

Volume 5: The Middle Ages
From Gregory VII to Boniface VIII
A.D. 1049-1294

INTRODUCTION TO THE POPES OF THE ERA

The fifth period of general Church history, or the second period of medieval Church history, begins with the rise of Hildebrand, 1049, and ends with the elevation of Boniface VIII to the papal dignity, 1294. In this period the Church and the papacy ascend from the lowest state of weakness and corruption to the highest power and influence over the nations of Europe. The papacy, as the controlling power of Western Christendom, embraces six stages.

1. The Hildebrandian popes, 1049-1073.
2. Gregory VII, 1073-1085, or the assertion of the supreme authority of the papacy in human affairs.
3. From Gregory's death to the Concordat of Worms, 1122, or the settlement of the controversy over investiture.
4. From the Concordat of Worms to Innocent III, 1198.
5. The Pontificate of Innocent III, 1198-1216, or the papacy at its height.
6. From Innocent III to Boniface VIII, 1216-1294, or the struggle of the papacy with Frederick II and the restoration of peace between the papacy and the empire.

The papacy had reached its lowest stage of weakness and degeneracy when at Sutri in 1046, under the influence of Henry III, two popes were deposed and a third was forced to abdicate. Nevertheless, in the public opinion of Europe, the papacy was still a necessary institution established by Christ in the primacy of Peter for the government and administration of the Church. There was nothing to take its place. It needed only a radical reformation in its head, which would be followed by a reformation of the members.

At last the providential man for effecting this necessary reformation appeared in the person of Hildebrand, who controlled five successive papal administrations for twenty-four years, 1049-1073, then occupied the papal chair himself for twelve years, 1073-1085, and was followed by like-minded successors. He is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of popes, and one of the most remarkable men in history.

HILDERBRAND or GREGORY VII

The moral reformation of the papacy began with Hildebrand as leader during the pontificate of Leo IX. He resumed the work of the emperor, Henry III, and carried it forward in the interest of the hierarchy. He was appointed cardinal-subdeacon, treasurer of the Roman Church, and abbot of St. Paul's. He was repeatedly sent as delegate to foreign countries, where he acquired an extensive knowledge of affairs. He replenished the empty treasury and became wealthy himself. But money was to him only a means for exalting the Church. His great object was to reform the clergy by the destruction of, in his opinion, two well-nigh universal evils: simony, that is, the traffic in ecclesiastical dignities,¹ and Nicolaitism, or the concubinage of the priests.²

In his first synod, held in Rome at Easter, 1049, simony was prohibited on pain of excommunication, including the guilty bishops and the priests ordained by them. But it was found that a strict prosecution would virtually deprive the churches, especially those of Rome, of their shepherds. A penance of forty days was, therefore, substituted for the deposition of priests. The same synod renewed the old prohibitions of sexual intercourse of the clergy, and made the concubines of the Roman priests servants of the Lateran palace.³ The synod also enjoined upon all Christians the almost forgotten duty of the tithe.

Leo IX died in 1054 while Hildebrand was absent in France. Hildebrand hurried back to Rome, but he could find no worthy successor in Italy and was unwilling to assume the burden of the papacy himself. A prelate of Germany, Gebhard, bishop of Eichstadt, was elected pope. He continued the synodical war against simony, but died in 1057 of a fever. He was the last of the German popes.

In the meantime, a great change had taken place in Germany. Henry III died in the prime of manhood, Oct. 5, 1056, and left a widow as regent and a son of six years, the ill-fated Henry IV. The long minority reign afforded a favorable opportunity for the reform party to make the papacy independent of the imperial power, which Henry III had wisely exerted for the benefit of the Church, yet at the expense of her freedom.

1 In other words, the buying and selling of promotions or offices within the church.

2 Strictly, Nicolaitism is the acceptance of clerical marriage. However, when prohibited to marry, priests often resorted to "concubinage," or living unmarried with a woman, by extension also called Nicolaitism.

3 From 1297, the popular name of the cathedral church of St. John Lateran at Rome, which was built on the site of the palace of the Plautii Laterani, a Roman family. As a papal headquarters, it was the site of five general councils of the Western Church.

The Roman nobility took advantage of Hildebrand's absence in Germany to reassert its former control of the papacy by electing Benedict X. But Hildebrand, on his return, expelled the usurping pope, and secured, with the consent of the empress, the election of Gerhard, bishop of Florence, a strong reformer, of ample learning and irreproachable character, who assumed the name of Nicolas II. The pontificate of Nicolas II was thoroughly under the control of Hildebrand, who became archdeacon and chancellor of the Roman Church in 1059.

Nicolas convened a Lateran Council in April, 1059. A far-reaching act of this council was the transfer of the election of a pope to the "cardinal-bishops" and "cardinal-clergy." Its corporate history may be said to begin with these canons. The election of the pope was made its prerogative. The synod further prescribed that the pope should be chosen from the body of Roman clergy, provided a suitable candidate could be found among their number. The matter was, therefore, taken entirely out of the hands of the emperor. As Henry IV was still young and not yet invested with the imperial dignity, it was a favorable opportunity for the papal circle to secure the perpetual control of the papal office for the Romans and the Roman clergy. With rare exceptions, as in the case of the period of the Avignon exile,⁴ the election of the pope has remained in the hands of the Romans ever since.

Nicolas died in 1061 and Anselm of Lucca was elected pope, taking the name Alexander II. He died in 1073. Hildebrand ordered a three days' fast with litanies and prayers for the dead, after which the cardinals were to proceed to an election. Before the funeral service was closed, the people shouted, "Hildebrand shall be pope!" He attempted to ascend the pulpit and quiet the crowd, but Cardinal Hugo Candidus anticipated him, and declared: "Men and brethren, ye know how since the days of Leo IX Hildebrand has exalted the holy Roman Church, and defended the freedom of our city. And as we cannot find for the papacy a better man, or even one that is his equal, let us elect him, a clergyman of our Church, well known and thoroughly approved amongst us."

This tumultuary election was at once legalized by the cardinals. It was eminently proper that the man who for nearly a quarter of a century had been the power behind the throne, should at last be pope in name as well as in fact. He chose the name Gregory in memory of his departed friend whom he had accompanied as chaplain into exile.⁵ He delayed his consecration long enough to

4 Avignon is a city in France. The city is probably best known for its Palais des Papes (Palace of the Popes), where the Popes lived for much of the 14th century.

5 In A.D. 1046, an appeal by advocates of reform was made to the new German emperor, Henry III, only 22 years old, to resolve the problem of three rival popes. While traveling to Rome for his coronation, he convened two

receive the consent of Henry IV, who in the meantime had become emperor. This was the last case of an imperial confirmation of a papal election.

THE GREGORIAN THEOCRACY

The Hildebrandian or Gregorian Church ideal is a theocracy based upon the Mosaic model and the canon law. It is the absolute sovereignty of the Church in this world, commanding respect and obedience by her moral purity and ascetic piety. By the Church is meant the Roman Catholic organization headed by the pope, as the vicar of Christ; and this hierarchical organization is identified with the Kingdom of God, in which men are saved from sin and death, and outside of which there is no ordinary salvation.

In Gregory VII, papal absolutism assumed flesh and blood. He did not claim infallibility in theory, though he assumed it in fact. But he did claim and exercise, as far as he could, an absolute authority over the temporal powers of Christendom, which the popes have long since lost and can never regain. Hildebrand was convinced that, however unworthy he might be personally, he was, in his official character, the successor of Peter. He is the universal bishop, entrusted with the care of all Christendom. He has absolute and final jurisdiction and is responsible only to God, and to no earthly tribunal. He alone can depose and reinstate bishops, and his legates take precedence of all bishops. He is the supreme arbiter in questions of right and wrong in the whole Christian world. He is above all earthly sovereigns. He can wear the imperial insignia. He can depose kings and emperors and absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance to unworthy sovereigns. This is the extreme of hierarchical arrogance and severity. Gregory always assumed the air of supreme authority over kings and nobles as well as bishops and abbots, and expected from them absolute obedience.

GREGORY VII AS A MORAL REFORMER

synods to deal with the matter. He asked Gregory VI, the most revered of the rival popes, to preside over the first of these synods at Sutri, about 25 miles north of Rome. Popes Benedict IX and Sylvester III were deposed at that synod. However, Gregory VI, though having a sincere desire to reform the papacy, had himself *bought* the high position from Benedict IX, the sin of simony. Therefore, following the deposition of the other two popes, he deposed himself and assumed a self-imposed exile. Hildebrand, later Gregory VII, followed him as his chaplain into exile across the Alps and back into Germany. In 1048 Hildebrand buried him on the banks of the Rhine. In December of 1046, a second synod was held by Henry in Rome, and Suidger of Bamberg, Germany, was chosen as the new pope, who took the name Clement II.

Gregory VII must be viewed not only as a papal absolutist, but also as a moral reformer. It is the close connection of these two characters that gives him such preeminence in history. His zeal for moral reform entitles him to real respect, while his pretension to absolute power he shares with the most worthless popes.

His reforms were directed against simony and Nicolaitism.⁶ What he had done as Hildebrand, by way of advice, he now carried out by official authority. In his war on Nicolaitism, Gregory was sustained by ancient laws of the Roman Church, but not by the genuine spirit of Christianity. [However, contrary to Gregory] enforced clerical celibacy has no foundation in the Bible and is apt to defeat the sacerdotal ideal which it was intended to promote. The real power and usefulness of the clergy depend upon its moral purity, which is protected and promoted by lawful matrimony, the oldest institution of God, dating from the paradise of innocence.

The motives of Gregory in his zeal for sacerdotal celibacy were partly monkish and partly hierarchical. Celibacy was an essential part of his ascetic ideal of a priest of God, who must be superior to carnal passions and frailties, wholly devoted to the interests of the Church, distracted by no earthly cares, separated from his fellowmen, and commanding their reverence by angelic purity. Another motive for opposing clerical marriage was to prevent the danger of a hereditary caste which might appropriate ecclesiastical property to private uses and impoverish the Church.

Gregory held synod after synod, which passed summary laws against simony and Nicolaitism, and denounced all carnal connection of priests with women, however legitimate, as sinful and shameful concubinage. He sent letters and legates into all countries with instructions to enforce the decrees. A synod in Rome, March, 1074, opened the war. It deposed the priests who had bought their dignity or benefices, prohibited all future sacerdotal marriage, required married priests to dismiss their wives or cease to read mass, and commanded the laity not to attend their services. The forbidding of the laity to attend mass said by a married priest was a most dangerous, despotic measure that had no precedent in antiquity. He thus openly encouraged rebellion of the laity against the clergy, contrary to his fundamental principle of the absolute rule of the hierarchy.

