

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE VIII.

THE CONTEST FOR SUPREMACY BETWEEN THE PAPACY AND
THE EMPIRE IN THE MIDDLE AGES.¹

By B. Sears, D. D., President of Newton Theological Institution.

PROTESTANT Christians are beginning to perceive that there are in the Papacy, elements of moral power which deserve to be more carefully studied. The theological errors of the papal church were profoundly investigated and elaborately refuted

¹ This Article is founded on an oration delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Brown University in 1844. Not only has it undergone considerable alteration in its form, but the subject has been investigated anew, and several points of inquiry prosecuted under the advantage of new helps. The authorities chiefly consulted in the preparation of the Article are the following: viz.

1. Luden's *Geschichte des teutschen Volkes*, in fourteen volumes, giving the history of the Germans from the earliest times to the close of the middle ages. To the preparation of this work the author devoted the best part of his life, and it is that on which his fame as a historian rests. It displays great ability and industry. The patriotic sentiments of the author give it a character of glowing enthusiasm and fervid eloquence, and his intellectual habits and tastes have led him to indulge largely in ratiocination upon the materials which his learning and industry had collected. To some, these features will appear as a commendation, to others as blemishes of the work.

2. Leo's *Geschichte von Italien*, in 5 vols., one of the best productions of this acute and genial historian.

3. Planck's *Geschichte der christlich-kirchlichen Gesellschafts-verfassung*, in 5 vols., a work which gives evidence of extensive reading and reflection, and which has been much used in the preparation of this Article. Still we have not unfrequently found it wanting in that peculiar sifting and adjustment of conflicting testimony and that profound appreciation of characters and events which mark Neander's *Church History*.

4. Bower's *History of the Popes*, notwithstanding its deficiency in method and in comprehensive historical surveys, a rich collection of well authenticated facts drawn from works accessible to but few.

5. Eichhorn's *Deutsche Staats-und Rechtsgeschichte*, in 4 vols., an invaluable aid to one who would understand the legal relations of the Empire to the church and the Roman see. Indeed, no work casts more light on the subject of which this book treats.

6. Neander, Gieseler, Guericke, Hase, Hencke, Schröckh, etc. of the ecclesiastical historians.

7. Wessenberg's *Die grossen Kirchenversammlungen des 15ten und 16ten Jahrhunderts*, in 4 vols., the work of a very able, learned and candid living Catholic writer, of strongly Gallican principles, and therefore at war with the

by the writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The ethical principles inherent in the system, principles not only necessary to its aims practically, but growing out of it logically, are yet to be more perfectly analyzed. Reuchlin, in *Pascal's Leben*, has given some valuable hints on this subject. He has made it quite apparent that Jesuitism, as it is set forth by the early ethical writers of that order, is not, as many have supposed, a new scion, engrafted upon the old stock of Romanism, but a natural off-shoot, putting forth from its very root. Jesuitism was but the residuum of moral principles which was left in the Catholic church, when the Protestant elements were withdrawn. Herein lies the chief ground of the failure of the Jansenists in their controversy with the Jesuits. They were not in the old church where there had, for centuries, been a very respectable reforming and protesting party, but in the new church where that party no longer existed. They consequently found no sympathy; but, on the contrary, were accused, not without reason, of having Protestant tendencies. The spirit of Jesuitism has been the ruling spirit of the Catholic church from the time of the council of Trent to the present day. Hence, when it has been put down by political power, it has acted like a scrofulous humor when scattered from the point where it had been concentrated, retiring within and gather-

ultramontane party. The first volume contains an admirable outline of the rise of the Papacy.

8. Stenzel's *Geschichte Deutschlands unter den Fränkischen Kaisern*, in 2 vols., the most critical and elaborate history of the period, a model of special documentary history.

9. Jaffé's *Geschichte des Deutschen Reiches unter Lothar dem Sachsen*, a Berlin prize essay, 1843, remarkable for the completeness with which all the known records of the period, whether printed or in manuscript, have been investigated.

10. Von Raumer's *Geschichte der Hohenstaufen und ihrer Zeit*. 2d ed. in 6 vols. The three last mentioned works form an unbroken series in the history of the Empire. The *History of the Hohenstaufens* has, deservedly, higher authority than any of the author's later historical productions. The haste with which he has written since he acquired a public name, has injured his reputation.

11. Hurter's *Geschichte Papst Innocenz des Dritten und seiner Zeitgenossen*, in 4 vols., the result of immense industry and labor, and presenting a magnificent panorama of the papal hierarchy at the height of its power. The author's interest in his theme, and imagined candor carried him beyond reasonable bounds. After laboring upon his work twenty years, as a Protestant, and enjoying for ten years longer a high reputation from it, as a learned biographer, not to say eulogist of the great papal monarch, he himself went over, in 1844, to the Catholic church.

ing new strength to make its appearance only the more formidably at another point.

The adaptedness of the papal forms of religion to the common mind, on aesthetic principles, was not a subject of much inquiry with the old Protestant writers. They labored rather to show that those forms were unscriptural and pagan. Others, at a later period, when the philosophy of these subjects began to be studied, discovered not only in the worship, but in the entire religious system of the church of Rome, a theocratic religion, a false Judaism, rendering the kingdom of Christ one of outward observation. Not a few of those who have speculated upon the subject, have believed, that inasmuch as the character of the people in the middle ages was no longer that of the primitive Christians, but one which was formed under the influence of a darkness as gross as that which hung over the mind of the ancient Jews, nothing could be better adapted to the condition of the people than just such a theocracy. It has furthermore been said that the majority of the common people are generally in a state of ignorance which requires a religion which shall address the imagination and the heart chiefly through the senses, and that it is one of the mistakes of Protestantism to address itself to a higher order of intellect than exists commonly among the people. The best reply to this is that it is the aim of Protestantism as it is of Christianity to elevate man to a higher degree of intelligence, in order to give them a purer and more solid morality. That Romanism, on the contrary, degrades the intellect and abuses human nature by keeping it in the fetters of ignorance, has been shown, with signal ability, in a previous number of this journal.

The interest now felt throughout the civilized world on the subject of the political influence of the see of Rome must necessarily call forth much discussion. That the whole Catholic church is, at this time, making a simultaneous effort to extend its political power, cannot be questioned. Many of the strongest minds of the age are deeply solicitous about the issue. Does the history of the past struggles of the Roman pontiff for political power throw any light on this point? We think it does; and though the subject has too wide a range to be fully illustrated in a single Article, we shall attempt, in the following pages, to bring forward, as a contribution to this end, some little light drawn from a historical examination of the protracted contest for supremacy between the Papacy and the Empire in the middle ages.

Though we are, in respect to the object proposed, more imme-

diately concerned with the origin and progress of the *political* influence of the Court of Rome, still as that influence itself emanated from the ecclesiastical relations of the pontiff, it will be impossible to obtain a clear view of the former without contemplating it in connection with the latter. In theory, the two kinds of papal power may be separated; in reality and in their practical operation, they go together. In the order of time, the ecclesiastical elevation preceded the political. Both ingredients were of slow growth, the former having its origin about the time of Cyprian, the latter about the time of the decline of the authority of the Greek emperors in Italy. Both were feeble in their beginnings and rose to power only by desperate efforts amid various vicissitudes of fortune, and reached alike the culminating point of their internal and moral vigor under Gregory VII, and of their physical and external sway under Innocent III. It would be interesting and instructive to trace out minutely all the successive steps by which the church of Rome ascended to her proud eminence. A mere indication of them is all that can be allowed in this place.

Its earliest distinction, that of being revered as an apostolical church, it shared in common with several others. The schisms and heresies which distracted the early church directed the attention of men first to the necessity, and then to the means of maintaining its unity. This unity was first sought in the bishops, already elevated to a superiority over the presbyters; and the bishops attempted to maintain it by means of provincial synods.¹ But when the theocratic conception of Christianity became general,

¹ *Episcopatus unus, episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus*, one episcopal officer, diffused through a consentaneous multitude of bishops. Cyprian's Ep. to Antonianus, cited by Guerike as the 62d, but numbered in Gersdorf; Bib. Lat. as the 55th chap. XX. sec. 16. *Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*, the episcopal office is but one, of which each holds a part in conjunction with the rest.—Cyprian, *De Unitate Eccles.* IV. cited by Wessenberg, I. 150, and by Rettberg, *Leben Cyprians*, p. 370. This unity was preserved by the mutual recognition, on the part of bishops, of each others rights and independence in their respective sees, and by acting together in synods in matters of common interest. *Manente concordiae vinculo—actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque episcopus rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus.*—Cyp. Ep. 55. XVII. 13. "In which thing we do no violence to any one, nor impose on him any law, since the bishop (*praepositus*), in the government of his church, follows his own free will, having to give account for his action to the Lord."—Cyp. Ep. 72, end. With reference to the synods, see Cyp. Ep. 75—*per singulos annos seniores et praepositi in unum conveniamus.*

the want of a single organ and representative of union was felt. What could be more natural than that this should be found at Rome? It was a matter of convenience that there should be some one church, not, indeed, to control, but simply to represent the orthodoxy of all the churches. Then it would be easy to bring schismatics and heretics to a simple and decisive test. Such was the occasion of Cyprian's celebrated treatise on the unity of the church, a production which contributed more than any other of that age to the formation of the *Roman Catholic* church. Papal *authority* was not then contemplated; but the oldest, the most influential, and the only apostolical church in the Western empire, was selected as the most natural exponent of the orthodox faith. The idea of its being the mother church on account of its having been the *cathedra Petri* was an after-thought, brought in somewhat awkwardly to support a vague theory already in existence. But in the course of time that which was accessory came to be considered as principal, and the apostle Peter, who was brought into the church of Rome, as bishop, by a very doubtful and unsatisfactory tradition, was finally ascertained to be the chief of the apostles, and the ground of the argument so far changed, as to make the preëminence of the church of Rome depend on the prominence of Peter. Still the object was the same, the representation of the *unity* of the church by that organ, not the administration of its government.¹

