

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



The Reconstruction of the Civilization of the West, from Charlemagne (Transitio Imperii) to the Era of the Crusades (And Concordat, 1122)

Author(s): W. J. Irons

Source: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol. 9 (1881), pp. 152-173

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Royal Historical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3677939>

Accessed: 26-06-2016 20:35 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press, Royal Historical Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE CIVILIZATION
OF THE WEST, FROM CHARLEMAGNE (*Transitio
Imperii*) TO THE ERA OF THE CRUSADES (AND
CONCORDAT, 1122).

BY THE REV. W. J. IRONS, D.D., BAMPTON LECTURER, 1870,
PREBENDARY OF ST. PAUL'S, F.R. HIST. SOC.

THE influence of Christianity on the Roman Empire, and so ultimately on modern Civilization, was immediately felt, as we first observed, in its action on the social system; and eventually in the formation of better public opinion in morals and Religion. The ideas of individual right and personal freedom (absolutely essential to the new faith which had appeared as the teacher of conscience), found their echo, and also in some sense a defined limit, in the advancing Roman Law; but the more active relations of the gradually-formed Christian Society to the State in which it took its mission would, as we saw, be much determined by the course of events, and by the action and development of the State itself. We must recall this.—

After the fall of Jerusalem, Christianity had no political or local centre, and naturally gravitated to Rome, the ruler of the nations, since the mission of the Church was to “all the world.” Christianity, in carrying out her religious mission, was at once the enemy of Roman as well as other Paganism; but it took time specially to disengage itself from Judaism as a national Religion. Perhaps it were more exact to say that it chiefly outlived Judaistic ideas while forming cosmopolite settlements in the great cities of the West. The “Perpetual Edict,”—followed by the social reforms of Hadrian,—reflected, even if unconsciously, the Ethical growth stimulated by Christianity. The Pagan Religions known to Rome really admitted of no revival; and Rome, as the head and law-

giver of the Empire, while dropping the old superstitions, still naturally attracted to itself all that was found most influential in moral and political life. Religious Eclecticism, as at Alexandria, was a dream ; and it came too late.—So, from the first, the union of Christianity with the Empire seemed inevitable, and events tended to make the two conterminous for the time. A State always has a Religious understanding with Conscience.

It has been fancifully supposed by recent speculators in history, that Rome had always some mysterious instinct, appropriating, both imperially and locally, the elements of future power and moral greatness ; in which speculation M. Renan follows close on the mild fanaticism of Mr. Formby (one of the most interesting converts to modern “Catholicism”). But the transfer of the seat of Empire to Constantinople (339), and then the divisions of East and West, and the abortive attempts to re-assert the City of Rome as, necessarily, the capital of the world, sufficiently dissipate this fancy, whether of ecclesiastic or sceptic (quite apart from the consideration of the present condition and prospects of Germany, or France, or the Italian peninsula). Still the fact remains, that the great Empire itself, wherever its seat was held, and whether divided or not, really drew to itself, and long retained, the reverence of the world ; and Christianity from the first had, in the very nature of the case, to acquire and establish relations with it, as the Civil Power, “the minister of God for good,”—(as it admitted),—without which its immediate mission could hardly proceed to mankind.

I. We have briefly, in former pages, traced the course of those advancing relations of the religious and political elements from the days of the Cæsars to those of Charlemagne ; and have found the Code of the Christian Church gradually incorporated into that of the Empire by the time of Theodosius. As a consequence, the general organization of the Church in the whole Empire was recognised ; and at last it penetrated more or less the laws and institutions of the invading

barbarians,—to some extent morally subdued by the grand power which they so rudely shattered. During these eight centuries the State (in its own belief) ruled the Church, and the Church (on its own view also) acquiesced as in duty ; though scarcely with a clear understanding.

The relations no doubt were theoretically indefinite, but jurists and ecclesiastics had inevitably to work together in that most trying period of the Education of the nations. The *de facto* governors of the uncultivated masses of men found churchmen even essential at the time ; and so Emperors and Kings learnt how to work with the Church and her Councils, Government could not, in fact, go on in any other way.