These decrees caused a storm of opposition. Many clergymen in Germany denounced Gregory as a madman and heretic. The bishops were placed in a most embarrassing position. Some sympathized with the married clergy and went so far as to bid the clergy to marry. Others were enthusiasts for sacerdotal celibacy. When the bishops showed a lack of zeal, Gregory stirred up the laity. He ordered steps to be taken to prevent by force, if necessary, the rebellious priests

⁶ The acceptance of clerical marriage.

from officiating.

As a result of this reform, society was almost dissolved. The married priests were exposed to the scorn and contempt of the laity, reduced to extreme poverty, or even mutilated by the populace, tortured and driven into exile. Their wives, who had been legally married with ring and religious rites, were insulted as harlots and their children branded as bastards. Many of these unfortunate women died from hunger or grief, or committed suicide in despair and were buried in unconsecrated earth. Peasants burned the tithes on the field lest they should fall into the hands of disobedient priests, trampled the host underfoot, and baptized their own children.

At last, the Gregorian enforcement of sacerdotal celibacy triumphed in the whole Roman Church, but at the fearful sacrifice of sacerdotal chastity. The hierarchical aim was attained, but not the angelic purity of the priesthood. The private morals of the priest were sacrificed to hierarchical ambition. Concubinage and licentiousness took the place of holy matrimony. The acts of councils abound in complaints of clerical immorality and the vices of unchastity and drunkenness. The records of the Middle Ages are full of the evidences that indiscriminate license of the worst kind prevailed throughout every rank of the hierarchy. The corruption again reached the papacy, especially in the fifteenth century. John XXIII and Alexander VI rivaled in wickedness and lewdness the worst popes of the tenth and eleventh centuries.

THE WAR OVER INVESTITURE

The other great reform-scheme of Gregory aimed at the complete emancipation of the Church from the bondage of the secular power. His conception of the freedom of the Church meant the slavery of the State. The State exercised control over the Church by selling ecclesiastical dignities, or the practice of simony, and by the investiture of bishops and abbots, that is, by the bestowal of the staff and ring.

The feudal system of the Middle Ages, as it developed itself among the new races of Europe from the time of Charlemagne, rested on land tenure and the mutual obligations of lord and vassal, whereby the lord, from the king down to the lowest landed proprietor, was bound to protect his vassal, and the vassal was bound to serve his lord. The secular lords regarded themselves as the patrons of the Church and claimed the right of appointing and investing its officers and of bestowing upon them, not only their temporalia, but also the insignia of their spiritual power. This was extremely offensive to churchmen. The bishop, invested by the lord, became his vassal, and had to swear an oath of obedience, which implied the duty of serving at

court and furnishing troops for the defense of the country.

GREGORY VII AND HENRY IV

The conflict over investiture began at a Roman synod in Lent Feb. 24-28, 1075. This synod forbade the king and all laymen from having anything to do with the appointment of bishops or assuming the right of investiture. A synod held in November of that same year positively forbade bishops, abbots, and other ecclesiastics from receiving ecclesiastical appointments from a king or any temporal lord whatsoever. At the same synod, Gregory excommunicated five counselors of Henry for practicing simony.

The king, hard pressed by the rebellious Saxons, at first yielded and dismissed the five counselors. But as soon as he had subdued the rebellion (June 5, 1075), he recalled them and continued to practice shameful simony. He paid his soldiers from the proceeds of Church property, and adorned his mistresses with the diamonds of sacred vessels. The pope exhorted him by letter and deputation to repent and threatened him with excommunication. The king received his legates most ungraciously and assumed the tone of open defiance.

Henry called the bishops and abbots of the empire to a council at Worms, Jan. 24, 1076. This council deposed Gregory without giving him even a hearing. Henry also secured the signatures of the disaffected bishops of Upper Italy at a council in Piacenza. He informed Gregory of the decree of Worms in an insulting letter. At the same time Henry wrote to the cardinals and the Roman people to aid him in the election of a new pope. The letter was brought to Rome at the end of February while Gregory was holding a synod with 110 bishops.

On the next day, February 22, the pope excommunicated and deposed Henry in the name of St. Peter, and absolved his subjects from their oath of obedience. He published the ban in a letter to all Christians.

The anathema was pronounced on Henry IV. At the same time the pope excommunicated all the German and Italian bishops who had deposed him at Worms and Piacenza. This was a most critical moment and the signal for a deadly struggle between the two greatest potentates in Christendom. Never before had such a tremendous sentence been pronounced upon a crowned head. Now the heir of the crown of Charlemagne was declared an outlaw by the successor of the Galilean fisherman, and Europe accepted the decision. There were not lacking, indeed, voices of discontent and misgivings about the validity of a sentence that justified the breaking of a solemn

oath. All conceded the papal right of excommunication, but not the right of deposition. If Henry had commanded the respect and love of his subjects, he might have defied Gregory. But the religious sentiment of the age sustained the pope, and was far less shocked by the papal excommunication and deposition of the king than by the royal deposition of the pope. It was never forgotten that the pope had crowned Charlemagne, and it seemed natural that his power to bestow implied his power to withhold or to take away.

When Henry received the tidings of the sentence of excommunication and deposition, he burst into a furious rage, abused Gregory as a hypocrite, heretic, murderer, perjurer, adulterer, and threatened to fling back the anathema upon his head. He summoned a national council to Worms on Whitsunday (May 15) to protest against the attempt of Gregory to unite in one hand the two swords which God had separated.

The council at Worms proved a failure. A council in Mainz turned out no better, and Henry found it necessary to negotiate. Saxony was lost; prelates and nobles deserted him. A diet at Tribur held Oct. 16, 1076, demanded that he should submit to the pope and seek absolution from him within twelve months from the date of excommunication, at the risk of forfeiting his crown. Meanwhile he was to abide at Spire in strict privacy, in the sole company of his wife, the bishop of Verdun, and a few servants chosen by the nobles.

CANOSSA, 1077

A few days before Christmas, Henry IV left Spire on a journey across the Alps as a penitent, seeking absolution from the pope. It was one of the coldest and longest winters within the memory of men, the Rhine being frozen to a solid mass. He was accompanied by his wife with her infant son and one faithful servant.

The royal couple passed through Burgundy and Susa under the protection of Count William and the mother of Henry's wife. The queen and her child were carried up and lowered down the icy slopes in rough sledges of oxhide. When Henry reached the plains of Lombardy, he was received with joy by the anti-Hildebrandian party, but he hurried on to meet the successor of Peter, who alone could give him absolution. He left his wife and child at Reggio, and, accompanied by his mother-in-law and a few friends, he climbed up the steep hill to Canossa, where Gregory was then stopping on his journey to the Diet at Augsburg, waiting for a safe conduct across the Alps.

Henry arrived at the foot of the castle-steep, Jan. 21, 1077, when the cold was severe and the ground covered with snow. He had an interview with the abbot of Cluny and declared his willingness to submit to the pope if he was released from the interdict. But Gregory would only absolve him on condition that he would surrender to him his crown and forever resign the royal dignity. The king made the last step to secure the mercy of the pope. He assumed the severest penances that the Church requires from a sinner, as a sure way to absolution. For three days he stood in the court between the inner walls as a penitent suppliant, with bare head and feet, in a coarse woollen shirt, shivering in the cold, and knocked in vain for entrance at the gateway.

Gregory refused admittance until he was satisfied that the cup of humiliation was drained to the dregs, or that further resistance would be impolitic. He first exacted from Henry, as a condition of absolution, the promise to submit to his decision at the approaching meeting of the German nobles under the presidency of the pope as arbiter and to grant him and his deputies protection on their journey to the north. In the meantime he was to abstain from exercising the functions of royalty. The king made the promise, and two bishops and several nobles, in his behalf, swore upon sacred relics that he would keep it.

After these preliminaries, the inner gate was opened. The king, in the prime of life, the heir of many crowned monarchs, and a man of tall and noble presence, threw himself at the feet of the gray-haired pope, a man of low origin and of small and unimpressive stature, who by his word had disarmed an empire. Henry burst into tears, and cried "Spare me, holy father, spare me!" The company was moved to tears, and even the iron pope showed signs of tender compassion. He heard the confession of Henry, raised him up, gave him absolution and his apostolic blessing, conducted him to the chapel, and sealed the reconciliation by the celebration of the sacrifice of the mass.

Henry gained his object, but at the sacrifice of his royal dignity. He confessed by his act of humiliation that the pope had a right to depose a king and heir of the imperial crown and to absolve subjects from the oath of allegiance. The head of the State acknowledged the temporal supremacy of the Church. Canossa marks the deepest humiliation of the State and the highest exaltation of the political papal Church of Rome.

The result of Canossa was civil war in Germany and Italy. It lasted several years. The friends and supporters of Henry regarded his humiliation as an act of cowardice and the pope's conduct as an insult to the German nation and the royal crown. His enemies, a small number of Saxon and Swabian nobles and bishops, assembled on March 13, 1077, and, in the presence of two legates of the pope, but without his express authority, offered the crown to Henry's brother-in-

law, Rudolf, Duke of Swabia.

Henry demanded from the pope the ban over the robber of his crown, but in vain. Therefore, he refused Gregory the promised safe-conduct to Germany, acted as king, crossed the Alps, and defeated Rudolf in a battle in Franconia, Aug. 7, 1078. But on Jan. 27, 1080, Henry was defeated by him in a decisive battle, which Rudolf regarded as a divine decision, and which inclined the pope in his favor.

In a synod of Rome, March 7, 1080, Gregory, invoking the aid of St. Peter and St. Paul, declared a second and severer ban against Henry and all his adherents, depriving him again of his kingdoms of Germany and Italy, forbidding all the faithful to obey him, and bestowed the crown of Germany on Rudolf. A reconciliation was now impossible. Henry replied to the papal ban by the election of an anti-pope. A council of Germany and Italian bishops met on June 26, 1080, and deposed Gregory on the frivolous charges of ambition, avarice, simony, and sorcery. At the same time they elected the excommunicated Archbishop Wibert of Ravenna, Italy pope, under the name of Clement III.