¹ "The Lord said to Peter, Thou art Peter; upon this rock will I build my church, etc. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom, etc. Feed my sheep. And though, after his resurrection, he gave the same power to all the apostles—yet, ut *unitatem* manifestaret, *unitatis* ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. *Hoc erant utique et caeteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis.*"—Cyp. De Unitate Eccles. IV. The same view was entertained by Augustine, as quoted by Guericke; *claves non homo unus, sed unitas accepit ecclesiae. Hinc ergo Petri excellentia praedicatur, quia ipsius universitatis et unitatis ecclesiae figuram gessit.* De Diversis 108, i. e. he possessed no superior power; he was merely the *representative* of the power of the church. So also Jerome, Ep. 101. Si auctoritas quaeritur, *orbis* majus est *urbe*, the authority of the whole church is greater than that of the church at Rome. When Stephen, bishop of Rome claimed to have authority over other bishops, none resisted him with more promptness than Cyprian. His theory of pontifical power must be interpreted by his practice. In Ep. 74 to Pompeius, he speaks thus of this haughty bishop of Rome: *Inter caetera vel superba vel ad rem non pertinentia vel sibi ipsi contraria, quae imperite atque improvide scripsit [Stephanus], etiam illud adjunxit, etc.—Quae ista obstinatio est quaeve praesumptio (of Stephen), humanam traditionem divinae dispositione antepone!—Praeclara sane (sarcastic)*

When the council of Nice recognized formally the three patriarchates of Alexandria, Rome and Antioch, giving them authority over their respective metropolitans, similar to that of the metropolitans over the bishops of their provinces, the church of Rome, like the other two patriarchates, had a jurisdiction, which was no longer founded on mere assumption. This jurisdiction was limited, however, to central and lower Italy, Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica. That the church of Rome did not then constitute a court of appeal from the other patriarchates is proved by the twenty-eighth canon of the council of Chalcedon, where it is said that Constantinople was raised to a patriarchate *with the same privileges* (τὰ ἴσα προεβεία)¹ as those which had been

ét legitima traditio, Stephano fratre nostro *docente*, proponitur!—Cur in tantum (to such a degree) Stephani fratris nostri *obstinatio dura* (in maintaining his own opinion against that of other bishops) prorupit?—Nec consuetudo, quae apud quosdám (at Rome) obrepserat impedire debet quominus veritas praevaleat et vincat. Nam consuetudo (even Roman) sine veritate vetustas erroris est.—Fit autem studio praesumptionis et contumaciae; ut quis (and, in this instance, the bishop of Rome) magis sua prava et *falsa* defendat, quam ad alterius recta et *vera* consentiat.—Oportet episcopum (no less at Rome than elsewhere) non tantum *docere* sed et *discere*. The next Epistle, the 75th, is from Firmilianus, bishop in Asia Minor, on the same subject and he is the representative of that country as Cyprian is of Africa. He says, Quantum ad id pertineat quod Stephanus dixit—plenissime vos respondistis, neminem tam stultum esse, qui hoc *credat* apostolos tradidisse.—Eos, qui Romae sunt, non ea in omnibus observare quae sint ab origine tradita, et *frustra apostolorum auctoritatem praetendere*, scire quis etiam inde potest, etc.—Unde apparet, traditionem hanc (at Rome) humanam esse.—Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, quod qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur et se successionem Petri tenere contendit super quem fundamenta ecclesiae collocata sunt, *multas alias petras inducat*. (Why is this epistle omitted in the *Sämmtliche Werke der Kirchenväter* now in a course of publication by the Catholics?) A council of eighty-seven bishops deliberated on the point in dispute between Cyprian, and the bishop of Rome and sustained the former. In the introduction to the acts of that council, Cyprian, with evident allusion to the assumption of undue authority by Stephen, uttered those memorable words, which Natalis Alexander (*Hist. Eccl. IV. 236*) has attempted in vain to weaken: Neque quisque nostrum (any one of us) *episcopum se esse episcoporum* constituit, aut *tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem* collegas suos adigit, quando habeat *omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suae arbitrium proprium*, tamque *judicari ab alio non possit*, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare. Sed expectemus universi *judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem* et praeponendi nos in ecclesiae suae gubernatione *et de actu nostro judicandi*. Sententiae Episc. 87, sive Concil. Carthag. in Cyprian's works. Are not the sentiments advanced in the foregoing extracts specimens of genuine Protestantism?

¹ See Suicer on the word, and Wessenberg I. 272.

given to Rome. The bishops of Milan, Ravenna, Aquileia, and of the churches in Africa and Spain and most of Gaul were still independent of Rome. But the circumstance that Rome was the only patriarchate and the only apostolical church in the Western empire, gave it great moral influence; and the judiciousness with which this influence was generally exerted and consequently the success which ordinarily attended the measures recommended by the Roman church, rendered the voice of the latter important to all contending parties, whether in church or in State. Persons wishing its support would naturally approach it in language of high respect and even of flattery, which the Roman bishops would take in earnest and lay up for future use. Neither princes nor prelates hesitated to acknowledge an extraordinary power, so long as it was on their side. It was almost uniformly the dependent person, struggling against a more powerful opponent, that exalted the pope, whose assistance he implored, but whose power he had, for the time being, no particular occasion to dread. Therefore it has been said by some writers, that the Roman pontiff was not specially in fault for assuming such power, for the people, in those times of general disorder, would have it so; and innumerable parties of various descriptions were continually compelling him to exercise it. All acts of this kind, however natural in themselves, were informal; and, until the consent of all the parties could be obtained, they were incapable of becoming a law. At the council of Sardica, in 347, which was not acknowledged to be oecumenical, a power of revision by a court of his own appointment was given to the Roman bishop Julian, in case of appeal by a bishop dissatisfied with a provincial trial.¹

In 385, Himerius of Spain, proposed certain questions relating to discipline and worship to Damasus, bishop of Rome, which, as the death of the latter soon ensued, were answered by his successor Siricius. The reply is the earliest decretal letter found in the collections of papal decretals, which in later times, but not in that early age, had the authority of law.² Innocent I. in 416, was *the first who laid absolute claim that all the churches of the Western empire should submit to his authority*, in matters of faith, in consequence of his being the successor of Peter, the chief of the apostles—a claim, however, which was far from being gene-

¹ Concilium Sard. canon 3.

² Hencke, Kirchengeschichte, Vol. I. p. 307.

rally acknowledged. In 445, pope Leo the Great, succeeded in convincing the emperor Valentinian III, then a minor, that one of the surest means of attaching the provinces to his throne would be to support the see of Rome in its authority over the churches.¹

There appears, on the whole, a striking analogy between the means employed by papal Rome and those employed by pagan Rome, for the subjugation of the world. The slightest show of reason and justice satisfied the Roman conscience, in each case, provided victory was on its side. The conquest of distant provinces was brought in to confirm the authority that was contested at home. Where was the Roman bishop first submitted to as absolute spiritual Lord? In England, whither Gregory the Great had sent Augustine and his forty associates, and in Germany whither Boniface and his coadjutors, under Roman dictation, had converted the rude tribes, at the same time to Christianity and to Romanism. How immensely did these two countries contribute to bring the other nations of Europe under the Roman yoke! How slow were the Gallic churches in submitting to Rome; and how successful would their resistance certainly have been, but for the opposing tide of influence that flowed in from Germany and England.²

¹ "Rome would not have been able to gain an entire ascendancy in the church, had not emperors and kings, who made use of bishops and popes as checks upon each other, lent their aid. It was these princes, who, to strengthen themselves by means of the papal authority, made that authority absolute in the church. The papal see was thereby raised to an eminence, from which it could look down upon kings as vassals. The history of the kings of Europe furnishes ample illustrations of this remark. Even Valentinian gave to the see of Rome absolute power in the West, in the hope of thereby binding the provinces more firmly to his throne."—Wessenberg, I. 274. Such is the language of an enlightened Catholic writer, who was for ten years bishop of Constance.

² "The church of Rome had extensive possessions not only in the immediate vicinity of the city and in the neighborhood of Naples, but also in the south of France, in Illyria, and, most of all in Sicily. How large the patrimony of the church of Rome was, especially in Sicily, may be learned from a letter of Gregory the Great. He says, in respect to the studs of horses on the Sicilian estates, that they were almost annihilated; that but little profit was derived from them; and that all the horses might as well be sold, except a *very few*, four hundred, for example. For the raising of such numbers of horses, large landed estates were necessary; and this will explain why the eastern emperor could safely leave Rome to take care of itself. The bishop provided for all the necessities of the city. He raised the money for the troops. He furnished corn to relieve the people from famine; and as most of

Intimately blended with the spiritual, was the temporal rule of the pope. It originated, partly in the extensive landed estates, which the benevolence of pious individuals bestowed upon it, and partly in the personal influence and authority of such men as Leo the Great and Gregory the Great, who, aided by their ecclesiastical position, acted a very patriotic part, at a time when political rule was nearly at an end in Italy.