The coronation of Charlemagne at length gave to Civilization a new point of departure. There had been confusion in the minds of all men as to the fundamental principle, Religious or Civil, on which the great order of human society should proceed. The Roman Civilization had actually, since 476, become, through the barbarians, more demoralized than it had probably ever been since Augustus. The Episcopal and Monastic schools, which at first were doing so much to form and instruct the people generally, had after the sixth century well-nigh ceased to exist. The “dignity of Rome” and of the “Imperial law” still penetrated the rude multitude ; and this became even as an instinct, not long afterwards expressed in the historical title, “*Holy Roman Empire.*” It was a name implying the sacredness of the LAW, *i.e.*, the secular dominion, as such ;—(a phrase indirectly illuminating, for coming times, the “*Holy See*” of the Imperial city of the West). Meanwhile, all was deteriorating. Facts, however, by the 8th century, determined themselves ; for the nations could no more wait. Events pressed. Leo III. had, almost by the accident of the hour, crowned Charlemagne (800). The people were fascinated, and some thought “the less was blessed by the better.” And now the question, always latent, was to be brought into the light of day, “Which was to rule the world,—the ecclesiastical power or the civil ?”

The great Emperor seems to have understood his mission

from the first. He had need of Ecclesiastics, and also of their few co-adjutors that remained in the ranks of the laity ; and they were no reluctant instruments provided to his hand. He found the Laws, the Education, and even the local institutions of his Empire, in many parts, in entire abeyance. The military classes, with the slaves, and retainers of various name, could of course do nothing to organize his vast, growing, and heterogeneous dominion.—The Emperor himself could not, it is said, well write his name. But among Charlemagne's first resolves (786) had been this,—that he would set up Schools for the people in all the West.

Before Charlemagne was crowned as "Emperor of Rome," he had been "King of the Franks" (Germans) thirty-two years. His kingdom was then by far the most powerful of all the (at first) half-dependent monarchies which rose, or tried to rise, on the ruins of so much of Rome in the West. He may be said also to have inherited the friendship of the Roman see ; and the mutual relations of the Popes and the Frankish kings, his ancestors, had been strengthened by their common necessities, and by the state of the times, from the days, at least, of Pepin who had been sanctioned by the Pope in dethroning the last of the Merovingian Franks (768). Pepin was a Patrician, and had been the defender and Patron of Rome ; and thus his son Charlemagne, also a Patrician, at the request of Pope Hadrian had undertaken, for Rome's sake, the subjugation of the aggressive Lombards. This kind of protectorate implied no less, practically, than Imperial power ; for the Emperors of the East, whatever their theory, had utterly allowed the West to drift away from them ; meanwhile power had everywhere, as was natural, localized itself. When at length the Byzantine throne was occupied by an Empress (797), Charlemagne, at the head of the great Western monarchy, was apparently willing to marry her, and so naturally occupy the old Imperial position. But this failing, he still was at once accepted as "Emperor of the Roman world,"—having to make such terms with ensuing Byzantine monarchs as the powerful can generally offer to the tolerated, adopting methods

of connivance, such as the nations of both East and West had already been accustomed to.—The Roman, clearly was to grow stronger, and the Byzantine weaker continually.—Even in the East, Charlemagne had privileges conceded to him by the Caliph Haroun al Raschid ; who now utterly despised the Greek “Emperor,” not only his tributary, but Charlemagne’s titular ally. The “coronation” was even superfluous, and submitted to rather than chosen at first ; and Charlemagne in accepting it, only did what his Franco-German predecessors had thought they strengthened themselves by doing. But he always knew that the world owned but one Imperial power, and he claimed to be that ; and maintained, both before and after the year 800, that Imperial Supremacy which had always carried with it the Ecclesiastical also.

In pausing upon this, we at once note that he dealt, for example, with the Iconoclastic controversy with a high hand, and in the Council of Frankfort which he summoned (794) he condemned the decrees of the Deuteronicene Council (though approved by Pope Hadrian), and had the “Caroline Books” issued, probably with Alcuin’s concurrence, to show the heresy of those decrees. (It is even said that the West owes to Charlemagne the *Veni Creator*, and the acceptance of the *Filioque*.) But further:—

Just as, before the fall of the West (476), the Imperial “Constitutions” from time to time were added to the Theodosian laws ; so now, in the newly rising nations, the “Capitularies” of kings had been issued as laws to the bishops and other magnates for practical adoption ; without at all abrogating the old Imperial Code, where it prevailed. The ancestors of Charlemagne had for ages—(more than two centuries at least)—summoned Synods of Bishops, together with the great men of their people, and with their consent put forth Constitutions and Capitularies on all subjects of Civil and Ecclesiastical interest, which immediately became laws of the realm.

No doubt, to overlook the administration of these laws was often a more difficult matter than to promulge them. The

confusions of the times, so continually deplored, had, in the eighth century, thrown, and even forced, the powers of administration, necessarily, into the hands of local ecclesiastics; with the effect, at length, of further secularizing the clergy themselves, and not by any means spiritualizing their magistracy. It would not be easy to exaggerate the abatement of the Episcopate in the West which had thus ensued, during the times immediately preceding Charlemagne.