This was the beginning of a double civil war between rival popes and rival kings, with all its horrors. Henry was [again] defeated Oct. 15, 1080, on the banks of the Elster, near Naumburn. But Rudolf was mortally wounded and died the same evening. His death turned his victory into a defeat, as it was regarded in that age as a judgment of God against him and the anti-pope, Wibert or Clement III. In the spring of 1081 Henry crossed the Alps with a small army to depose Gregory. He was welcomed in Lombardy, defeated the troops of the Countess Matilda, and appeared at the gates of Rome before Pentecost, May 21. Gregory, surrounded by danger, stood firm as a rock and refused every compromise. Henry, not being permitted by the Romans to enter their city, spent the summer in Upper Italy. He returned to Rome in 1082, and [returned] again with a larger force at Easter, 1083, [this time] conquered the city and the Church of St. Peter in June. Gregory was entrenched in the Castle of St. Angelo and fulminated anew his anathema upon Henry and his followers. Henry answered by causing Wibert to be enthroned in St. Peter's. He soon left Rome with Wibert, promising to return. In the spring of 1084 Henry returned and called a synod, which deposed and excommunicated Gregory. Wibert was consecrated on Palm Sunday as Pope Clement III. Henry and his wife received from him the imperial crown in St. Peter's. They left Rome, leaving the defense of the city in the hands of the Romans. He never returned.

Gregory called to his aid the Norman chief, Robert Guiscard. With a motley force of Normans,⁷

⁷ From France.

Lombards,⁸ Apulians,⁹ and Saracens,¹⁰ amounting to thirty thousand men and six thousand horses, Guiscard arrived in Rome on May 27, 1084, and liberated Gregory. He then began such a pillage and slaughter as even the barbarians had not committed. Half the city was reduced to ruins; many churches were demolished, others turned into forts; women and maidens, even nuns, were outraged, and several thousand citizens sold into slavery. The survivors cursed the pope and his deliverer. The cruelty of the Normans gained more hearts for the emperor than a hundred-thousand pieces of gold. Rome was a ghost of her former self.

Gregory was again in possession of the Lateran palace, but he left the scene of melancholy desolation, accompanied by Guiscard and a few cardinals and Roman nobles. He went first to Monte Cassino and then to Salerno. The descent from Canossa to Salerno was truly a *via dolorosa*. But the old pope, broken in body, was unbroken in spirit.

He renewed the ban against Henry and the anti-pope at the close of 1084 and sent a letter to the faithful in Germany, stating that the words of the Psalmist, *Quare fremuerunt gentes* (Ps. 2:1,2), were fulfilled, that the kings of the earth have rebelled against Christ and his apostle Peter to destroy the Christian religion but could not seduce those who trusted in God. He called upon them to come to the rescue of the Church if they wished to gain the remission of sins and eternal salvation. This is his last written document. Gregory died May 25, 1085. He was, in his own time, and has been since, the subject both of the highest praise and of the severest censure.

LOTHARIO or INNOCENT III

The brilliant pontificate of Innocent III, 1198-1216, lasted as long as the combined and uneventful reigns of his five predecessors. It marks the golden age of the medieval papacy and one of the most important eras in the history of the Catholic Church. No other mortal has before or since wielded such extensive power. As the spiritual sovereign of Latin Christendom, he had no rival. At the same time he was the acknowledged arbiter of the political destinies of Europe from Constantinople to Scotland. He successfully carried into execution the highest theory of the papal theocracy and anticipated the Vatican dogmas of papal absolutism and infallibility. To the papal title "vicar of Christ," Innocent added for the first time the title "vicar of God." He set aside the decisions of bishops and provincial councils, and lifted up and cast down kings. He summoned and guided one of the most important of the councils of the Western Church, the

8 From Germany.

9 From Italy.

10 Arabs.

Fourth Lateran, 1215, whose acts established the Inquisition and fixed transubstantiation as a dogma. He set on foot the Fourth Crusade, and died making preparation for another. On the other hand, he set Christian against Christian, and by undertaking to extirpate religious dissent by force, drenched parts of Europe in Christian blood.

Innocent was only thirty-seven years old when he ascended the throne, the youngest in the line of popes up to that time. Almost at once he began to give expression to his conception of the papal dignity. Throughout his pontificate he forcibly and clearly expounded it in a tone of mingled official pride and personal humility. At his coronation he preached on the faithful and wise servant.

Ye see what manner of servant it is whom the Lord hath set over his people, no other than the vicegerent of Christ, the successor of Peter. He stands in the midst between God and man; below God, above man; less than God, more than man. He judges all and is judged by none. But he, whom the preeminence of dignity exalts, is humbled by his vocation as a servant, that so humility may be exalted and pride be cast down; for God is against the high-minded, and to the lowly He shows mercy; and whoso exalteth himself shall be abased.¹¹

Under Innocent's rule, the subjection of the entire Christian world to the Roman pontiff seemed to be near realization. But the measures of force which were employed in the Latin conquest of Constantinople, 1204, had the opposite effect from what was intended. The overthrow of the Byzantine empire and the establishment of a Latin empire in its stead and the creation of a new hierarchy of Constantinople only completed the final alienation of the Greek and Latin churches. The rigorous system of the Inquisition which he set on foot begat bitterness and war of churchman against Christian dissenter and of Christian against Mohammedan. More blood was shed at the hand of the Church during the pontificate of Innocent, and under his immediate successors carrying out his policy, than in any other age except during the papal counter-Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The audacious papal claim to imperialism corrected itself by the policy employed by Innocent and his successors to establish the claim over the souls and bodies of men and the governments of the earth.

THE CRUSADES, CHARACTER AND CAUSES

The crusades were armed pilgrimages to Jerusalem under the banner of the cross. These

¹¹ Vol. V, p. 157.

expeditions occupied the attention of Europe for more than two centuries, beginning in 1095. They continued to be the concern of the popes until the beginning of the sixteenth century. There were seven greater crusades, the first beginning in 1095, and the last terminating with the death of St. Louis in 1270.

Contemporaries had no doubt of the crusades being a holy undertaking. Those who fell under Eastern skies or on their way to the East received the benefits of special indulgence for sins committed and were esteemed in the popular judgment as martyrs. Urban II promised the first crusaders marching to Jerusalem that the journey should be counted as a substitute for penance. Eugenius, 1146, went farther in distinctly promising the reward of eternal life. The virtue of the reward was extended to the parents of those taking part. Innocent III included in the plenary indulgence those who built ships and contributed in any way, and promised to them "increase of eternal life."

The rewards were not confined to spiritual privileges. The crusaders were granted exemption from debt, and freedom from taxation and the payment of interest. Complaint was frequently made by the kings of France that the crusaders committed the most offensive crimes under cover of ecclesiastical protection.

The crusades began and ended in France. The French element was the ruling factor, and the contemporary accounts of them were for the most part written by Frenchmen. The movement spread through all Europe from Hungary to Scotland. Spain alone forms an exception as she was engaged in a crusade of her own against the Moors. *The aim of the crusades was the conquest of the Holy Land and the defeat of Islam.*

The immediate causes of the crusades were the ill treatment of pilgrims visiting Jerusalem and the appeal of the Greek emperor, who was hard pressed by the Turks. Nor may we forget the feeling of revenge for the Mohammedans when they invaded Italy and Gaul. In 841 they sacked St. Peter's, and in 846 threatened Rome for the second time, and a third time under John VIII.

From an early day Jerusalem was the goal of Christian pilgrimage. The Holy Land became to the imagination a land of wonders, filled with the divine presence of Christ. To surmount the dangers of such a journey in a pious frame of mind was a means of expiation for sins. Special laws were enacted in the pilgrim's behalf. Hospitals and other beneficent institutions were erected for their comfort along the main route and in Jerusalem. The favorite route was through Rome and by the sea, a dangerous avenue, as it was infested by Saracen pirates. The conversion of the Hungarians in the tenth century opened up the route along the Danube. Barons, princes,

bishops, and monks followed one after the other, some of them leading large bodies of pious tourists.

However, a sudden check was put upon the pilgrimages by the Seljukian Turks, who conquered the Holy Land in 1076. A rude and savage tribe, they heaped, with the intense fanaticism of new converts, all manner of insults and injuries upon the Christians. Many were imprisoned or sold into slavery. Those who returned to Europe carried with them a tale of woe which aroused the religious feelings of all classes.

The call that resulted in the first expedition for the recovery of Jerusalem was made by Pope Urban II at the Council of Clermont, 1095, in Southern France. Its chief popular advocate was Peter the Hermit who, on returning from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, spread its tale of woes and horrors.

At the Council of Piacenza, in the spring of 1095, envoys were present from the emperor Alexius Comnenus. They made addresses, invoking aid against the advancing Turks. In the following November, the Council of Clermont was held, which decreed the First Crusade.

The council comprised a vast number of ecclesiastics and laymen, especially from France. Urban II was present in person. On the day of the opening there were counted 14 archbishops, 250 bishops, and 400 abbots. Thousands of tents were pitched outside the walls. On the ninth day, the pope addressed the multitude from a platform erected in the open air. It was a fortunate moment for Urban, and has been compared to Christmas Day, 800, when Charlemagne was crowned. The address was the most effective sermon ever preached by a pope or any other mortal. It stirred the deepest feelings of the hearers and was repeated throughout all Europe.

In a few months large companies were ready to march against the enemies of the cross. A new era in European history was begun. A new passion had taken hold of its people. All classes, lay and clerical, saw in the expedition to the cradle of their faith a solace for sin, a satisfaction of Christian fancy, a heaven-appointed mission. The struggle of states with the papacy was for the moment at an end. All Europe was suddenly united in a common and holy cause, of which the supreme pontiff was beyond dispute the appointed leader.

THE FIRST CRUSADE AND THE CAPTURE OF JERUSALEM

The departure for the first crusade was set for the 15th of August, 1096. But the excitement was

too intense for the people to wait, so as early as March throngs of both sexes and all ages began to gather in Lorraine and at Treves, and to demand of Peter the Hermit and other leaders to lead them immediately to Jerusalem. The priest forsook his cell, the peasant left his plow and placed his wife and children on carts drawn by oxen, and thus went forth to fight the Turk.

The unwieldy bands, or swarms, were held together loosely under enthusiastic but incompetent leaders. The first swarm, comprising from 12,000 to 20,000 under Walter the Penniless, marched safely through Hungary, but was cut to pieces at the storming of Belgrade or destroyed in the Bulgarian forests. The leader and a few stragglers were all that reached Constantinople.

The second swarm, comprising more than 40,000, was led by the Hermit himself. On their march through Hungary they were protected by the Hungarian king. But when they reached the Bulgarian frontier, they found one continuous track of blood and fire, robbery and massacre, marking the route of their predecessors. Only a remnant of 7,000 reached Constantinople, and they in the most pitiful condition, in July, 1096. Here they were well-treated by the Emperor Alexius, who transported them across the Bosphorus to Asia, where they were to await the arrival of the regular army. But they preferred to rove, marauding and plundering, through the rich provinces. Finally, a false rumor that the vanguard had captured Nicea, the capital of the Turks in Asia Minor, allured the main body into the plain of Nicea, where large numbers were surrounded and massacred by the Turkish cavalry. Peter the Hermit had fled back to Constantinople before the battle began, unable to control his followers.