It was about this time that the empire of the Franks or the German empire, whose many conflicts with the Papal hierarchy are soon to engage our attention, took its origin. While Goths and Vandals and Huns were pouring a tide of desolation over Italy, Gaul and Spain and all the territories from the north of Asia to the south-west of Europe and to Africa were in a state of the wildest disorder, the four German tribes, which were destined to become the regenerators of nearly all Europe, were emerging from their obscurity, and assuming importance as rising States. The homes of these tribes, known under the names of Saxons, Franks, Allemauns or Suabians and Bavarians, were between the Rhine and the Elbe, the Baltic and the Alps. The three great problems of historical interest to be solved by important events extending through successive centuries, were, first, Which of these tribes was to bear rule over the rest? Secondly, Whether they could ever be made to coalesce and be consolidated into one empire? Thirdly, Whether, they, while all the other nations of Europe were overrun, would be able to resist the furious assaults of the Slavonic race on their eastern frontier, the Northmen on their northern and western waters, and the Hungarians, on the south-east? The first problem, respecting internal rule, seemed to be solved by the supremacy of the Franks and the subsequent establishment of the Carolingian dynasty. But scarcely a century from the time of Charlemagne was to pass, before the fierce Saxon, who never forgot nor forgave the inhumanity of his humiliation, should, with a strong hand, wrest

the estates near Rome belonged to the church, and were cultivated by *coloni* under the bishop's direction, these cultivators of the soil came, by the Roman law, under his jurisdiction. Such authority became the more necessary as nearly all connection between the people of Rome and the exarch of Ravenna was broken off by the Lombards. Hence, after the invasion of Italy by the Lombards, we find the bishops of Rome at the head of all secular transactions in and about Rome, with almost princely power. They transact the business with the court at Constantinople. They treat with the Lombards respecting war and peace, and contribute from their own resources to defray the expenses of war."—Leo's *Geschichte Italiens*, Vol. 1. p. 143.

the imperial power both from the family and the tribe that had humbled him, and for a full century, under the two Henrys and the three Ottos, maintain his proud position as master of all the centre of Europe. Again the Frank was to recover his sway, and hold it a hundred years longer and then deliver the sceptre over to a stronger hand, from which it was to pass to the Hohenstaufens. Finally, the jealousy and hostility of the four great dukedoms, especially when divided into two nearly equal parties, as Guelfs, in Saxony and Bavaria, and Ghibilines, in Suabia and Franconia, were to rend the empire into fragments as fatal to its political power as they are, in their representation, unseemly to the eye that rests on the map of that unfortunate country.

We have anticipated our reply to the second inquiry. The third problem found its solution, in part, in the ultimate establishment of strong military colonies, extending in one unbroken line from the Baltic to the Adriatic. This boundary line of Marks between the two hostile races of men, the Teutonic and the Slavonic, was to wave backward and forward with defeat or victory for two centuries, and the territory between the Elbe and the Oder was to be drenched alternately with the blood of the one and the other, in many successive massacres of the whole population.¹ In consequence of the insignificance and weakness to

¹ In 789, Charlemagne crossed the Elbe with an army and reduced the Slavi to a nominal subjection.

805, He sent his son to quell a revolt, who gained a victory at the mouth of the Saale.

923, The rebellious Wends (Slavi) were again subdued and Brandenburg, their capital taken by Henry I.

929, After another revolt in which the Slavi murdered the Christian population, they were conquered again.

938, After renewed massacres on both sides, Otto I. reduced all the country to a subject province.

983, Havelburg and Brandenburg were captured and burnt by the Wends and the inhabitants murdered and all the marks of Christianity and of Saxon rule east of the Elbe were utterly destroyed, and Saxony itself was invaded by an army of 30,000 men.

992, A war of extermination raged between the Elbe and the Oder, in which the Wends were finally victorious, and were not reconquered till 1155.

For a very minute and accurate account of these bloody scenes, the reader is referred to Spicker's excellent *Kirchen-und Reformations-geschichte der Mark Brandenburg*, vol. I. (the only one which has yet appeared, published in 1839) pp. 12—53. The Saxon Mark, on the Elbe, at its great bend below Magdeburg, was on the original boundary line. But as the Saxons extended their conquests to the east, the boundary was removed, and new Marks were

which the descendants of Charlemagne were to sink, the Northmen were to swarm all along the coasts of the Baltic and North seas, and penetrate to the interior on every navigable river, and hundreds of cities and towns, smoking in ruins, were to mark their desolating track. Meanwhile, the Hungarians, with the spirit of the old Huns, were to make their inroads upon the empire from the south-east, and carry their conquests into Bavaria and Suabia, and even to Thuringia and Saxony. But the empire was to be renewed, and its authority and power restored under the iron strength of the Saxon monarchs. Especially, under Otto the Great, the Northmen were to flee to their homes, and the Hungarians, after the battle of Lochfeld, were to retire below the Enns never to return. With these sketches of the rise of the empire, we must content ourselves, for the present.

How came the two powers, whose origin has been thus imperfectly described, the papal and the imperial, to form a connection with each other? The first act that tended to their union was the organization, by Boniface, of a national church in Germany, subject to the Holy See. The primate of Germany, the archbishop of Mayence, was brought into immediate connection with the government, and this relation led to measures of the highest importance to both parties. Soon, the circumstances under which Pepin came to the throne, to the exclusion of the royal family, rendered it necessary to satisfy the moral sense of the people by

established. The first was subsequently called the Old Mark; the second, the Middle Mark; and the third, which was farthest to the east, the Uker Mark, which were finally all united under the name of the Mark of Brandenburg, out of which the kingdom of Prussia has grown. That a similar struggle between the hostile races took place farther south, along the Elbe, might be inferred, if we did not know it otherwise, from the frequent changes of the Marks on the frontier. The old Thuringian Mark is soon found to be in the interior; and East Mark, and the Mark of Lusatia spring up successively in the east, and the new marks of Zeitz, Merseburg and Misnia in the south-east. In these destructive wars, fresh colonists were sent by the Germans, who were always crowding to the east, to fill the places of those that were slain in the frontier towns and fortresses. The *Slavi* or *Sclavi* in these districts were mostly annihilated, the remainder were reduced to bondage, and the very name of the people came to be employed to designate all who are in a state of servitude, in English, *slave*; in German, *Sklav*; in French, *esclave*. So the German race, formerly bounded on the east by the Elbe, spread themselves ultimately in a northerly direction over Mecklenburg and Pomerania to the Baltic; north-east to Russia and Poland; and south-east to the district around the Adriatic. The Bohemian boundary on the east of Germany remained unchanged. Hence the German language is spoken to this day west of a crescent line running from Illyria to Russia on the Baltic.

procuring the express sanction of the highest ecclesiastical authority in Christendom. Within two or three years from that time, the bishop of Rome, oppressed by the Lombards, and deserted by the Greek emperor, had occasion to look to Pepin for a reciprocity of favors. The brave Frank, at the request of the pope, crossed the Alps, conquered the Lombards and recovered the territories which they had seized; but instead of restoring them to the Greek emperor, who was supposed to lose his claim to them on losing his power to defend them, generously made a grant of them to the church of Rome, saying that he had fought, not for the Greeks, but for the apostle Peter. From this time, the pope became a temporal prince in reality. Twenty years later, on the renewal of hostilities by the Lombards, Charlemagne, at the call of the pontiff, destroyed their kingdom, became master of Italy and assumed the power which had formerly been claimed by the eastern emperors. Charlemagne, on his part, confirmed and increased the cession of territory made by his predecessor to the patrimony of saint Peter; and the pope, in return, gave a religious sanction to the bold and somewhat questionable step of Charlemagne, and consummated the union, to which so many measures had tended, by crowning him as Roman emperor.

Here we find the two great powers, which eclipsed all others in Europe during the middle ages, meeting and embracing each other with youthful confidence, and though united, destined to exist henceforth as jealous and contending parties. What arbiter, in case of dispute between them, was to decide whether the emperor elevated the pope, or the pope the emperor? Both had acted with selfish aims, and neither had sufficiently provided against the endless and bloody disputes, which finally grew out of these transactions.¹ Here we find in these potentates the two pivots on which turned the policy of European cabinets for centuries. Though rivals, they were mutually dependent on each other. Neither could exist alone. They were, to use the favorite metaphor of that age, the two great lights of heaven; only it

¹ "Charlemagne received through his coronation by the pontiff no real increase of power, but a higher dignity by which, in the view of the people, his power over the western empire was sanctified. All this existed only in thought; but the world is governed more by such ideas than by the sword. If the pope, by removing, in this manner, the empire in the West, solemnly acknowledged a sovereign over himself, he, at the same time, appeared to have created that sovereign by his own power."—*Hase's Kirchengeschichte*, p. 168.

was undetermined which was to rule by day and which by night. The pope conferred a moral sanction upon the state, the emperor gave protection to the church. The one was the spiritual, the other the temporal head of Christendom,—two dangerous powers when combined, as they often were, against the liberties of the people, and scarcely less so, when, as was most common, they were at variance with each other. The hapless condition of enlightened patriots, when emperor and pontiff should join hands in the work of persecution and outlawry, is illustrated in the fate of such men as Arnold of Brescia. The general state of wretchedness that ensued when, in case of dissension between them, either an angry potentate, in the three-fold character of German monarch, Lombard king and Roman emperor, should lead a veteran army over the Alps to take vengeance on the pope and his allies among the princes and free cities of Italy, or, on the other hand, the successor of saint Peter, at the alleged call of God and of the church, should ply the vast machinery at his command to arouse the superstitious consciences in the greater part of all Christendom to a sense of their religious obligations to abandon a sacrilegious sovereign—the general state of wretchedness, I say may be seen in the melancholy history of Italian campaigns, of cities sacked and plundered, and of armies perishing more by the plague than by the sword, or in the blighting curse of the ban which sanctified the unholy ambition of jealous princes and nobles, and called out from their lurking places in every corner of the empire all the fiendish spirits of rebellion.

The first century of the union of the two parties above named, reaching from the time of Charlemagne to that of the last of his descendants, is comparatively barren of interest, and may be passed over here in silence. During that period, the empire was dismembered, and went nearly to decay. Meanwhile the Roman bishops took advantage of the times, and wrested from the weak and contending princes a superiority which was far from being conceded by the founder of the empire. This was the time for the false decretals of Isidore, purporting to be a collection of the decretals of the bishops of Rome from Clement I. A. D. 91 to Damasus I. in 384, according to which, Christ himself gave to the church of Rome sovereign power over all other churches, to come forth probably from the hand of some writer attached to the court of the pontiff, and find the more support among the credulous from the fact that the civil power was not in a condition to make resistance. Thus Nicholas I. (858—867) could assume to

be the protector of the whole church, and with the general sympathies of the people, and the aid of servile bishops on his side, could humble the profligate Lothaire II, compel him to be re-united with his virtuous queen Theutberga, and could bring to terms the archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, who had strenuously and violently maintained the liberties of the Gallican church.

