

THE LIVES OF THE POPES

VOL. II.

THE
LIVES OF THE POPES
IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

BY THE
REV. HORACE K. MANN

"De gente Anglorum, qui maxime familiares Apostolicæ Sedis semper existunt." (*Gesta Abb. Fontanel. A.D. 747-752*, ap. M.G. SS. II. 289).

HEAD MASTER OF ST. CUTHBERT'S GRAMMAR SCHOOL, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE
CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY OF HISTORY OF SPAIN

THE POPES DURING THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE

LEO III. TO FORMOSUS

795-891

VOL. II.—795-858

SECOND EDITION

LONDON

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD.

ST. LOUIS, Mo. : B. HERDER BOOK CO.

1925

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

To

HIS ALMA MATER

ST CUTHBERT'S COLLEGE, USHAW

THIS VOLUME

Is respectfully Dedicated

BY

A GRATEFUL SON

PREFACE.

ENCOURAGED by the reception which was accorded by the press of various shades of opinion both at home and abroad to my previous volumes, which treated of the *Lives of the Popes* who flourished during the seventh and eighth centuries, and moved especially by the words addressed to me by our late Holy Father Leo XIII., of blessed and glorious memory, I venture to offer to the reading public another series of papal biographies. The first series dealt with the Pontiffs who reigned whilst the Lombards lorded it over Italy; the present one embraces the *lives* of those who ruled the Church whilst the Carolingians, the conquerors of the Lombards, held the reins of Empire, and will be published in two volumes.

Considering how tenderly my first literary offspring was treated by those who undertook to criticise it, it would ill become me to forget to thank them. To my thanks I would only add that, as my one wish is to produce a good and reliable work, I shall be grateful for any helpful criticisms. I have endeavoured to profit by those which my former volumes received, and it will not be my fault but my misfortune if I cannot still further profit by those which may be passed on the ones I have just completed. But I cannot help feeling in regard to them what Wibert felt concerning his biography of S. Leo IX., namely, that I shall have had a great measure of success if I become the

means of transmitting to posterity, no matter in what literary style, some slight knowledge of the great deeds of the Roman Pontiffs.¹ For I can never forget the striking words of Archbishop Hincmar, that "he who honours the See of Peter and its bishop honours Him who said: 'he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth Me'"² (John xiii. 20).

Nor must I omit to thank once more the authorities of the Public Library of the City of Newcastle-on-Tyne for the most obliging manner in which, at all times, they have placed their services and books at my disposal. My friends, C. Hart, Esq., B.A., and F. F. Urquhart, Esq., M.A., have assisted me in the most ungrudging manner. They have read over the proof-sheets for me with the greatest care, and have saved me from many a mistake. To express to them my sincerest gratitude is at once my duty and my pleasure.

H. K. MANN.

¹ "Unde ab ipsius (Leo IX.) exordio jam ordiatur sermo, in quo plurimum nobis successisse credemus, si ea tantum, quæ in pontificatu Leucorum laudabiliter gessit, ex aliqua parte quovis stylo posteris transmiserimus." Wibert, *in vit. Leo IX., Prolog.*

² "Cujus (Petri) sedem, suæque sedis pontificem qui honorat, illum honorat qui dixit: 'Qui accipit si quem misero, me accipit.'" Hincmar, Ep. 2, ap. *P. L.*, t. 126, p. 33.

A LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS
USED IN THIS VOLUME

- Jaffé, or Regesta . . . = *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, ed. Jaffé, 2nd ed., Lipsiæ, 1885.
- Labbe = *Sacrosancta Concilia*, ed. Labbe and Cossart, Paris, 1671.
- L. P., *Anastasius*, or the } = *Liber Pontificalis*, 2 vols., ed. L. }
Book of the Popes } Duchesne, Paris, 1886.
- M. G. H., or Pertz . . . = *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*,
either *Scriptores* (M. G. SS.) or
Epistolæ (M. G. Epp.).
- P. G. = *Patrologia Græca*, ed. Migne, Paris.
- P. L. = *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Migne, Paris.
- R. I. S. = *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. Muratori, Milan, 1723 ff.

The sign † placed before a date indicates that the date in question is the year of the death of the person after whose name the sign and the date are placed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE,	vii
LEO III. (795-816),	I
STEPHEN (IV.) V. (816-817),	111
PASCHAL I. (817-824),	122
EUGENIUS II. (824-827),	156
VALENTINE (827),	183
GREGORY IV. (827-844),	187
SERGIUS II. (844-847),	232
S. LEO IV. (847-855),	258
BENEDICT III. (855-858),	308
GENEALOGICAL TABLE—The Descendants of Charlemagne,	329
INDEX,	331

LEO III.

A.D. 795-816.

Sources.—Although the *life* of Leo III. is the longest one in the *Liber Pontificalis*¹ (*L. P.*), sometimes here cited as *The Book of the Popes*, it furnishes us with comparatively little information as to his doings. Apart from a short account of his early years, and a more detailed notice of the attack made upon him by Paschal and his associates, there is practically nothing else in it but an interminable list of expenses incurred by the Pope in connection with different churches in Rome and elsewhere.

Among the other sources whence we must seek fuller information are ten of his letters to Charlemagne in the *Codex Carolinus*,² or rather, to speak more accurately, in another beautifully written MS. of the beginning of the ninth century, drawn up, like the *Codex Car.*, by order of Charlemagne. A few more of his letters will be found ap. *P. L.*, t. 129; *M. G. Epp.*, v., etc. Various letters of Alcuin (ap. *Monument. Alc.*; *Bib. Rer. Germ.*, vi, ed. Jaffé, or, more recently, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii.) and of Charlemagne (*Mon. Carol.*, ed. Jaffé; *Bib. Rer. Germ.*, iv.) are addressed or have reference to Leo III. The latter may also be read ap. *P. L.*, t. 98, and, best of all, in *M. G. Epp.*, iv.

The *Carmen de Carolo Magno* (ap. *P. L.*, t. 98), assigned by some to Angilbert (†814), abbot of St. Riquier at Centula, in

¹ On it see vol. i., pt. i., p. 259 ff. of this work.

² See *ib.*, pt. ii., p. 203.

Picardy, gives a contemporary narrative in verse, imitated from the *Æneid*, of the above-mentioned attack on the Pope. Very useful, of course, are the *Annales veteres Francorum* (ap. *P. L.*, t. 98) and the other chronicles¹ of the time (ap. *M. G. SS.*, i., etc.).

Our own historians, William of Malmesbury, etc., must be consulted on the relations of the Pope with regard to this country. The documents will be found in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. p. 516 ff. Evincing the literary renaissance in progress among the Franks at this period, our authorities are now more satisfactory.

Modern Works.—Of the first importance are biographies of Charlemagne and his *entourage*. To those cited in the previous volume under Hadrian I., add *L'empereur Charlemagne*, by L. Double² (Paris, 1881); *Essai sur la vie d'Alcuin*, by F. Hamelin (Paris, 1873); and *Alcuin*, by A. F. West (London, 1893), a very sympathetic work on our industrious and practical scholar. *Alcuin: His Life and His Work*, by C. Gaskoin (London, 1904), is the most complete work on Alcuin. *Théodulfe*, by Ch. Cuissard (Orléans, 1892), may also be usefully consulted.

On the *Holy Roman Empire*, created by Leo III., see the well-known work of J. Bryce which bears that title (London, 1889), and which treats most ably on the establishment of the Carolingian Empire. He would seem, however, to show too great a respect for obsolete law; see also *L'empire Carolingien*, by A. Kleinclausz (Paris, 1902), a work which, though very learned, appears to me somewhat 'to drag its weary length along,' and *Le Saint Empire*, by J. Birot (Paris, 1903). C. Bayet has published several pamphlets on this period—e.g. *L'élection de Léon III. et la révolte des Romains en 799* (Paris, 1883). As the modern literature which might be cited in connection with Leo III. is exceedingly extensive, we will confine ourselves to naming two

¹ See *ib.*, p. 225.

² This author, writing as a modern patriotic Frenchman, and considering Charlemagne as a modern German, passes judgment accordingly! The spirit of the work may be gathered from this quotation: "Jamais peut-être la France ne fut plus misérable que sous le règne de cet Austrasien sanguinaire, cruel et débauché," p. ix. Cf. p. 180 regarding "l'épais cerveau du Germain enivré, du babare ébloui," etc.

more works : *Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical*, by L. Duchesne (Paris, 1898), and vol. viii. of Dr. Hodgkin's *Italy and Her Invaders*, Oxford, 1899.

EMPERORS OF THE EAST.

Constantine VI. (Porphyrogenitus),
780-797.
Irene, 797-802.
Nicephorus, 802-811.
Michael I., 811-813.
Leo V., 813-820.

EMPERORS OF THE WEST.

Charlemagne (King of the Franks),
771-800.
(Emperor), 800-814.
Louis, the Pious or Débonnaire,
814-840.

THE period of the history of the papacy, co-extensive with the duration of the Carolingian Empire (795-891), opens under very different external conditions to those under which its preceding period (590-795) commenced. During the latter epoch the popes were the nominal subjects at least of the emperors at Constantinople, whose representatives were installed in the crumbling palace on the Palatine. Their election had to be confirmed by them, and their lives and liberties were dependent on their whims. Italy, the centre of the papal power, was divided between the rude Lombard and the grasping Byzantine.

Introductory. The papacy at the beginning of the seventh century and at the beginning of the ninth.

But now all this was changed ; no longer did the presence among them of a Byzantine duke remind the Romans that their lord and master was a Greek Basileus on the shores of the Bosphorus ; no longer were the effigies of the descendants of Constantine received in Rome with the respectful submission due to their prototypes, and placed with honour in the chapel of S. Cæsario in Palatio ; and no longer did the coins of Rome, by their 'image and inscription,' proclaim that it owed tribute to Cæsar. The Byzantine power had vanished from the Eternal City, and,

with the exception of Calabria and of a few isolated places (*e.g.* Naples, Hydruntum, etc.) in S. Italy, from the whole of the peninsula. Rome and Italy had now new masters. Leaving out of account the parts just mentioned and Venice, which was a practically independent state under the protection of Constantinople, the provinces of Italy were in the hands of the Pope and of the Frank. The former, now free in every sense of the word, was lord of Rome and its duchy (along with the southern portion of Tuscany to Populonium), of the old Exarchate of Ravenna, including the Pentapolis, and of the duchy of Perugia (Perugia), which connected these two nearly equal strips of territory.¹ The donations of Pippin and Charlemagne gave him claims over various other portions of Italy; but the rest of the peninsula was, in fact, ruled by the Frankish, either in person or by the intermediary of subject Lombard dukes. In place, then, of being a subject insulted and oppressed by the domineering Greek and terrified by the savage Lombard,² he was an independent ruler honoured and protected by the grateful Frank.

Rome, which already in the days of the first Gregory was falling to pieces, was now, phoenix-like, springing from its ashes into new life and splendour. During the prosperous reign of Leo, its 'ever-increasing decay' (*frequentia ruinarum*),³ which St. Gregory had mourned and which had received a great check in the time of Hadrian, was

¹ See plate 63 of Poole's *Historical Atlas*.

² So late as 718, St. Boniface and his companions, when about to journey to Rome, prayed, "ut . . . Longobardorum erga illos humanitatem (=immanitatem) mitius sentirent." Willibaldi, *Vita S. Bonif.*, c. 5.

³ S. Greg., *Hom.* 18 *super Ezech.*; al. *Hom.* 6, c. 22-4. Cf. *Dial.*, ii. 15: "In hac urbe dissoluta moenia, eversas domus, distructas ecclesias turbine cernimus ejusque ædificia longo senio lassata, quia ruinis crebriscentibus (*sic*) prosternantur, vidimus."

still further arrested. The city was, in fact, furnished with a new lease of life.

What was true of Rome was true of the world at large both in the East and West. It seemed to Gregory I. that "the world was fast sinking into the grave by its ever-multiplying maladies."¹ But now its demise seems far distant. In the West the genius and strong right arm of Charlemagne, combined with the industry and intelligence of his ministers, were evolving order out of chaos; and in the history of the long decay and successive dismemberment² of the Eastern Empire, it would appear that at this epoch³ the effects of the revival in the eighth century are still being felt. At any rate, before the close of this century, which Pope Leo III. was to inaugurate in so striking a manner, there will have been begun under the Macedonian dynasty a splendid period of expansion for the Byzantine Empire—the last, however, which its annals will have to record.

But though all this is true, and though, in the main, the epoch which is now to engage our attention was a glorious one for the papacy, it must not be supposed that it was entering a millennium. As in the life of man every age has its peculiar diseases, so in the existences of dynasties and states every period has its difficulties and dangers. The troubles of the papacy were henceforth, for a long period, to arise rather from within than from without. The great increase of temporal power and wealth which had just come into its hands had fired fresh ambitions. Powerful families arose in Rome whose members would fain, by fair

¹ *Hom. 1 in Evang.*

² "Chaque siècle depuis son origine en (l'empire byzantin) eût vu disparaître quelque lambeau." Schlumberger, *Un Empereur Byzantin*, p. 325 (Paris, 1890).

³ Still, during the reign of Michael II., the Stammerer (820-9), Crete was lost, and the Saracens obtained a firm foothold in Sicily (827).

means or foul, keep the papacy or, at least, its power and possessions in their own grasp. As long as the Frankish protectors of the See of Peter were strong, these evils were kept to some extent in check. But when they in their turn grew feeble, when the Carolingian empire went finally to pieces towards the close of the ninth century, the papacy fell upon evil times indeed. The savage attack upon Leo III. by the relations of his predecessor, which we shall soon have to narrate, and the terrible death said to have been inflicted on John VIII., are indications of what will befall the popes when, if not the halcyon days, at any rate the comparatively bright times, of the ninth century shall have passed away.

Unani-
mous elec-
tion of Leo.

On the very day that Hadrian was buried (December 26, 795), Leo, the cardinal priest of S. Susanna and *vestiarius* (or *vestararius*), or chief of the pontifical treasury,¹ one of the principal officials of the papal court,² was elected to succeed him. That he was, moreover, unanimously elected was asserted by him in a letter to Charlemagne,³ and is also definitely affirmed by his biographer.⁴ As there was now no necessity for waiting for any imperial confirmation of the election, he was duly consecrated on the following day.

¹ In which not merely money, but the plate of the Church was preserved. Cf. *Ordo Romanus*, i., ap. Grisar, *Analecta Romana*, i. p. 219, or ap. *P. L.*, t. 78. "Diebus vero festis calicem et patenam majores et ævangelia majora de vestiario dominico exeunt sub sigillo vestararii per numerum gemmarum ut non perdantur." That Leo was actually *vestiarius* is really only a deduction from an obscure phrase in the *L. P.*

² *Ib.*, n. 2. Cf. *L. P.*, *in vit.* Severini, and *in vit.* Step. (III.) IV., n. 9.

³ In writing to Leo, the Frank king says: "Gavisi sumus . . . in electionis unanimitate." Ep. 93, inter Epp. Alcuin, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iv.

⁴ *L. P.* "Divina inspiratione, una concordia . . . a cunctis sacerdotibus seu proceribus, et omni clero, necnon et optimatibus vel cuncto populo Romano electus est." To explain the events of Leo's life in his own way, Bayet (*op. cit.*, p. 6) chooses to call in question this unanimity.

He who was thus by the suffrage of all raised to the See of Peter was a Roman and the son of Atyuppius and Elisabeth.¹ At a very early age he had been attached to the treasury department of the Lateran, and had therein been brought up and trained. The barbaric name of his father, coupled with the fact that nothing is said in the *Liber Pontificalis* about his having any aristocratic connections, gives some colour to the conjecture that he was of a more or less plebeian origin. An incidental notice of his biographer² informs us that he was ordained priest in the Church of S. Susanna on the Quirinal, a church which, as Pope, he took care to enlarge and enrich, and of which it will have been noticed he was the titular priest at the time of his election to the papacy.

Leo's early career and character.

According to the *Book of the Popes*, he was chaste, eloquent,³ and of a persevering disposition; well versed, as a priest should be, in the Sacred Scriptures and in psalmody, and very fond of the society of the pious. A great almsgiver himself, he was wont, when visiting the sick, which he was in the habit of doing most regularly, to exhort them to redeem their souls by alms. Whatever was entrusted to him in this way, he used to distribute to the poor in secret, as well by night as by day. It was by conduct such as this that, whilst he was occupied with the care of the vestments, money, and plate in the papal *vestiarium* or treasury,⁴ he became the beloved of all.

¹ *L. P.* The name of his mother is supplied by the *Ann. vet. Franc.*, an. 799, 'Matre Helisabeth.' With additions, these annals (ap. *P. L.*, t. 98) close with the year 840. They are practically identical with the *Chron. of Moissac* (ap. *M. G. SS.*, i.) as far as it goes, viz., to 818.

² *N. 9.*

³ Whence he was known as the Preacher; "qui sermocinarius appellatus est," says Bonizo of Sutri (†1091), ap. Mai, *Spicil. Rom.*, vi. p. 277.

⁴ Cf. the *trésor* of French cathedrals,

These were the arts which secured him a unanimous election to the chair of Peter.

After he became Pope, he showed himself a defender of the property of the Church and ever ready to face difficulties. Over merciful, slow to anger, quick to forgive, never returning evil for evil, nor even exacting full punishment when punishment was justly due, but on the contrary, gentle and tender-hearted, he strove to render their due to all—aye, and even more than their due. For we read that he greatly increased the pecuniary presents (*presbiteria*) which the popes were in the habit of making to the Roman clergy at Easter and other times.