A third swarm, comprising 15,000, mostly Germans under the lead of the monk Gottschalk, was massacred by the Hungarians.

Another band began its career, May, 1096, by massacring and robbing the Jews in Mainz and other cities along the Rhine. Albert of Aachen, who describes these scenes, does not sympathize with this lawlessness, but saw a divine judgment in its almost complete annihilation in Hungary. This band was probably a part of the swarm, estimated at the incredible number of 200,000.

These preliminary expeditions of the First Crusade may have cost 300,000 lives.

The regular army consisted, according to the lowest statements, of more than 300,000. It proceeded through Europe in sections which met at Constantinople and Nicea. The emperor Alexius, who had so urgently solicited the aid of Western Europe, became alarmed when he saw the hosts arriving in his city. They threatened to bring famine into the land and to disturb the order of his realm.

The crusaders had their successes. However, the success of the enterprise was retarded and its glory diminished by the selfish jealousies and alienation of the leaders which culminated in disgraceful conflicts at Antioch. The hardships and privations of the way were terrible, almost beyond description. The crusaders were forced to eat horse flesh, camels, dogs, mice, and even worse. The sufferings from thirst exceeded, if possible, the sufferings from hunger.

The culmination of the First Crusade was the fall of Jerusalem, July 15, 1099. The army was then reduced to 20,000 fighting men. A desperate but futile assault was made on the fifth day. Boiling pitch and oil were used, with showers of stones and other missiles, to keep the crusaders at bay. Ladders, scaling towers, and other engines of war were constructed, but the wood had to be procured at a distance from Shechem. The trees around Jerusalem, cut down by Titus twelve centuries before, had never been replaced. The suffering due to the summer heat and the lack of water was intense. The valley and the hills were strewn with dead horses, whose putrefying carcasses made life in the camp almost unbearable. In vain did the crusaders with bare feet, the priests at their head, march in procession around the walls, hoping to see them fall as the walls of Jericho had fallen before Joshua. Help at last came with the arrival of the Genoese fleet in the harbor of Joppa, which brought workmen and supplies of tools and food.

Friday, the day of the crucifixion, was chosen for the final assault. A great tower surmounted by a golden cross was dragged alongside of the walls and the drawbridge let down. Letold of Tournay was the first to scale the walls. It was noticed that the moment of this crowning feat was three o'clock, the hour of the Savior's death.

The scenes of carnage that followed belong to the many dark pages of Jerusalem's history and showed how, in the quality of mercy, the crusading knight was far below the ideal of Christian perfection. The streets were choked with the bodies of the slain. The Jews were burnt with their synagogues. The greatest slaughter was in the temple enclosure.

Such a slaughter of the pagans had never been seen or heard of. The number none but God knew.

Penitential devotions followed easily upon the gory butchery of the sword. Headed by Godfrey, clad in a suit of white linen, the crusaders proceeded to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and offered up prayers and thanksgivings. The devotions over, the work of massacre was renewed. Neither the tears of women, nor the cries of children, nor the protests of Tancred,¹² who for the

¹² One of the leaders of the Crusader army.

honor of chivalry was concerned to save three hundred to whom he had promised protection, none of these availed to soften the ferocity of the conquerors. Saracen prisoners were forced to clear the streets of the dead bodies and blood to save the city from pestilence. "They wept and transported the dead bodies out of Jerusalem," is the heartless statement of Robert the Monk.

Such was the piety of the crusaders. The religion of the Middle Ages combined self-denying asceticism with heartless cruelty to infidels, Jews, and heretics. According to William of Tyre, "They cut down with the sword everyone whom they found in Jerusalem, and spared no one. The victors were covered with blood from head to foot." In the next breath, speaking of the devotion of the crusaders, the archbishop adds, "It was a most affecting sight which filled the heart with holy joy to see the people tread the holy places in the fervor of an excellent devotion."

Urban II died two weeks after the fall of Jerusalem before hearing tidings of the event. No more favorable moment could have been chosen for the crusade. The Seljukian power, which was at its height in the eleventh century, was broken up into rival dynasties and factions by the death of Molik Shah, 1092.

THE FALL OF EDESSA AND THE SECOND CRUSADE

On Oct. 2, 1187, the Mohammedan Saladin entered Jerusalem after it had made a brave resistance. There were no scenes of savage butchery such as followed the entry of the Crusaders ninety years before.

The Second Crusade was led by two sovereigns, the emperor Konrad III and Louis VII of France, and owed its origin to the profound impression made in Europe by the fall of Edessa¹³ and the zealous eloquence of St. Bernard. Konrad prepared for the expedition with 70,000 armed men, 7,000 of whom were knights, in 1146. They assembled at Regensburg and proceeded through Hungary to the Bosphorus, meeting with a poor reception along the route. The Greek emperor Manuel and Konrad were brothers-in-law, but this tie was no protection to the Germans. Guides, provided by Manuel, treacherously led them astray in the Cappadocian mountains.¹⁴ Famine, fever, and the attacks of the enemy were so disastrous that when the army fell back upon Nicea, not more than one-tenth of its original number remained.

13 An ancient city of Mesopotamia on the site of present-day Urfa in southeast Turkey. It was a major Christian center after the third century A.D. but was conquered by the Arabs in 639 then recaptured by Crusaders in 1097.

14 Cappadocia was ancient region of Asia Minor in present-day east-central Turkey.

Louis followed, in 1147, the same route taken by Konrad. The two sovereigns met at Nicea and proceeded together to Ephesus. There they departed but met again at Jerusalem with her king, Baldwin III. At a council of the three, they decided to direct their arms against Damascus before proceeding to the more distant Edessa. The siege ended in complete failure, owing to the disgraceful quarrels between the camps and the leaders. Edessa remained lost to the crusaders, and Damascus never fell into their power.

THE THIRD CRUSADE, 1189-1192.

The Third Crusade was undertaken to regain Jerusalem which had been lost to Saladin in 1187. It enjoys the distinction of having had for its leaders the three most powerful princes of Western Europe, the emperor Frederick Barbarossa, the king of France Philip Augustus, and the English king Richard I, or the Lion-hearted. This crusade has been more widely celebrated in romance than any of the others, yet it was almost a complete failure.

Jerusalem had surrendered to Saladin on Oct. 2, 1187. On the news of Saladin's victory, Urban III is alleged to have died of grief. An official summons was hardly necessary to stir the crusading ardor of Europe from one end to the other. Danes, Swedes, Welshmen, Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Germans joined in readiness for a new expedition.

Frederick Barbarossa, who was on the verge of seventy, reached the Bosphorus. With an army of 100,000, of whom 50,000 sat in the saddle, he set forth by way of Hungary to Constantinople. The Greek emperor, Isaac Angelus, far from regarding the crusaders' approach with favor, threw Barbarossa's commissioners into prison and made a treaty with Saladin. However, this afforded Frederick the opportunity of uniting the East and West once more under a single sceptre. The Wallachians and Servians promised him their support if he would dethrone Isaac and take the crown. But though there was provocation enough, Frederick refused to turn aside from his purpose, the reconquest of Jerusalem. In March, 1190, his troops were transferred across the Bosphorus. He took Iconium and reached Cilicia. There his career was brought to a sudden end in the waters of the Kalycadnus river into which he had plunged himself in order to cool off [but drowned]. Scarcely ever has a life so eminent had such a tragic and deplored ending. His son, Frederick of Swabia, with a demoralized contingent, reached the walls of Acre (or Ptolemais) in Syria, where he soon after became a victim of the plague, October, 1190.

Philip and Richard reached the Holy Land by the Mediterranean. Acre, under Mount Carmel, had become the metropolis of the crusaders, as it was the key to the Holy Land. Guy of

Lusignan had been laying siege against Acre for two years. But the army had engaged in shameful practices, yielding to ease and lust rather than encouraging virtue.

Saladin was watching the besiegers and protecting the garrison. The horrors of the siege made it one of the memorable sieges of the Middle Ages. It was carried on from the sea as well as on the land. Greek fire was used with great effect by the Turks. Women as well as men participated in the struggle. With the aid of huge machinery and other engines constructed by Richard in Sicily, and by Philip, the city was made to surrender, July, 1191.

The advance to Jerusalem was delayed by rivalries between the armies and their leaders. Once or twice Richard came so near the Holy City that he might have looked down into it had he so chosen. But after a signal victory at Joppa he closed his military achievements in Palestine. A treaty, concluded with Saladin, assured to the Christians for three years the coast from Tyre to Joppa, and protection to pilgrims in Jerusalem and on their way to the city.

The exploits of the English king won even the admiration of the Arabs, whose historian reports how he rode up and down in front of the Saracen army defying them, and not a man dared to touch him. Saladin died March 4, 1193, by far the most famous of the foes of the crusaders. Christendom has joined with Arab writers in praise of his chivalric courage, culture, and magnanimity. What could be more courteous than his granting the request of Hubert Walter for the station of two Latin priests in the three churches of the Holy Sepulchre, Nazareth, and Bethlehem?

The recapture of Acre and the grant of protection to the pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem were paltry achievements in view of the loss of life, the long months spent in making ready for the crusade, the expenditure of money, and the combination of the great nations of Europe. In this case, as in the other crusades, it was not so much the Saracens, or even the splendid abilities of Saladin, which defeated the crusaders, but their feuds among themselves. Never again did so large an army from the West contend for the cross on Syrian soil.

THE FOURTH CRUSADE AND THE CAPTURE OF CONSTANTINOPLE, 1200-1204

It would be difficult to find in history a more notable diversion of a scheme from its original purpose than the Fourth Crusade. Inaugurated to strike a blow at the power that held the Holy Land, it destroyed the Christian city of Zara and overthrew the Greek empire of Constantinople. As the First Crusade resulted in the establishment of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, so the

Fourth Crusade resulted in the establishment of the Latin empire of Constantinople.

Innocent III, on ascending the papal throne in 1198, threw himself with all the energy of his nature into the effort of reviving the crusading spirit. He issued letter after letter to the sovereigns of England, France, Hungary, and Sicily. He also wrote the Byzantine emperor, urging him to resist the Saracens and subject the Greek church to its mother, Rome.

An army was gathered, and the leaders meeting at Soissons¹⁵ in 1200, sent a deputation to Venice to secure transportation for it to Egypt, the point of landing and attack. The Venetian Grand Council agreed to provide ships for 9000 esquires, 4500 knights, 20,000 foot soldiers, and 4500 horses, and to furnish provisions for nine months for the sum of 85,000 marks. The agreement stated the design of the enterprise to be "the deliverance of the Holy Land." The Venetian doge,¹⁶ Henry Dandolo, already passed 90 years old, was full of vigor and decision.