The most important and interesting period in regard to the contest with whose history we are concerned, embraces the four centuries from the last of the Carlovingians, about the year 900, to the removal of the papal court to Avignon and its subjection to the king of France, about the year 1300.

The first century and a half, extending to the time of Henry III, being strongly marked by the predominance of the imperial power, may be conveniently contemplated by itself. At the commencement of this period, we find the empire in ruins and the Roman bishops in power. But the Saxon house soon ascended the throne, raised the empire from its impotency and dishonor, and gave it a new and almost independent form of existence. Germany was again united; its sovereignty was now established, not by papal influence or authority, but solely by Saxon heroism. France was left to become an independent kingdom, but Italy was conquered afresh and incorporated into the empire. Such a series of events was adapted to revive some old, and to give rise to some new questions of a very grave character. Was the empire, as it now existed, to be considered as the old empire founded by Charlemagne? or was it a new kingdom, won by the sword of Henry and Otto, and therefore dependant for its form on their power alone? If the former should be maintained, then the same relations of mutual dependence, whatever they were, which subsisted between the empire and the papacy would naturally be renewed; if the latter, then all such questions would remain yet to be settled. The respective rights and powers of the two parties in regard to each other, were, in point of fact, never definitely settled by agreement. What, then, determined the character of the subsequent relations existing between the pontiff and the emperor? We answer, *power*. So long as the latter could, and wherever he could, he put down and set up popes, at pleasure; when the former had acquired the requisite power, he disposed of the imperial crown with equal independence. Their weapons were different, but their authority was nearly equal. The power of the one was moral, that of the other physical. The one strengthened the military and polit-

ical bulwarks of the empire, in order to awe the Roman court into submission ; the other educated the consciences of the people and founded a system of canonical law by which all controversies between the church and the State were to be determined, and then securely relied for its execution on the moral sentiments of the age. Public opinion was his magazine of power, and in forming and employing that, he was as great an adept as any conscience manufacturer of later times.

With respect to the line of policy pursued by the emperors, we may remark that Otto the Great, the chief promoter of the Saxon rule, was so far influenced by the image of the old empire, floating in his imagination, that after having, as German king, firmly established his throne by driving back the Northmen and the Hungarians, who had swept over the western and eastern borders of the kingdom, he put forth his hand eagerly to seize the iron crown of Lombardy, and the more splendid one of the Roman empire. He therefore followed the example of Charlemagne, brought Italy into subjection, and annexed it to his dominions. Mistaken policy ! the cause of almost infinite evil to the empire, and, ultimately, as will appear hereafter, of the ruin of the most splendid family that was ever raised to the imperial throne of Germany.

Mountains, seas and rivers had marked out the natural boundaries of Germany. It had all the geographical advantages for a great and prosperous nation. It actually extended, at a little later period, from the Rhone to the Vistula, and from the Baltic to the Alps and the Adriatic. Its territory, though vast, was compact and well rounded. But when Otto annexed Italy to the empire, it was geographically divided, and its two parts so widely separated by the Alps, that they could never be closely connected. The Germans and Italians were, moreover, so diverse, not only in language, manners and institutions, but in the very frame-work of their intellectual and moral character, as to render it impossible for them ever to coalesce. The German was honest, plain, vigorous, high-minded and enthusiastic ; the Italian was wily, intriguing, courtly, and incapable of high aims and great principles. They hated each other bitterly through all the vicissitudes of their political connection.

The project of a German Roman empire was magnificent, indeed, but impolitic and impracticable ; flattering to the ambition of great minds in that romantic age, but necessarily ending in ruin. Had the Saxon emperors employed their well-known energy in

strengthening and consolidating their government at home,—had they, in this respect, adopted the policy of the French kings, and reduced their powerful vassals to a greater dependence on the crown, they would have established their throne on an enduring foundation. But the false glory of a Roman empire, a nominal supremacy among the nations of Christendom, and the honor of being protector of the church, were too alluring to be resisted, and they acted with fatal efficacy upon the great and splendid qualities of ambitious emperors. The resources and best energies of the nation were exhausted in useless and worse than useless Italian campaigns. The blood and treasure wasted there were scarcely less than in one of the great crusades. The Lombard cities, burning with a spirit of freedom, would fight to desperation in defence of their liberties; and when defeated and such places as Milan completely leveled to the ground, the people would rise again in rebellion, immediately form a new confederacy, and even fall upon the returning imperial army in the very passes of the Alps and send the emperor home in disgrace after his most signal conquests. Often did he escape narrowly with his life on his way home, pursued and attacked, at an unguarded moment, by those very persons who had just received pardon from his lips, as they passed in long procession before him with halters about their necks. It thus became necessary at length, as we shall see under the Hohenstaufens, for the emperors to pass much of their time in Italy, and leave Germany, in the meanwhile, to the unsafe government of ministers. Thus the hearts of the people were finally alienated from their prince. They cared but little about an emperor whom they rarely saw, and conquests in which they had no interest. The nobles took this occasion to aggrandize themselves. The emperor, needing all their support in his Italian projects, especially in the time of the Hohenstaufens, would bestow upon them, in order to secure their military services, dangerous grants of power. It is easy to perceive that no individual would watch with more interest all these movements than the Roman pontiff. He did not relish the presence of the emperor with his military forces in the vicinity of Rome. He cunningly seized the moment when the malaria and the plague were sweeping away the imperial army, and then secretly pulled the wires, which, in his hands, generally acted upon the greater part of Italy, stirring it up to rebellion. With the large party of disaffected and ambitious princes and nobles, which could be found at almost any time in Germany, the pope never failed to be on good

terms and to keep up a confidential correspondence. One of two things he could always effect,—he could either create a political explosion in Germany, when the emperor was in Italy, or, if the emperor had returned home with his army, he could stir up the oppressed and exasperated Lombard and Italian cities to open revolt. Under the Saxon emperors, however, the empire had generally power enough to maintain itself firmly. Soon after its transition to the Franconian family, and just before it gave any indications of decline, it presented a most magnificent spectacle.

Let the reader imagine himself standing upon an eminence on the banks of the Rhine, a little above Mayence, about eight hundred and twenty years ago. He would have seen the German nation assembling, in a vast plain, on both sides of the river, to elect a new emperor. The four great duchies of Saxony, Franconia, Suabia and Bavaria, the heart and strength of the empire, and four other distant duchies, forming its greatest circumference, would have been seen represented by great armies under the command of their respective dukes, pitching their tents where their fathers had done, on similar occasions before them. The congregated thousands of feudal lords and vassals covered the whole plain. The complicated forms of election were passed through. Conrad, the first of the Franconian dynasty was elevated to the imperial throne; festivities of extraordinary brilliancy and pomp succeeded, and the people went, with increased enthusiasm and national pride, to their castles or to their huts. All this was not a vain show, but was a true index of the great resources and military power of the empire. The vigor of the government continued to increase through that whole reign; and during the next succeeding one the empire reached, under Henry III, the summit of its greatness, embracing nine duchies, besides the three kingdoms of Burgundy, Italy and Hungary. The emperor was without a rival among the sovereigns of Europe. The church bowed to his will, and four successive pontiffs received the tiara from his hand.

Here the scales begin to turn in favor of the papacy, and for about a century and a half, till the time of Innocent III, a very different period of history is presented to our view. This may properly be designated as the age of Hildebrand, inasmuch as it was peculiarly his policy that infused new life and power into the church and gave it a complete victory over the empire. It will now be necessary to go back and take up the narrative where we left it, in respect to the papacy.

The whole of the foregoing period, and even the time previous to that, as far back as to the age of Charlemagne, was one which did little credit to the Holy See. Otto I. found the papal court a perfect seraglio, occupied by a series of dissolute popes with no parallel in the history of the hierarchy, except, perhaps, in Alexander VI. at the dawn of the Reformation. From that time onward, cabals and violence prevailed over honor and justice at the apostolical seat. Unprincipled men snatched the tiara from the heads of their more successful rivals and drove them with armed forces from the city. A single noble family had for thirty years held forcible possession of the see of Rome, when Henry III. felt loudly called upon, by a regard to the public good, to put a stop to these abuses and restore the papacy to its ancient character. No one, therefore, was disposed to be very scrupulous about forms and to dispute his right, when he placed several successive popes on the throne.

But at this point a new era commences. A wonderful series of events gives a new and unexpected turn to the tide of affairs, and one of the most striking spectacles in the history of mankind, presents itself in the grandeur of the papal power from the pontificate of Gregory VII. to that of Innocent III. The papacy was reformed and invigorated beyond all former example. The most splendid talents of the age ruled in the college of the cardinals and on the pontifical throne. In the meantime, the emperors who succeeded were rendered wanton by their hereditary power, and abandoned themselves to cruelty and oppression, and every vice of royalty. They were quite destitute of that loftiness of aim and fixedness of purpose which rendered Gregory the wonder of the age, and consequently lost both the support of their great vassals and the moral consideration and respect which belonged to their predecessors.

In the year 1048, Henry III. was invited by the Romans to give them a new pontiff. He appointed a German bishop, a personal friend, whom he could safely trust as a determined reformer, and whom he hoped to retain in his interest. This individual (Leo IX.) took with him on his way to Rome, Hildebrand, a poor carpenter in his boyhood, afterwards a student at Rome, but now a monk at Clugny. From that moment he infused his own genius into the papal counsels, suggesting to the new pope, immediately on meeting him, to delay assuming his official character till he should reach Rome and receive from the church his appointment in due form, and thus avoid the appearance of re-

cognizing the emperor's authority in the election. This remarkable young man, henceforth the soul of the hierarchy, by forming a masterly system of policy, and carrying it into execution through five successive pontificates, wielded a greater individual moral power than any other statesman of the Middle Ages.