Papal decrees and synods, even from the time of Pope Siricius (398), had been allowed to assist in holding things together. The Emperor Phocas in the East (150 years before Charlemagne), regarding the West as still, in theory, part of the Byzantine-Roman Empire, may have hoped to assert himself, and also arrest disorders, by conceding a sort of distant religious exarchate to the Bishop of Rome (in a quasi-Republic, as Rome so often was); but this did not succeed in really ruling the local Episcopacies and people. The generally painful list of Pontiffs from Boniface III. (606) to Honorius (638), on to Leo III. (795), is sufficient to show the moral powerlessness of this State-made primacy; but doubtless it may have seemed to answer awhile an Imperial purpose, in keeping in check the heresies and pretensions of Constantinople (as "New Rome"), some of which the Eastern Emperor had found inconvenient. It left, however, in the West a demoralized Episcopacy in the magistrate's office, without immediate remedy.

In this state of things, and soon after his coronation (802), Charlemagne once more called together the leading ecclesiastics and laity, at Aix-la-Chapelle, and thoroughly revised the laws of the subject nations under his control—the Ripuarii, the Allemanni, Burgundians, Lombards, and the rest), and required all Ecclesiastical and other Magnates and their dependents, to swear to him as "Cæsar," and as directly Supreme. Alcuin of York, whom the Emperor had met at Parma some twenty years before (781), carrying the *pallium* to the Archbishop of York, from Pope Hadrian, was now the Emperor's adviser. He had become for some time, at his

request, the organizer of the Western Schools of the Empire ; Schools which have influenced, since then, the whole intellectual culture of Europe. A Supremacy, like this of Charlemagne's, over the instruction and discipline of Church and State, over the Creed of the nations (*cap. i. an. 802, c. 41*), and over all the Schools of secular learning, could not but put into distinctest prominence the question (practically unraised since the days of the pagan Emperors), as to the independent spiritual claims of the Church in his Empire.

Civilization thus had clearly entered on its new phase. The Emperor at Aachen was acting no doubt under urgent necessity, which all must have seen ; but it was by his own surprising energy that he succeeded in securing the wonted homage of the Bishop of Rome, and of the Episcopacy in all his dominions—never really withheld from Christian Emperors ; and thus his Empire was founded.

His son, Louis the Pious, followed him (814). It had been probably the policy of Charlemagne to divide the Empire (as Constantine and Theodosius had done) among his posterity ; hoping so to retain and enhance that theoretical Unity of the Roman world which all men desired. But the division proved to be as disastrous as in the former cases. After Louis the Pious, Lothair II. (840), Louis II. (855), Charles the Bald (875), and Charles the Fat (888), through their dynastic divisions, brought the Carlovingian Empire to utter destruction in less than a hundred years.—

Meanwhile the Photian schism in the East, and the Eighth General Council (Constantinople, 869), were occupying attention there ; but were of course untouched by the Emperors in the again distracted West ; and during the then ensuing seventy years (of the feeble and less direct members of the house of Charlemagne), there was, as described by Gibbon, a "kind of Vacancy of the Empire itself."

A new barbarism was threatened even in Italy. Popes, as a rule, however, demanded all along "the protection" of the Western Emperors ; and the Emperors, one after the other, as in return, claimed when they could, to be "crowned" by

the Popes ; the latent problem of their mutual relations being really unsolved as much as ever. No Emperor, indeed, appeared for a long time after Charlemagne strong enough to rule imperially with a high hand as he did ; and there was worse than feebleness all the while on the side of the Ecclesiastical power. For then, if ever, would have been the time to show, if it could be, that a Spiritual hierarchy was, as it had now believed itself, the true government for mankind. But history has no more disappointing story to tell than in the lives of a large portion of the fifty pontiffs (if we may so call them), from Leo III. to John XVIII.—a period of two hundred years.

It must not be supposed, however, that during this prolonged political struggle the nations lapsed into such degradation as in the eighth century. A forward step had been taken. Great names appear, and assure us at once that the Imperial Schools had not existed in vain. Now (as not before) another life was successfully being lived, full of intellectual promise. Our former British missionaries, Colaban in Austrasia, and Boniface in Frankland, and the rest, had been followed, as we have said, by our Alcuin ; and then John Scot Erigena became in due succession master of the "Schools of the Palace," which held on in the quiet vale of literature much apart at least from the heights of empire ; and they transmitted the light of truth, and earnest thought, to centuries yet to come ; a light still destined to penetrate mankind. The "*trivium*" and "*quadrivium*" bore their fruit naturally. The Schools of the diocese, or of the monastery, acquired also a recognised sacredness, which made them henceforth refuges amidst the political confusions.