The crusading forces mustered at Venice. The fleet was ready, but the crusaders were short of funds and able to pay only 50,000 marks of the stipulated sum. Dandolo took advantage of these straits to advance the selfish aims of Venice. He proposed, as an equivalent for the balance, that the crusaders aid Venice in capturing Zara, the capital of Dalmatia belonging to the Christian king of Hungary. Zara was the chief market on the eastern coast of the Adriatic. The offer was accepted. Upon hearing of this venture, Innocent III threatened papal excommunication against them, but, nevertheless, after a solemn celebration of the mass, the fleet set sail with Dandolo as virtual commander.

Zara was taken Nov. 24, 1202, given over to plunder, and razed to the ground. No wonder Innocent wrote that Satan had been the instigator of this destructive raid upon a Christian people and excommunicated the participants in it.

The Crusade now directed itself against Constantinople. The rightful emperor, Isaac Angelus, was languishing in prison with his eyes put out by the hand of the usurper, Alexius III, his own brother. Isaac's son, also named Alexius, had appealed to Innocent III and Philip of Swabia for aid in behalf of his father. Greek messengers appeared at Zara to appeal to Dandolo and the crusaders to take up Isaac's cause. This proposal suited the ambition of Venice, which could not have wished for a more favorable opportunity to confirm her superiority over the Pisans and the Genoans.

¹⁵ A city of northern France northwest of Paris.

¹⁶ The chief magistrate in the former republics of Venice and Genoa.

As compensation for their aid, Alexius offered 200,000 marks silver. Dandolo fell in at once with the proposition, but it was met with strong voices of dissent in the ranks of the crusaders, a few of whom refused to be used for private ends and withdrew from the expedition. Nevertheless, the expedition continued in spite of Innocent's threat of excommunication if they turned against Constantinople.

The fleet was joined by Isaac's son Alexius, in person. By the end of June, 1203, it had passed through the Dardanelles and was anchored opposite the Golden Horn. After prayers and exhortations by the bishops and clergy, the Galata tower was taken. Alexius III fled, and Isaac was restored to the throne.

The Greeks found it impossible to fulfill the agreement made with the Venetians. Confusion reigned among them. Two disastrous conflagrations devoured large portions of the city. Those discontented with the hard terms of the agreement and the presence of the Occidentals, gave Alexius Dukas opportunity to dethrone Isaac and his son Alexius and to seize the reins of government. The prince was put to death, and Isaac soon followed him to the grave.

The confusion within the palace and the failure to pay the promised reward were a sufficient excuse for the invaders to assault the city, which fell April 12, 1204. Unrestrained pillage and riot followed. Innocent denounced the conquest of the city in the following words:

You have spared nothing that is sacred, neither age nor sex. You have given yourselves up to prostitution, to adultery, and to debauchery in the face of all the world. You have glutted your guilty passions, not only on married women, but upon women and virgins dedicated to the Saviour. You have not been content with the imperial treasures and the goods of rich and poor, but you have seized even the wealth of the Church and what belongs to it. You have pillaged the silver tables of the altars; you have broken into the sacristies and stolen the vessels.

To the revolt at these orgies succeeding ages have added regret for the irreparable loss which literature and art suffered in the wild and protracted sack. Constantinople proved to be the richest of sacred storehouses, full of relics, which excited the cupidity and satisfied the superstition of the crusaders.

The Latin Empire of Constantinople, which followed the capture of the city, lasted from 1204 to 1261. It widened the schism of the Greek and Latin churches. The only party to reap substantial gain from the Fourth Crusade was the Venetians.

FREDERICK II AND THE FIFTH CRUSADE, 1229

Innocent III's ardor for the reconquest of Palestine continued unabated until his death. A fresh crusade constituted one of the main objects for which the Fourth Lateran Council was called. The date set for it to start was June 1, 1217. Innocent, however, died before the expedition started.

In 1217 Andreas of Hungary led an army to Syria, but accomplished nothing. In 1219 William of Holland with his Germans, Norwegians, and Danes helped John of Brienne, titular king of Jerusalem,¹⁷ to take Damietta. This city, situated on one of the mouths of the Nile, was a place of prime commercial importance and regarded as the key of Egypt. Malik-al-Kameel, who in 1218 had succeeded to power in Egypt, offered the Christians Jerusalem and all Palestine, except for Kerak, together with the release of all Christian prisoners, on condition of the surrender of Damietta. But the crusaders, elated by victory and looking for help from the emperor, Frederick II, rejected the offer. In 1221 Damietta fell back into the hands of the Mohammedans.

The Fifth Crusade reached its results by diplomacy more than by the sword. Frederick [1194-1250] set forth with forty galleys and six hundred knights, and arrived in Acre, Sept. 7, 1228. The sultans of Egypt and Damascus were at the time in bitter conflict. Taking advantage of the situation, Frederick concluded with Malik-al-Kameel a treaty that was to remain in force ten years and delivered up to the Christians Jerusalem with the exception of the mosque of Omar and the Temple area, Bethlehem, Nazareth, and the pilgrim route from Acre to Jerusalem. On March 19, 1229, the emperor crowned himself with his own hand in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The same day the archbishop of Cesarea pronounced, in the name of the patriarch of Jerusalem, the interdict over the city.

Frederick returned to Europe in the spring of 1229, but only to find himself for the fourth time put under the ban by his implacable antagonist, Pope Gregory. In 1235 Gregory was again appealing to Christendom to make preparations for another expedition, and in his letter of 1239, excommunicating the emperor for the fifth time, he pronounced him the chief impediment in the way of a crusade. Frederick had no compunction about living on terms of amity with Mohammedans in his kingdom, and he probably saw no wisdom in endangering his relations with them at home by unsheathing the sword against them abroad. Perhaps, with his freedom of thought, he did not regard the possession of Palestine after all as of much value.

¹⁷ King in name only; Jerusalem was in the hands of the Mohammedans.

ST. LOUIS AND THE LAST CRUSADES, 1248, 1270.

The Sixth and Seventh Crusades owe their origin to the devotion of Louis IX, king of France, usually known as St. Louis. Louis combined the piety of the monk with the chivalry of the knight, and stands in the front rank of Christian sovereigns of all times. His religious zeal showed itself not only in devotion to the confessional and the mass, but in steadfast refusal, in the face of threatened torture, to deviate from his faith and in patient resignation under the most trying adversity. A considerate regard for the poor and the just treatment of his subjects were among his traits.

The sack of Jerusalem [which had been in Christian hands since 1229] by the Chorasmiens¹⁸ [in 1244] was followed by the fall of Gaza and Ascalon.¹⁹ It was just one-hundred years since the news of the fall of Edessa had stirred Europe, but the temper of men's minds was no longer the same. The news of disasters in Palestine was a familiar thing.

A summons went forth by the pope and council for a new expedition, and the usual gracious offers were made to those who should participate. St. Louis responded. He was joined by his three brothers and with troops totaling 32,000 sailed first to Cyprus and then on to Egypt. Damietta fell, but after this first success, the campaign was a dismal disaster. Louis' benevolence and ingenuousness were not combined with the force of a leader. He was ready to share suffering with his troops but had not the ability to organize them. His piety could not prevent the usual vices from being practiced in the camps.

At Mansourah the Turks dealt a crushing defeat. On the retreat which followed, the king and the count of Poitiers were taken prisoners. King Louis, though threatened with torture and death, declined to deviate from his faith or to yield up any of the places in Palestine. For the ransom of his troops, he agreed to pay 500,000 livres, and for his own freedom to give up Damietta and abandon Egypt. The sultan remitted a fifth part of the ransom money on hearing of the readiness with which the king had accepted the terms.

Louis returned home, but in spite of bodily weakness and the protest of his nobles, sailed again in 1270. Sixty-thousand men constituted the expedition, but disaster was its predestined portion.

¹⁸ Mohammedans from the area of modern Iran pushed from behind by the Mongals.

¹⁹ Christian forces were defeated by the Mohammedan sultan in Egypt at the battle of Gaza. Jerusalem was the prize. Ascalon likewise fell in 1247.

The camp was scarcely pitched on the site of Carthage when the plague broke out. Among the victims was the king's own son and the king himself.

With Louis the last hope of Christian tenure of any part of Palestine was gone. At his death the French army disbanded. In 1289 Tripoli was lost, and the bitter rivalry between the Military Orders hastened the surrender of Acre, 1291, and with it all Christian rule in Syria was brought to an end.

Attempts were made to again fan the embers of the once fervid enthusiasm into a flame, but in vain. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries repeated appeals to the piety and chivalry of Western Europe were made, but these were voices as from another age. The deliverance of Palestine by the sword was a dead issue. New problems were engaging men's minds.

EFFECTS OF THE CRUSADES

The Crusades failed in three respects. The Holy Land was not won. The advance of Islam was not permanently checked. The schism between the East and the West was not healed. They were also the cause of great evils. As a school of practical religion and morals, they were no doubt disastrous for most of the crusaders. They were attended by all the usual demoralizing influences of war and the sojourn of armies in an enemy's country. The vices of the crusading camps were a source of deep shame in Europe.

The schism between the East and West was widened by the insolent action of the popes in establishing Latin patriarchates in the East and their consent to the establishment of the Latin empire of Constantinople. The memory of the indignities heaped upon Greek emperors and ecclesiastics has not yet been forgotten.

Another evil was the deepening of the contempt and hatred in the minds of the Mohammedans for the doctrines of Christianity. The savagery of the Christian soldiery, their unscrupulous treatment of property, and the bitter rancors in the crusading camps were a disgraceful spectacle. While the crusades were still in progress, the objection was made in Western Europe that they were not followed by spiritual fruits, but that on the contrary the Saracens were converted to blasphemy rather than to the faith. Being killed, they were sent to hell.

Lastly, the crusades gave occasion for the rapid development of the system of papal indulgences, which became a dogma of the medieval theologians. The practice, once begun by Urban II at the

very outset of the movement, was extended further and further until indulgence for sins was promised not only for the warrior who took up arms against the Saracens in the East, but for those who were willing to fight against Christian heretics in Western Europe. Indulgences became a part of the very heart of the sacrament of penance and did incalculable damage to the moral sense of Christendom.

