aubigné, vol. 5, p. 98; James White, *Eighteen Christian Centuries*, p. 290.