Such is what one who knew him, who perchance worked by his side in the *vestiarium*,¹ says of Leo III. It will be important to bear some of these traits of his character in mind, as it is most likely that they were the cause of much of the suffering which fell to his unfortunate lot. One of the weak points of government by ecclesiastics will generally be that, in the always difficult task of nicely adjusting mercy and justice, such rulers will be naturally too prone to mercy. And if, moreover, justice has to be meted out by an ecclesiastic who is by his own particular character already predisposed to be too forgiving, the result will not be conducive to strong government. So, in the absence of any ascertained cause for the violent behaviour towards him of Paschal and his fellow-conspirators, it is far from unlikely that a certain amiable weakness in Leo's character was to some extent, if not the cause, at least the occasion of it.

There is, however, no doubt that the fact, that some of

¹ For it is the highly probable belief of its most important editor, Duchesne, that the *Lib. Pont.* was the work of men attached to the *vestiarium*. *L. P.*, i. clxij.

the very phrases¹ used by his biographer to put such a pleasing personality before us were copied from previous papal *lives*, causes a suspicion to arise that we are only gazing on an official portrait. The feeling is natural, but in the present case apparently not well-grounded. Other standards have come down to us by which we can judge him; and we find that he was not only honoured and loved by his successors,² and praised by subsequent papal biographers,³ but extolled by others outside the limits of the local Roman Church. Our own countryman, Alcuin, never wearied of sounding his praises. He knows that the heart of the Pope is all aglow with the fire of God's love, and he would have him scatter from it broadcast blazing sparks "to enkindle the torches of the Churches of Christ";⁴ and he does not think it right that the burning light of divine grace which Leo possesses should be hidden beneath his prudent breast as beneath a bushel. It must be set "on the candelabrum of the Apostolic See, that with glorious effulgence" it may shine on all.⁵ Prose does not suffice this "angel from Deira" to sound forth the virtues "of Christ's most clear-toned trumpet." In elegiac verse he proclaims him "a pursuer of justice, a lover of

¹ Many of the following are to be found in the biographies of Gregory II., Zachary, or both:—"Erat enim vir castus, loquela fecundus et animo constans. . . . Erat enim ecclesiasticarum rerum defensor et contrariis fortissimus expugnator et nimis mitissimus, eidem ecclesiæ benivolis præclarus amator, tardus ad irascendum et velox ad miserendum, nulli malum pro malo reddente, neque vindictam secundum meritum tribuente, sed pius et misericors, a tempore ordinationis suæ omnibus nituit justitias faciente." Cf. *vit. Greg. II.*, nn. 1 and 2; *vit. Zach.*, n. 1.

² *Vit. Pasc.*, n. 16.

³ *Vit. Serg. II.*, n. 2, where he is called "benignus atque præcipuus."

⁴ Ep. 234, which the humble levite Alcuin addresses "to his beloved lord Pope Leo."

⁵ *Ib.*, cf. Ep. 94.

true piety, bountiful to the poor," and illustrious throughout the whole world for his merits.¹ Should this seem to some undeniably glowing, but after all somewhat misty and vague, it must be noted that, if it is bright-coloured indeed, it is so because it is the outpouring of one "who ever loved as far as in him lay the most blessed princes and pastors of the holy Roman See."² But the fact is that it is not really hazy, because it is founded on exact reports sent to him from his friends on the spot, of the religious and just life³ of his most dearly beloved⁴ Pope Leo. Alcuin's testimony is all the more valuable because, realising that it was for the Pope to illumine "the length and breadth of the Christian empire," he did not hesitate to exhort him not to allow "the hardest of toils to terrify him nor any honied words of flattery to draw him off the path of truth." Knowing, too, the dangers attending the holding of considerable temporal power, he begged him, with holy freedom, not to let "any greed of worldly ambition silence the trumpet of his most sacred throat."⁵ And no doubt, in Charlemagne's direct and indirect exhortations to Leo on his accession, of which we shall speak presently, we are listening to the voice of his chief counsellor raised

¹ "Justitiæ cultor, veræ et pietatis amator,
Pauperibus largus, clarus honore pio,
Notus in orbe procul, meritum laude venustus,
Virtutum titulis nomen amoris habens."
Poem. xv., ap. *M. G. PP.*, i. 238; cf. P. xxv., p. 245.

² Ep. 94: "Semper S. R. sedis beatissimos, quantum valui, principes et pastores amavi." It will be noticed how Alcuin brings out the temporal position of the popes with his *Principes*. He bestows no higher title on the emperors at Constantinople.

³ "Scripsisti mihi de domni apostolici religiosa vita et justitia." Ep. 159, to his friend Arno of Salzburg.

⁴ Ep. 186.

⁵ Ep. 234. Cf. Osee, viii. 1. This letter was written in 801. Hence its allusions to the Christian empire and to "sæcularis ambitionis cupiditas."

not in suspicion of the new Pope's moral character, but in support of it.

Leo lost no time after his election in notifying it to Charlemagne. Along with the official notice of his election,¹ he sent him letters, presents, the keys of the *confession* of St. Peter, and the standard of the city.² He also begged him to send some authoritative person to receive the oaths of fidelity due to him, as Patricius, from the Roman people. All this was, of course, to induce him to continue his role as 'defender' of the Roman Church. For it was not an uncommon practice for religious houses to present "banners to their defenders as symbols of armed advocacy,"³ and not as typifying that the recipients of them were the lords and masters of those who sent them. That Charlemagne inferred nothing more from the Pope's presents is plain from his letter of instructions⁴ to Angilbert, who had to take to Rome the king's acknowledgment of them. For it bears the superscription: "Charles, by the grace of God, king and defender of his Holy Church."

Its contents, however, while they set the zeal of the Frankish monarch for the honour of God's Church in a very favourable light, show that he knew how to exercise that pious freedom towards its earthly head which enabled St.

¹ This, which Charlemagne calls the *decretalis cartula*, was probably formula 82 (ed. Sickel) of the *Liber Diurnus*, there known as the *decretum pontificis*. It was simply a notice of election and not a request for its confirmation, and was a copy of the decree of election which was placed in the archives of the Lateran and which was signed by humilis presbyter, and by "totus clerus cum optimatibus et militibus seu civitonicis." Cf. Ep. 93, inter Epp. Alc., of Charlemagne to Leo.

² *Ann. Eginhard*, 796; *Ann. Lauris.*, *ib.*

³ It is Gregorovius (*Rome, etc.*, ii. p. 465) who is speaking—Gregorovius who holds that this action of the Pope shows that Charlemagne was king of Rome. A defender, of course, has rights, and, moreover, if the defender is strong and the defended weak, he may abuse those rights. But, in any case, the defender is not the lord.

⁴ Ep. 92, inter Epp. Alc.

Leo announces his election to Charlemagne, 776.

Charlemagne's instructions to his missus.

Paul "to withstand St. Peter to the face," and St. Bernard to send food for reflection to Eugenius III. 'The youthful Homer' (*Homerianus puer*), as Angilbert was called in the literary circle of the court of Charlemagne, was instructed, whenever he had a suitable opportunity and the Pope was in a mood to listen to him, to urge upon 'the Apostolic lord, our father,' the importance of his life being in every way spotless, the strict observance of the holy canons, and the obligation that lay upon him of governing the Holy Church of God well. The worthy abbot was to impress upon Leo how short would be the time he could hold the honour which now was his, but how endless would be the reward which would be his if he laboured well whilst he held it. He was also to exhort the Pope to do all he could to suppress simony, which in many parts was doing so much harm in the Church. Finally, the *missus* was not to forget to speak to the Pope about the monastery which Charlemagne was anxious to build at St. Paul's, and concerning which he had already treated with Pope Hadrian.¹ The minutes conclude with a prayer that God will guide the heart of Leo, so that he may labour for the advantage of the Church, may be a good father to the king, and may obtain for him strength to do the will of God and to secure perpetual peace.

His own
letter to the
Pope.

Angilbert was supplied not only with instructions as to the matters he was to lay before the Pope, but with a letter for him which was an answer to the one, now lost, which the king of the Franks had received from him. In its superscription 'Defender of the Church of God' is replaced by 'Patricius of the Romans.'² Charlemagne begins by

¹ Cf. *Ann. S. Amandi*, 797, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i.

² Ep. 93, inter Epp. Alc. In Charlemagne's *Capitularies*, now the one and now the other addition is found to his general title of King of the Franks and Lombards.

expressing his joy at learning from the Pope's letter and from the decree of election (*decretali chartula*) that Leo has been unanimously elected, and has expressed his intention of being loyal¹ to the king. After a touching allusion to Pope Hadrian, whom he mourns not as one dead, but whom he calls to mind as now living a better life with Christ, he rejoices that in Leo there will be one who will daily pray to St. Peter both for the whole Church and for the king and his people, and will adopt him as his son. The presents which he had prepared to send to Hadrian he is now sending to him. "We have instructed Angilbert as to everything which we would like for ourselves or is necessary for you, that you may by mutual conference, decide what will tend to the exaltation of the Holy Church of God, and to the strengthening of your honour and of our patriciate. For as I concluded a treaty with the most blessed predecessor of your holy paternity, so with your blessedness I wish to make an inviolable treaty of the same faith and love, so that I may obtain the apostolic benediction and the most holy See of the Roman Church may be ever *defended* by our devotion." He then goes on himself to define his relations with the Church more exactly. "For it is our task² to *defend* by arms from without the Holy Church of Christ from the ravages of the pagan and the infidel, and from within by the profession of the Catholic faith. It is yours, lifting your hands to God with Moses, to help our warlike

¹ "Gavisi sumus . . . in humilitatis vestræ obœdientia et in promissionis ad nos fidelitate." Ep. 93.

² *Ib.* "Nostrum est . . . sanctam ubique Christi Ecclesiam ab incursu paganorum . . . armis defendere foris, et intus catholicæ fidei agnitione munire. Vestrum est," etc. Cf. the translation of this passage in Gregorovius, *l.c.*, p. 462. "And *may it follow* . . . that the Holy Church may be guarded," etc. It would seem that Charlemagne's own definition of his position did not suit Gregorovius.

endeavours with your prayers." In conclusion, he entreats the Pope to let his light shine before men.

Angilbert
takes pre-
sents to
Leo, 796.

The presents of which Angilbert was the bearer were "a great part of the treasure which Eric, Duke of Friuli, had this same year (796) offered to Charlemagne, and which he had taken from the camp of the Avars, who were lords of Pannonia."¹ This great central camp, defended by a triple wall, and situated near the river Theiss, was the place to which the Avars, or Huns, had brought the fruit of their long series of successful raids, and was known as 'the Ring.' The loss of it broke their power and put enormous wealth into the hands of Charlemagne, and thence into the hands of the Pope. This gift of the Frank king undoubtedly helped Leo to be as generous as he was to the churches of Rome.

Letter of
congratula-
tion from
Alcuin.

Among the many letters of congratulation which Leo would have received on his accession, it is very interesting to find that one from our countryman Alcuin has survived the ravages of time. Begging Leo to accept his letter,² he continues: "I have loved, as much as in me lay, the most blessed princes and pastors of the Holy Roman Church, desiring by their most holy intercession to be numbered among the sheep of Christ, which after His resurrection He entrusted to St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, to be fed. . . . Thou art, most holy father, the Pontiff elected by God, the Vicar of the Apostles, the heir of the fathers, the ruler (*princeps*) of the Church, the nourisher of the one immaculate dove. . . . The position in which you are, makes you honoured by all, the nobility of your character praised by all, the devotion of your piety loved by all."

The
mosaics of
Leo's addi-
tion to the
Lateran.

Whether with the treasures of the Avars' *Ring* or not, Leo executed a work some time before the year 800, which aptly expresses the relations between Charlemagne and

¹ Eginhard, *Annal.*, ad an. 796; *Ann. Lauriss. maj.*, 796. ² Ep. 94.

himself which their first letters to each other put before us. The King is the armed defender or protector of the Pope, and as such receives from him a promise to adhere to the Frankish cause, as his predecessors had done. The religious and political relationship between them is admirably typified by the designs of the artists in mosaic employed by the Pontiff. For the iconoclastic persecution had driven many Greek artists into Italy, and rendered possible the renaissance of art, such as it was, which the popes of this period fostered.

To the east of the great pile of buildings, of which the Lateran Palace was even then composed, Leo erected a great hall, called from its superior size the *Triclinium majus*.¹ This he decorated with mosaics. Although in a ruinous condition, it was still standing as late as the pontificate of Clement XII. (1730-40). Its mosaics had already been restored by Cardinal Baberini in 1625, but, of course, perished with the ruined *Triclinium* itself under Clement. Benedict XIV., his successor, however, caused a copy of them to be made and placed under a tribune against the side of the oratory *Sancta Sanctorum*, to the north-east of the Lateran, where it may be seen to this day, with three inscriptions in which these facts are set forth at length. This he accomplished in 1743, from designs of it which had been drawn before its destruction.² Looking at the apsidal construction of Benedict XIV., there are to be seen two groups of figures. The one on the left shows Our Lord giving the keys to Pope St. Silvester and a standard to the Emperor Constantine. A precisely similar group is depicted on the right. A seated figure with a round nimbus, which the inscription, *Scs. Petrus*, sufficiently indicates as that of the Prince of the Apostles, is presenting a pallium to Pope Leo, who is kneeling at his right, and

¹ *L. P.*, n. 10.

² A fragment of the old mosaic is still preserved in the Vatican library.

is distinguished by the inscription, Scissimus dn Leo Pp (*Sanctissimus Dominus Leo Papa*). Another kneeling figure on the left of the saint is receiving from him into its right hand a standard. The letters Dn. Carulo Regi around its square nimbus show that the figure is that of the famous King of the Franks. Beneath the picture is a large tablet, on which, in the vulgar Latin of the period, is a prayer to St. Peter calling upon him to grant life to the Pope and victory (*victoriam*) to the King.¹

Arno of
Salzburg,
798.

A year or two has to elapse before we hear of any further communication between the Pope and Charlemagne. But about the beginning of the year 798 the king gave his approval to the wishes of the Bavarian bishops for an archbishop. To attach Bavaria still more closely to his kingdom, he resolved to strengthen its ecclesiastical organisation. For this purpose he decided to establish an archbishopric; and selecting Arno of Salzburg, the friend of Alcuin, to be its first occupant, sent him to Rome along with other *missi* to receive the pallium from the Pope. The Bavarian bishops, too, sent to make the same request at the same time.² Finding that Arno was all that could be desired both in character and learning,³ he presented him with the pallium,⁴ and notified the bishops and the king⁵ that he had done as desired by them. In the

¹ A beautiful copy of this mosaic may be seen in Daniel's *Hist. de France*, i. 469, or in Hodgkin's *Italy*, viii., frontispiece. Cf. *Les Mosaiques Chrétiennes de Rome*, by de Jouy, p. 50 ff. (Paris, 1857), and *L. P.*, ii. 35.

² Ep. 3, Leo. Ap. *M. G. SS.*, v. 58: "Nobis petitorias emisistis syllabas." Cf. *Ann. Juvvenses*, 798, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i.: "Domnus Arn episcopus cum magna legatione ad Romam, et ibidem a Leone P. pallium accepit, et archiepiscopus constituitur."

³ *Ib.*

⁴ Jaffé, 2498, following the 46th formula of those in the *Liber Diurnus*, ed. Sickel.

⁵ Epp. 3 and 4, ap. *M. G. SS.*, v. p. 58 ff.

opening sentence of his letter to Charlemagne he unfolds the reason of his complying with his request. "Inasmuch as through your laborious and royal efforts the holy catholic and apostolic Roman Church, enriched with all good things, is this day in glory, it is only proper that we should in every way comply with your reasonable wishes."¹ It would appear that it was not long before the bishops regretted that they had applied for a master, and that they endeavoured, as far as possible, to withdraw themselves from subjection to him. Accordingly, when Arno again had occasion to go to Rome, he induced the Pope to write them a letter exhorting them to obey their new metropolitan, and not to try to weaken the bonds which united them to him by flying in their canonical differences to the secular courts.² He begged them to receive with joy, as their predecessors had done, the decisions (*consultum et sanctae fidei documentum*) of the Apostolic See. "For as the Roman Church has received authority from the decrees of the Holy Fathers, that, where Christianity has spread, the vicar of Blessed Peter should have the power of constituting an archbishop, so have we acted in your case. This holy See has had the doing of this in view for a considerable period, but up till our time it has been prevented by various causes from putting its wishes into effect."³ Now that a metropolitan has been given them, he exhorts them to accept the position and to act in harmony with their new archbishop.

Both the Pope and Charlemagne were the more anxious for the upholding of Arno's authority because to him had been entrusted the conversion of the Avars. Their power had been broken⁴ by the Franks in various campaigns from

¹ Ep. 4.² Ep. 5.³ Ep. 5.⁴ Charlemagne despatched his generals 'Hunnos exterminare.' See a fragment *De conversione Carentanorum*, ap. *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 1269 ff.

the year 791 to 795. As well to civilise them as to incorporate them the more readily with his kingdom, Charlemagne, in accordance with his usual policy, endeavoured to make Christians of them as quickly as possible. Therefore no sooner had Arno been made archbishop, and had rendered to him an account of his embassy, than he sent him into the country of the conquered Avars¹—a country embracing the ancient Noricum and Pannonia, and, as it included the territory between the Danube, the Drave, and the Carpathian Mountains, most of the present Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Arno and
Alcuin.