And yet the crusades were not in vain. It may not always be easy to distinguish between the effects of the crusades and the effects of other forces active in this period or to draw an even balance between them. But it may be regarded as certain that they made far-reaching contributions to the great moral, religious, and social change which the institutions of Europe underwent in the latter half of the Middle Ages. The crusades engaged the minds of men in the contemplation of a high and unselfish aim, the rescue of the Holy Sepulchre, drawing attention away from the petty struggles of ecclesiastics. They called forth and developed that spirit of nationality that resulted in the consolidation of the states of Europe. The crusades gave to commerce an immense impetus. The fleets of Marseilles and the Italian ports were greatly enlarged through the demands for the transportation of tens of thousands of crusaders.

The crusades also furnish the perpetual reminder that not in localities is the Church to seek its holiest satisfaction, and not by the sword is the Church to win its way. It is by the message of peace, by appeals to the heart and conscience, and by teaching the ministries of prayer and devout worship that she is to accomplish her mission.

THE JEWS

Would that it might be said of the medieval church that it felt a tenth of the interest it manifested in the recovery of the holy places of their ancient land in the well-being of the Jews, the children of Abraham according to the flesh. But this cannot be said. Though there were popes, bishops, and princes here and there who were inclined to treat the Jews in the spirit of humanity, the predominant sentiment of Europe was that of hatred and disdain. The very nations that were draining their energies to send forth armaments to reconquer the Holy Sepulchre joined in persecuting the Jews.

Some explanation is afforded by the conduct of the Jews themselves. Their successful and often unscrupulous money dealings, the flaunting of their wealth, their exclusive social tendencies, their racial haughtiness, and their secretiveness strained the forbearance of the Christian public to the utmost. The edicts of councils and civil edicts put it beyond reasonable question that, in an

offensive way, they showed contempt for the rites and symbols of the Christian faith. The provocation was great, but it does not justify a treatment of the Jewish people in all parts from Bohemia to the Atlantic which lacked the elements of common humanity. The active efforts that were made for their conversion seem to betray fully as much of the spirit of churchly arrogance as of the spirit of Christian charity.

The grounds upon which the Jews were persecuted were three:

1. Their fathers had crucified Christ, and the race, predestined to bear the guilt and the punishment of the deed, was receiving its merited portion.
2. They perpetrated horrible atrocities upon Christian children, and mocked the host and the cross.
3. They imposed upon the Christians by exacting exorbitant rates of interest.

In no Christian state were they safe. They were aliens in all, and had the rights of citizenship in none. The "enemies of Christ" and "the perfidious"²⁰ were common names for them, and canonists and theologians use the latter expression.

Three classes are to be taken into account in following the treatment of the Jews: the popes, including the prelates, the princes, and the mass of the people with their priests.

Taking the popes one-by-one, their utterances were, upon the whole, opposed to inhumane measures and uniformly against the forced baptism of the Jews. Gregory the Great protected them against frenzied persecution in Southern Italy. In 1247 Innocent IV denied the charge of child murder brought against them and threatened with excommunication Christians oppressing them. In 1419 Martin IV issued a bull in which he declared that he was following his predecessors in commanding that the Jews be not interrupted in their synagogal worship, or compelled to accept baptism, or persecuted for commercial transactions with Christians.

As for the princes, the Jews were regarded as being under their peculiar jurisdiction. At will they levied taxes upon them, confiscated their goods, and expelled them from their realms. It was to the interest of princes to retain them as sources of revenue, and for this reason they were inclined to protect them against the violence of blind popular prejudice and rage.

The inception of the Crusades was accompanied by violent outbursts against the Jews. Innocent III, in 1216, established the permanent legal basis of their persecution. Their expulsion from

²⁰ That is, those deliberately faithless, treacherous, or deceitful.

Spain in 1492 represents the culminating act in the medieval drama of their sufferings. England, Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, and Hungary joined in their persecution. In Italy they suffered least. Tens of thousands were burned or otherwise put to death. They were driven, at one time or another, from almost every country. The alternative of baptism or death was often presented to them.

The path of anti-Semitism was struck early by Church and Christian state. The medieval legislation followed closely the precedent of earlier enactments. The Jews were forbidden to employ Christian nurses, servants, or laborers, to publicly sell meat, to work on Sundays or feast days, to employ Christian physicians, or to practice usury. They were commanded to make a monetary payment to the priest at Easter. The culminating blow in the humiliation of the Jews was the law forcing them to wear a distinguishing patch or other object on their garments. The canonical regulations against usury gave easy excuse for declaring debts to the Jews not binding. Eugenius III offered all enlisting in the Second Crusade exemption from interest due Jewish creditors. Gregory IX made the same offer to later crusaders.

The charge was frequently repeated against the Jews that they were guilty of the murder of Christian children for ritualistic purposes, especially at the time of the Passover. This almost incredible crime again and again stirred the Christian population into a frenzy of excitement that issued in some of the direst miseries the Jewish people were called upon to endure. In 1182, Philip Augustus of France, using as a pretext the alleged crucifixion of a Christian child, expelled the Jews from his realm and confiscated their goods.

In England the so-called Jewries of London, Lincoln, Oxford, and three or four other cities represented special tribunals and modes of organization with which the usual courts of the land had nothing to do. From the reign of Henry II, 1133-1189, when the detailed statements of Jewish life in England begin, bishops, priests, and convents were ready to borrow from the Jews. Nine Cistercian convents were mortgaged to the famous Aaron of Lincoln. He boasted that his money had built St. Albans. The arm of St. Oswald of Peterboro was held by a Jew in pawn. The usual interest charged was two pence a week on the pound, or 43% a year. And it was as high as 80%.

The Jews were tallaged²¹ by the king at pleasure. They belonged to him as did the forests. The frequency and exorbitance of the exactions under John and Henry III are notorious. At the time of the levy of 1210 many left the kingdom. Henry III's exactions became so intolerable that in 1255 the Jews begged to be allowed to leave the realm. The last act in the history of the Jews in

21 Taxed; often the occasional tax levied by the Anglo-Norman kings on crown lands and royal towns.

medieval England was their banishment by Edward I in 1290.

The treatment the Jews received in Spain is justly regarded as the most merciless the race received in the Middle Ages. The number of Jews who emigrated from Spain in the summer of 1492 is estimated at 170,000 to 400,000. They went to Italy, Morocco, and the East, and, invited by King Manuel, 100,000 passed into Portugal. But here their tarrying was destined to be short. In 1495 an edict offered them the old alternative of baptism or death, and children under fourteen were taken forcibly from their parents and the sacred Christian rite was administered to them. Ten years later two thousand of the alleged ungentine converts were massacred in cold blood.

Such was the drama of sufferings through which the Jews were made to pass during the medieval period in Western Europe. As against this treatment, what efforts were made to win the Jews by appeals to the gospel? But the question might well be asked whether any appeals could be expected to win them when such a spirit of persecution prevailed. How could love and such hostility go together? The attempts to convince them were made chiefly through tracts and disputations. The most famous of these tracts was written by Peter the Venerable. In Migne's edition it fills more than 140 columns and would make a modern book of more than 300 pages of the ordinary size. Its heading, little adapted to win the favor of the people to whom it was addressed, ran "A Tract against the Inveterate Hardness of the Jews." If Peter the Venerable, the mild abbot of Cluny, approached the Jews in such an arrogant tone, what was to be expected from other writers, like Peter of Blois who wrote upon the *Perfidy of the Jews*? These efforts relieve the dark picture, but only a little. The racial exclusiveness of the Jew and the defiant pride that Christendom associates with him when he attains to prosperity render it difficult to make any impression upon him by the presentation of the arguments for Christianity. There is fortunately no feeling today, at least in the church of the West, that it should come to the aid of Providence in executing vengeance for the crucifixion of Christ, a thought that ruled the Christian mind in the Middle Ages.

THE INQUISITION

The measures for the repression and extermination of heresy culminated in the organized system known as the Inquisition. Its history presents what is probably the most revolting spectacle in the annals of civilized Europe. The representatives of the Church appear sitting as arbiters over human destiny in this world, and in the name of religion applying torture to countless helpless victims and pronouncing upon them a sentence that they knew involved perpetual imprisonment or death in the flames.

It has been argued that the Church stopped with the decree of excommunication and the sentence to lifelong imprisonment and that the Church did not pronounce the sentence of death. However, the Church turned the heretics over to the civil authorities knowing full well that the sentence of death would follow. Through popes and synodal decrees, the Church continuously threatened princes and municipalities with her disfavor and spiritual punishments for not punishing heresy.

The history of the Inquisition during the Middle Ages has three main chapters: the persecution of doctrinal heretics down to 1480; the persecution of witches in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; and the Spanish Inquisition organized in 1480.

The Inquisition was a thoroughly papal institution, wrought out in all its details by the popes of the thirteenth century, beginning with Innocent III. He wrote that as treason was punished with death and confiscation of goods, how much more should these punishments be meted out to those who blaspheme God and God's Son. A crime against God, so he reasoned, is surely a much graver misdemeanor than a crime against the secular power.

The legislation fixing the Inquisition as a Church institution and elaborating its powers began with the Synod of Tours in 1163 and the ecumenical council of 1179. The Synod of Tours called upon the bishops and clergy to forbid the Catholics from mingling with the Albigenses²² and from having commercial dealings with them and giving them refuge. Princes were instructed to imprison them and confiscate their goods. In 1179 the Third Lateran extended the punishments to the defenders of heretics and their friends. In 1184 Pope Lucius III and the emperor Frederick Barbarossa joined in making common cause in the sacred undertaking. Bishops were compelled to visit, at least once a year, all parts of their sees, to try all suspects, and to turn them over, if guilty, to the civil authorities. Princes were ordered to take an oath to support the Church against heresy upon pain of forfeiting their dignities. Those cities refusing to punish offenders were to be cut off from other cities and, if episcopal seats, were to be deprived of that honor.

The regulations for the episcopal supervision of the Inquisition were completed at the Synod of Toulouse in 1229. Bishops were commanded to appoint a priest and laymen to ferret out heretics in houses and rooms. They were authorized to go outside their sees and princes outside their realms to do this work. But no heretic was to be punished until he had been tried before the bishop's tribunal. Princes were ordered to destroy the domiciles and refuges of heretics. If

22 Members of a Catharistic sect in the south of France that arose in the 11th century and was exterminated in the 13th century by a crusade (Albigensian Crusade) and the Inquisition. Catharistic sects held to a dualistic theology.

heretics were found to reside on their lands without their knowledge, such princes were to be punished. Men above fourteen and women above twelve were obliged to swear to inform on heretics. And all, wishing to avoid the charge of heresy, were bound to present themselves at the confessional at least once a year.