Here, too, perhaps we may mention, as a practical example of mental growth, the great Predestinarian Controversy long ago bequeathed by Augustine, apart from its philosophy, and now raised by Gotteschalculus. We see it bringing into activity such men as Rabanus, Maurus, Erigena and Hincmar, with their throngs of eager disciples filling Europe, and in themselves sufficient proof that the human mind was moving on,

and that at least the old hopeless chasm of barbaric ignorance was really passed.

The needs of the Roman Episcopate, amidst the struggles of local potentates, obliged, in the tenth century (as of old, in similar cases), an appeal to the Civil Power. The Carlovigians were passed, and Otho was now King of Germany. After the extinction of the old imperial line, the territory of the Roman see and City fell, for half a century, into inextricable disasters. The imperial power itself had there seemed again as if suspended. The city, with its immediate dependencies, was again governed, more than half that time, as a republic, by a so-called "Consul." Octavian, who held that office at sixteen years of age (after Alberic, the Patrician), made himself Pope also, young as he was, under the title of John XII., and he was accepted by the Church. Finding the security of his quasi-rule threatened by Berengar (915), who had succeeded for a short time in being Emperor in Italy, (but was now holding power as vassal of the great German monarch), this John XII. appealed to Otho, who, no doubt, effectually interfered; and was himself, in due course, crowned "Emperor" by the Pope, who had invoked his aid (962).

A succession of infamous, or unworthy, ecclesiastics (not wholly unbroken by better men), who held the popedom, had made all come to feel that the secular Empire, suspended only too long, was a necessity; and Otho the Great was thus hailed as a deliverer—another Charlemagne—"Imperator, Augustus, Pater Patriæ."

The world, also, beyond Italy, began to apprehend once more that the "Holy Roman *Imperium*" was a reality, and that, with it, society had something to rest on. The cause of the Ecclesiastical Supremacy had (not for the first time) been tried, and was clearly lost; and the Empire held its former place.

Otho "the Great" (as he is justly named) confirmed to the Roman prelate, however, the "donations" of Pepin, Charlemagne, and Louis I., which had been so great a snare to the Ecclesiastics, though so opportune at times, as constituting a

lieutenancy for the too-distant "Emperor ;" but Otho specially obliged John XII. to admit the Imperial Supremacy; and soon after, on the same Pope's rebellion, he called a Council of Bishops, requiring them to depose John "for his many crimes," and to elect in his place, and at the imperial bidding, Leo VIII.

Unhappily for Rome, John XII. was not the last who shocked the conscience of mankind, and, finally, made Supreme hierarchical rule impossible in the order of the world. For the Popes, from John VIII. to John XVIII.—ten Popes of that name in the tenth Christian century—were of themselves enough to destroy any cause (without specifying other prelates of the time, such as Benedict VI., Stephen VI., and Sergius III.)

Otho the Great died in 972, only ten years after his coronation. In ten years more Otho II. passed away (983). Otho III. was but a child, the son of Otho II. by the Greek Princess Theophano. At sixteen he took from his mother the reins of government, but he died before attaining ripe manhood. As noble as his grandfather, and more devout, courageous and lofty in his character (notwithstanding the fearful sternness of his outset), possibly Rome might have been raised by him to greatness, more than Justinian's (whose Code he commanded to be restored as the Law of the Empire); but it was not to be.

The Othos were followed in the empire by the Henries—on the whole an heroic set of men, yet none of them equal to the struggle which they inherited, or able to settle the *modus vivendi* of the two Powers. The strength of the Papal cause at the time, as often before, lay in the Monasteries and Schools, which had given it a new Unity. The Imperial defence was in the minor landholders of various States, whose power was increasingly despotic, whether they ruled as an aristocracy, in a lax subjection to the Roman *imperium*, or asserted more independence.

The immediate form which the dispute for Supremacy (so vital to the Empire) always took during the eleventh century

M

was twofold ; first, as to the election of the Emperor by the Pope's consent, or of the Pope by the Emperor's ; and next, and in natural sequence, as to the forms of Investiture in the case of all Ecclesiastics.

The election itself, as to the Popes, had been secured to the College of Cardinals by Nicholas II. (1059)—a serious change in the papal position—only fourteen years before the pontificate of Gregory VII. But the Imperial consent was not formally conceded.