In his successful work among the Avars, Arno was much encouraged by Alcuin, ever anxious to hear of its conversion.² It is through the correspondence of these two great friends that we first hear the mutterings of the storm that was to break over the head of the devoted Pope in the early part of the following year. In one letter after another, Alcuin seeks for information about the designs of the Romans, or about the schemes of the Roman nobility.³ At length, writing to his friend towards the close of 798, he lets us see more plainly to what exactly he is referring: "You wrote to me about the religious life and virtue of our Apostolic Lord, and what troubles he has to endure at the hands of certain sons of discord. For my own part I confess I am rejoiced that, with a pious and faithful mind, without guile, the father of the churches strives to serve

¹ *ib.* "Retulit ei (Charlemagne) quidquid per eum D. P. Leo mandavit."

² He begs him to write "ut sciam . . . quid Avaria faciat vel credat." Ep. 146. Cf. Epp. 150, 156-9.

³ Ep. 146. "Quid Romanorum nobilitas novi habeat adinventum"; . . . "quid . . . de Romanorum consiliis." To illustrate the force of the first phrase, Isaiah iii. 8 ("ad inventiones eorum contra Dominum . . . their devices are against the Lord") is compared with it.

God. Nor is it wonderful that justice should suffer persecution in him at the hands of the wicked, when in Christ, Our Lord, Our Head, the Fount of all goodness and justice, it was persecuted unto death.”¹

And it was nearly persecuted unto death in the person of Pope Leo. The tragic incident we are about to relate had its origin purely in the personal ambition of a section of the nobility, and was not in the least degree prompted by any abstract objections on the part of the Romans to the Pope's having temporal dominion.² This is obvious from the fact that its chief agents sprang from the very bosom of the Roman Church itself, and were relations³ of the late Pope Hadrian.

The principal conspirator, Paschal, was also the principal official of the papal administration. He was a nephew of Hadrian,⁴ and under Pope Leo at least was *primicerius* of the Holy See.⁵ His lieutenant was Campulus, who from a notary had seemingly been made *saccellarius* (paymaster) by Leo.⁶ Allied with them were probably other members of the military aristocracy which the increased temporal power of the Holy See had augmented both in numbers and influence, if it had not actually brought into being. All that is known for certain regarding the motives which

¹ Ep. 159.

² The *temporal power* was a bugbear to Gregorovius, and hence here (*Rome*, ii. 478), as elsewhere, he constantly asserts, without any grounds, that it was an equal bugbear to the Roman people in the early Middle Ages.

³ Theophanes, *Chron.*, 789 (Latin version), calls the conspirators “affines (συγγενεῖς) b. Adriani.”

⁴ *Cod. Carol.*, Ep. 61, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, iii. ; ed. Jaffé, 62.

⁵ *L. P.*, n. xi. Cf. Jaffé, i. p. 307, where it appears he was also known as ‘senior’ and ‘consiliarius’ of the Holy See.

⁶ At any rate, there was a Campulus who was frequently employed by Pope Hadrian, and who then figured as a notary (Ep. Had., *Cod. Car.*, 67; ed. J., 68. Cf. Ep. Car., ad Leo, Ep. 93. inter Epp. Alc.), whereas the conspirator Campulus is called *saccellarius* by the *L. P.*, n. xiii.

brought about the conspiracy against the Pope is contained in the statement of some of the chronicles, to the effect that, "The Romans (*i.e.* Paschal and his party) condemned or attacked the Pope through envy."¹ But whether the jealousy arose from the fact that Leo was not a member of the aristocracy, and consequently bestowed his favours elsewhere, or because he favoured a section of the nobility to which the relations of the late Pope did not belong, cannot be stated with certainty. Moreover, in this and similar cases it is always well to bear in mind the well-founded satirical remark of that gossiping 'stammering and toothless' old biographer of Charlemagne, the monk of St. Gall. "It is," he says,² "a matter of solemn custom with the Romans" to be uniformly inimical to every distinguished Pontiff.

The
Greater
Litanies.

In accordance with ancient traditions, a notary³ of the Roman Church had proclaimed, on the feast of St. George (April 23) and in his Church 'in Velabro,' that the procession of the Greater Litany (the Litany of the Saints) would take place, as it does to-day, on the feast of St. Mark (April 25). This Christian custom took the place of the old pagan festival of the Robigalia or of the goddess Rubigo

¹ "Romani per invidiam condemnauerunt papam." *Ann. S. Amandi*, 799: "ob invidiam a sede apostolatus pulsus." *Ann. Petav.*, 799. The *Ann. Lauresh.*, 799, assign the attack to the instigation of the devil—"instigante dyabulo"—all ap. *M. G. S.S.*, i. Cf. *Monach. Sangall.*, i. 26, "Invidia cecati."

² "Nam ut inter emulos semper bachatur invidia, sollemne Romanis et consuetudinarium fuit, ut omnes papatibus alicujus momenti ad sedem apostolicam per tempora subrogatis jugiter essent infensi vel potius infesti," i. 26. He wrote c. 885. He says of himself (ii. c. 17), "ego balbus et edentulus."

³ "Quando letania major debet fieri, adnuntiat eam diaconus in statione catholica et dicit: 'Feria tale veniente, collecta in basilica beati illius, statio in basilica sancti illius.'" *Ordo Romanus*, n. 6, ap. Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 473. This particular *ordo* was transcribed about the year 800.

(*rust*¹), and was instituted for the same purpose, viz., to ask for the divine protection on the fruits of the earth then springing into being. There was a procession connected with both the pagan and the Christian rites, and in both cases it left the city by the Flaminian Gate (Porta del Popolo). But the Christian one, which started from the old Church of S. Lorenzo in Lucina,² after making stations at the Church of St. Valentine, outside the walls, and at the Ponte Molle, turned to the left to St. Peter's, the Church of the *station* where Mass was celebrated.³

When, on the morning of the twenty-fifth, the Pope left the Lateran palace to join the people who were awaiting him at the Church of S. Lorenzo, he was met, of course, by the arch-conspirators Paschal and Campulus. Neither of them was wearing the prescribed dark *planeta*,⁴ an ecclesiastical vestment from which our chasuble is the very much curtailed descendant, and which, from its cumbersome-ness, was not a suitable garment for men about to engage in deeds of violence. Paschal hypocritically excused himself for not having his *planeta* by pleading ill-health; Campulus tendered a similar plea. And, "with sweet words in their mouths which they had not in their hearts,"⁵ they took their places by the Pontiff's side.

The Pope is attacked and mutilated.

The procession, which had been duly formed in the Church of S. Lorenzo, and which, headed by the poor from the hospitals carrying a painted wooden cross, and by

¹ Cf. Ovid, *Fasti*, iv. 901 ff.

² On the left of the Corso as you face the P. del Popolo.

³ Cf. vol. i., pt. i., p. 47 of this work; Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome*, p. 163 ff.; Duchesne, *Origines du culte*, pp. 288, 473 ff. Leo caused "the history of the greater litany"—whether of this particular recitation of it or not I cannot say—to be embroidered: "et aliam vestem (fecit) crysoclabam habentem historiam litaniarum majoris." *L. P.*, n. xxxiii.

⁴ "Induunt se planitas fuscas." *Ordo*, *l.c.*

⁵ "Dulcia verba que non habebant in pectore cum eo loquentes." *L. P.*, n. xi.

those who bore the seven *stationary* crosses,¹ was to move up the Corso, had scarcely started, when there rushed forth from their place of concealment by the monastery of SS. Stephen and Silvester, a band of armed ruffians. They at once made a dash for the Pope. His attendants, unarmed and helpless, fled in all directions. Leo himself, however, was seized, dashed to the ground and stripped; and whilst Paschal stood at his head and Campulus at his feet, a hasty attempt was made to deprive their victim of his eyes and tongue.²

Thinking their deed of blood was accomplished, the assassins withdrew, leaving the unfortunate Pontiff lying bleeding in the street. But finding no immediate attempt was being made to rescue him, they returned, dragged him into the Church of St. Silvester, again gashed his face (eyes and tongue),³ covered him with blows, and left him half dead, bedewed with his own blood, before the very altar. They confined him at first in the adjoining monastery; but fearing that, if left there, his whereabouts would soon be discovered, as it would be naturally suspected that he had been taken there, they forced the abbot (*eguminus*) of the Greek monastery of St. Erasmus⁴ on the Cœlian to

¹ *Ordo, l.c.*

² "Ferino more comprehendentes . . . crudeliter oculos evellere et ipsum penitus cæcare *conati sunt.*" *L. P.*, n. xii.

³ "*Iterum eum bis oculos et linguam amplius crudeliter eruerunt.* Again more cruelly twice plucked out his eyes and tongue." *L. P., ib.* Now it is quite certain that the eyes and tongue cannot be extracted *twice*. Hence the biographer must have meant his *eruerunt* to be equivalent to his former 'eruerunt,' *i.e.* he meant to state that the conspirators made a more cruel attempt than before on the Pope's eyes and tongue. Leo himself, too, afterwards only said that they 'debilitare *voluerunt.*' *Cf.* his oath, ap. *M. G. Epp.*, v. 63.

⁴ It stood behind the Church of S. Stefano Rotondo. Even its ruins are no longer visible. "Fecerunt eum (the abbot) ad se venire clam per nocte." *L. P.* From these words it seems to me that the abbot took charge of the Pope on compulsion.

receive him. Thither they took him by night, and kept him under the strictest surveillance.

“But God Almighty Himself . . . wonderfully brought to naught their wicked attempt.” Whilst still in the monastery on the Cœlian, “by the Will of God and the intercession of Blessed Peter, the Keybearer of the Kingdom of Heaven, he recovered his sight and received back the use of his tongue.”¹ Moreover, by the connivance of friends within the monastery, he was let down at night by a rope into the arms of the chamberlain Albinus and other god-fearing men.² Escorted to St. Peter’s, he was received by the people with every demonstration of joy, whilst his enemies, quarrelling with each other, or else in despair, were only saved from killing each other by being led to sack the house of Albinus.³ Leo had been taken to St. Peter’s, and not back to the Lateran, because it happened that, at that time, there were in residence there two *missi* of Charlemagne, viz., Wirund, abbot of Stablo, and Winichis, Duke of Spoleto, and conqueror of the Greeks (788).⁴ As the latter had no great force with him, he did not think it wise to remain in the city, but at once escorted his illustrious but unfortunate charge to his ducal city (Spoleto).

The Pope recovers the use of speech, etc., and is rescued.

Thither from all the cities ‘of the Romans’ flocked the chief clergy and laity to offer their sympathy to the Pope. With some of these in his train, Leo set out for the north to seek the protection of Charlemagne. The author of the *Carmen de Carolo Magno*, whether Angilbert (†814), or

Leo sets out for Germany.

¹ “Et visum recepit et lingua ad loquendum illi restituta est.” *L. P.*, n. xiii.

L. P. Cf. *Ann. Einhardi*, 800: “Albini cujusdam, cubicularii sui, cura noctu per murum demissus,” ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. ; and *Ann. Lauriss. min.*, ap. *ib.*, pp. 119 f.

² *L. P.*, nn. xiv. and xv.

³ *Annal. Lauriss.*, an. 799. Cf. *L. P.* and *Ann. Einhard*, 799: *Ann. Fuld.*, 799, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 352.

whoever else was its composer, poetically represents the Pope as begging the legates, 'by Charles' dear health,' to defend him, driven *from his own territories*, and to bring him before the face of their king;¹ and the legates as answering, "Apostolic Pastor, priest, revered throughout the world, it is for you to order whatever you desire; for us, O best of fathers, to obey your behests." The same writer tells us of the crowds that came to look upon the Pope as he went north, eager to offer him presents, to kiss his feet, and, as the poet quaintly puts it, to gaze in astonishment at new eyes in an old head, and to hear a tongue that had been torn out speak.²

News of the attack on the Pope was, of course, soon conveyed to Charlemagne, and by him to his adviser, Alcuin. He at once wrote³ to the king (May 799), and pointed out: "On you alone the whole safety of the churches of Christ rests They (the Romans), blinded in their own hearts, have blinded their own head." In conclusion he begged him to make peace with the Saxons,

¹ "Vos ego per caram Caroli conjuro salutem
Regis ut ejectum me defendetis in armis
Finibus a propriis et sedis honore repulsum."

Ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 98, p. 1441.

"Et capite in veteri visus cernendo novellos

Obstupeant, linguamque loqui mirantur ademptam." *Ib.*

³ Ep. 174 (ed. Jaffé, 114). This letter contains the following well-known passage, in which Alcuin is thought by some to have impressed upon Charlemagne that he ought to be emperor: "Nam tres personæ in mundo altissime hucusque fuerunt: id est apostolica sublimitas; quid vero in eo actum sit, qui rector præfatæ sedis fuerat, mihi bonitas vestra innotescere curavit. Alia est imperialis dignitas; quam impie gubernator imperii illius depositus sit ubique fama narrante crebrescit. Tertia est regalis dignitas, in qua vos D. N. J. Christi dispensatio rectorem populi Christiani disposuit, ceteris dignitatibus potentia excellentiorem, regni dignitate sublimiorem." But it does not appear that the passage goes beyond stating what was true at the moment when Leo was outraged by his enemies and Constantine V. was deposed by Irene.

against whom he was then leading his army, as the more weighty affairs at Rome needed his full attention. "For it is better that the feet (of the Church) should suffer rather than the head." Another letter¹ (about July 10th) exhorts the king to take suitable steps to receive the Pope.

In this matter Charlemagne was not wanting. He first sent forward to meet him Hildebald, archbishop of Cologne, and Count Aschericus; and then his son, King Pippin, and more of his nobles. He was at this time staying at Paderborn. Thither went the Pope, and there, "as the Vicar of St. Peter," the king² received him with the greatest honour and affection. With Charlemagne the Pope stayed some weeks. During that interval his enemies were not idle. Their 'public spirit' they displayed by plundering and destroying the papal property, and their enmity to the Pope by maliciously accusing him to Charlemagne of all kinds of crimes. But neither were Leo's friends inactive. Alcuin, though detained at Tours by ill-health, earnestly exerted himself in the interests of the Pope, and wrote (August 799) both to Charlemagne and to his friend Arno of Salzburg. The king was advised to consider carefully how to treat the Romans and how to take measures that Leo, "freed by divine providence from the hands of his enemies, might be able in security to serve Christ, Our Lord, in his See."³ To Arno he

¹ Ep. 177 (J., 118).

² "Rex pater Europæ, et summus Leo pastor in orbe" (*Carmen*. Cf. *L. P.*, etc.).

³ Ep. 178 (J., 119):

"Nam salvare Petrus cum posset in urbe Quirina
Hostibus ex atris insidiisque feris,
Hoc tibi salvandum, rex clementissime, misit.

Per se reddit ei membrorum damna pavenda,
Et per te sedis officique decus."

Theodulf, *Versus ad Carol.*, ap. *M. G. PP.*, i. 524.

wrote¹: "I understand that there are many rivals (*æmulatores*) of our lord the Pope, who are seeking to depose him by subtle suggestions, and to lay to his charge crimes of adultery or perjury, and who maintain that he should clear himself of these charges on oath. They are thus working in secret that he may lay down the pontificate without taking the oath and pass his life in some monastery. This must not be done at all; nor must he consent to bind himself by an oath, nor lose his See. . . . What bishop throughout the Church of Christ would be secure, if he, who is the head of Christ's churches, be cast down by the wicked?"² Arno must do his best for the Pope's safety and authority, and remember that it is laid down in the canons that the Apostolic See was to judge and not be judged.³ To Alcuin's regret, however, the Pope seems even at this time to have made some solemn denial of the misdeeds alleged against him.⁴

Leo is escorted back to Rome.

Whilst Leo was with Charlemagne at Paderborn, he consecrated the altar of the church there, placing therein relics of St. Stephen, the protomartyr, which he had brought from Rome,⁵ and received the clergy of all ranks, who flocked to him from every side. With the approval of his nobles, cleric as well as lay, the Frankish monarch caused him to return to Rome with a great company of

¹ Ep. 179 (J., 120). In this letter he says of Leo, "quem confessorem Christi nominare et venerari omnibus Christi ecclesiis æquum arbitror."

² Ep. 179. "Quis potest immunis esse in ecclesia Christi pastor, si ille a malefactoribus dejicitur, qui caput est ecclesiarum Christi?"

³ "In aliis legebam canonibus apostolicam sedem judicariam esse, non judicandum" (*cf. Concil. Sinuessan.*, a. 303, a pretended council). *Ib.*

⁴ Ep. 181 (J., 121). For he fears lest "apostolica negatio renovaretur in urbe antiquæ potestatis, et sit error novissimus pejor priori."

⁵ *Trans. S. Liborii*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, iv. 150.

his bishops and counts.¹ Received in each city through which he passed 'like the apostle himself,' he was welcomed at the Ponte Molle (November 29) by the Romans of every rank, by the clergy and by the nobility, by the *senate* and by the military, by the nuns and by the deaconesses—in a word, by all the Romans, carrying, as usual, the ensigns and banners of their various quarters. Equally demonstrative in their reception of the Pope, who had, as all believed, received back from Heaven his sight and speech, were the four great *Scholæ* (colonies or guilds) of foreigners, whose quarters were around St. Peter's, viz., the Franks, Frisians, English and Lombards, and no doubt too the Greeks, from their quarter on the Aventine and the slopes of the Palatine.² With canticles of triumph Leo was escorted to St. Peter's, where he said Mass and gave to all present "the body and blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ."³

Next day he once again took up his residence at the Lateran. At the same palace were also lodged Arno of ^{His} enemies are tried.