The great political power possessed by Henry III, and the extraordinary authority which he had assumed, began to be dangerous even in his hands. He built up and fortified the fabric of the State at the expense of the church. Especially in the exercise of the assumed right of investiture, did he squander the funds of the church upon his political tools and favorites. The bishops were at the same time temporal lords, enjoying large estates, and even commanding armies,¹ having been raised to great power as a check upon the secular vassals. It was this two-fold character of the bishops which lay at the bottom of all disputes about investitures. There was an obvious incongruity in their receiving ecclesiastical appointments from the crown, and yet the incongruity would be no less, if they were to be introduced to large estates and to political power by the Roman bishop. In the one case, the emperor would secularize and degrade the church; in the other, the hierarchy would control the civil administration. In point of fact, the German prelates were, at this time, like the secular princes, holders of estates and offices in feudal dependence upon the crown. In every controversy that might arise between the court of Rome and the emperor, they were bound by their allegiance in their secular character, to espouse the cause of

¹ "In Suabia from the time of its earliest dukes, the appointment of bishops was made by the kings, the election by the chapters being regarded more or less, according to circumstances. The bishops were in a state of dependence upon the throne. From the king they received their investitures; to him they took the oath of allegiance; at his command, they were bound to levy and even to lead armies, and were deposed in case of unfaithfulness or disobedience. On the other hand, as they were always to attend at court, they enjoyed facilities for obtaining grants of territory, and various privileges, such as the right of coining and levying taxes. Though often compelled to convert a part of their possessions into fiefs in order to support armies, they thereby came to have courts and cabinets of their own."—Stalin's *Wirtembergische Geschichte*, Vol. I. (published in 1841, the remainder has not yet appeared), p. 573. The same indefatigable and most excellent antiquarian, has given a complete list of the bishops of Suabia who accompanied the emperors in their Italian campaigns, many of whom, like others attached to the imperial court and army, lost their lives there. In this list are found the names of six bishops of Constance, four of Augsburg, four of Worms, two of Spire and two of Strasburg. See p. 519.

the latter; and he, to make the matter doubly sure, would ordinarily invest with the ring and the staff only those ambitious men on whose political influence he could safely rely. No wonder that the eagle-eyed Hildebrand should early perceive the true nature and importance of that policy and resolve on breaking it up. This was the chief, nay the essential point contested between the pope and the emperor. That gained or lost, all was gained or lost. For as the respective claims of pontiff and emperor, growing out of the double character of the bishops, as prelates and vassals, were equal, nothing but the superiority of one of the parties over the other could settle those claims. Thus the decision of the particular point in dispute involved the whole question of precedence between the respective parties. The emergency was met with a corresponding effort on both sides. On the issue the emperor staked his crown and the pontiff his see. The contest would seem to be unequal; for, on all questions of power, the emperor had the means of decision immediately at hand. Yet everything depended at last on the public sentiment. He who could wield that most effectually, was sure of victory in the end. This Hildebrand understood full well,—better than his opponents, who felt strong, not so much in the manifest goodness of their cause as in their arms. Still the patriotic feelings of the nation were on the side of the emperor. The contest opened on the part of Hildebrand sagaciously, if not nobly. His first great effort was to win for the church a solid reputation and permanent influence, founded on character, and thus to intrench himself and his cause in the hearts of all the conscientious, against the brute force of the emperor. The work of reform was commenced by the emperor himself. Hildebrand, while he was *apparently* a mere instrument of the emperor, coöperating with him through the agency of the pontiff whose adviser he was *in reality*, conducted the process in such a manner as to give the pope an extraordinary judicial authority, and directed the reform to such objects and such only as tended to increase and concentrate the power of the church.

Never was there a more complete change wrought in the posture of affairs than when Henry and the pope of his own nomination opened the campaign of reform. The reformation was, indeed, carried on, but under Hildebrand's direction, it was brought to an unexpected issue. Leo, the reforming pope, passed most of his pontificate in a novel manner,—in travelling from country to country, meeting synods, and sitting in judgment in

cases of simony. Never before did a pope exercise such a judicial power. Heretofore the provincial synods themselves were the judicatory for the trial of such offences. Thus the Holy Father monopolized, not only the legislative and executive authority of the whole church but the judiciary also.

Why was such an extraordinary procedure submitted to on the part of the emperor and of the synods? Because this unprecedented power was applied to a good end, the purification of the church;—because the emperor himself was the mover, and supposed there could be no danger, inasmuch as the pope was his own creature, and wholly in his power;—because numbers of the synods were the very persons to be tried;—because appearances of regular forms were kept up by making the synods the *place* of trial, though the tribunal itself was essentially changed;—and finally because only those notorious cases were taken up, where all the popular sympathies were on the pontiff's side.

It is impossible not to recognize the agency of Providence in the course of these important transactions. Precisely at this juncture a child, six years old, succeeded to the imperial throne, and different factions of German nobles and prelates successively had him under their direction. He grew up in all the wantonness of irresponsible power. Hildebrand, during this period of misrule completed his preparations for the crisis that was drawing on. The decisive battle was now to be fought. He therefore put the triple crown upon his own head, and under the name of Gregory VII. made himself memorable in the history of the world. The right of investiture was not contested mainly with France or England, where the royal power was now strong, but Germany, was made the point of attack; because the empire was in a state of weakness and disorder, and the victory being once secured in such a monarchy, it would be easy afterwards, in more favorable times, to extend it elsewhere. The diplomatic skill also of Gregory was of the highest order.¹ Foreseeing that the prohibition of investitures by *laymen* (as he cautiously generalized the term for emperor), and the suspension of those bishops whom the emperor had inducted into office, would arouse the utmost indignation of the latter, and bring him immediately to Rome at the head of a powerful army, he entered into negotiation with the disaffected German princes and created such a fac-

¹ "Gregory VII. was intellectually the most powerful and the most genial statesman, of the middle ages."—*Leo's Universalgeschichte*, Vol. II. p. 124.

tion as to render it perilous for the emperor to leave the country. He also formed an alliance with the Normans, now masters of Naples and Sicily, and the most warlike and powerful people on that side the Alps. After taking all these precautions, the pope was ready for the onset. But in pursuing his main object, he proceeded covertly, and was careful, while drawing on the decisive action, to keep the religious sympathies of the public strongly in his favor. In his first skirmishes, he always managed to have the open rupture turn on a point where he was clearly in the right. He assailed, not the emperor, but the bishops invested with office by him; and not even such indiscriminately, but those only whose profligacy, or wanton abuse of power was notorious; and then he proceeded with amazing boldness and decision. When the provoked emperor espoused their cause, he himself was first warned, and then put under the ban for violating the established discipline of the church. But Gregory did not suffer such a crisis to come on till he knew the emperor's vassals were ready to break with him, and were eager to seize upon any pretence for revolt. Thus the passionate monarch found himself like a wild beast in a net. The moment he began to rage, the cords which held his subjects in allegiance were snapped; and yet in all this, the emperor alone seemed to be in fault.

The intelligent reader is familiar with the result, the most perfect triumph recorded in the history of political genius and statesmanship over the wantonness of mere physical power. The German diet, prepared for the occasion as it was, refused to acknowledge their emperor until he should free himself from the papal ban. The humbled monarch, who was now as destitute of fortitude as he had been of prudence, went in the character of a private individual and of a penitent to seek reconciliation with the pope. The scene of this unparalleled humiliation was at Canossa in Tuscany. There the emperor was compelled to stand in the open air, barefooted, three days in the midst of winter, before he could be admitted to the presence of the pope. This to be sure, was an ecclesiastical penance, from which royalty could not claim to be wholly exempted. But the severity of the holy father was dictated by something more than a conscientious regard to the discipline of the church. The humiliation was complete, and the right of investiture conceded to the pope.

Under the Hohenstaufens who, at a somewhat later period ascended the imperial throne, the empire was arrested in its fall and the papacy in its ascendancy by the brilliant qualities which

distinguished this family. It will be a pleasing relief to contemplate the state of the empire and its relations to the Holy See, under their reign.

Ascending the course of the Neckar from Heidelberg in a southern direction till we come opposite to Stutgard, and then facing the east, we behold two tributary streams flowing into the Neckar and on their banks, the loveliest vales in all Suabia. Between these rivers extends a broken range of the Rauhe Alp, producing a pleasing variety of hill and dale. But high above every other elevation rises, in the form of a sugar loaf, the *Hohenstaufen*, with a smooth level summit from which more than sixty Suabian towns and villages can be seen.¹ Here was the castle of the family, which was raised first to the rank of Suabian dukes by the Franconian emperors, and then, by the other dukes and great vassals, to the imperial throne. Of this Hohenstaufen family the two Frederics were the most distinguished. They were in many respects the most splendid men that ever swayed the imperial sceptre of Germany. Manly beauty and strength, chivalrous daring, magnanimity, intellectual greatness, statesmanship and learning, unite to render them the favorites of poets and historians. The Franconian family, like the age to which it belonged, was nearly destitute of poetic and of all literary excellence. But the Hohenstaufens were themselves among the best representatives of a new age, an age of enthusiasm, of romance and of adventure, nourishing in great men a strong passion for glory. Christian Europe had been kept in a state of alarm for centuries by the Northmen on all the waters from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, by the Slavonic tribes, no less heathen and savage, covering all the territory immediately on the east of Germany, and by the Mohammedans, threatening the peace and the very existence of Christendom, on the south. All Europe had long been agitated as if rocked by subterranean fires and was like a trembling volcano, ready to pour out its burning streams at every opening. It was not Peter the Hermit, nor the popes, nor Saint Bernard that produced the crusades. It was the spirit of the age, formed by peculiar influences which had long been at work.² This same spirit had already reared the stupendous fabric of the empire with its many gradations of rank and feudal de-

¹ Raumer Geschichte der Hohenstaufen, Vol. I. p. 288.

² Gervinus, Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Deutschen, Vol. I. p. 162.

pendence from the monarch to the serf, and the still more stupendous fabric of the church with its corresponding system of gradations in rank from the spiritual head of Christendom to the sacristan of its meanest chapel. It produced the Gothic cathedral and the scholastic philosophy, no less than the poetry of the Troubadours and of the Minnesingers. This age of high enthusiasm, in which a love of literature and art was united with heroic daring, an age distinguished for the influx of new ideas and tending to modern life, was led on in Germany by the two Frederics.