The most disastrous, because exasperating, episode of this part of the struggle is the melancholy account of the meeting of Henry IV. at Canossa, with Pope Gregory VII. It seemed, at one moment, that the ignominious penance of this Emperor had finally conceded the Ecclesiastical supremacy in things secular. But no ; the penance failed, for it was wrung from Henry IV. by his necessities, viz., by the practical difficulties in which he was involved through the papal excommunication. To be relieved from these, Henry went through an act of hypocrisy, which we can but wonder at, as we read of it. How he could possibly do it (as we should now say), as a "gentleman," and, after attaining his object, break all his pledged faith, and persecute to the end the Pontiff to whom he had vowed his allegiance before all Europe, we cannot comprehend. Or how Gregory VII., with the awful recollections, as well as immediate experience, of the abominable baseness of the Papacy of the preceding generations, could claim for the Pope the plenitude of Divine authority here on earth, must ever remain among the enigmas of the human conscience. The next generation cruelly avenged both the Pontiff who died in exile (1085) and the Emperor who sank (1105), dethroned by his unnatural son and successor, Henry V. But the grounds of the struggle still remained just as before between the Church and the Empire.

And when Henry V. came to be crowned (in 1112) by Pope Pascal II., the stern conflict of centuries arrived only at a poor compromise. Practically passing by the question of the Imperial and Papal Elections, the Concordat of Worms

(1122), as if in irony of both Pope and Emperor, had adopted the discreditable hypothesis that the Church and Empire had, in this long controversy, been disputing about the symbols and forms of Investiture, and not concerning the entire realities of government. Pope Calixtus, who had followed Pascal II. (1118), conceded, however, at that time that no bishop, or even abbot, should be consecrated in future until invested by the Emperor, and swearing allegiance to him—only the Investiture was to be by the “Sceptre,” and not by the Staff and Ring. The ninth General Council of the Church was convoked in the following year (1123) to promulgate to Christendom this hollow truce.

The question, who should choose the Pope? was henceforth to be formally untouched, and only had a piecemeal decision in the mingled events of the time. The difficulty as to the choice of the Emperor brought into existence, later on, an Electoral system among the leading potentates of the West, very similar to that of the electoral Papacy, fatally vested in the Cardinals. On the growing theory that all minor states were fiefs of the empire—(a theory encouraged by the long disorders of the reign of Henry IV.),—certain kings and dukes became “Prince Electors of the Empire” (1156); and upon this the papal assent to the Imperial election came somewhat as a matter of course. For two hundred years after this the Electoral system grew, till formally settled by the “Golden Bull” (1356).

The brief and troubled interval from the Council of Lateran (1123) to the rise of the great house of the Hohenstaufens—(Conrad III., 1138, whom St. Bernard influenced to take up the Crusades),—conducts us speedily to Frederick the Great;—bringing us to another era, on which we do not at present enter.

II. In the meanwhile our subject obliges us to remember other great events which could not but throw their influence on the difficult controversy as to the organization of Civilization which was to be the inheritance of later times.

The "Crusades" (from 1096) had attraction for both statesmen and churchmen. To the former they had a fascination as promising a recovery of the East to the Empire; to the latter as regaining the "Holy Places" of Christianity from the power of the Mahometans. The Crusades had also the effect of partly diverting attention from the political divisions among the princes and prelates of the West; while yet they accentuated the religious animosities of Greeks and Latins. They had, however, a charm for the greatest minds (like St. Bernard), though they distracted the Empire, and misled the Church from her great work of instruction and Civilization, which, as we may say, was thrown back awhile almost hopelessly. The power and encroachments of the local nobility at the same time became greater, and the reign of Imperial law more disturbed; while the possessors of the land gradually reduced to deeper serfdom the masses of the people who remained on their estates. The Crusades were a great parenthesis in European civilization.

It is not our purpose in these pages to trace other historical outlines of the Roman Empire of the West, only so far as to follow certain chief developments affecting the progress of the Civilization. We pause to mark, that the intellectual advancement of Europe happily was, in a large degree, distinct from many of the political movements; and we must turn our thoughts specially in that direction. Education, notwithstanding the Crusades, we may observe, was still doing its work in Europe; and we must refer to this.

People are in the habit of loosely describing the ages from Charlemagne onwards, as the "dark ages," and writers have too commonly spoken of the *Trivium*, of Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic, and the *Quadrivium*, of Arithmetic, Geometry, Music, and Astronomy, as a somewhat narrow training for the elementary Schools founded in the ninth and tenth centuries. This is exaggeration, and indeed something worse. The times of the Carolingians and their successors were "light" compared with the 8th century. Perhaps every age is a "dark age" if judged by the amount of knowledge, and power of thought, in the over-

whelming majority of the people ; but if Grammar, Arithmetic, Geometry, and Astronomy, and so on, were to be the subjects universally taught even in our own times (say under the Elementary Code, Act 1870), instead of any complaint of the "darkness," we should hear no small outcry as to our over-educating the people ; and if further, there were *free* access to all these subjects secured by the Clergy for all classes, many politicians would childishly think our condition even dangerous. The truth is that people who speak of certain ages as "dark" seem here to need education themselves. They have a sort of superstition, that there had been somehow and somewhere a determined suppression of "light," in the interest of ignorance. The facts are the reverse of this imagination. The irruption of the barbarians of the North and East destroyed, no doubt, the ancient cities of the Empire ; and the Saracens at first burnt the Libraries. But the Monasteries of the Church saved all they could of the old literature ; while the Clergy deplored the devastation, and long worked on with silent industry in the Schools, seeking, almost single-handed, to preserve and copy the precious manuscripts they could secure.