¹ "Roma illum remeari in sua apostolica sede honorifice, cum nimio, ut decuit, emiserunt honore." *L. P.* n. xviii. *Cf.* n. xx. The *Annals*, called of *Eginhard*, relate (an. 799), "Romam cum magno honore per legatos regis reductus." *Cf. Annal. vet. Franc.*, an. 799.

² The churches of the *scholæ* will serve to mark their localities more exactly. S. Salvatore, the church of the Franks, is now among the buildings of the *Holy Office*, and was afterwards known by the additions in *Macello*, *de Torrione* and *de Ossibus*. The little Church of S. Michele, in *Borgo* or in *Sassia*, still standing, was the centre of the *Schola Frisonum*. Not far from it stood the church of the Lombards, viz., S. Justin's, destroyed in the sixteenth century. The Church of Our Lady, which was the title of the original church of the Anglo-Saxon quarter, is now represented by S. Spirito, in *Sassia*, built in 1528 to replace the former which had been destroyed by the Saracens. S. Maria, in *Cosmedin*, was the church of the *Schola Græcorum*. The last-named schola dates from the seventh century; the others, of which the oldest seems to have been the Anglo-Saxon, from the eighth. *Cf. L. P.*, ii. 36.

³ "Ubi et missarum solemniam celebravit, et omnes pariter corpus et sanguinem D. N. J. C. fideliter participati sunt." *L. P.*

Salzburg and the other envoys of Charlemagne; and there, in Leo's new Triclinium, they examined the Pope's enemies for more than a week. Fierce and bitter they proved to be. They tried both violence and calumny. Plots were hatched against the king's envoys and the wildest charges made against the Pope's character. But to no purpose. The Frankish power was too strong, their sense of justice too keen. Accordingly, finding that his accusers had no case, the envoys caused them to be seized, powerful though they were, and sent to France.¹

Charlemagne's fourth visit to Rome, 800.

Next year Charlemagne held, in August, a *placitum* or one of his great assemblies of his nobles, at Mayence, and, "finding that there was peace throughout his dominions, he bethought him of the injury which the Romans had inflicted upon Pope Leo,"² and set out for Rome. He availed himself of this first opportunity, for Alcuin had impressed upon him that "Rome, which has been touched by the discord of brethren, still keeps the poison which has been instilled into her veins, and thus compels your venerable Dignity to hasten from your sweet abodes in Germany in order to repress the fury of this pestilence."³

At Nomentum (Mentana), some fifteen miles from Rome, on the Nomentan Way, he was met by the Pope, who, after supping with him, returned to the city. The next day, after the usual solemn reception, Leo introduced him into

¹ It is Alcuin's correspondence that gives us this glimpse of the violent doings of Paschal, etc. Writing to Arno about the close of 799, he speaks of a letter received from him, "quærimonias quasdam habens de moribus apostolici et de periculo tuo apud eum (Rome) propter Romanos." He adds that he burnt the document to prevent any scandal arising, if it came into other hands. Ep. 184 (J., 127). "Nihil habuerunt (Paschalis, etc.), adversus eum, quod dicerent. Tunc illos comprehendentes prædicti missi magni regis emiserunt eos Franciis." *L. P. Cf. Annal. V. Franc.*, etc.

² *Annal. V. Franc.*, 800.

³ Ep. 178 (J., 119). Hodgkin's version.

St. Peter's. Seven days later the king convened an assembly in St. Peter's of the chief clergy and nobility both of the Franks and Romans. After Charlemagne and the Pope had taken their seats together (*sedentes pariter*) the principal clergy also sat down, whilst all the rest of the clergy and the nobility remained standing.¹ The king then explained that the principal reason which had brought him to Rome was that the charges brought against the Pope might be looked into, and that the present assembly had been summoned that it might examine the accusations.² If the examination of the charges meant examination of the Pope, the assembled prelates made it very plain that they were not going to be partners in anything of that kind. "We dare not judge the Apostolic See, which is the head of all God's churches. For by it and by His Vicar are we all judged. But as ancient custom dictates, the Apostolic See is not judged by any one. And in accordance with the canons, what the chief bishop decrees we obey."³ The Pope, however, declared that, following the example of his predecessors, he was ready to clear himself of the charges levelled against him. The examination of his accusers was proceeded with. But not one of them was able to prove a point against him, or perhaps, it should be said, was even willing to make an attempt so to do. For the words of the Frankish chroniclers on this point are somewhat ambiguous.⁴ However, it was generally agreed that they had accused the Pope not for the sake of

¹ *L. P.* ² *Ib.*, and *Annal. Lauris. et Eginhard*, ad an. 800.

³ *L. P.*

⁴ *Annal. vet. Franc.* ad an. "Nullus probator criminum inventus est." Cf. *Annal. Lauris.*; *Eginhardi*; *Moissiac*, ad an. 800. The *Ann. Fuld.*, 800, following the others, have the following: "Nullus probator criminum ei objectorum esse voluit." Cf., on the contrary, the *Annals of Lauresheim*: "Ibi venerunt in præsentia qui ipsum apostolicum condemnare voluerant." Cf. *Ep. Alc.*, 212 (J., 157).

justice¹ but through envy. Thus ended all that there was of a trial strictly so-called. "Then," say the annals of Lorsch, "it seemed good to the most pious prince Charles himself, to all the bishops and the assembled fathers, that if he himself (Leo) chose, and himself asked, but not by their judgment, but quite of his own free will, he might purge himself.² Accordingly on another day (December 23), in the same place, viz., St Peter's, the Pope, with the book of the Gospels in his hand, ascended the pulpit, and before the assembled Franks and Romans declared 'on oath in a loud tone,'³ that of his own free will, and not judged by any man, and without any intention of forming a precedent, but more certainly to free men's minds from any unjust suspicion, he wished to clear himself on oath. Hence he solemnly averred that he had never done, nor commanded to be done, the wicked deeds of which he had been charged. Thereupon, all present burst forth into the *Te Deum*, and thanked God that they had the happiness of having the Pope preserved for them 'sound both in body and soul.'⁴

¹ "Non propter aliam justitiam, sed per *invidiam* eum condemnare volebant (*Annal. Lauresh.*, ad an. 800). Cf. *Chron. Moissiac, ib.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. p. 304. From the actual data supplied to us by contemporary historians, whose 'ipsissima verba' we have quoted, it is absolutely *evident* that the motives for the action of Leo's enemies assigned by Gregorovius (*Rome*, etc., p. 476 f.) are the figments of his imagination. When he 'assumes' (p. 485) that 'the insurgents' . . . rested their cause "on the ancient majesty and freedom of the Roman people," he is simply inventing.

² *Annal. Lauresh.*, ad an. 800 (*ib.*, p. 38). "Si ejus voluntas fuisset, et ipse *petisset*, non tamen per eorum judicium sed spontanea voluntate se purificare debuisset." Cf. *Chron. Moissiac (ib.*, p. 304). The *Ann. vet. Franc.* say that the Pope took the oath "nullo judicante, sed sua voluntate."

³ *L. P.* Cf. *Annal. Lauriss. min.*, etc. The formula of the oath taken by the Pope is given in the different edd. of the councils, Mansi, etc., and ap. *Monument. Carol.*, ed. Jaffé, p. 378.

⁴ 'Laudes Deo dabant, quia apostolicum Leonem sanum in corpore et in anima custoditum habere meruerunt.' *Annal. vet. Franc.*, ad an. 800.

After Christmas, Paschal and the other conspirators, bitterly upbraiding one another in their hour of need,¹ were condemned to death in accordance with the Roman law, as guilty of high treason.² However, despite the treatment he had received at their hands, Leo, in keeping with the character assigned to him by his biographer, actuated by his merciful disposition,³ begged that life and limb might be spared them. His request was granted, and the prisoners were sent into exile in France.

From some of the quotations adduced in the above narrative, it will perhaps have been observed that there was current at the time a belief in the minds of many, that Pope Leo had been actually deprived of his eyes, or at least of his sight, and of his tongue, and that they had been miraculously restored to him. A careful examination of the best authorities, however, seems to show that if the Pope's sight was miraculously restored, his eyes at any rate had not been actually put out. Turning to the contemporary author in the *Book of the Popes*, we find that after saying that an attempt was made to put out the eyes of the Pope, he says a little further on that they were plucked out a *second time*.⁴ As it has been already noted this must mean, that a second attempt was made to put out his eyes. That his enemies got no further than making the attempt is the statement of the best contemporary chroniclers.⁵ Hence Theophanes's version of this

Paschal,
etc., con-
demned to
death.

Were the
eyes of
Pope Leo
put out?

¹ Campulus to Paschal: "Mala hora faciem tuam vidi, eo quod tu me misisti in isto periculo." *L. P.*, n. 26.

² *Annal. Einhardi*, ad an. 801: "ut majestatis rei."

³ *Ib.* "Pio affectu." Gregorovius knows better than Eginhard, and says that Leo interceded to save their lives, because he feared that "the execution of Adrian's relatives . . . would increase the hatred with which he was already regarded" (*Rome*, etc., ii. p. 493).

⁴ *L. P.* Cf. *supra*.

⁵ *Annal. Lauresh.*, ad an. 799: "Volucrunt eruere oculos"; *Annal. Lauriss.*, *ib.*, "oculos eruere moliantur"; *Annal. Einhardi*, "erutis

matter may be the correct one. Though he lived at such a distance from Rome, and is in general not well acquainted with the affairs of the West, still he was in the strictest sense a contemporary, and, by the time that the story had reached him, it may have had time, so to speak, to cool down to its original dimensions. He says¹ that after the first attempt on the Pope's eyes, the men who had been commissioned to completely deprive him of the use of them were touched with pity, and did not quite destroy his sight. In any case there cannot be a doubt that the unfortunate Pontiff was dreadfully mangled about the face, and it is only natural to suppose that, under the circumstances, the report would be bruited about that he had actually been blinded. And, if the account of Theophanes is true, it would be the very report that the men who had spared him would have spread abroad to screen themselves from the vengeance of Paschal. And so the first news that reached Charlemagne, and which he communicated to Alcuin, would seem to have been that the Pope had lost his eyes. For in his reply to Charlemagne's communica-

oculis ut aliquibus visum est." Cf. *Chron. Moissiac*, ad an.; all ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. Even the Monk of St. Gall, who might have been expected to have adopted the more wonderful account, says it happened by Divine Providence, "ut nequaquam oculos ejus eruerent, sed rasoriis per medios inciderent." *De Car. Mag.*, i. 26. He wrote c. 885. As might be expected, the poets (Poeta Saxo, *ib.*, and the *Carmen*) adopt the more sensational story. The same Eginhard, however, who is thought to have written the annals, in his *Life of Charlemagne* (§ 28), says that Leo's "eyes were plucked out and his tongue cut off." It may be that, when he wrote his annals, he found reason to modify the statement he had made on this matter in his *Life*.

¹ *Chron.*, ad an. 789 (Latin version). "Haud ei penitus oculorum lumen extinctum est." Cf. *Hist. Miscella*, ap. Migne, *P. L.*, t. 95, pp. 112-4. John, the Neapolitan deacon (*Gest. Epp. Neap.*, c. 48) writes: "Cujus cum vellent oculos eruere, inter ipsos tumultus, sicut assolet fieri, unus ei oculus paululum est læsus."

tion, Alcuin speaks¹ of the Romans who, blinded in their hearts, 'had blinded their own head.' But writing a few months later (August), he seems to thank God that the Pope's eyes were miraculously prevented from being torn out—which is probably the true view to take of the case—and that his wounds had healed so quickly. Speaking² of what Charlemagne had told him of the 'wonderful recovery' of the Pope (and that the recovery was, at least, marvellously quick cannot be doubted), he thinks that every Christian should thank God for restraining the hands of the wicked men from carrying into effect their design of blinding their head. Finally, according to a passage quoted above, it would appear that even Leo himself stated publicly that his enemies did not get further than trying to mutilate him (*me debilitare voluerunt*). However one may view the evidence here adduced, most apt is the reflection of another contemporary of the Pope, Theodulfus,³ Bishop of Orleans: "If the Pope's eyes and tongue were restored to him, it is a miracle. It is equally a miracle that his enemies were unable to deprive him of them. I know not whether I must marvel more at the former or the latter."

Two days⁴ after the Pope had taken in St. Peter's the oath by which he proclaimed his innocence of the charges made against his character, there took place, in the same

Charlemagne is crowned emperor, Dec. 25, 800.

¹ *Mon. Alc.*, p. 463, Ep. 114, dated May 799.

² Ep. 178 (J., 119): "De apostolici mirabili sanitate decet omnem populum Christianum gaudere et laudare nomen Dei qui impias conpescuit manus a pravo voluntatis effectu; volentes cæcatis mentibus lumen suum extinguere," etc.

³ *Carmina*, l. iii. c. 6:

Reditta sunt, mirum est; mirum est auferre nequise,
Est tamen in dubio, hinc mirer an inde magis.

⁴ If in some chronicles the crowning of Charlemagne is assigned to December 25, 801, it is because the new year was then reckoned by some from Christmas Day.

basilica, an event noticed by all the historians of the time, an event which, apart from the great facts of divine revelation, has exercised more influence on the history of Europe than perhaps any other—especially if the comparatively unostentatious character of its performance be taken into consideration. The event in question, the crowning of Charlemagne by Leo as Emperor of the West, was the occasion of much fierce controversy in the later Middle Ages, when the harmonious working of the Empire and the Church came to an end; and it has been the occasion of modern historians unfolding endless theories. These controversies and theories can scarcely be said to have greatly enlightened the subject. For it was a question sufficiently understood and explained by the contemporary authors who relate it. To them we will turn in the first instance.

Charle-
magne
proceeds to
St. Peter's.

On the Christmas Day of the year 800, Charlemagne, clad not in his ordinary Frankish dress, viz., in his short tunic with its silver border, his vest of sable, his blue cloak and sword, and his hose bound round with thongs,¹ but in the long tunic, chlamys or green mantle, sandals and gold circlet² of the Roman *Patricius*, went with his nobles to hear the Pope's Mass in St. Peter's. He would have made his way to this venerable basilica, then already nearly five hundred years old, by the magnificent colonnade which led up to it from the bridge of S. Angelo. A fine flight of thirty-five steps brought him to the *atrium* or *paradise*, a sort of courtyard with arcades running all round it and with two fountains in its midst. Gazing on the tombs of the popes on his left, he entered the Church by the great central doors—the *Porta Argentea*. The building he entered was,

¹ Eginhard, *Vit. Car.*, c. 23.

² Cf. Benzo (eleventh century), ap. Watterich, i. 79 n., and the *Ann. Roman.*, ap. *L. P.*, ii. 332. The latter speak of the "circulum quod *ab antiquitus* Romani coronabant patricios."

of course, not the present glorious structure of Bramante, but the basilica which had been erected by Pope Sylvester (c. 323) on the site of the oratory built by Pope Anacletus (first century) in the gardens of Nero, at the foot of the Vatican hill, where the first Christians had been martyred in Rome, and where the body of the Prince of the Apostles had been finally laid to rest. Though not to be compared in size with the present church, which in turn stands on the site of Sylvester's, the old basilica was a large edifice, over three hundred feet long and some two hundred broad, with its nave and aisles separated by four rows of twenty-four marble or granite columns of varying lengths, taken from old Pagan temples. When the spacious *atrium* which is now being erected in front of St. Paul's *Without-the-Walls* is completed, the traveller will gaze on a veritable counterpart of old St. Peter's.

As Charlemagne and his suite passed up the broad nave in stately procession, and as they crossed the great disc of red porphyry, on which his successors were to be crowned, there must have been some who, gazing on inscriptions bearing the names of the emperors Trajan and Galienus,¹ were reflecting on the unexpected successor they were soon to have.

Approached on each side by two flights of seven porphyry steps, stood the high altar in the centre of the chord of the apse. In front of it was a sort of vestibule flanked by twelve twisted columns of white marble,² on

¹ "Here and there (in old St. Peter's) a pagan inscription still remained, so that even in Severano's time (seventeenth century) there could still be seen one that bore the name of Trajan, another that of Galienus." Barnes, *St. Peter in Rome*, p. 274, a most fascinating book. In it, as in Lanciani's charming *Pagan and Christian Rome*, will be found various illustrations and plans of old St. Peter's.

² Eleven of them still exist. One is in the Capella della S. Colonna in the present St. Peter's.

which rested Gregory III.'s beams covered with embossed plates of silver supporting silver candelabra,¹ and paved by Hadrian I. with pure silver. Through the silver gates affording admittance to the choir, which was enclosed by walls of marble² and decorated with images of silver, and which was lit by the enormous candelabrum of Hadrian I. with its 1365 candles,³ walked the stalwart king of the Franks. Crossing its vestibule, he found himself in front of the *confession* of the Prince of the Apostles and below the high altar. There by the golden railings⁴ before the *confession* he knelt in prayer,⁵ and the Mass began.