Germany was, furthermore, in a peculiar state politically, when the Hohenstaufens came to the throne. Saxony and Franconia had been long the competitors for the prize of empire. The latter, while in possession of the throne, stood in fear of the Guelfs, one of the oldest families, and most influential of the nobility. To counteract their growing influence and to have a balancing power at his command, in case of their union with the Saxons, Henry IV. raised the Hohenstaufens to political importance, by giving his own daughter in marriage to one of them, having first made him duke of Suabia. Thus the two great south-western duchies constituting half of the empire, were politically united by family ties, and in the following reign we actually find them both under the government of Hohenstaufen dukes. When the next imperial election took place, the princes and nobles followed their established policy, that of preferring the weaker candidate in time of peace, and the stronger one only in time of danger; and the duke of Saxony was chosen, because the Hohenstaufens, having connected themselves not only with the late imperial house, but with two other distinguished families by intermarriage, were considered as already too powerful. Lothaire, in coming to the throne, felt the necessity of strengthening his power by family connections, so as not to be overborne by the Hohenstaufens. He therefore formed an alliance with the Guelfs, by giving his daughter in marriage to Henry the Proud, who was, at that time, duke of Bavaria. The emperor afterwards went so far as to make his son-in-law duke of Saxony also. Thus the four great duchies of the empire were equally divided between two rival families. This is the origin of the feud, so celebrated in history, that of the Guelfs and Ghibelines or Hohenstaufens. On the death of Lothaire, who left no son to succeed him, the question, Who was to be the next emperor? was one of deep interest to the two parties. Henry the Proud was son-in-law to

the late emperor; and moreover, his territories, the duchies of Saxony and of Bavaria, stretched from the Baltic to the Adriatic; and the estates of the family of Este to which he was heir, extended far into Italy. But that on which he founded his claim was turned to an objection; and even the pope, in this case, though the Franconian emperors and their protégés, the Hohenstaufens had always been arrayed against him, did not wish to see so powerful a prince as the young Guelf placed at the head of the empire. The choice therefore, (for the empire was still elective in reality, though nominally made hereditary more than half a century before,) fell upon one of the Hohenstaufens.

With these explanatory remarks, it will be easy to bring before our minds the state of the parties at the opening of the contest soon to be renewed between the emperor and the pontiff. The Guelfs were shut out altogether from the succession, the object of their highest ambition and of their most confident hopes; the Hohenstaufens were permanently established in power; and the papal court was now, as ever, enlisted in behalf of the excluded or offended party. The moral sentiments of the age were inclined to the side of the pope. The hierarchy had, in the previous struggle under Gregory VII, gained important points in precedent, if not in law; and the whole weight of the Guelf influence and power, both in Germany and Italy, was thrown into the scale of the pope. The undertaking of the Hohenstaufens to regain, in the rupture with Rome, what their predecessors had lost, was a fearful one. But, then, they were superior to all their opponents in statesmanship. Of the ten popes who wore the mitre during the first two reigns of this family not one equalled them in ability. In military talent, the Guelfs and Hohenstaufens were nearly on a level. A struggle was now to commence, as desperate in its character as that between Henry IV. and Gregory VII, and more decisive in its results. It was to terminate ultimately in the elevation of the papacy to its highest external grandeur, and in the execution of the last of the Hohenstaufens on the scaffold, in the kingdom of Sicily. But tragical vicissitudes of fortune, and great events were to precede this final catastrophe.

The first important advantage gained by the reigning family, was, that on the revolt of the Guelfs, the emperor succeeded in depriving them of their feudal estates, or the duchies of Bavaria and of Saxony, and in reducing them to their allodial possessions in Brunswick. The great duchy of Saxony spreading over all

the north of Germany from the Rhine to the Oder, was taken forcibly from the reigning duke, on his revolting a second time, and broken up into fragments, never again to be united. But there is a *Nemesis* in history. That ancient family is still perpetuated in the line of Brunswick, and a Guelf now sits as queen on the proudest throne in the civilized world. The Hohenstaufens, on the contrary, then the most splendid monarchs on earth, disappeared in history utterly after two centuries, and their territories shared the same fate with those of their rivals. Hence all the west of Germany, from Denmark to Switzerland, was torn piecemeal before the close of the thirteenth century, and no great state has ever risen out of it since.

The long reign of Frederic Barbarossa would of itself furnish materials for a separate history. He succeeded his uncle in 1152, and was crowned at Aix la Chapelle at the age of thirty-one. Everything seemed to conspire to invite him to Italy. Conrad, at his death, had advised him to proceed immediately to Rome and receive the imperial crown. In Italy, the pope was still aspiring to tread on the necks of kings; the inhabitants of Rome, under Arnold of Brescia, were meditating the restoration of the ancient republic; the cities of Lombardy, particularly Milan, were assuming airs of sovereignty and independence; and the kingdom of Sicily was extending its power. It is not strange that the ambition of a high-minded and powerful monarch, should lead him to contemplate Italy, in its present condition, as the chief theatre of his glory. The example of Charlemagne and of Otto I. tended to strengthen his desire. How little did he anticipate the result! Had he perceived that it was only Syren voices that were alluring him to Italy, that the mistakes of his great predecessors were to be illustrated in his case, that Italy was to be the grave of all the hopes of his splendid family; had he turned his whole attention to Germany alone, how different might have been the fate of the empire! Even had he determined still to go to Italy, a fore-knowledge of opposing powers, and of the great importance of public opinion, might have enabled him to retain Lombardy in his interest, to have supported Arnold of Brescia as a check upon the pope, instead of delivering him over to the latter as a heretic, deserving execution; and then he might have had power enough in Italy, and with moderation in adjusting the claims of Alexander III, have had influence enough over the common people, to render harmless that invisible, but all-pervading papal agency, which finally baffled him. But what the event has rendered

plain, was to him and to the most sagacious men of his age dark and unseen.

About the time that Frederic had reached Pavia, where he received the Lombard crown, Hadrian IV, a native of England, who, in his boyhood, came to Rome in indigent circumstances, was raised to the papal throne, and with this cunning and dogged pontiff, began the fatal strife. He had already put revolted Rome and Arnold of Brescia under the ban. He fled from the city at the approach of the emperor, but sent an embassy of cardinals to treat with him and induce him not to listen to the proposals of the Romans, but to seize and deliver up Arnold. Frederic was a rigid monarchist and therefore had no sympathy with republicans. He was protector of the church, and was now called on to defend it against a reputed heretic. He yielded; and not only sacrificed one of the noblest men of his times, but cut off the right hand of his own power. It was not republican Rome, it was papal Rome that endangered the empire. One of the leading objects of Arnold and his party, was to reduce the bishop of Rome to his ancient position and character, and make him simply a religious teacher. Nothing could have been more valuable to Frederic in the terrible conflicts that were to follow, than just such a coadjutor as he unwisely delivered to the pope, and the pope, to the flames. Hadrian was still suspicious of the emperor and would not meet him in person till he had obtained a promise upon oath that his life should be safe in the emperor's hands. As Frederic neglected the courtesy of holding the stirrup of the pope, the latter refused him the kiss of peace. The astonished emperor, after learning that Lothaire had performed that humble service on a similar occasion, finally consented, for the sake of peace, to make reparation by a supplementary act of complaisance. After being crowned at Rome, he abandoned, for the present, his enterprise in regard to lower Italy on account of the approaching hot season, and returned to Germany. In the following year he entered upon a second Italian campaign. Milan had revolted again, the pope had, contrary to agreement, supported and strengthened the king of Sicily, and, besides, written an insulting letter to the emperor, intimating that the empire was the gift (*beneficium*) of the pope. The latter, learning that the emperor was on his way to Rome, saw fit to explain. "It was never intended," he said, "on our part, to intimate by the words, *beneficium imperii Romani contulimus*, that the emperor was our vassal." Frederic, nevertheless, advanced with an army of over a

hundred thousand men, subdued Milan, and held, according to custom, a sort of imperial diet in the Roncalian plains, at which the rights of the emperor in respect to Italy were to be legally ascertained and decided. The four great jurists of Bologna, and magistrates from fourteen cities were to give the legal decision. In Bologna, the authority of the civil law was revived, and, as by the Roman code the emperor possessed almost unlimited power, the decision could hardly be otherwise than favorable to Frederic. Indeed, one of the strongest supports of the imperial authority, in the time of the Hohenstaufens, was the influence of the study of the Roman law at Bologna. The emperor exercised the rights accorded to him at Roncalia in such a manner as to excite the opposition both of the pope, of Milan,—ready now to forget its oath of obedience,—and of other Italian cities. Hadrian died during the year. The majority of the cardinals chose Alexander III, the minority, Victor III, as successor. Both applied to the emperor for a confirmation of their election. The weaker party was, of course, preferred, and an ecclesiastical council was called at Pavia by the emperor, and Victor acknowledged as legitimate pope. Milan was next besieged, and after a long resistance, it surrendered, and was razed to the ground. Everything seemed to favor the emperor's wishes. All Italy trembled before him. The pope of his own choice was in power, and the pope of the cardinals' choice, Alexander III, was a refugee in France. But France and England, jealous of the emperor's growing power, acknowledged Alexander as rightful pope, and their monarchs were actually seen, on a public occasion, leading the palfrey of the fugitive pontiff. In the meantime Victor died. Had the emperor seized upon this moment to effect a reconciliation with Alexander, he might have crushed in the bud an alliance which was about to be formed against himself, and which was destined to give victory to the papal pope, as Alexander was significantly termed. But this occasion was indiscreetly allowed to pass, and a successor to Victor was appointed by an election still more uncanonical than his. These events induced many to espouse the cause of Alexander, and this unyielding pope himself, on seeing his prospects brighten in Italy, left France, where he had sojourned for nearly four years, and arrived at Rome in 1165. Frederic now prepared for a fourth campaign into Italy, where Alexander had been received in triumph, and Pascal, the imperial pope, was but little regarded. Alexander succeeded, shortly after, in persuading the cities of Lombardy to form a league among

themselves in defence of their liberties against the emperor. The bishop was, indeed, obliged to flee from Rome before the imperial army; but soon the plague broke out, which destroyed nearly all the troops, and Frederic was reduced to the necessity of escaping as a fugitive, and even of passing the Alps in disguise. The Romans interpreted this sudden calamity as a scourge of God upon the emperor, and now the Venetian and Lombard leagues combined together in defence of themselves and in support of Alexander, with a military force which the emperor could not overcome. It was many years before the decisive trial came on. Then, in the battle of Lignano, in 1176, the emperor, in six short hours, lost all the fruits of twenty-two years' labor. In the following year, a reconciliation was effected between him and Alexander, which might certainly have been secured as well, if not better, on the death of Victor in 1164.¹