The eager population were encouraged by their lords to be constantly at war, and even the old desire of learning was lost. From Sidonius Apollinarius (450) to Gregory of Tours (570), from Gregory to Hincmar (846), there had been a time of growing barbaric encroachment, to which, perforce, even Ecclesiastics at length succumbed. Schools both Episcopal and Monastic were, for want of protection, nearly extinct at last, except in our own land, at the time Charlemagne met Alcuin at Parma (and later to Alfred—900). But now, and for above 300 years the imperial schools were to become once more the agency which mainly formed anew the Civilization of Europe. Just as, from Lactantius to Boëthius (520), Christianity had been reviving the Empire, until the crushing barbarian irruptions ; so now, on the contrary (780), the revived schools with Charlemagne's protectorate began a work which was never to be so fatally interrupted ; and which was all along the life of the Civilization of the West, if regarded as an advancing whole.

At the same time there were other elements,—those of political thought among the nations,—arising out of the Education, which influenced the growing course of Civilization.

That the freedom and justice which should rule among men should be uniform “Law” had been indeed the common conviction which gave strength to the respect for the Roman power, and its Code of just legislation, which pervaded even barbarians as they advanced; and this conviction, as we have been observing, had long made the Empire appear a kind of human necessity. That the Religion, also (which should develop the human conscience), should be true, and therefore one and the same everywhere, was for ages accepted with rigor in Europe as self-evident; and with that mixed feeling the Civil and Ecclesiastical Codes were intermingled. The “One Empire” and the “One Church”—(“Eternal Rome” and “Catholic Religion”)—seemed thus to be natural constituents of the highest Civilization. These convictions had been shaken to the foundation by the division of the secular, and by the heresies of the ecclesiastical power, as also by the inroads of Mahometanism, after the fall of the West, and onwards to the “Transition of the Empire” (as it was called) in the Carlovingian days. But the convictions still existed, though so deeply shaken; and destined to be further shaken in the 12th century. The separation of the two codes, by the “Decretum” of Gratian required to be taught in all universities of Europe, was in the same direction.

Charlemagne, indeed, had found the old Empire, which was deemed One and sacred, practically dissevered from the nominal head at Constantinople, and (with the assistance of the Bishop of Rome) acted on the belief that the Roman Empire, which had, if it may be so expressed, emigrated to Constantinople in 339, only returned as the same Roman *Imperium* to its true home in the West, when he was monarch. To him there was but one Rome and One true Christianity. He endeavoured always to regard the Greek Emperors as holding outlying posts of the Roman world (very much as the East had, from 476, long

imagined the Ostrogothic, Frankish and Lombardian kings, and exarchs, to be *their* deputies in the West). Had not Charlemagne, however, been great enough to attempt the free and almost compulsory Education of the West, he could not have succeeded in upholding this "Unity," or arresting the barbarism which was destroying it. In another hundred years the ruin must have been fatally consummated, which however was averted.

But there were other causes (including Education itself), which mingled in producing the changes which were to supersede the old ideas at last. The Empire, after Charlemagne's own time, we have seen split up into divisions which tended more and more to independence and disruption. But certainly they aimed no barbarous blow at Education, the great Civilizer, and now the Uniting power. The formation of the new languages of the West, as shown later on, also contributed to the inevitable disintegration of the old and long attempted "Roman Unity," encouraging separation into Nationalities. But all this change rather promoted Education. On the other hand, the "Catholic" idea of Religion, true for all alike (as hitherto interpreted), was the instrument of all Education, and naturally was in collision with secular Nationalism, imperilling Unity on every side.

Thus the old Roman organization was receding, together with the old ideas. Not, indeed, till the beginning of our own century, was the history worked out; so that the shadow of the title of the "Roman Emperor" (as the ideal head of law and civilization) finally passed away. It was then (1806) formally resigned by the Emperor Francis II.; and Europe began to be readjusted by new ideas—and by the French Revolution.