Is crowned. After the singing of the Gospel, Leo arose from his seat in the centre of the apse, and placed 'a most precious crown'⁶ upon the head of the Frankish monarch. At once from bishop and noble, from Frank and Roman, burst forth the acclamation, "To Charles, the most pious Augustus, crowned by God, to our great and pacific emperor, life and victory!"⁷ Thrice did the great basilica's lofty roof ring

¹ Cf. vol. i., pt. ii., p. 210 of this work, and especially Barnes, *l.c.*, p. 193 f.

² As are to this day the choirs of S. Clement and S. Maria in Cosmedin.

³ Christmas Day was one of the four days on which Hadrian ordained that it had to be lighted. *L. P.*, in *vit. Had.*, n. 46.

⁴ By the work of Hadrian and Leo III., "the shrine attained the summit of its splendour." Barnes, *l.c.*, p. 198.

⁵ "Cum rex ad missam ante confessionem b. Petri Ap. ab oratione surgeret, Leo papa coronam capiti ejus imposuit," etc. *Ann. Lauris. maj.*

⁶ "Coronam auream expressam signo sanctitatis . . . posuit." *Ann. Xant.*, 801, ap. *M. G. SS.*, ii.

⁷ *L. P.*, n. xxiii.; *Ann. Lauris. maj.*, an. 800. The acclamation in the text, cited from the *L. P.*, is found, with the substitution of the word *emperor* for *king*, in what are called the *Carolingian litanies* (or the *laudes*), as they were first employed when Charlemagne visited Rome in 874. As they were then rendered, there were exclamations of "Life to Hadrian, the chief bishop (*summo pontifici*) and universal Pope!" and "To Charles, the most excellent and crowned of God, to the great and pacific King of the Franks and Lombards and Patricius

with the glad shout, and thrice did its mighty beams vibrate to it. Then did the *schola cantorum* intone the litanies. God and His Saints were implored to give all prosperity to the Pope, the emperor and all the Franks. After the chanting of these *laudes*, Charlemagne was duly 'adored' as emperor "after the manner of the ancient princes" by the Pope and all the nobility.¹ On the completion of the ceremony of adoration "the most holy Pontiff anointed with holy oil his most excellent son Charles as king."²

of the Romans, life and victory!" ap. Mabillon, *Analecta Vetera*, ii. 687. The series of acclamations invoking Our Lord, the angels and saints for the benefit of certain persons was technically known as the *laudes*. Duchesne (*L. P.*, ii. 37) gives a complete specimen of them from MS. Latin 13159 of the Bib. Nat., which dates from the short interval between the death of Hadrian and the restoration of the empire, and from which we see that invocations were offered up for Pope Leo, Charlemagne, the royal family, and the *judges* and whole army of the Franks.

¹ "Post laudes ab Apostolico more antiquorum principum adoratus est, adque ablato patricii nomine, imperator et Augustus est appellatus." *Ann. Lauris. maj.*, 800. Cf. *L. P.*, "ab omnibus constitutus est imperator Romanorum." The first emperor crowned with religious rites seems to have been Leo I., who received his crown in 457 from the patriarch of Constantinople (Bury, *Later Rom. Emp.*, i. 228).

² The son here spoken of was Charlemagne's eldest son Charles, and not his son Pippin (who had already been anointed), as is generally stated by modern writers. The assertion of the *L. P.* is borne out by Alcuin, who, writing to the young Charles (Ep. 217, J. 162, after April 4, 801), says he has heard from the Pope that, with the consent of 'David,' *i.e.* Charlemagne, he had crowned him king: "nomen cum corona regiae dignitatis vobis impositum." Besides, when Theophanes states (A.M. 6289) that Leo anointed Charlemagne 'from head to foot,' he has possibly confused the imperial coronation of the one Charles with the regal unction of the other. The anointing of Christian kings seems to have been first practised among the Visigoths in Spain in the seventh century (cf. *L. P.*, ii. 38). Certainly later on the Western emperors were anointed; and both Louis II., in his famous letter to Basil I., and Pope Nicholas I., in a letter to Charles the Bald (Ep. 79, ap. *P. L.*, t. 119), assert that Charlemagne was anointed when he was made emperor.

After the Mass was over "the most serene lord emperor," and his "most excellent royal sons and daughters," offered a number of magnificent presents, silver tables, golden crowns and chalices to the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, and of the Lateran and St. Mary Major. To the last-named the emperor presented a cross adorned with gems, which, at his particular request, the Pope ordained should be used in the processions of the greater litanies.¹

Thus, quietly, was accomplished an event which was to give a special colour to the history of Europe for centuries and was to be fraught with the greatest consequences both for good and for evil.

The causes
that led to
the revival
of empire
in the
West.

Concerning this most momentous act many questions have been asked, and to each question many and widely differing solutions have been offered. It will here be utterly impossible to propound all these queries, and still more impossible to notice all the answers which have been suggested to them. Of the former we shall note only the more pertinent, and of the latter only bring forward such as seem most in harmony with the plain meaning and spirit of the best contemporary authorities.

As, of course, a great historical event cannot be thought of as a *deus ex machinâ*, but must be considered as the natural outcome of preceding causes, as fast welded with other links of the great chain of human events, the first inquiry regarding the revival of empire in the West which would seem to suggest itself is one into the reasons which induced men to contemplate that revival. Why did they think of bringing back the seat of empire to Rome?

In the year 476, the imperial insignia had been sent from the West to the emperor Zeno, with an intimation that one emperor would suffice for both the East and the West.

¹ *L. P.*, n. xxiv. f.

Now, in the year 800, we find the same West demanding that an emperor should once again hold sway in its midst. Those who had with ill-disguised contempt sent to the emperor at Constantinople the crown and purple robe of Augustulus were the conquering Teutons. But the descendants of those who had lived under the Empire of Trajan, of Constantine, and of Theodosius the Great, of those who had known the *Pax Romana*, looked on with shame and apprehension. And they hoped that the day would not be long in coming when the Teuton hordes which oppressed them with their cruel swords, and with their barbarous laws, would once again be made to respect the might of the imperial arms and obey the right of the imperial laws. This was especially true of the Churchmen, who never lost sight of the sublime idea of One Church and One State, such as it had been developed by Eusebius, Bishop of Cesarea under the first Christian emperor. "Formerly," he wrote, "the world with its diverse peoples and localities was divided into a countless number of different kinds of governments. Hence endless wars and dire plunderings and ravages which are their consequences. This division was intensified by the different gods which each section adored. But to-day that the cross, the instrument of salvation and the trophy of victory, has been shown to the world, and has been opposed to the demons, straightway their work, *i.e.* that of the false gods, is dissipated like a breath; dominations, principalities, tyrannies, republics have had their day. 'One God' is preached to all men, and a single empire is ready to receive and contain them all, to wit, the Roman Empire. Thus at the same time, by God's holy will, two seeds have sprouted and have shot forth from the earth mighty trees which have covered the world with their shade—the Empire of Rome and the faith of Christ; and

these are destined to unite the whole human race in the bonds of an eternal concord.”¹

These glorious yearnings never faded from the hearts of the vanquished, even after they had realised that Constantinople could not fulfil them. Moreover, by the year 800, the case had altered even for the conquering Teutons themselves. By that date, at length comparatively civilised, they were themselves in turn in dread of the surrounding barbarians. Those in the North had already heard disquieting stories of the long-ships of the terrible Danes and Norsemen which were soon to work such dread havoc.² Those in the South had already felt the keen edge of the Moslem scimitar; the fame of the power of the great Caliph Haroun-el-Raschid was in the mouths of all. The world, then, must have an emperor “to make head against the nations which were surging up all round it,” or, as a contemporary author expresses it, “lest the pagans

¹ *De laud. Const.*, c. 16. “Unus quidem Deus omnibus prædicatus est; simul vero unum apud omnes imperium viguit Romanorum. . . . Duæ maximæ potestates, velut ex una transenna simul emissæ, cuncta repente pacarunt et in concordiam reduxerunt, Romanum videlicet imperium et Christi doctrina.” *Ap. P. G.* (Latin version only), t. 13. This Christian idea of the union of Church and State soon found an expression in art. Among the numerous textile fabrics comparatively recently discovered at Achmim, in Upper Egypt, on the right bank of the Nile, and known as Panopolis in Ptolemaic times, was a piece of woven silk. “Above is represented the imperial eagle attacking an evil beast; below Christ slaying the dragon. . . . The picture plainly represents the Empire and the Church united in the suppression of evil. It is strange to find upon so ancient a monument the expression of an idea which was destined to become at once the greatest and most disturbing ideal of European history.” Lowrie, *Christian Art and Archaeology* (London, 1901), pp. 241 and 372. The monument “is ascribed to the fifth or sixth century.”

² “Paganæ vero naves multa mala fecerunt per insulas oceani partibus Aquitaniæ. . . . Castigatio est magna horum (the Northmen) eruptio, antiquis ignota temporibus populo Christiano,” writes Alcuin to Arno. *Ep.* 184 (J. 127). *Cf.* *Ep.* 16 (J. 22), “talís terror nec ejusmodi navigium fieri posse putabatur.” *Cf.* Einhard, *Vit. Car.*, c. 17.

should revile the Christians if the name of emperor should die out among them.”¹

Now, too, that the Teutons had become Catholics like those whom they had conquered, they felt with them that the true faith and its head stood in need of an emperor who would really be its defender. They had seen that the emperors at Constantinople affected to be as autocratic in matters of faith as of civil government, and they had seen the head of the Church treated by his servile officials as an outcast. The simmering religious disunion between the real rulers of the West and the emperor at Constantinople, rendered acute by the iconoclastic controversy, deepened their political disunion, and gave strength to the idea that the seat of empire should once again be in the West, or that it, at any rate, should impose the emperor on the world.

An attempt had already been made under Gregory II. to transfer this idea into the domain of fact. “Understanding the impiety of the emperor, the whole of Italy resolved to elect an emperor itself and to conduct him to Constantinople.”² It was only the address of the Pope that stopped the execution of this decision. But, in the year 800, it was argued that, as the emperors by the Bosphorus had not become more satisfactory, the time had now come to choose

Why it
took place
in 800.

¹ An old (twelfth century) Northumbrian annalist asserts (an. 800) that the Christians of Jerusalem when they sent Charlemagne the standard, etc. (cf. *Ann. vet. Franc.*, 801), begged him, “ut . . . contra insurgentes gentes exurgeret bellica virtute et regali majestate”; ap. *M. G. SS.*, xiii. p. 156. If of no great historical value, the passage is interesting not only on account of its curious alliteration, but when compared with the contemporary *Ann. vet. Franc.* (an. 801) or *Chron. Moissac, ib.*, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. 306, which relate that many asked for an emperor, as the ruler at Constantinople was then only an empress, “ne pagani insultarent Christianis, si imperatoris nomen apud Christianos cessasset.”

² *L. P., in vit. Greg. II.*, n. xvii.

one from the West. The empire on the one hand was practically vacant, for it was out of the question that a woman could be allowed to rule it¹; and, on the other, the proper person to govern it was ready in the person of the ruler of the West. Charlemagne was the undoubted lord of most of the old seats of empire. It was right that he who had the power of the emperor should have the name.² Whatever may have been the Pope's personal views on these contentions before the outbreak of Paschal, the awful peril through which he had then passed made him quite ready after it to subscribe to a scheme which would mean for him more protection even if less liberty.

Preliminary
discussion.

Hence, if he was not himself the source whence first sprang the idea of the imperial consecration of Charlemagne, he soon heartily embraced it. To state precisely whence it originated may be impossible; but it would seem that the attempts which have been made to trace it beyond the Pope himself are not very successful. Because, impressed by the power of Charlemagne, the poets of the court have employed the loftiest language when singing

¹ Irene had deposed and blinded her son (August 6, 797), and since then had in fact held the reins of government.

² *Ann. Lauresh.*, 801. "Et quia jam tunc cessabat a parte Græcorum nomen imperatoris, . . . tunc visum est . . . Leoni . . . seu reliquo christiano populo, ut Carolum regem Franchorum imperatorem nominare debuissent, qui ipsam Romam tenebat ubi semper Cæsarum sedere soliti erant, seu reliquas sedes," etc. *Ap. M. G. SS.*, i. *Cf. Chron. Moissac*, *ap. ib.*, p. 305, and the note of the continuer of the chronicle of Prosper of Aquitaine. When speaking (p. 37, *ap. L. P.*, i. 322) of the rebellion of the exarch Eleutherius, he says of Rome, "ubi imperii solium maneret." The annals of Northumbria (an. 800, *ap. M. G. SS.*, xiii.) pretend that a party of Greeks came and asked Charlemagne "ut illorum susciperet regnum et imperium." It is not, of course, impossible that a party at Constantinople opposed to Irene may have taken this step, but the evidence is not of a high order.

his praises,¹ and because Alcuin often before the Christmas Day of 800 calls his kingdom a 'Christian empire,'² it has been surmised that projects to have him proclaimed emperor were matters of common discussion among his *entourage*. But, when all legitimate deductions have been drawn from high-flown epithets of poets and from obscure remarks in the generally one-sided correspondence of Alcuin, it can only be said that it is possible that the elevation of Charlemagne was planned by his own advisers.³ The probability remains that even in such preliminary negotiations as must have taken place—and it would seem that they were of very limited extent—the greatest share was taken by him whose name is directly connected with the imperial coronation by our authorities in every variety of phrase.⁴ The unanimity of the proceedings in St. Peter's is enough to show that Leo must have previously conferred with the chief men of the

¹ "Rex Carolus, caput orbis, amor populique decusque,
Europæ venerandus apex, pater optimus, heros
Augustus"

Carmen de Car., ap. *P. L.*, t. 98, p. 1436. Cf. *Carm.* 45, *Ad Car. reg.*, of Alcuin and poems by Theodulf (p. 523), both ap. *M. G. PP.*, i.

² Epp. 177 (118), 185 (125), 202 (142).

³ As far as Alcuin's correspondence is concerned, Gaskoin does not think it can "be inferred, from Alcuin's use of such expressions as *imperiale regnum* (Ep. 121 [78]), that he either expected or desired the elevation of his patron." *Alcuin*, p. 123 n.

⁴ With the quotations already cited, comp. *Annal. S. Amand.*, "Leo benedixit eum ad imperium"; *Annal. Juv. Maj.*, "Carolus imperium suscepit Romanum in Roma, et a Leone secundo juniore constitutus imperator." Both ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. Already in 850, when Florus, the deacon of Lyons, wrote his poetical *Querela de div. imp.*, it was held that Charlemagne had received his imperial crown 'by apostolic gift,' and that the empire had the 'key-bearer' of heaven for its founder :

"Hujus ibi (Rome) princeps regni (of Rome) diademata sumpsit
Munere apostolico
Cujus (regni) Roma arx est, et coeli claviger auctor."

Ap. *P. L.*, t. 119, p. 251.

Franks and Romans, and must have secured their adhesion to what he was about to do. But it would seem that the great act under discussion was rather the result of the enthusiastic adoption of a suddenly conceived idea, at once both opportune and splendid, than the consummation of an elaborately prepared plan. "The act is conceived of as directly ordered by the Divine Providence, which has brought about a state of things that admits of but one issue, an issue which king, priest, and people have only to obey."¹

Charlemagne's unwillingness to receive the imperial crown.

If it can scarcely be doubted that Charlemagne had at least a vague knowledge that there was a movement of some sort on foot to choose him as the successor of the deposed Constantine VI., it is quite certain that he did not contemplate its coming to a head, nor himself entertain the idea of ever assuming the title of emperor. For this there is the irrefragable testimony of Eginhard. "At this time," writes the secretary, "he received the name of Emperor and Augustus. To this he was at first so averse that he declared that, if he could have foreseen the Pope's intention, he would never have entered the church on that day, though it was one of the chiefest festivals of the year."² The principal reason for this reluctance on the part of Charlemagne to accept the imperial crown is unfolded for us by the same authority which tells us of this unwillingness. For Eginhard goes on to say: "When he had received the imperial title, he bore with great patience the ill-will

¹ Bryce, *Holy Rom. Emp.*, p. 53. Cf. Birot, p. 15. The *Annals of Moissac*, 800, are enough to prove that there was some preliminary discussion.

² "Quod (the name of Emperor) primo in tantum aversatus est, ut adfirmaret, se eo die, quamvis præcipua festivitas esset, ecclesiam non intraturum, si pontificis consilium præscire potuisset." C. 28. Cf. *Monach. Sangall.*, i. c. 26. "Nichil minus suspicantem ipsum pronunciauit imperatorem defensoremque ecclesiæ Romanæ."

displayed towards him by the Roman emperors, who were indignant at what had been done. However, he overcame their irritation¹ by his magnanimity, by which beyond all doubt he was immeasurably their superior, sending them frequent embassies, and, in his letters, calling them brothers.”² The first attempt he made to allay the vexation which his imperial coronation caused at Constantinople was to apply for the hand, blood-stained though it was, of the Empress Irene. To Constantinople there came “apocrisarii from Charles and Leo with a request that she might be joined to Charles in wedlock, and that the East and West might be made one.”³ The intrigues of the eunuch Aetius and the subsequent illness and deposition of Irene prevented the accomplishment of a scheme which might have been followed by the happiest of results in the domains both of politics and religion. Charlemagne, however, continued his negotiations with her successors, Nicephorus and Michael II., and was at length, after a display of force, recognised by the latter as ‘emperor and basileus’ (812).⁴ The empire, in theory one and indivisible, was divided between two independent emperors.