The whole contest and its results may be summed up in a few words. The papal party had maintained the right asserted by Gregory VII, of electing their own pope, of investing their own bishops, and of confirming the election of the emperor. Frederic had disputed all these points, and thrown himself back upon ancient usage under the Saxon emperors. The immediate effect of the rupture was, that rival popes existed through the whole period, and that the emperor passed nearly half his life under the ban. While at the head of a hundred thousand armed men, and supported by a pope of his own election, he stood in little fear of the exiled pope; and yet the latter was gradually winning the universal suffrages of the people, and, in the end, he gained the most essential points in dispute.

The emperor, however, near the close of life, seemed to have gained one important advantage over his opponents, by contracting for his son Henry, a marriage with the heiress of the throne of Sicily, by which that kingdom would be annexed to the empire. On the succession of Henry VI. to the empire and to the kingdom of Sicily, which actually took place, a fatal blow appear-

¹ Il y avait dix-huit ans que le pape Alexandre errait d'états en états, faiblement soutenu par les princes, demandant un asyle à l'un, tandis qu'il en excommuniait un autre, chassé plusieurs fois de son église, voyant sans cesse renaître ses compétiteurs, et opposant avec une constance inébranlable toutes les prétentions de la tiare à toutes les forces de l'empire.—Daru, *Hist. de Venise*, Tome I. p. 162. The same writer has given a graphic account of the scene at Venice, where the emperor and the pope mutually recognized each other in public ceremony.

ed to have fallen upon the papacy, striking down one of the main pillars on which the policy of Gregory VII. had built up the hierarchy. Hitherto this Norman power in Sicily and lower Italy had been in feudal subjection to Rome, and had been industriously raised by the latter to a high pitch of political prosperity, for the express purpose of producing a strong military force to serve, in time of need, as an antagonist to the army of the emperor.

Again the hand of Providence became visible in the affairs of the empire, and by giving an unexpected direction to the course of events, turned the scales of fortune as completely as when Henry III. was succeeded by a mere boy, without self-control and without principle, while the papal throne was ascended by the greatest of all the popes. The proud son of Frederic, now heir to four thrones, the German, the Lombard, the Roman and the Sicilian, while he was preparing the way for establishing a power beyond that of Charlemagne, and was upon the point of rendering the empire hereditary in his family, was suddenly smitten down by death, at the early age of thirty-three, before his great designs were fully consummated. His son Frederic, afterwards known as Frederic II, was but three years of age, and the very next year, the weak pontiff then on the throne, was succeeded by Innocent III, under whom the papal authority reached its zenith. The empress mother made Innocent guardian of the young Frederic, hoping thereby to secure some measure of justice to her son, at a time when powerful usurpers were ready to seize the sceptre.

Innocent knew how to turn all these circumstances to the very best account. He seized with an iron grasp all the advantages of his position. By supporting the free cities of Lombardy, by annexing Ancona and Spoleto to his own dominions, and by reducing Naples and Sicily to their former vassalage to the holy see, he completely annihilated the imperial power in Italy. Germany itself was now rent into two factions, the south espousing the cause of Philip, the north that of Otto. The shrewd pontiff, as great an adept in canonical law as he was in statesmanship, held the two rival emperors in suspense, having resolved to withhold his sanction to the claims of either, till circumstances should throw the party, which he had resolved to favor, entirely into his own power.

We must not imagine the sovereigns of Europe to have been blind to the papal policy, nor to have thrown themselves unwit-

tingly into the snares laid for their feet. All Europe was, at that time in an unusual state of disorder. Almost every throne was disputed by rivals, and each competitor would sooner make any concession to the see of Rome, than yield everything to his opponent. Innumerable cases were laid before his Holiness for arbitration. Never did so many contending parties appeal to the pope before. His judicial circuit extended from the Mediterranean to the Arctic ocean, and from the Atlantic far into Asia. He settled questions of divorce for the kings of France, Leon and Portugal; and, by his own authority, crowned Peter, as king of Arragon. He put the king of Norway under the ban, and brought his successor to terms. In Poland and in Hungary he settled the disputed succession.¹ He by no means satisfied himself with judicial decisions, but significantly said, "there was a rod as well as manna in the ark of the covenant." No pope before him had so often held the ban over princes; none had so often laid the people under the interdict, depriving them of the consolations of religion; or so often dissolved subjects from their oath of allegiance. The humiliation of John of England is a brilliant specimen of the effect which could be produced by the combined power of the papal artillery.

Philip, in whose favor the greater part of Germany had declared itself, promised to the pope the surrender of all the points contested by his predecessors, on condition of being crowned by him. Otto did the same. We scarcely know which should excite most wonder, Innocent's statesmanship and legal skill in the litigations which came before him, or the moral degradation, and shameful want of patriotism, manifested by aspirants for the crown, who, for the attainment of their object were ready to sacrifice their own honor and their country's independence.

In only one important act did Innocent consult his passions rather than his judgment. When he declared in favor of Otto as sole emperor, and the latter, on condition of receiving the crown from his hands, promised to submit to the papal authority in all things, but on the fulfilment of the condition, immediately turned about, violated his oath, and directed his newly acquired power against the very person from whom he had received it, the papal

¹ Hurter's *Innocenz III.* Vol. 1. pp. 179—207. For the theory of Innocent in respect to this power, see Vol. III. pp. 61—77. A good summary of the Life of this pontiff, and one which has here been adopted in several instances and especially in the passage above, may be found in Böttiger, *Weltgeschichte in Biographien*, Vol. IV. p. 14.

revenge was kindled too deeply to allow any ordinary consideration of prudence to deter him from glutting his vengeance. From that moment, he resolved to raise to the imperial throne his young ward, Frederic, son of the late emperor, and grandson of Frederic I. The plan succeeded beyond his expectation. The young Hohenstaufen was received with enthusiasm by the German nation, who remembered the glory and power of the empire under Frederic I. Innocent lived but a year from this time, and was succeeded by men of less prudence and skill. The young prince became the most gallant and powerful ruler of his age; and, true to the policy and fame of his ancestors, added a new splendor to the empire. This is the last brilliant struggle of the Hohenstaufens, who, in greatness and imperial authority belonged to the age of the old empire in its greatest power and glory, but, in enlightened views of government, science and literature were a century in advance of their times. The long and glorious reign of Frederic II. was, therefore, one continued effort, contrary, indeed, to the spirit and sentiments of that age, but coincident with those which now universally prevail, to free the State from the domination of priests, and the people from ignorance and superstition.

Bred in Sicily, his native place, (and, in fact, always his chief residence,) where Greeks and Arabs, Italians and Frenchmen were intermingled with Germans, he understood all their languages; was distinguished as a poet and a naturalist; collected the first modern gallery of ancient art; founded at Naples the first university that originated with a monarch; raised the medical school at Salerno to a high rank; and prohibited all quackery in medicine, requiring of every physician, before entering upon practice, to be examined and approved by a medical faculty. Surely it would seem that such a man belonged not to the dark ages! From the second year of his reign, in which Innocent III. died, till towards the close of life, his splendid talents and wonderful intelligence raised him above not only the general character, but even the comprehension of the age. At last, the accusation of betraying the church to the Saracens was absurdly brought against him, and he was wantonly excommunicated as a heretic. These circumstances put it into the power of the mendicant friars to alarm the superstitions of the people and excite them to rebellion against the emperor. It now came to appear that his residence in Sicily, and his devotion to literature and philosophy, had given opportunity for dangerous factions to grow up in Ger-

many, in which even his own son was engaged. The crown of Italy, which was, at best, but a brilliant meteor, well nigh destroyed the empire, and finally cost the reigning family its last drop of blood.

From the time of Innocent III. to that of Boniface VIII, or the whole of the thirteenth century, the papacy maintained, for the most part, its external power and greatness; but its internal decay had already commenced. Like all great establishments of long standing, it was so fortified with legal usages and forms, and had become so much a matter of course, that much time was requisite for the new ideas of a more enlightened age to acquire equal consideration and power. But the time fixed by Providence for turning the current of universal opinion was drawing near. The papacy itself was changed. In its earliest days, it was the protectress of the faithful against ruthless barbarians. It was the friend of civil order, of justice and of good morals. Afterwards it sunk to the lowest degradation in morals, and remained in that condition of comparative weakness till Gregory VII. gave it a new character, and raised it to the height of its moral influence. Now it became lordly, arrogant and unjust. The crusades, undertaken on moral but mistaken grounds, being under the direction of the pope, very naturally placed him at the head of Christendom. But that which began in the spirit, in some low sense, ended notoriously in the flesh. The religion of the age, always external, and misguided, had less and less to do with those marauding armies which infested every land and sea, from the Atlantic to the Euphrates. Ambitious crusaders showed their true character, and conscientious men had their eyes opened to the absurdities and atrocities of these military movements of the church.