Civilization, in fact, has not since then marked out its own future; but it has shown what it will not be; it will not repeat the past. The position latent in the "States of the Church," *i.e.*, the whole Ecclesiastico-secular claim, as well as in that of the Empire, has finally changed. The "Roman world," whether Secular or Spiritual, Imperial or Pontifical, will

rule the nations no more ; though the influence of "Roman Law" will long be felt, and of "Catholic Religion" for ever. The antagonism of the two "Roman" powers, as such, was essentially at an end. As they for 1500 years had lived, so now they practically died together.—(From Pius VII.—Leo XIII. we have Concordats, quasi-Pragmatic Sanctions, and then the Syllabus, the Falke Laws, and now the expulsion of Religious, &c.)

Reverting, however, to the Civilization of the Carlovingian Empire yet once more, we have to emphasize the fact of the ordinary connection through all political changes of its great agent, the Schools, with the Palace, the Cathedral, and the Monastery, whatever were the failures of each. The Schools were, no doubt, intensely secular, but they were Ecclesiastical even more ; and this latter characteristic was often, as we have said, their protection. We must not turn away from facts which so deeply interest us.

Christian Monasticism had begun in an age of disorder, war, crime, and social uprooting. It never remained in one stay, but seemed itself, in all its various orders, to be easily corrupted, even when only in its second generation, and always to need speedy reform, new rules, and sometimes re-foundation. Meanwhile, it was always a protest against barbarism, whether by its looking back into the silent past for a model of a better life, or looking on dimly into the desired future, as containing the undeveloped hopes of man. Amidst the divisions of the striving world it held forth a vision of peace. It was as a voice in the wilderness of often decaying Civilization, and had eventually the reverence of even the turbulent. Monasticism soon became actively an Educator, and it was never a dry Expositor of learning.

The monastic orders grew to be educators in *many* ways, not one only. They may be said to have created new Literature as a common right, or they revived the old ; or they were Preachers to the masses, like our English Boniface, or pious teachers, like those at Fulda ; who put forth the "Biblia Glosata," with the comments of a hundred Fathers (9th century),

after the schools of Alcuin were founded. The monks were also the *thinkers*, who made men feel (what barbarians never felt, and some still do not know among ourselves) that truth is worth pursuing for its own sake. If Alcuin himself were more an organizer than a thinker, the monk Rabanus, who succeeded him in the "School of the Palace," was not so; nor, again, the acute successor of Rabanus, John Scot Erigena—in will a very martyr of free thought. The Schools which produced this Erigena, the author of the necessary "Consistency of Reason and Religion," the defender of moral responsibility against the fatalism of Gotteschalculus, and a bright line of teachers, onwards to that grandest of thinkers, St. Anselm, cannot but be regarded as chief factors in that permanent Civilization, which soldiers and tyrants could not henceforth destroy.

It would be wrong to imagine, indeed, that the advancement of the world cannot again be thrown back by barbarism; for the animal still dominates too much over the moral and intellectual in the human family; and there are schemes fostered, which sober greatly all enthusiasm for our immediate future. But the ultimate prevalence of truth and righteousness is an indestructible faith of the human heart; and an ever-growing "cloud of witnesses" certifies that humanity is waiting for "better things."

But, looking finally at our chief subject, what shall we say of the Civilized position at the close of the era we have been considering? Taking leave of Anselm and the Imperial Schools, and Bernard the "last of the Fathers," who died (1153) just when the "Master of the Sentences" had completed his work (so destined to influence the Schools of the centuries that followed), let us give a summary glance at the practical result thus far reached, by the two disputants in the Roman world claiming the Supreme government of men, the Ecclesiastical and the Temporal, and asking to order the Civilization of the West.

Each of the contending Powers had more than once had the opportunity of showing what it could achieve for Society,

or for the Empire ; and we see that not one Emperor attained even a *minimum* of success as a Ruler, unless (to use a common phrase) he "took the law into his own hands," and resolutely used the Ecclesiastical power as his subordinate. From the first Christian Emperor to Charlemagne, as we look back, most of the Emperors were admitted as Supreme, and, had they been resisted, they might probably have been unable to vindicate their real claim ; for, with the exception of a few great men (like the Theodosiuses), they were personally unequal to the moral position ; but they would actually, no doubt, have been upheld at the time by the imperial code. But, after the question had been practically raised, no Emperors but Charlemagne, and the Othos, and Henry III. had wisdom or vigour enough fully to maintain the *de jure* or even *de facto* Supremacy of the Temporal power. This Imperial feebleness was probably inherent in the Imperial institution ; for even when successful, the Secular Supremacy was maintained by might only, and not by demonstrated right. There was, thus far, no intelligent solution of the difficulty. It was simply "submit to *authority*,"—this or that. Human society thus subsisted under a perpetual apology. The conscience of man, socially and morally, could not finally or really surrender itself to the Temporal Authority of the Civil Ruler ; and yet the Civil ruler was obliged, if he would have peace, to act publicly as if it could, though he felt the impossibility.