The legislation of the state showed its full sympathy with the rules of the Church. Peter of Aragon, 1197, banished heretics from his dominions or threatened them with death by fire. Frederick II, at his coronation in 1220, spoke of heretics as the viperous sons of perfidy and placed them under the ban of the empire. Four years later he condemned them to the penalty of being burned or having their tongues torn out at the discretion of the judge. The Sicilian Constitutions of 1231 made burning alive in the sight of the people the punishment for heretics previously condemned by the Church.

In order to carry out the purpose of the Inquisition more efficiently, Gregory IX took the trial and punishment of heresy out of the hands of the bishops and put them into the hands of the monastic orders. In 1233 the Dominicans became the agents of the Inquisition. The Inquisitors were thus made a distinct clan, disassociated from the pastoral care of souls. The Franciscans were afterwards joined with the Dominicans in parts of Italy, in France, and later in Sardinia, Syria, and Palestine. By the papal bull of 1252, Innocent IV authorized torture as a measure for extorting confessions, a weapon that was used mercilessly.

In spite of papal authority, the Inquisitors did not always have an easy path. In 1235 the citizens of Narbonne drove them out of their city. In 1242 a number of them were murdered in Avignon. Parma was placed under the interdict for three years when the convent of the Dominicans was broken into and one or two friars killed in retribution for having burned a certain noble lady and her maid for heresy.

The Inquisitors proceeded using methods that offend against all our modern ideas of civil justice. The testimony of wives and children was valid or required as was also the testimony of persons known to be criminals. Suspicion and public rumor were sufficient grounds of complaint, seizure, and formal proceedings. Heretics were to be diligently hunted out, and when there was only the slightest suspicion of guilt, to be taken before the bishop. A party not answering a citation within a year was declared a heretic even when no proofs were advanced. One who harbored a heretic for forty days after a warning had been served was also treated as a heretic. Not satisfied with seeing the death penalty executed upon the living, the Inquisition made war upon the dead by exhuming the bodies of heretics and burning them.

As Torquemada stands out as the incorporation of all that is inhuman in the Spanish Inquisition, so does Konrad of Marburg in the German. This Dominican ecclesiastic, whom Gregory IX called the "Lord's watch-dog," first came into prominence at the court of Louis IV of Thuringia at the Wartburg, the old castle that was destined to be made famous by Luther's confinement after the diet of Worms in 1521. Konrad became confessor of Louis' wife, the young and saintly Elizabeth. The daughter of King Andreas II of Hungary, she was married to the Landgrave of Thuringia in 1221 at the age of fourteen. At his death in 1227 she became more completely under the power of Konrad. Scarcely any scene in Christian history exhibits such wanton and pitiless cruelty to a spiritual ward as he displayed to this tender woman who yielded him obedience. From the Wartburg, where she was adored for her charities and good works, she was removed to Marburg. There Konrad subjected her to daily castigations and menial services, deprived her gradually of all her maids of honor, and separated her from her three children. On one occasion when she visited a convent of nuns at Oldenburg, something which was against their rigid rule, Konrad made Elizabeth and her attendant lie prostrate and receive a severe scourging from friar Gerhard while he himself looked on and repeated the Miserere.²³ This, the most honored woman of medieval Germany, died of her castigations in 1231. Four years later she was canonized, and the St. Elizabeth church was begun which still stands to her memory in Marburg.

The year of Elizabeth's death, Gregory IX invested Konrad with a general inquisitorial authority and right to appoint his own assistants and call upon the secular power for aid. Heretics were freely burned on the very day their sentences were pronounced. A reign of terror broke out wherever he went. He was murdered in 1233 on his way back to Marburg from the diet of Mainz, and as the Annals of Worms remarked, "Germany was freed from the abominable and unheard-of tribunal of that man."

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS

As the doctrines of the Trinity and the person of Christ were wrought out in the Nicene and post-Nicene periods, so the Schoolmen of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries wrought out the Catholic doctrine of the sacraments. At no point were the medieval theologians more industrious or did they put forth keener speculative force. For the Roman Catholic communion, the results of this speculation continue to be of binding authority.

In defining what a sacrament is, the Schoolmen started with Augustine's definition that a

²³ Psalm 51 or any prayer or expression of appeal for mercy.

sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, but went beyond him in the degree of efficiency they ascribed to it. Beginning with Hugo, they assert in unmistakable language that the sacraments, or outward symbols, contain and confer grace. They have a virtue inherent in themselves.

The relation the priest sustains to the sacraments is a vital one, and except in extraordinary cases his ministrations is essential. Their efficacy does not depend upon the priest's personal character, provided only he administer according to the rite of the Church. An immoral priest may confer sacramental grace. Ultimately it is Christ who works the effect of the sacrament and not the priest through any virtue of his own.

The seven sacraments are the following:

- Baptism
- Confirmation
- The Eucharist
- Penance
- Extreme unction
- Ordination
- Marriage

BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION

Baptism is the door to the other sacraments and to the kingdom of heaven. It is essential to salvation, except for persons who desire to be baptized and have not the opportunity to receive the rite. The desire on their part to be regenerated by water and the Holy Spirit is certain evidence that the heart is already regenerated.

The definition of baptism excludes all unbaptized children, dying in infancy, from heaven. Hugo of St. Victor discusses the question of whether children of Christian parents may be saved who happen to be put to death in a city besieged by pagans and die unbaptized. He leaves it unanswered, remarking that there is "no authority for saying what will become of them." Duns Scotus makes it plain that children yet unborn are under the law of sin, not because they are connected with the bodies of their mothers, but because of their own bodies. He mercifully excepts from the law of perdition unborn infants whose mothers suffer martyrdom or blood baptism. The Reformers, Zwingli excepted, shared the views of the medieval theology that

unbaptized children dying in infancy are lost. At a later date, about 1740, Isaac Watts and other Protestant theologians, as a relief from the agonizing thought that the children of non-Christian parents dying in infancy are lost and suffer conscious torment, elaborated the view that they are annihilated. It remained for a still later Protestant period to pronounce in favor of the salvation of all such children in view of the superabounding fullness of the atonement and our Lord's own words, "for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

The sacrament of confirmation corresponds to the adult period as baptism does to the child period. It completes, as it were, the earlier ordinance and confers the graces of strength and hardihood. The baptized thus become full Christians.

THE EUCHARIST

The Eucharist, called by the Schoolmen the crown of the sacraments and the sacrament of the altar, was pronounced both a sacrament and a sacrifice. In practice, the celebration of this sacrament became the chief religious function of the Church. The festival of *Corpus Christi*,²⁴ commemorating it, was celebrated with great solemnity.

The fullest and clearest presentation of the Eucharist was made by Thomas Aquinas. He discussed it in every possible aspect. Where Scripture is silent and Augustine uncertain, the Schoolmen's speculative ability, though often put to a severe test, is never at a loss. The Church accepted the doctrines of transubstantiation and the sacrificial meaning of the sacrament, and it fell to the Schoolmen to confirm these doctrines by all the metaphysical weapons at their command.

The culminating point in the history of the medieval doctrine of the Eucharist was the dogmatic definition of transubstantiation by the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215. Thenceforth it was heresy to believe anything else. The definition ran that "the body and blood of Christ are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the forms of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood by divine power." The council did not foist upon the Church a new doctrine. It simply formulated the prevailing belief.

At the moment of priestly consecration, the elements of bread and wine are converted into the very body and blood of Christ. The substance of the bread and wine disappears. The

²⁴ Latin for *body of Christ*.

"accidents"--*species sensibiles*²⁵--remain, such as taste, color, dimensions, and weight. What becomes of the substance of the two elements has no clear answer. Thomas Aquinas went so far as to declare that, though the substance of bread and wine disappears, these elements continue to preserve the *virtue* of their substance. Luther said the Schoolmen might as well have set up a theory of *transaccidentation* as of transubstantiation. Thomas Aquinas anticipated his objection and argued that by a providential arrangement this was not so for three reasons. First, it is not the custom for men to eat human flesh and drink human blood, and we would revolt from eating Christ's blood and flesh under the form of bread and wine. Second, the sacrament would become a laughing stock to infidels if Christ were eaten in his own form. Third, faith is called forth by the enveiling of the Lord within the forms of bread and wine. The body of Christ is not broken or divided by the teeth except in a sacramental way.

A second statement elaborated by the Schoolmen is that the whole Christ is in the sacrament, divinity and humanity--flesh, bones, nerves, and other constituents--and yet the body of Christ is not there locally or in its dimensions. A third integral part of the scholastic treatment of the Eucharist was the assertion that the whole Christ is in each of the elements, a view which offered full justification for the withdrawal of the cup from the laity.

Two serious questions grew out of this definition, namely, whether the elements which our Lord blessed on the night of his betrayal were his own body and blood and what it was the disciples ate when they partook of the Eucharist during the time of our Lord's burial. To the second question the reply was given that if the disciples partook of the Eucharist in that period, they partook of the real body. Here Duns Scotus brought to bear his theory that a thing may have a number of forms and that God can do what to us seems to be most unreasonable. As for the first question, Hugo of St. Victor shrank from discussing it on the sensible ground that such divine mysteries were to be venerated rather than discussed. The other Schoolmen boldly affirmed that Christ partook of his own body and blood and gave them to the disciples.

This monstrous conception involved a further question. Did Judas partake of the true body and blood of the Lord? This the Schoolmen answered in the negative. The traitor took only natural and unblessed bread.

Another curious but far-reaching question occupied the minds of Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Thomas Aquinas, and other Schoolmen. Does a mouse, in eating the consecrated host, actually partake of its consecrated substance? Thomas argued in this way: the body and blood of Christ would not be withdrawn if the consecrated host should be cast into the mire, for God allowed

25 Properties detectable by the five senses.

Christ's body even to be crucified. As for mice, they were not created to use the bread as a sacrament and so they cannot eat Christ's body after a sacramental manner, *sacramentaliter*, but only the accidents of the elements, *per accidens*, just as a man would eat who took the consecrated host but did not know it was consecrated. Bonaventura took the more reasonable view that the body of Christ is withdrawn under such circumstances. Peter the Lombard had said that an animal does not take the body of Christ in eating the bread. But what it does take and eat, God alone knows. Duns Scotus took up the similar question, what occurs to an ass drinking the water consecrated for baptism, and sensibly called it a *subtilitas asinina*, an asinine refinement, for the virtue of ablution inhering in such water an ass could not drink.

EUCCHARISTIC PRACTICE AND SUPERSTITION

The celebration of the Eucharist is the central part of the service of the Latin Church. The priest's fitness to consecrate the elements lies in the sacerdotal power conferred upon him at his ordination. While in the other sacraments the benefits accrue through the use of the elements, in the Eucharist the benefit consists in the consecration of the elements by the priest and not in their use by the people.