¹ The contemptuous manner in which later Greek authors speak of Charlemagne show how enduring was their annoyance. A pamphlet printed by Hergenröther (*Mon. Græca ad Photium pertinet.*, Ratisbon, 1869, p. 156) alludes to Pope Leo’s summoning from the inner parts of Frankland ‘a certain Charles’ (Καρϋλόν τινα), whom he crowned emperor.

² *Ib.* Again *cf. Mon. San., l.c.*, who says that Charlemagne did not receive the empire with pleasure, “eo quod putaret Grecos, majore succensus invidia, aliquid incommodi regno Francorum machinaturos.”

³ Theoph., *in Chron.*, 794. *Cf. an.* 793 and *Ann. Eginhard.*, 802.

⁴ *Ann. Eginh.*, 812. *Cf. Egin., in vit. Car.*, c. 16. “Cum quibus (Imperatores Constantinopolitani)—tamen propter susceptum a se imperatoris nomen et ob hoc, quasi qui imperium eis eripere vellet, valde suspectum—fœdus firmissimum statuit.”

Was Charlemagne averse to the intervention of the Pope?

Arguing from the fact that Charlemagne caused his son, Louis the Pious, to crown himself emperor, or perhaps rather crowned him himself, not a few historians conclude that his aversion arose, to a large extent at least, because the imperial crown was bestowed on him by the Church. Dr. Hodgkin, to quote one who represents the thoughts of many, believes¹ that he "was averse to the title of emperor," perhaps chiefly on account of the "intervention of the Pope. . . . He would have wished it (the imperial crowning) done in some other way by the invitation of his Frankish nobles, by a vote of the shadowy body which called itself the Roman Senate (if such a shadow still haunted the north-west corner of the Forum), by the acclamations of the Roman people, or by all those instrumentalities combined, but not by a touch of the Pontiff's fingers. He foresaw, probably with statesman-like instinct, the mischief which would accrue to future generations from the precedent thus furnished of a Pope appearing by virtue of his ecclesiastical office to bestow the imperial crown." Were this a true presentment of Charlemagne's view of his imperial coronation, it would suppose that he had failed to grasp the most salient feature of life in Europe in the early Middle Ages. It is well nigh impossible to overstate the influence of the Church—of the bishops, and particularly of the Pope—during that epoch on the political affairs of the West.² In that age of violence no right could be acquired or held, except by the sword or by the anathema of a bishop. If Charlemagne's father Pippin was only too glad to have his kingly title recognised by Pope Zachary, he himself, it cannot be doubted, was pleased, if he had to receive the imperial title, to have it bestowed by the Pope. Besides, not to mention the

¹ *Italy, etc.*, viii. 202.

² *Cf. Della dignità imp. di Carlomag.*, del A. Rolando, Napoli, 1873.

intervention of the Roman Senate, which at that time was too dead even to have a shadow, it can scarcely be believed that Charlemagne, whose only idea of the 'Roman people' can but have been of men cowering before the Lombards, and trusting to the Pope even for their temporal safety, would have esteemed a request from them to become emperor. As to his 'Frankish nobles,' no ground can be imagined which would give them a colourable title to offer their ruler the imperial dignity. But it was very natural that an invitation should be valued from the Pope who was the acknowledged head of the whole Catholic Church, the recognised lord and saviour of Rome (the first seat of the Roman Empire), and the successor of the one whose sanction had given stability to the Carolingian dynasty. A letter¹ of Charlemagne's great grandson, the emperor Louis II., addressed to the Eastern emperor Basil I., proves indeed how highly the Pope's action was valued. Besides, the whole political career of Charlemagne was coloured by papal intervention, and that, too, of his own seeking. He would have the Pope crown and anoint his sons, subscribe his treaties, and even confirm his will. Moreover, it is highly unlikely that Leo would risk performing an act which, if chiefly because done by him, would irritate his benefactor and protector. One of Charlemagne's most trusted advisers was his cousin Adalhard, abbot of Corbey. He was with him at Rome in 800, and must have known his mind on the papacy. Now of all the Franks he was the most beloved by Leo also.² It is surely, then, more

¹ Quoted *infra*, p. 52.

² Paschasius, *in vit. Adalh.*, n. 17, ed. *P. L.*, t. 120. "A D. Leone . . . tanto familiaritatis officio susceptus, ut neminem constiterit Francorum antea suscepisse." Leo used to say that if he had misplaced his faith in trusting him he would never put confidence in another Frank. With his brothers Wala and Bernard he formed, according to the expression of his biographer (*ib.*, c. 32), along with Charlemagne,

than likely that he consulted with him before he took the momentous step of giving an imperial crown, and must have been convinced that, on whatever other grounds Charlemagne might not wish for it, he would have no objection to receiving it because it came from his hands. And though, in the light of Greek politics, Charlemagne might have preferred that he had never been saluted as emperor, it seems certain that he was far from bearing any ill-will to Leo personally for his share in that transaction. For Alcuin, writing only a few months after it, viz., in April 801, tells us that word had been brought to him from Rome that "the *Apostolicus* was in high favour with the lord emperor."¹

Motives of
Leo's
action.

In placing the imperial crown on the head of the Frankish monarch, Leo was animated by motives both personal and political. The cruel attack which had been made upon him rendered him more desirous of increased protection, and he felt that an emperor of the Romans would have more title to interfere on his behalf than would a king of the Franks, though styled Patricius and defender of the Church. A wish for civil as well as religious unity also urged him on. He could not fail to realise the danger to Christian Europe from the Norseman and the Saracen. He knew that before the rise of the power of Charlemagne it was split up into numerous kingdoms, without any bond of unity between them but submission in spiritual matters to the See of Rome. And he understood that if Christendom was to resist the pressure from without, and

the foundation of the empire of the Franks. "Quorum trium imp. Augustus familiari usus consilio, una secum fundabili quadratura Francorum imperium satis admodum dispositum regebat reipublicæ augmentatum."

¹ Ep. 216 (J. 161). "Candidus noster de Roma reversus est . . . (et) Apostolicum suos superare adversarios referebat et in magna esse gratia cum domino imperatore."

the tendency to disintegration from within, there must be more than spiritual unity amongst its kingdoms. There was need of some material unity. There must be some temporal authority to which all would look up and rally. To a Roman what was more natural than the idea of a revival¹ of the Roman empire,² held then to be theoretically vacant by the deposition of Constantine VI., and known to have been practically dead even in Italy, much less in the rest of Europe, since the descent of the Lombards (568).

Those authors, then, who would have us regard this ‘renovation of the Roman empire’ as an act of rebellion against the emperors of Constantinople, ask far too much of our common-sense. The authority of Byzantium in Europe at this time was simply derelict. What is derelict belongs to the first hand that can hold it. But if it be asked what special right the Pope had to revive the empire, it may be answered that he had at least as much right as the men who made the imperial power in the first instance—Julius Cæsar and Augustus. And in times of difficulty and danger, when there is need of ability and willingness to ward off impending disaster, any man has the natural right, if he has the power, to seize the helm and save himself and others. Besides, what more natural than that the acknowledged Head of the Church should seek to provide even for the temporal welfare of his flock? Was he not, too,

It was not
an act of
rebellion.

¹ A leaden seal, preserved at Paris, proclaims in its silent way that it was a ‘revival’ and not a new creation of empire that was intended. The reverse presents an armed bust of Charlemagne, with the inscription, D. N. KAR. IMP. PP. PP. AUG.; the obverse a city gate surmounted by a cross and flanked by two towers, with the word ROMA below it, and the inscription, RENOVATIO ROMAN IMP.

² Which, wrote Jornandes, in the sixth century, once held subject the whole world “et hactenus vel *imaginarie* teneat.” Ap. R. I. S., i., pt. i., p. 222.

lord of Rome and, as the heir of its preservers, the natural guardian of its rights?¹

It is sufficiently obvious that Leo could not have re-established the authority of the Eastern emperors in Europe, had he wished to do so. And certainly he had no reason to entertain any such wish. They had proved themselves unable to save the West from the barbarians, and anything but the defenders of the Church. The Pope, then, with sense chose as emperor one who had the power to save Europe from the heathen and the will to defend the Church. The power of Charlemagne is acknowledged by friend and foe alike; his goodwill to defend the Church is proclaimed by himself. In the preface to his "Admonitio generalis," among his *Capitularies*, or legal pronouncements, he styles himself: "By the grace and mercy of God, king and ruler of the kingdom of the Franks, and of Holy Church the devout defender and humble helper."² And in the heading of the first capitulary, he declares, according to one reading at least, that he is "in all things³ the adjutant of the Apostolic See." As he called himself, so was he addressed by others. The bishops assembled at the Council of Mayence (813)

¹ Quite in harmony with this is the judgment of Professor Bury: "As the virtual sovereign, then, of Italy, as far as it was Roman—for even in the days of the exarchs he had often been its sovereign far more truly than the exarch or the emperor—and as the bearer of the idea of the Roman empire with all its traditions of civilisation, the Pope had the right, by the standard of justice, to transfer the representation of the ideas whereof he was the keeper to one who was able to realise them." *Hist. of the Later Rom. Emp.*, ii. pp. 508–9. He had previously observed: "If it (the election of an emperor) was not legally defensible, it was as thoroughly justifiable by the actual history of the two preceding centuries as it has been justified by the history of the ten succeeding centuries."

² "Ego Carolus gratia Dei ejusque misericordia donante, Rex et rector regni Francorum et devotus S. ecclesie defensor humilisque adjutor." (*Præfat. Capit.*, 22, ap. Boretius, i. p. 52.)

³ *Ib.*, p. 44.

addressed him as "the most¹ Christian emperor, the rector of the true religion and the defender of the Holy Church of God." Even at the risk of being tedious, we will add to the evidence already cited of Charlemagne's position in regard to the Church an extract from an introduction to a MS. of the laws of the Lombard king Rotharis, preserved in the library of the dukes of Gotha. "As he (Charlemagne) was worthy of the empire's honour, he obtained the imperial crown; he received all the dignities of the Roman power; he was made the most dutiful son of Lord Peter, the Apostle, and he defended *Peter's property* from his foes."²

If it be imagined that too much has been assumed in supposing that it was chiefly the Pope's act which revived the empire in the West, we have not only the word³ of

The famous letter of Louis II. to Basil.

¹ Labbe, vii. 1240.

² *M. G. SS. Langob.*, p. 10; Dr. Hodgkin's translation, *Italy, etc.*, v. 149. This passage indicates clearly enough that, though Charlemagne was meant by Leo to be the successor of Augustus, of Constantine the Great, and of Justinian, it was not intended that he should be the heir of all the power assumed by those rulers in Church and State alike. Leo designed him to be, not the Church's master, but her 'dutiful son.' The centre round which the minds of men were to move was not to be this world, the empire, Cæsar—but heaven, the Church, and the Pope. Cf. Balan, *Storia d'Italia*, ii. 220 ff.

³ In a brief in behalf of the monastery at Centula, the Pope speaks of Charlemagne, "whom we, moved by God, have this day consecrated Augustus for the defence and promotion of the Holy Universal Church," ap. Jaffé, ad an. 800. It is only fair to note that some consider this charter spurious. Gregorovius shows himself very anxious to establish the idea that the 'Roman people' had an effective share, perhaps equal to that of the Pope, in this renovation of empire. But the fact is they had no more say in the matter than they had in the making of the first Roman emperors. They made themselves *despite* the Roman people, and the Pope instituted the Carolingian emperors *without* them. And when he asserts (*Rome*, ii. p. 499) "a decree of election of the Roman nobility and people had undoubtedly preceded the coronation," he has only his own ideas of what he thinks 'ought to have taken place' to fall back upon. Charlemagne had not an atom of respect for the 'Roman people.'

the Pope himself that such was in fact the case, but the authoritative declaration of an emperor. The emperor of Constantinople, Basil I., wrote to the emperor Louis II. (†875) to complain of his taking the title of emperor, which belonged to him alone. In his reply, Louis points out that, with the exception of Basil, he is recognised as emperor by all Christian kings; for they look "to the anointing and consecration by which, by means of the imposition of the hands of the supreme Pontiff and by prayer, we have been, by the will of heaven, advanced to this high position, and to the empire of the Roman principate, which we hold by God's will. . . . Your beloved fraternity further writes that you are astonished that we are called emperor of the Romans, and not emperor of the Franks. But you must understand that if we are not *emperor* of the Romans, we cannot be emperor of the Franks. For as among the Romans this sublime appellation first arose, we have assumed it from those whose city we have received from heaven to govern, as we have received in like manner the mother of all the churches of God to defend and advance. From this mother our race received in the first instance the authority of kings (he refers to the action of Pope Zachary), and then that of emperors. For the princes of the Franks were first called kings; and then those were called *emperors* who were for this end (*ad hoc*) anointed by the Roman Pontiff with the holy oil. Charles the Great, my great-great-grandfather, anointed by the supreme Pontiff, was the first of our race to be called emperor, and to be made the anointed of the Lord. And if," continues Louis, "you rail against the Pope for his action, you have as much reason to rail against Samuel for passing over Saul, whom he had himself anointed, and for anointing David king." The Western then reminds the Eastern emperor of the way in which the

popes had been left defenceless against their enemies by the rulers of Constantinople, and, what was worse, had been through them assailed by heresies. Hence, naturally, the popes turned their backs on the apostates, and embraced the Franks.¹

The outcome of Leo's act (and the letter of the emperor Louis shows how truly it *was* the Pope's act), while it did not in any way interfere with the power, or real rights, of the Eastern emperors, increased that of Charlemagne at least indirectly. Though it did not add to his dominions by one rood of land, it gave him a solid increase of authority by the way in which it caused him to be looked up to as well by his own subjects as by other Christian peoples and kings.² For there was such a charm about the name of emperor, that even the very barbarian rulers who had destroyed in the West the power of the emperors, kept a sort of covert respect for them, and sometimes even accepted from the emperors of Constantinople the title of *patricius*. But the result of Leo's work on the Christmas Day of 800 was not confined to the reign of Charlemagne. It endured in appearance till the August of 1806, when the emperor Francis II. renounced the imperial crown, and thereby brought "the oldest political institution in the world" . . . to an end.³ It existed practically till the days of the emperor Charles V., who was the last of the emperors crowned by the Pope.

As a last word on this subject we will point out that the union of Church and State, brought about by the renovation of the empire, was in the main productive of

¹ This letter, from the *Chronicle of Salerno*, is to be found ap. *R. I. S.*, ii., pt. ii., p. 243. Kleinclausz has made a vain attempt to upset the authenticity of this letter.

² Cf. Einhard, *in vit. Car.*, c. 16. The emperor was publicly prayed for in the services of the Church.

³ Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, p. 1.

Results of
Leo's
action.

good.¹ It is true that, with the advance of time, great struggles arose between the papacy and the empire. From the nature of things it was inevitable that difficulties should arise. If the Church is not infallible in its temporal policy, no more, perhaps still less, is the State. And as it is impossible in some cases to fix the exact boundaries of the proper spheres of action of the Church on the one hand and the State on the other, it is only to be expected that, when both are full of life, friction must arise. In a man of energy, especially when plunged in the midst of the affairs of life, there is an endless struggle going on between the powers of his body and those of his soul. It does not, however, follow that the union of body and soul is not in itself good. Similarly the struggles, sometimes fierce enough, between the popes and the emperors do not prove that the institution of the empire was not to the great advantage of Europe generally.

There can indeed be no doubt that the grand idea of one Church and one State acting in harmony, with which the act of Leo inspired the minds of the men of the West, was productive of great good. Wild and rough as were but too many of the leaders of men in Western Europe in the early Middle Ages, they conceived the thought, so important for the development of European civilisation, that they were all members of one great Christian family. It was this idea that made united action possible in Europe, that hurled the warriors of the West against the Moslem, who, like the locust, can but devour all that is good as he moves along. It was this thought, this habit of looking up with respect to a common head, not merely at Rome, but also, though to a much less degree, at Aachen, or wherever else the seat of empire might be, which so

¹ Cf. Dr. Hodgkin, in his eminently readable and accurate *Charle the Great* (p. 249).

frequently averted the horrors of war at a time when men seemed to think they were born to fight. It was this feeling of the brotherhood of peoples which promoted an intercourse among the men of the West, greatly, of course, to their mutual benefit, to which nothing in our times can compare. Where there was much to be learned, or where there was much to do, thither, heedless whether to London, to Paris, or to Rome, went the workers or the seekers after truth. And gladly were they welcomed. For they were received without that miserable jealousy and suspicion which modern ideas of nationality have engendered—ideas which make many men act at least as though they believed that the be-all and end-all of everything was nationality. One Church, one empire was a clear, noble, and grand central idea to which others, at once beautiful and practical, could aggregate. Out of reflection of this kind arose the remark of Gregorovius: "All the life of nations became henceforward bound together in a great concentric system of Church and empire, and out of this system sprang the common civilisation of the West."¹

Among the results of Leo's crowning Charlemagne was *not* that he gave up all his sovereign rights in Rome. He no more ceased to be its ruler than did the king of Bavaria lose all his regal power over Bavaria on the proclamation of William, King of Prussia, as Emperor of Germany, in 1871. No doubt, as emperor, Charlemagne would have more rights than those of a simple patricius; he would stand to the Pope in much the same position as our sovereign does to the independent princes of our Indian empire.² Hence in his letters to the emperor, Leo does

Who had
supreme
power in
Rome?

¹ *Rome*, ii. 508 f. Cf. Davis, *Charlemagne*, p. 14 f., 210 f., and Solmi, *Stato e Chiesa*, p. 15. Of this last work see a full and able criticism in the *Rev. d'hist. eccles.*, July 1904, p. 573 ff.