Besides, the humane character of the early Roman church was entirely lost. Instead of succoring the oppressed, it became the oppressor. In compassing its own selfish aims, it became reckless of the public interests; and arrogant, unjust, false and cruel to all who stood in the way of its aggrandizement. It laid heavy contributions on the poor for its own luxuries, and for its other wicked ends. Instead of being a Christian mediator between princes and people, it became the greatest promoter of civil dissensions, in order to fatten upon the spoils of both parties. Instead of taking the sword, as it once professed to do, for the relief of suffering innocence, it now drew it for the slaughter of the saints. On one occasion, the legates of Innocent III, in their

zeal against what they called heresy, set fire to a church in which seven thousand persons had taken refuge, and massacred twenty thousand others without distinction, a sanctimonious abbot crying out, "Cut them all down; God will be able to find out his own." It was impossible that such a system of wickedness should continue to command the love and veneration of mankind.

Boniface VIII. has justly been said to be the last of the popes, in the same sense that Brutus was the last of the Romans. After his death in 1303; the king of France controlled the papal cabinet, and even succeeded in transferring the papacy to his own domains. The popes actually resided for seventy years at Avignon, in the south of France, a period which has aptly been called "the seventy years captivity."

From this period the relations of the German empire and the Roman see to each other were changed. Each went its own way, but stooping to the earth as it went. The empire, after various fortunes became hereditary in the house of Hapsburg, and degenerated into an Austrian monarchy, with a mere shadow of authority over the rest of Germany. The Reformation divided Germany religiously; and Frederic the Great by establishing a strong northern power in Prussia, divided Germany politically into North and South, representing Austrian and Prussian interests. In 1806, the German emperor dropped the useless title, and called himself what he had long virtually been, emperor of Austria. Thus, after a thousand years of great and glorious existence, the German empire passed away, to be known henceforth only in history.

Before dismissing the subject, whose history has occupied our attention, it will be proper to consider the lessons which such a series of remarkable events is adapted to teach.

It must occur to the mind of every reader, that in some of its forms, the curse of Romanism has passed away forever with the age which gave it birth. The nations of Christendom will never again concede the right of the Roman pontiff to dispose of thrones and kingdoms on the plea of divine authority. Those nations will never again be one flock to be folded by that shepherd. The theocratic form of government, in the hands of a monk or priest, as vice-general, will not return. So much progress has been made in society, that it is quite too late for universal popular ignorance and superstition to recover their ancient sway, and entail their ghostly institutions upon mankind. Though Romanism has once and again revived since the thirteenth century, the thunders

of the Vatican, which, under Innocent III, filled all Europe with dread, have never since been able to strike terror into the hearts of kings. In all the great sisterhood of nations has the church ceased, by direct authority, to rule the State. What could his Holiness do even in his own dominions, were it not for the bristling of Austrian bayonets? The emperor of Austria is, as it respects any power that can terrify, the head of the church. The civilized world has undergone a complete change within five centuries. Everywhere, the civil authority is now the greater light that rules by day, and ecclesiastical power is sinking with every revolving year. The moral and even political influence of the church, and of Romanism, is still great; but its direct authority is next to nothing. A heretic is as safe as a saint.

The history of the papacy and of the empire shows conclusively that the spiritual and the temporal powers, when lodged separately in their respective heads, can never be held in equipoise. The beautiful theory, set forth by so many catholic writers, and even by Hurter, of a loving emperor and pope mutually recognizing each other's supreme authority in their respective departments, and working together, like true yoke-fellows, for the temporal and spiritual good of all the people, is as unlike what the earth has ever seen, as the successor of saint Peter is to his prototype. Human nature must be wholly sanctified before such a theory can appear beautiful in practice; and when that state of perfection shall arrive, it will be time enough to consider its claims. In the Catholic view of government, according to which there is to be a two-fold supremacy, there lies a plain contradiction, for all the matters of difficulty are of that mixed character, which gives to both parties an equal claim. So it is in the law of marriage and of divorce. So it was with the right of investitures. The canonical law and the civil law will always be at variance, for they emanate from different sources and contemplate different ends. The civil and the ecclesiastical functions, then, will always interfere and clash with each other. There is for them, in the present state of mankind, no possible mode of existence but that of perpetual strife. No point can be more clearly established from history than this. At what period, during the connection of the papacy and the empire, were these two powers held in equipoise? There must always be a determining authority ultimately somewhere. Emperors and pontiffs, each in turn, said, and said with truth, there can no more be two heads of Christendom than there can be two Gods, or two suns in the heavens.

But it is no less true, on the other hand, that the Roman Catholic church is capable of rising, under favorable influences, to an elevation of moral dignity and religious seriousness, which never fail to command very general respect. We refer not to the many single examples of excellence, of which no one can be ignorant, but to the general character of the church in such times as those of Gregory VII, and of the early Jesuits, when there was enough of moral force to strengthen the foundations of the hierarchy. The loss of that earnestness of religious character, at other times, (at the close of the Carolingian period, at the beginning of the reign of Henry III, and just before the reformation, for example,) was the chief cause of the waning power of the church. If even now, in the nineteenth century, the religious elements of Romanism should be extensively revived; if the work of missions should be prosecuted with as much pious zeal as in some earlier periods; if the education of the young should be conducted with the care and thoroughness which have been known to characterize some of their schools formerly; if, in this country especially, intelligence, dignity of deportment, seriousness and candor should ever come to be general among the Catholics, and such men as Möhler, Schlegel and Hurter should come before the public as their representatives, Romanism would yet acquire a power among us which could not be put down by violence, nor dislodged by abusive epithets. If such a time should ever come, superior moral excellence will be our only real strength; and truth and candor our only effective weapons. Public opinion will be the prize for which both parties will have occasion to contend, and this cannot be taken by storm. The triumph of Gregory VII illustrates the superior value of cool philosophy to passion and an immediate resort to force. Not only are Catholics men, and Protestants but men, but, what is of more consequence, the persons to judge between them are men.

We close with a remark, to which it will be well for American patriots to give heed, namely, that the papacy has always owed its elevation to the existence of political parties, between which it could hold the balance of power. Its entire history is but a continuous commentary on this fact. The character and constitution of the German empire, in respect to the power of its great vassals, and the encouragement held out to them by the history of the past, that they might one day take their turn and sit on the imperial throne; the loose manner in which remote duchies and kingdoms were attached to the empire,

giving them opportunity to revolt with comparative ease and impunity; and finally the high rank and great authority given to ecclesiastical dignitaries, when their elevation was resorted to as a check upon the dukes and other dangerous vassals, together with their dependence upon Rome,—these and other similar circumstances opened the way for a strong opposition to spring up in the heart of Germany. To keep such an opposition in existence, and to hold such other political connections as should enable him to give it effectual support, was the settled policy of the pope of Rome. Jesuitical, in this respect, he has always proved to be. He was not over anxious to inquire who was the rightful sovereign, or which the better party; it was enough to know which would be most obedient and make the greatest concessions to himself. Of all this the history of the Carolingians, of the Guelfs and of the Hohenstaufens furnishes abundant illustration. Such essentially has Romanism always been and will, no doubt, always continue to be. Never was there a more inviting field for the exercise of its political power than that presented by our popular government with its ever-growing factions. In the German empire open opposition to the government could be put down as rebellion, or made a cause of war; with us, it is claimed as a constitutional right. There profound secrecy was necessary, and exposure at too early a day was defeat. Here the mask may be thrown off at any time, and that which has ripened to sufficient maturity in secret council, may come forth and manifest itself like any other political scheme. In combination with any political party to which it may have sold itself, or rather, which it may have bought, Romanism, with its peculiar tactics, may with apparent honor enter into a political campaign, and not unfrequently control our popular elections. How can the danger which threatens us from this quarter be averted? By regulating emigration, and limiting the right of citizenship? Let the politicians settle that question. Let it be remembered, however, that it is not with emigrants alone, but also with their more numerous descendants, who will of course be native citizens, that our posterity will be concerned. These must be won over to a sincere love of our free institutions, and, if possible to a better faith and a better life. But, after all, it is in ourselves that the chief difficulty lies, and to ourselves that the remedy must be applied. It is our own corruption, our want of virtue and of union, our political rancor and strifes, our unprincipled recklessness of consequences in partisanship, it is this that gives the papists their

power over us ; and if heaven do not interpose and give us more integrity and virtue, and turn back the advancing tide of our political corruption, we shall be destroyed as a nation, if not by the papists, by some other brute force that will come over us as it did over the ancient Roman republic.

ARTICLE IX.

SELECT NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

Biblical and Oriental Works. The fifth, enlarged and corrected edition of Winer's "Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms als sichere Grundlage der neutestamentlichen Exegese," was published in 1844, in a volume of 733 pages. Every page of this edition, the author remarks, will show that he has striven to come nearer the truth. For many corrections and improvements, he acknowledges himself indebted to the learned commentaries of Fritzsche, of Giessen, Lücke, Meyer and De Wette and to the philological works of Lobeck and Krüger. Winer suggests that this may be the last edition which he may live to bring out. His health, we believe, has been for some time in a precarious state.

Prof. Ewald and Leopold Dukes have published a volume of "Contributions to the History of the most ancient Interpretation of the Old Testament." Dukes seems to be a Jew from Hungary, who has resided some time in Tübingen. He is deeply skilled in the Talmuds and other monuments of Jewish learning. The contents of the volume are an Introduction on the present condition of Old Testament Learning by Ewald ; Psalms according to Sadius ; Job according to Sadius, Ben Gegatilia and an unknown translator ; the oldest investigators in the Hebrew language, embracing some account of the life and works of about fifteen Jewish rabbies and learned men ; and, finally, the grammatical works, in about 200 pages, of R. Jehuda Chajjug of Fez, commonly named the prince of grammarians. The pieces are accompanied with introductory remarks and notes. The work is full of curious, and to most scholars, hitherto inaccessible learning. Some of the treatises are printed from MSS. in the Bodleian library.

The second No., Vol. VI. of the "Zeitschrift für d. Kunde des Morgenlandes," contains a Grammar of the Berber language by Francis W. Newman, in about 100 pages. The materials are some MSS. in the possession of the British and Foreign Bible Society, consisting of transla-