But the Ecclesiastical power, which in the time of Gregory VII., claimed universal submission from all men, made the same practical assumption, of course, as the Empire made, as to the claims of "authority." It assumed that because of the Divine origin of the Ecclesiastical Power, the conscience of man was to surrender to its "authority," in things spiritual and moral,—which include everything ; a theory as subversive ultimately of the ground of moral goodness, as Imperialism itself could be.

Then the actual qualifications of the line of Ecclesiastics, who claimed this lofty character as the hierarchs of the world, were even more flagrantly at variance with their asserted

calling than those of the worst and feeblest Emperors. If the Imperial power commonly exhibits its own unfitness, from Charlemagne to Henry V., still more impossible is the power of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy as seen in the light of the facts, down to the poor compromise effected at Worms (1122).

Nearly sixty popes succeeded, one after the other, in these 300 years from Leo III. to Pascal II. There were some great men; but they were very few. Baronius would allow that the greatest was Gregory VII., virtually the guide of several of his predecessors, and the nominator of Victor III., who succeeded him as Pope, to hand on his principles. The subjugation of both the Church and the world to the Papacy was the object of Gregory's life. His theory was clear; but he died in defeat and exile. Not one besides approached him in vigour, though there was spasmodic action here and there. Victor III. may be taken as a fair witness of the condition to which the Roman See had come, just before Gregory's time:—(and no one could refer with pride to other Popes of the age, to 1123). Victor III., in his dialogues, delineates the position, when describing one of his predecessors:—"Benedict IX. (1023), terrified by the outcry "against his crimes, given up to voluptuous pleasures, and more "disposed to live as an epicurean than as a pontiff, adopted the "resolution of selling the pontificate!"—This Benedict IX. was nephew of the preceding Pope, John XIX., who was brother to Benedict VIII. When the Emperor Henry III. came to Rome, he found the three popes there; Benedict IX., at the Lateran; Sylvester III., at the Vatican; and Gregory VI., at St. Maria Maggiore. The Emperor deposed them all, and a fourth was elected as Clement II.!

It is needless to continue the mournful story. Enough has been said to show that the Gregorian Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the world had been tried and found wanting.

In conclusion: We have seen that the project of One Empire, and One Established Faith in combination, was thus far thwarted by the history of the nations. But the battle was by no means fought out. The Empire, however low,

was not yet extinct even in the East. In the West the Roman *Imperium* had to struggle for centuries for its idéal place among the growing nationalities. The Church had to learn, whether it could be at the same time Catholic and National. The mind of the various peoples had to be trained to freedom and law.—Some began to ask, “Is there a *lex gentium* in Religion?”

The Schools of the next 300 years will conduct to the Renaissance; and, after that, 400 more will be needed to disentangle the mingled Imperial Christianity from the rough accidents of all the eighteen centuries, and open the way to the Polity and Christianity of the future.

Further on, we may be able to watch this great problem of the relations of Society and Religion,—onwards from the time of Frederick the Great to the fall of Constantinople; and after that our inquiry might be completed by observing the development of our mixed Civilization from the 15th century to the 19th, bringing the final disruption of Feudalism at the French Revolution.

The harmony of the Social basis of our common Civilization, and the freedom of the Religious conscience of man, will have to be worked out by the law and philosophy of the coming generation, if a chaos of Society and for a time of Religion itself is to be avoided. The watchwords of party will avail nothing in the end, nor will an interregnum of compromise long be possible. Reason and right ought to prevail, and will prevail. Our Christianity will demand no less.

It would be unphilosophical and ignorant to sanction the coarse supposition, that in the opposition of the Empire and the Church, as gradually developed, there was nothing but a struggle for rule. The matter to be decided always was, How shall Religion and Natural Society co-exist? Christianity began its work on the human conscience by penetrating the *Roman* world. The kingdoms within reach of the Roman Empire were absorbed as much as possible; and the Unity asserted for the Empire made it easier for the Church to press its own Unity, in it and with it. When the Roman world

began to break up once more, and divided laws, and divided territories, and lost Latinity, and lost provinces, East and West, asserted permanent changes in Civilization,—with the revival of separate kingdoms and republics,—then the difficulty inherent in the whole Ethical and Religious position became more and more apparent.—“How far the State should fix even the needful morality of a people?”—and,—“Where the function of the individual should begin?”—had henceforth to be worked out under matured conditions.