The theory of the sacrificial efficacy of the mass encouraged superstition. It exalted the sacerdotal prerogative of the priest who had it in his power to withhold or give this viaticum, the spiritual food for pilgrims looking forward to heaven. The people came to look to him rather than to Christ, for could he not by the utterance of his voice effect the repetition of the awful sacrifice of the cross!

The elevation and adoration of the host were practiced in the Latin Church as early as the twelfth century. Honorius III, 1217, made obligatory the ringing of a bell at the moment the words of institution were uttered that the worshipers might fall on their knees and adore the host. The Lambeth Synod of 1281 ordered the church bells to be rung at the moment of consecration so that the laboring man in the field and the woman engaged in her domestic work might bow down and worship. Synods prescribed that the pyx, the receptacle for the host, be made of gold, silver, ivory, or, at least, of polished copper. A light was perpetually kept burning before it. In case a crumb of the bread or a drop of the wine fell upon the cloth or the priest's garments, that part was to be cut out and burnt and the ashes thrown into the sacrary. And if the *corporale*, the linen cover for the altar, should be wet in the blood, it was to be washed out three times and the water drunk by a priest. If a drop happened to fall on a stone or a piece of wood or hard earth, the priest or some pious person was to lick it up.

The treatment of the medieval theory of the Eucharist would be incomplete without giving at least one of the marvellous stories that bear witness to the excessive reverence for the sacred host and blood. In 1223 a woman in Harbais, in the diocese of Liege, kissed her lover with the host in her mouth, in the hope that it would inflame his love for her. She then found she could not swallow the host and carefully wrapped it up in a napkin. In her agony she finally revealed her experience to a priest who called in the bishop of Livland, who happened to be in town. Together they went to the place where the host was concealed and lo! there were three drops of fresh blood on the cloth. The abbot of Trond was called in and it was then found that half of the host was flesh and half bread. The bishop thought so highly of the relic that he attempted to carry off two of the drops of blood, but sixty armed men interfered. The sacred blood was then put in a vase and deposited among the relics of the church of St. Trond.

PENANCE AND INDULGENCES

The sacrament of penance was placed in close connection with baptism by the Schoolmen as it was later by the Council of Trent, which called it a "sort of laborious baptism." Baptism serves for the deletion of original sin; penance for the deletion of mortal sins committed after baptism. In daily religious life, penance became the chief concern of the people, and also the chief instrumentality of the priesthood in securing and strengthening its authority. The treatment of it given by the Schoolmen is even more elaborate than the treatment they give to the Eucharist.

At the close of the twelfth century a complete change was made in the doctrine of penance. The theory of the early Church, elaborated by Tertullian and other church fathers, was that penance is efficient to remove sins committed after baptism, and that it consisted in certain penitential exercises such as prayer and alms. The first elements added by the medieval system were that confession to the priest and absolution by the priest are necessary conditions of pardon. Peter the Lombard did not make the mediation of the priest a requirement but declared that confession to God was sufficient. In his time there were three aspects of penance on which there was no agreement.

- First, whether contrition only was all that was necessary for the remission of sins.
- Second, whether confession to the priest was essential.
- Third, whether confession to a layman was insufficient.

Alexander of Hales marks a new era in the history of the doctrine. He was the first of the Schoolmen to answer clearly all these questions. To him more than to any other single theologian does the Catholic Church owe its doctrine of penance. Thomas Aquinas confirmed what Alexander taught.

Penance consists of four elements: contrition of heart, confession with the mouth, satisfaction by works, and the priest's absolution. The first three are called the substance of penance and are the *act of the offender*. The priest's absolution is termed the *form of penance*.

1. *Contrition* was defined as the sorrow of the soul for its sins, an aversion from them, and a determination not to commit them again.
2. *Confession* to the priest is defined by Thomas Aquinas as the making known of the hidden disease of sin in the hope of getting pardon. Not even the pope has the right to grant a dispensation from it any more than he may offer salvation from original sin without baptism. It covers mortal sins. For the remission of venial sins, confession is not necessary. If a priest is not available, a layman may also hear confession. By such confession the offender may be reconciled to God but not to the Church. In order to be so reconciled and admitted to the other sacraments, he must confess again to the priest as opportunity affords.
3. *Satisfaction* is imposed by the priest and consists of prayer, pilgrimages, fastings, payments of money, and other good works. The priest is the judge of what the act of satisfaction shall be. Satisfaction differs from contrition and confession in the very important particular that one person can perform it for another.
4. *Absolution* belongs primarily and in its fullness to the pope and then, by distribution, to bishops and priests. Its use opens and shuts the kingdom of heaven to immortal souls.

The extent to which absolution is efficacious called forth careful discussion and statement. Does it cover guilt as well as punishment, and does it extend to the punishments of purgatory? The answer to these questions was positive and distinct from the time of Alexander of Hales. Peter the Lombard was the last of the prominent Schoolmen to declare that the priest did not give absolution for guilt. The later Schoolmen with one consent oppose him at this point and teach that the priest absolves both from the guilt and the punishments of sin in this world and in purgatory.

The ultimate and, as it proved, a most vicious form of priestly absolution, was the indulgence. An indulgence is a remission of the guilt and punishment of sin by a mitigation or complete setting aside of the works of satisfaction which would otherwise be required. A lighter penalty was substituted for a more severe one. Towards the close of this period this substitution usually took the form of a money payment. For a lump sum absolution for the worst offenses might be secured. It became a tempting source of gain to churches and the Roman curia, which were quick to take advantage of it.

On what grounds did the Church claim the right to remit the works of penance due for sins or, as Alexander of Hales put it, grant abatement of the punishment due sin? The statement was this: Christ's passion is of infinite merit. Mary and the saints also by the works of patience laid up merit beyond what was required from them for heaven. These supererogatory works or merits of the saints and of Christ are so abundant that they would more than suffice to pay off the debts of all the living. Together they constitute the *thesaurus meritorum*, or fund of merits. This is at the disposal of the Church by virtue of her nuptial union with Christ, Col. 1:24. This fund is a sort of bank account, upon which the Church may draw at pleasure.

These statements of the Schoolmen received explicit papal confirmation at the hands of Clement VI in 1343. This pontiff not only declared that this "heap of treasure"--*cumulus thesauri*--is at the disposal of the successors of Peter, but he made, if possible, the more astounding assertion that the more this storehouse is drawn upon the more it grows.

Down to the latter part of the thirteenth century, the theory prevailed that an indulgence dispensed with the usual works of penance by substituting some other act. Before the fourteenth century another step was taken, and the indulgence was regarded as directly absolving from the guilt and punishment of sins. It was no longer a mitigation or abatement of imposed penance. It immediately set aside or remitted that which acts of penance had been designed to remove, namely, guilt and penalty.

As for the application of the sacrament of penance to souls in purgatory, Alexander of Hales argued that if the sacrament did not avail for them, the the Church prays in vain for the dead. Further treatment of this subject properly belongs to the period just preceding the Reformation. It is sufficient to say here that Sixtus IV, in 1476, definitely connected the payment of money with indulgences and legislated that by fixed sums paid to the papal collectors, persons on earth may redeem their kindred in purgatory. Thus for gold and silver the most inveterate criminal might secure the deliverance of a father or mother from purgatorial pain and neither contrition

nor confession were required in the transaction.

THE OTHER SACRAMENTS

Extreme unction is administered to those who are in peril of death, and is suppose to be referred to by James 5:14. The effect of the sacrament is to remit venial sins and the remainders of sin left after penance and to heal the body. It may be repeated. Like the Eucharist it is to be denied to children.

Ordination conveys sacramental grace to the seven orders of the ministry: presbyters, deacons, sub deacons, acolytes, exorcists, lectors, and doorkeepers. Its virtue is not affected by the character of the person ordained.

Since the fall, marriage has become a remedy against lust and a medicine for unholy desire. As a sacrament, it signifies in addition the union of Christ and the Church and the union of the two natures in one person. That which constitute the sacramental element is the verbal consent of the parties. Death dissolves marriage and the surviving party has the right to marry again. Otherwise the marriage bond is perpetual. Divorce was allowed for one cause only, fornication. Divorce, however, is a separation, not a release with license to marry again. Marriage can never be annulled by the act of man.

THE WORSHIP OF MARY

The worship of the Virgin Mary entered into the very soul of medieval piety and reached its height in the doctrine of her immaculate conception. The titles given to Mary were far more numerous than the titles given to Christ, and every one of them is extra-biblical with the exception of the word "virgin." She was found referred to in almost every figurative expression of the Old Testament that could be applied to a pure, human being. Monks, theologians, and poets strain the Latin language to express their admiration of her beauty and benignity, her chastity and heavenly glory.

To Mary was given a place of dignity equal or superior to Christ as the friend of the sinful and unfortunate and the guide of souls to heaven. Albertus ascribed to her thirty-five virtues, on all of which he elaborates at length, such as humility, sincerity, benignity, omnipotence, and modesty. He finds eighty-one biblical names indicative of her functions and graces.

Bonaventura equals Albertus in ransacking the heavens, the earth, and the waters for figures to express Mary's glories. He pronounces her the mediator between us and Christ. Anselm was no less firm as an advocate of her mediatorial powers.

The medieval estimate of Mary found its loftiest expression in the doctrine of the immaculate conception, the doctrine that Mary herself was conceived without sin. The Schoolmen were agreed that she was exempt from all actual transgression. They differed on the question whether she was conceived without sin and so was immaculate from the instant of conception or whether she was also tainted with original sin from which, however, she was delivered while she was yet in her mother's womb. Bonaventura reasoned against the doctrine exempting Mary from original sin. Thomas Aquinas emphatically took the same position and declared that it was sufficient to confess that the blessed virgin committed no actual sin, either mortal or venial. Duns Scotus argued for Mary's spotless conception whereby she was untainted by hereditary sin, and no doctrine has become more closely attached with his name.

It was the misfortune of the medieval theologians to fall heir to the eulogies passed upon Mary by Jerome and other early Fathers of the early Church and the veneration in which she was held. They blindly followed, having inherited also the allegorical mode of interpretation from the past. In part they were actuated by a sincere purpose to exalt the glory and divinity of Christ when they ascribed to Mary exemption from sin. On the other hand, it was a pagan, though chivalric, superstition to exalt her to a position of a goddess who stands between Christ and the sinner and mitigates by her intercession the austerity which marks his attitude towards them. But this piety, while it no doubt contributed to the exaltation of womanhood, also involved a relaxation of penitence, for in the worship of Mary tears of sympathy are substituted for resolutions of repentance.