² And so, as my friend Mr. Urquhart has pointed out to me, the popes regarded the emperors not only as 'brothers and sons,' but as

not fail to make it clear that Charlemagne is his defender, but not in all things his master. Writing¹ on one occasion to complain of the doings of some of the emperor's 'missi,' he asks that "the oblation which your ancestors and you yourself have offered to Blessed Peter may remain acceptable in his sight, so that you may deserve to receive a suitable reward from the keybearer of the kingdom of heaven, who has constituted you his defenders in his interests." Further, whilst consenting to work along with the emperor in taking defensive measures on the coasts against the Saracens and Northmen, whose sea power was now making itself felt, Leo's very words² show that there were coasts that belonged to him as well as to the emperor. And if the emperor's *missi*, who came to assist in the administration of justice, interfered with the Pope's arrangements, Leo did not hesitate to ask the emperor indignantly if it was by his orders that his *missi* hampered, to the great detriment of the papal exchequer,³ the administrative rights of the *duces* whom he had appointed over

their 'overlords' in temporals under certain circumstances. They were the *lords* of the popes as the German emperor is now the *lord* of the German Princes. S. Gregory VII. calls Henry IV. "*dominum fratrem et filium.*" Jaffé, *Reg.*, iii. 7.

¹ Ep. 9, ap. *M. G. Épp.*, v. 9, ap. Jaffé, *Mon. Carol.* "Qui (b. Petrus) vos in suis utilitatibus defensores constituit." This letter perhaps belongs to the year 807. Cf. Ep. 1, ap. *M. G. SS.*, v., and ap. Jaffé, *ib.*, 1, where Leo tells Charlemagne that he will receive his son Pippin in a way that will become "the son of so great a *defender* of the Holy Church of God."

² "Ut litoraria *nostra* ac *vestra* ab infestatione paganorum tuta reddantur nos studium ponimus." Ep. 1, *ubi sup.* Cf. Ep. 6, *ib.*, where, after narrating to the emperor the ravages of the Moors on the islands of Ponza and Ischia, etc., the Pope adds: "De *nostris* autem terminibus insinuamus *vestræ* imp. potentix: quia per intercessionem B. V. M. . . . et per *vestram* prudentissimam ordinationem omnia salva existunt. A quo enim de illorum adventu *vestra* nos exhortavit serenitas, semper *postera et litoraria nostra* ordinata habuimus."

³ Ep. 2, ap. *M. G. SS.*, v., or ap. Jaffé.

the different cities. It may be noted here that these *missi* were in the nature of itinerant judges, whose business it was to see that the local authorities in the different towns did their duty. Cenni,¹ in his notes to this letter, quotes the famous constitution of the emperor Lothaire, drawn up in the time of Eugenius II. (824-827), to the effect that it was the emperor's will that *missi* should be appointed by the Pope and himself, who should each year report how the different dukes and judges administered justice. Complaints were in the first instance to be referred to the Pope, as to the ordinary and immediate authority, who should himself cause them to be satisfied; or, if he preferred it, they were to be referred to the emperor to be dealt with.² The idea of Leo was that the emperors were to administer justice within the dominions of the Pope when invited by him so to do, though not whenever they chose to do so on their own initiative; but that in grave temporal difficulties they should constitute the ultimate court of appeal. Living at a distance and interfering only occasionally in the papal government, they were nevertheless to be always in the background, as it were, and to serve as a continual warning and menace to the turbulent nobility. While the emperor had no little ecclesiastical authority, and the Pope still more temporal power, each was to be independent in his own sphere. The scheme was, certainly, an admirable one for securing the independence of the papacy.³

We may now return to the history of the course of events.

Charlemagne stays in Rome till Easter, 801.

¹ *P. L.*, t. 98, p. 532.

² *Constit. Loth.*, c. 4, ap. Boretius, *Capit.*, i. 323.

³ *Cf.* a very lucid article, *Del Sacro Romano impero*, by E. Santini, in a volume addressed to Leo XIII. on the occasion of his episcopal jubilee. Siena, 1893. The above paragraph in the text has been compiled in accordance with some admirable suggestions I received from Mr. Urquhart.

Charlemagne passed the winter in Rome, occupied not only with the trial and punishment of the Pope's enemies, but with the affairs, public and private, ecclesiastical and civil, of Rome and the whole of Italy. After despatching an army under his son Pippin, the king of Italy, against the Duke of Beneventum, who was too independent to suit the new emperor, that prince left Rome after Easter (April 25) and set out for the North.¹

Charlemagne to marry Irene.

Whilst Einhard in his annals² relates that in the following year negotiations were entered into between the Eastern court and Charlemagne, Theophanes³ adds that to the emperor's ambassadors were added those of the Pope, and that, besides confirming peace between the two sovereigns, the ambassadors had in view the bringing about a marriage between the empress Irene and their master. If their mission had been successful, it would have put an easy end to the soreness felt by the East at the creation of a Western emperor. The plan, whether originating from the Pope or from Charlemagne himself, was a good one. But it miscarried, and that through the interested advice of one of Irene's ministers. Well would it have been for Irene if she had accepted the proffered hand of the mighty Frank. For, on October 31 of this very year, she lost her throne, and found herself banished to the Isle of Lesbos by the usurper Nicephorus, who had formerly been the Treasurer (*Logothete*). Thus passed from the stage of the world's history a princess whose beauty, abilities, and even virtues, were brought into more striking prominence by her later crimes. Charlemagne's ambassadors were graciously heard by Nicephorus, who sent back legates of his own with them both to the emperor and

¹ Einhard, *Annal.*, ad an. 801.

² *Ib.*, ad an. 802.

³ Theoph., *in Chron.*, ad an. 793, 794, and *Hist. Miscella*, l. 23.

the Pope, and concluded at least a preliminary treaty of peace.¹

In the following year the North of Italy was agitated by the story that there had been found in Mantua a sponge that had been dipped in the blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ and carried thither by Longinus. In the summer (803), news of this so-called discovery was brought to Charlemagne, who at once begged the Pope to inquire into the truth of the affair. Leo took advantage of this request² of the emperor to go still further north and pay Charlemagne a second visit,³ as well for his love of the emperor as for the needs of the Church. Charlemagne was at Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle) when word was brought to him, about the middle of November, that the Pope wished to keep the feast of Christmas with him. At once the young prince Charles was sent forward to meet the Pope at St. Maurice in Valais. He himself received the Pope in the old basilica of St. Remy at Rheims, and then went with him to Quiercy—a place already so famous in the history of the relations between the popes and the Carolingians—where they kept the feast of Christmas. Here, and at Aachen, they were together for eight days. Unfortunately we are left utterly in the dark as to what matters were discussed between them. Gregorovius,⁴ however, who is here cited

Leo III.
again visits
Charle-
magne, 804.

¹ Einhard, *Annal.*, ad an. 803. Cf. *supra*, p. 45.

² *Ib.*, ad an. 804. "Causa adventus ejus (Leonis) hæc erat. Perlatum est ad imperatorem æstate præterita, Christi sanguinem in Mantua civitate fuisse repertum, propter hoc misit ad Papam, petens ut hujus famæ veritatem inquireret," etc.

³ Poeta Saxo (ap. *M. G. SS.* 1, or Jaffé, *Mon. Carol.*) says (ad an. 804) that the Pope left Rome:

"Augusti Leo flagranti deductus amore
Aecclesie quoque pro causis, quibus imperiali
Esse videbat opus munimine, rursus adire
Francorum terras."

⁴ *Rome*, iii. 13, 14. Fleury, *Hist. eccles.*, l. xlv. n. 27, conjectures with at least as much reason that Leo wished to consult the emperor on the

merely as a type of a certain class of historians, is not without sources of private information. Leo had come for more land. But he did not obtain "all his desires, for the dispute concerning the frontiers of his property, or those between imperial supremacy and the papal territorial power, remained to be the subject of lasting dissensions, while the exorbitant demands of St. Peter awoke the indignation of the youthful Pippin," etc. With such pure imaginings certain modern authors are literally crammed. What lover of truth would not almost prefer the bare list of dry facts, given by many of the early chroniclers of the Middle Ages, to this? On his return journey the emperor caused the Pope to be escorted to Ravenna through Bavaria, a country which he wished to see. He reached Rome loaded with presents.¹

Charle-
magne
divides his
empire by
will, 806.

The great emperor, feeling that the allotted span of human life, the threescore years and ten, was drawing on apace for him (he was now sixty-four), and thinking that the best way to avoid disputes arising between his three sons after his death was to let them know during his life what portion of his great empire would fall to each one of them, and to have this division previously well ratified, assembled the great ones of his realm at Thionville (806). Before this gathering he announced his intention of dividing his empire between his three sons, Louis, Charles, and Pippin. This policy of endless subdivision² of territory was

affairs of Venice and of Fortunatus of Grado. Balbo and Balan (*Storia d'Ital.*, ii. 238) hold with greater probability that Charlemagne had invited the Pope to come and discuss with him the important question of the division of his empire.

¹ Eginhard, *Annal.*, ad an. 804. Cf. Poeta Saxo, who writes that the gifts were worthy of the giver and the taker—the most illustrious bishop and sovereign of the time.

"Hic cum pontificum clarissimus, illeque regum
Temporis illius, nullo dubitante fuissent."

² Just as detrimentally as the equal distribution of property acts on France at this day.

to prove fatal not only to the Carolingian empire itself, but to the prosperity of Europe in the ninth and tenth centuries. There is no call here to give the terms of the will¹ which Charlemagne read up before his nobles, especially as it never took effect, for both Charles and Pippin died before their father. But in assigning his dominions to Pippin, Italy was declared his "up to the boundaries of St. Peter" — a fact which shows plainly enough that Charlemagne did not consider the dominions of the Pope to be at the disposal of the emperor. And the three brothers were exhorted to be in earnest about the defence of the Church of St. Peter in the first place, and then of the other churches. They had to defend the former from its enemies, and, as far as they could and as was reasonable, to strive that it obtained its rights. After the nobles had sworn to adhere to the clauses of the will, Einhard himself, who gives² us this information, took it to Rome to receive the signature of the Pope. If there is one thing that the conduct of Charlemagne towards the popes teaches, it is that he placed in everything the utmost reliance on the moral support to be derived from the concurrence of the

¹ The text of it may be read in the *Capit. Reg. Franc.*, ed. Boretius, i. 126 f., etc. A full analysis of it may be read in Père Daniel's *Hist. de France*, i. p. 484 f. The 'Italy' which he leaves to Pippin he is careful to define as 'Lombardy.' "Italiam, vero, quæ et Langobardia dicitur . . . Pippino dilecto filio nostro"; and later on, when making another division, on the supposition that Pippin were to die before the other two, Charles has to have Italy "usque ad terminos S. Petri." The exact words of the will with regard to the relations of his sons to the popes are of the last importance. "*Super omnia autem jubemus, ut ipsi tres fratres curam et defensionem ecclesiæ S. Petri simul suscipiant, sicut quondam ab avo nostro Carolo et b. mem. genitore Pipino Rege, et a nobis postea suscepta est; ut eam cum Dei adjutorio ab hostibus defendere nitantur, et justitiam suam quantum ad ipsos pertinet et ratio postulaverit habere faciant.*"

² "Quibus pontifex lectis, et ad sensum præbuit, et propria manu subscripsit." Einhard, *Annal.*, ad an. 806.

Church. The assent of Leo to the will was given in due course.

The
Council of
Aix-la-
Chapelle on
'Filioque,'
809.

Among the honours which his deserved reputation had won for Charlemagne was the concession¹ to him of a sort of honorary suzerainty over the city of Jerusalem, especially over the Holy Places, by the great Caliph Haroun-al-Raschid. This suzerainty involved him as well as the Pope in discussions on the 'Procession of the Holy Ghost.' On this most abstruse question the doctrine of the Catholic Church is that the Holy Ghost proceeds, or has His origin, from the Father and the Son as from one principle, and that as the Son comes from the Father by *generation* and is His Word, the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son by *spiration*, and is, as it were, the outcome of their mutual love. To express this doctrine more clearly, there sprang up, it seems, in Spain, a custom of singing the Creed of Nice with the addition of the words, 'Filioque.' The Holy Ghost was thereby definitely stated to have proceeded from the Father 'and the Son—qui ex Patre Filioque procedit.' For it was in Spain that the orthodox doctrine was first proclaimed² in a profession of faith. This was at a Council held probably at Toledo, in 447, against the Priscillianists. When the Arian Visigoths were converted under King Reccared, it was again declared³ at the Third Council of Toledo, in 589, that the Holy Ghost proceeds 'from the Father and from the Son.' This custom, then, begun in Spain some time between 447 and the time of Felix of Urgel, passed into France, then into Germany, and last of all into Italy. On this doctrine, the teaching of the early Greek⁴ Fathers was at one with that of the

¹ Einhard, *in vit. Car.*, n. 16; *Annal. Moissac*, ad an. 801.

² Hefele, *Hist. Conc.*, ii. p. 495 (Fr. ed.).

³ *Ib.*, iii. p. 589.

⁴ For various testimonies from SS. Basil, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, etc., *cf.* Hurter, *Theol. Dogmat. Compend.*, ii. §§ 198–202. The difference between the doctrine of the Greeks and the Latins on

Latin Fathers. But as they often simply said that He proceeded from the Father, and sometimes that He 'was sent through the Son,' some of the Greeks began to imagine that the addition of the 'Filioque' implied some false doctrine. Hence the question of the 'procession' of the Holy Ghost was discussed at the Council of Gentilly (767) and in the Caroline Books. And when certain Latin monks in Palestine began to use the Filioque, they were accused by their neighbours of heresy. The letter in which they make known their difficulties to the Pope is still extant,¹ and is very interesting. It is addressed: "To the most holy and reverend Lord in Christ, Father Leo, the first Bishop and universal Pope of the Holy Apostolic City of Rome, the congregation of the Mount of Olives." It then begins as follows: "Our Lord has deigned to exalt you, Father, over all bishops, and your holy See over all Christian Sees. For with His own lips did Christ condescend to say, 'Thou art Peter, etc.' (Matt. xvi. 18). Most kind father, we who are strangers in this holy city of Jerusalem, love no man on earth more than you, and day and night pray for you. Hence to you do we make known the troubles we are here enduring." They go on to state that John, a monk of the laura of S. Sabas, near Jerusalem, called them and all the Franks heretics. In defence, the Franks replied that if they were called heretics, it would be necessary to charge the apostolic See with heresy.² John then had recourse to deeds; and on Christmas Day (808) sent some laymen "to pitch them

this difficult question is admirably set forth in Brehier, *Le schisme Orient. du XI^e Siècle*, p. 129 ff. Cf. Vincenzi, *De process. Spiritus S.*, Rome, 1878. Neale's *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church*, Dissert. iii., p. 1095 ff., gives the Orthodox Greek point of view.

¹ Jaffé, *Mon. Carol.*, p. 382.

² *Ib.* "Frater, sile. Quodsi nos dicis hæreticos, de sede S. apostolica dicis hæresim." . . . "Non enim potuerunt nos foras ejicere."

out" (as the letter phrases it) of the Church built over the cave at Bethlehem where Our Lord was born. But the sturdy Franks were not easy to eject. And they proudly inform the Pope: "They could not put us forth. We all said," they continue, "here we wish to die; and you shall not cast us out." They piously attribute their power of resistance to extra strength which the Pope's prayers and faith had obtained for them. They then, they say, appealed to the clergy of the city. A public meeting was held in the neighbourhood of Mount Calvary. Interrogated as to their faith, they declared that it was the same as that of the Roman Church, but pointed out that they were in the habit of using certain expressions in their prayers that the Greeks were not. "In the 'Glory be to the Father,'" urged the Frank monks, "you do not say 'as it was in the beginning'; in the 'Gloria in excelsis' you do not say 'tu solus altissimus'; you say the 'Our Father' differently to us; and in the Creed we say more than you, we add, 'who proceeds from the Father and the Son.'" They (the Franks) then begged the people not to listen to the monk John; and reminded them that if they called the Frankish monks heretics, it would be to accuse of heresy the throne of Peter. "If you do that you¹ will sin." "And now, our most kind Father, deign to think of us your servants, who though so far away, are your sheep. To you,² as your holiness knows, the whole world

¹ *Ib.* "Quodsi nos dicitis hæreticos, de throno Petri dicitis hæresim. Et si hoc dicitis, peccatum inducitis super vos."

² *Ib.* "Et tibi commissus est omnis mundus, sicut vestra sanctitas scit; sicut ait Dominus Petro: 'Si diligis me, Petre, pasce oves meas.'" We may remark here, by the way, that when any ancient writers attribute the right to rule the whole Christian world to the bishop of Rome, it is not to any of the thousand and one reasons which some authors have invented to account for the position of the Pope that they appeal in support of their assertion, but simply to the words of Our Lord to the first Pope, St. Peter.

has been entrusted; inasmuch as the Lord said to Peter, 'If you love me, feed my sheep' (S. John, xxi. 17). They then go on to inform the Pope that they had heard the words, 'who proceeds from the Father and the Son,' sung in the chapel of 'the emperor (Charlemagne) your son'; and that in the homily of St. Gregory and the Rule of St. Benedict, which the same emperor had given them, the same words also occurred. But the monk John had caused them much trouble by asserting that the Holy Ghost did not proceed from the Father and the Son. In conclusion they earnestly beg the Pope to look into the matter of the 'procession of the Holy Ghost,' to call to the mind of the emperor that they had heard the words, 'who proceeds, etc.,' in his chapel, and to let them know the result."

Of this matter Leo at once informed¹ Charlemagne (809), sending him the letter he had just received. He at the same time sent to the monks of Mount Olivet "a creed² of the orthodox faith, that all might preserve it true and intact, in accordance with this our Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

In consequence of this letter of the Pope, Charlemagne convened an assembly of bishops in November 809, at

Council of
Aix-la-
Chapelle,
809.

¹ Ep. ad Car., *Mon. Carol.*, Jaffé, p. 386.

² *Ib.* "Nos symbolum . . . illis misimus, quatenus omnes secundum hanc nostram Cath. et Apost. eccles. rectam et inviolatam teneant fidem." The Creed of Leo is printed in Baluze, *Miscell.*, vii. *init.*, and in Migne, *P. L.*, t. 129, p. 1260. It is addressed "to all the Oriental Churches," that, "all the *world* may hold the faith inviolate according to the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church." "Leo episcopus servus servorum Dei omnibus orientalibus Ecclesiis. Hoc symbolum orthodoxæ fidei vobis mittimus ut tam vos quam omnis mundus secundum Romanam S. Cath. et Apost. Eccles. rectam et inviolatam teneatis fidem." What that faith was with regard to the procession of the Holy Ghost, he makes quite clear. "Credimus . . . Spiritum S. a Patre et a Filio æqualiter procedentem, consubstantialem, coæternum Patri et Filio."

Aachen. The Council proclaimed¹ the orthodox doctrine in regard to the procession of the Holy Ghost, and seems to have sanctioned the continued use of the 'Filioque' in the Creed. For the sake² of having the matter settled, Charlemagne sent to the Pope an embassy composed of a bishop and an abbot.

Conference
at Rome,
810.

Early in the year 810, the Pope held a conference with the legates of the emperor in the sacristy (*secretarium*) of St. Peter's. When various 'testimonies'³ had been read, he declared that his belief was in accordance with the authors quoted, and with the passages of the sacred Scriptures adduced, and that he forbade anyone to teach or hold any doctrine opposed to that of the Council at Aachen. The testimonies here spoken of were doubtless extracts from the works of Theodulphus, bishop of Orleans, and Smaragdus, abbot of St. Michel (now St. Mihiel), near Verdun. It is from one of his letters to Charlemagne—to which such acts as we have of the Roman synod were appended—that we know what went on in Rome between the Pope and the emperor's legates. In his work Smaragdus had made it his chief object to collect the passages of Scripture that bear directly or indirectly on this subject of the procession of the Holy Ghost; while Theodulphus aimed at collecting texts from the Greek, and especially from the Popes and the Latin Fathers. After the declaration of the Pope above rehearsed, an informal discussion took place, which the abbot Smaragdus, who

¹ Hefele, *Hist. Conc.*, v. p. 174 (Fr. ed.).

² "Cujus (quæstio de process. S. S.) definiendæ causa Bernharius, etc., Romam ad Leonem papam missi sunt." Einhard, *Annal.*, ad an. 809.

³ "Lectis a prædictis Missis testimoniis . . . ait (Leo), ita teneo cum his auctoribus et S. Scripturæ auctoritatibus. Si quis aliter de hac re sentire vel docere voluerit, defendo," etc. Cf. *Smarag. lib.*, ap. Mansi, *Conc.*, xiv. p. 18 seq., or any other of the great editions of the Councils, e.g. Labbe, vii. 1194.

was himself present, says he could not undertake to write down (clearly). By degrees the discussion took a more formal character, of which the worthy abbot has left us a most interesting summary. Of course, it was at once quite plain to the envoys that there was no difference in point of faith between the Pope and themselves. But they naturally wished to get their custom of singing the Creed, with the 'Filioque' addition, recognised by the Pope. Hence they argued that since it was true that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son, that truth ought to be taught. To this Leo agreed. Why not then teach the truth by singing? Teaching by singing, replied the Pope, is a good method, but it is not good to insert words where one has no right. The envoys admitted that they were aware that the Fathers of the different œcumenical councils had forbidden additions to be made to the Creed, but they asked whether it would not be lawful to sing the 'Filioque,' if they (the Councils) had inserted it. It would, assented the Pope. Would not the Fathers of the General Councils have done *well* if they had inserted such an important addition, persisted the envoys? No doubt, was the answer; but as they did not insert it, they had very good reasons for their omission of the addition. Before night put an end to the discussion, the Pope pointed out that it was impossible to put all the articles of faith into the Creed.

When the conference was reopened next day, the envoys urged that the 'Filioque' had been added solely with the laudable object of instructing the people on a most important point of doctrine. Whereupon Leo reminded them that after the Fathers of the different Councils had forbidden people to tamper with the Creed on their own authority, it made no matter with what intention they acted when they violated the decrees of the Fathers. But

have you not yourself given leave for the singing of the Creed, put in the envoys? The Pope allowed that he had *permitted* the singing of the Creed, but not with the addition, told them they had better follow the custom of the Roman Church, and asked what it was to him (*Quid ad nos*) that the Franks could urge that they had not originated the custom. The irrepressible Franks now adduced their final argument, and acutely insisted that to drop the 'Filioque' would be to cause the people to think that it was not true that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and from the Son. Could the Pope tell them what was best to be done, therefore, under the circumstances? "Had I been asked," retorted the Pope, "before the custom of singing the Creed in your manner began, I should have told you not to make the insertion." As it was, he advised,¹ not commanded, that, on the ground that it was not sung in the Church of Rome, their custom of singing the Creed should be gradually abandoned. Then what had been established rather from love of novelty than by authority would be gradually abandoned by all. An unlawful custom would thus come to an end and nobody's faith would be injured.

Whether or not the Pope's wise advice was followed in the Royal chapel we do not know; but the custom of the West was not abandoned. Had his prudent counsels, however, been followed, much difficulty would have been avoided. When in the days to come the Greeks sought an occasion to quarrel with the Western Church, their only tangible argument (the Filioque) would not have been forthcoming. Meanwhile, to show 'his love for the orthodox faith,' says his biographer, Leo caused two shields

¹ "At nunc (quod tamen non *affirmando*, sed vobiscum pariter tractando dico) . . . ut paulatim in palatio (quia in nostra S. Ecclesia non cantatur) cantandi consuetudo ejusdem symboli intermittatur.

of silver, weighing 94 lbs. 6 ozs., to be cast. On one of them, in Greek, and on the other, in Latin, he caused the Creed to be inscribed without the 'Filioque.' This he did to afford a standing proof that the Roman Church preserved the Creed as it had come down to her. These shields Leo hung up, one on the right and the other on the left of the confession of St. Peter, and as late as the eleventh century they were seen by St. Peter Damian.¹ He put up a corresponding one in the confession of St. Paul.²

Of the joint efforts of Charlemagne and Pope Leo III. for the refutation of Adoptionism, and of the Council held at Rome against its able advocate, Felix of Urgel, in 799, mention has already been made under Pope Hadrian I. Their mutual relations with Fortunatus of Grado may well engage our attention now.

Felix of Urgel. Council at Rome, 799

On the authority of the *Annals of Venice*,³ Muratori⁴ informs us that to the bishopric of Olivola Castello, an island that now forms part of Venice, there was elected a Greek of the name of Christophorus, at the instance of the Greek emperor Nicephorus and by the influence of John, the Doge of Venice. But the tribunes of Venice, who did not approve of this Greek interference, begged the patriarch of Grado, also named John, not to consecrate Christophorus. John yielded to their wishes, and even excommunicated the bishop-elect. Furious at this, the Doge sailed over to Grado and had the refractory prelate hurled from the top of a high tower. The tribunes, however, contrived to bring about the election of Fortunatus of Triest, a relation of the murdered patriarch, to the vacant See of Grado. The Pope approved the choice, and

Fortunatus, patriarch of Grado.

¹ Opusc. 38, c. 2, ap. *P. L.*, t. 145.

² *L. P.*, n. lxxxv. Cf. Photius, ep. i. 24, who tells of Leo inscribing their undefiled faith on certain shields.

³ Ap. *M. G. SS.*, vii.

⁴ *Annal.*, ad an. 802.

sent Fortunatus the pallium¹ (March 21, 803). The treatment that had been meted out to his predecessor and relative led Fortunatus to conspire with some of the chief men in the State against the Doge. The plot was discovered, and Fortunatus fled for his life to Charlemagne. He found the emperor at Saltz (Koenigshofen), presented him² with some beautiful gifts and implored his assistance. This Charlemagne granted, and even took him into favour and wrote to the Pope to ask him to allow the exiled patriarch to have the then vacant See of Pola, as "he did not³ wish to appoint him anywhere without consulting with the Pope." The Pope consented (806), on condition that, if his See of Grado were restored to Fortunatus, he was to leave the See of Pola in every way intact just as he found it.⁴ But in a postscript to the letter he wrote to Charlemagne on this matter, the Pope asked him to use his influence with Fortunatus for the good of the latter's soul, as he had not heard good reports of him, either whilst he was in Italy or France.

King
Eardulf of
Northum-
bria in
Rome.

The joint action of Charlemagne and Leo in a case⁵ much nearer home serves to give us an insight as to the blessings that would have accrued to Europe, not from an ideal 'Roman emperor,' but even from a succession of rulers like Charlemagne. With such emperors and such a union of Church and State as existed in the days of Charlemagne and Leo, the great standing armies, which

¹ Cf. *Chron. de pat. Nov. Aquil.*, ed. Monticolo, p. 15; *Cron. Altinate*, l. 8, ed. Rossi, p. 227; Dandolo, *Chron.*, ap. *R. I. S.*, xii.

² *Annal.*, Einhard, ad an. 803; *Cron. Venez.*, of John the Deacon, ad an. 803 (ed. Monticolo, p. 101).

³ "Vestra imp. potentia sine consultu apostolatus nostri nequaquam eum aliubi collocare voluit." Ep. 5 Leo., ap. *M. G. Epp.*, v., or *Mon. Carol.*, p. 321.

⁴ *Ib.*

⁵ Cf. Ep. 2 Leo., ap. *Mon. Carol.*, p. 313; and *Anglo-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 806

sap the strength of modern Europe, and are a perpetual menace to its peace and to the priceless blessings that flow therefrom, would not be needed.

At this time, when from years of wild anarchy the once powerful kingdom of Northumbria was fast going to pieces, its king, Eardulf, who when only a noble had been wounded it was thought to death, had been seized by his enemies and cast into prison (806). During the time of his power¹ he would seem to have acknowledged some kind of superior authority in the emperor,² and to have cultivated the friendship of the Pope in a particular manner. Hence, both took an active interest in his misfortunes. Both sent special messengers³ to Northumbria. Whilst the emperor's messenger succeeded in obtaining the king's release⁴ (808), the Pope's envoy heard what both parties had to say on the merits of the case; for appeal to the Pope had been made in the first instance.⁵ Leo expresses his delight to the emperor that his action saved the life of the king, and assures Charlemagne that this 'imperial defence' of his is praised on all hands. After visiting Charlemagne at Nimeguen, about Easter 808, Eardulf

¹ Some notice of this king may be got from Simeon of Durham (†1133), *De Gest. Reg.*, ad an. 801, etc.; *Anglo-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 795, etc.

² Hence when writing to the emperor (*Mon. Carol.*, ep. 2, p. 311, or ap. *M. G. SS.*, v.), Leo rejoices in the safety of Eardulf, "quia et vester semper *fidelis* extitit, et ad nos missos suos dirigebat."

³ *Ib.*

⁴ *Ib.*

⁵ *Ib.* To the information contained in a letter to the Pope from Charlemagne, to the effect that Eardulf had been driven from his kingdom, Leo replied that 'the Saxons' had already informed him of the affair, and that it was especially on account of that wicked deed that he had sent his envoy into the kingdom. "Hoc per Saxones agnovaramus. Unde maxime ipsum missum nostrum pro ipsa nequitia illic direximus." The next letter of the Pope to Charlemagne (December 31, 808) shows him sending the emperor all the correspondence he had received on the subject, and asking him to return it when read, as "eorum verba pro pignore retinemus."

went on to Rome.¹ He would seem to have satisfied the Pope as to his right to the throne; for in the beginning of the year 809, he left Rome and was escorted back to his kingdom by the envoys of the emperor and the Pope.² On this incident Gregorovius³ remarks: "Rome, it is true, had already beheld kings, more especially from the British Isles, come to take the cowl. Eardulf was, however, the first to sue in the Lateran for the restoration of the crown of which he had been deprived. The instance shows *the views which were arising* in the West concerning papal authority. And since, after Pippin's days, it was *kings themselves* who, for the sake of temporal advantage, exalted the conception of the Roman episcopate in the eyes of peoples and princes, we cannot be surprised that these bishops, renouncing the idea of spiritual intercession, soon arrogated to themselves the divine power of giving and removing crowns." The concluding statement in the foregoing quotation is simply a groundless assertion of Gregorovius himself, for which he does not venture to advance the smallest semblance of proof. And it should be observed that men do not 'arrogate to themselves' power freely placed in their hands; so that if, in the Middle Ages, we find popes from time to time adjudicating on the rights of kings to their thrones—not arrogating to themselves the divine power of giving and removing crowns at pleasure—we might say, with Gregorovius himself, that this exercise of authority was the result of the free appeal to Rome of kings themselves. It was certainly, however, the legitimate outcome of the feudal ideas of the Middle Ages. In the eyes of men in those times, not

¹ Einhard, *Annal.*, ad an. 808.

² Einhard, *Fuldenses Ann.*, ad an. 809, ap. *M. G. SS.*, i. Cf. Einhard, *Ann.*, ad an. 808-9.

³ *Rome, etc.*, ii. 15.

only was every man in each kingdom subject to an overlord, but in the union which then existed between Christian states and the Church, kings themselves were taken to be responsible for the proper exercise of their power to the ultimate tribunal of the See of Rome.

There was being discussed at Rome at the same time as that of Eardulf, the case of the Archbishop of York, Eanbald, the second of that name, a man of great influence, and seemingly somewhat worldly. Whether this was in connection with the affair of king Eardulf (whose enemies he was said to have harboured), or with some other business, is not clear. It has been conjectured that it concerned the endless dispute between the archbishops of York and Canterbury¹ on the subject of the primacy. For his pallium this prelate was indebted to the exertions of Alcuin, who had been his master. Sometime before August 797, Alcuin wrote² to Pope Leo: "In behalf of the envoys—who have come from my country and my city, according to canonical and apostolic custom and the command of Blessed Gregory our apostle, to beg the dignity of the sacred pall—I humbly beg you to graciously listen to the prayers of a necessitous church. For in those parts the dignity of the sacred pallium is necessary to overcome the wicked and preserve the authority of the holy church." Eanbald received his pallium on the 8th³ September 797.

Eanbald
II., Arch-
bishop of
York.

¹ For Leo in his letter to Charlemagne above quoted (*Mon. Carol.*, p. 313) writes: "Coenulfus rex nec suum archiepiscopum (viz., Wulfred of Canterbury, 805-832) pacificatum habet nec istum Eanbaldum idem archiepiscopum." Of course it may have been that Eanbald had had a hand in dethroning Eardulf. The letters of Alcuin to Eanbald show that, by the year 801, there was bad blood between the king and the archbishop. (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 534).

² Ep. 125, ed. D. or ap. *Mon. Alc.*, p. 358. The envoys of Eanbald went to Rome "more canonico atque apostolico, B. Gregorii prædicatoris nostri præcepto," etc.

³ *Anglo-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 797.

Whatever the case of Archbishop Eanbald was, it greatly saddened the Pope, and he daily prayed at the Confession of St. Peter that the dispute between Eanbald and Wulfred of Canterbury might come to an end. Charlemagne had interested himself in this matter as in that of Eardulf, and Leo begged¹ him to continue his good offices. In answer to a request from Charlemagne that the Pope would send by a suitable envoy "a hortatory letter of his apostolic authority" to Eanbald, to summon him to Rome or to state his case in the emperor's presence, Leo replied² that he had already composed such a letter and sent it on to Charlemagne to be forwarded at once by one of the emperor's envoys, as his own was not yet ready. As no more of this affair is known, it may perchance be concluded that this combined papal and imperial action was as successful in dealing with Eanbald as in restoring Eardulf.

The Council, so-called, of Beccanceld, 796.

The other relations of Leo with this country may be now suitably treated of in chronological order. With the approach of the ninth century and its Danish inroads, the glory of the Anglo-Saxon, which was at its height during the seventh and eighth centuries, began to set. With the general confusion in the civil order, disorders were increasing in the ecclesiastical. One of these was the abuse of nominating laymen to be superiors of monasteries. This breach of the canons Ethelheard, the Archbishop of Canterbury, condemned "by the command³ of Pope Leo" in a synod at 'Beccanceld' (or really at Clovesho in 803), declaring that whoever did not observe "this decree of God, and of our Pope, and of us," would be

¹ Cf. the letter oft quoted above—viz., Ep. Leo., ap. *Mon. Car.*, 311-5.

² *Ib.*

³ *Anglo-Sax. Chron.*, ad an. 796. Cf. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. pp. 517 and 545. As this decree of Ethelheard is practically the same as one issued by him at Clovesho in 803, it would seem that this council of 'Beccanceld' is no other than the council of Clovesho.

