

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1864.

No. II.

By D. E. Paul

ART. I.—*Platonis*, et quæ vel Platonis esse feruntur, vel Platonica solent comitari, Scripta Græce omnia, ad Codices Manuscriptos recensuit, variasque inde Lectiones diligenter enotavit IMMANUEL BEKKER. Eleven volumes, 8vo. London, 1826.

The Works of Plato, viz., his fifty-five Dialogues and twelve Epistles, translated from the Greek, by FLOYER SYDENHAM, and THOMAS TAYLOR, with occasional Annotations and copious Notes. Five volumes, quarto. London, 1804.

The Works of Plato; a new and literal version, chiefly from the text of Stallbaum. By HENRY CARY, M. A., HENRY DAVIS, M. A., and GEORGE BURGESS, M. A. Five volumes, 12mo. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1848.

To most of the editions of the works of Plato are prefixed brief sketches of the philosopher's life. The edition of Bekker contains four of these biographies in Greek, viz., those by Diogenes Laertius, Suidas, Hesychius the Milesian, and Olympiodorus. The edition of Taylor has the sketch by Olympiodorus, translated into English. The translators of Bohn's edition propose to give, in an additional volume, what they call, "the three existing lives of the philosopher, and the introduction of Alcinous, all for the first time translated into English." Some of these have certainly been translated into English; whether all, we are not able to say.

By Rev. J. C. Moffat D.D.

ART. II.—*History of Latin Christianity*; including that of the Popes, to the pontificate of Nicholas V. By HENRY HART MILMAN, Dean of St. Paul's. 8 vols. 12mo. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1860.

THE Christian church, during the first three hundred years, or thereby, although consisting of a great number of free communities, under no external control going to enforce conformity to a common standard, made the nearest approach to a perfect catholicity. Heretics and schismatics there were, but not in such strength as seriously to impair the general harmony. In the next hundred years, it presented itself under the external form of a completely organized government, regulating both doctrine and discipline, covering the whole Roman empire, and recognising one common head in the emperor.

Those two periods are one as belonging to the true church catholic, by the term *catholic* distinguishing the great community adhering to a common scriptural faith, from dissentients in doctrine or discipline. Meletians, Donatists, and other schismatics, were comparatively small bodies; and the Arians, who were numerous, never separated from the rest of the church, and, in course of time, lost their importance.

Towards the middle of the fifth century, that great and impressive organization began to divide. First, the Nestorians, constituting the church of the further east, completely separated at once from the catholic church and from the empire, and took up a new position, under the protection of Persia. Then the great patriarchate of Egypt went off, on the ground of Monophysite doctrine, and defended its own ecclesiastical independence. The Greek and the Latin were still catholic. But progressive error, in different directions, introduced dissension between them. Both became more and more sectional, until all fellowship was broken off. And thus the visible church ceased to be catholic, and broke apart into sections. Of those sections the greatest were the church of the further east, that of Egypt, the Eastern, or Greek church, including all that remained of the empire, with Russia and the countries lying between them; and the Latin, or Romish

church, extending to all the southwest of Europe and northward into Sweden and Norway. Each one of these churches has a history of its own. But those of the east lay under two great disadvantages. They had to deal with a worn-out civilization, except in the north, where their work was late in beginning, and was impeded by other obstacles; and they were themselves subjects of the secular government, which was either unfavourable to them, or, in the case of the Byzantine empire, so weak as to involve them in the calamities of its own decay. The Latin church, on the other hand, except in Spain, was independent; and, although the nations of its jurisdiction were rude, ignorant, and some of them barbarous, they were those in whom was the force of a young and yet undeveloped vitality. That branch of the church was destined, under God, to have the principal hand in educating the people of the future civilization. And, consequently, although its work was very imperfectly done, even more imperfectly than man ordinarily does his work, it greatly surpassed, in point of historical importance, all its rivals of the middle ages. It is not improbable that the Greek church may yet take on a reformation and revive, while the Latin, in its present type, must go down; but, in as far as pertains to their mediæval history, the superiority of interest is largely with the latter.

Latin Christianity took its peculiar features from the Roman mind and the fashion of Roman life, operating, at first, in the non-essentials of religious observance. Its corruptions grew out of the same causes, accumulated with their decay and with the introduction of barbarian ingredients, and became exaggerated and monstrous as they carried Roman practices into a new civilization of a different style. From other branches of the church it is distinguished chiefly by features inherited from imperial Rome; centralization of authority, forcible execution of law, and the enormous growth of the western patriarchate, but also by the development of certain doctrines and the incorporation of certain practices of western nations.

Roman law, when every thing else was perishing, marked the second, fourth, and sixth centuries with evidences of healthiest vitality. With it did Christianity form the most intimate relations, gradually infusing into it much of her own

spirit, and adopting many of its forms into her own government and statement of doctrine. In that union lay the intrinsic strength of the great mediæval church system of which Rome was the head.

In the Greek world, the ally of Christianity was philosophy. The result was endless discussion of doctrine, and division and subdivision of sects, repressed only by Mohammedan invasion. A catholic system of theology was thereby determined, but an effective central force could not be maintained, except in as far as the Roman spirit was transferred to Constantinople. And that never went the length of reducing to obedience the great patriarchates of earlier foundation.

In the west, subtlety of discussion did not mark the early history of the church. But, there, the power of a central authority continued to increase, until it became a compulsion resting upon all classes of society. Before the civil law began to suffer diminution of its authority, the canon law was rising to a place beside it, when the western church alone was in condition to give it full effect and free development. And, what was of far more importance, the organization of the church had taken its structure from that of the state, and the spirit of its government was to a large extent adopted from that of Roman dominion. The real origin of Romanism in the church was Romanism in the state. St. Peter's chair was an after-thought, a fabrication to suit the circumstances. Rome's domination in the church of mediæval times was simply the offspring of Rome's dominion in the empire of ancient times. The question is no longer either mysterious or doubtful. Although we cannot discern the person of every successive bishop of that church, from the beginning, the general outline of its history is sufficiently plain.

In the early days of Christianity, the church, in any one city, was a small body. As it increased in numbers, it extended its organization over all, not by repeating itself, but by expanding. The idea of setting off new churches in other parts of the city, upon the model of the original church, and thereby perpetuating its simplicity of government, does not seem to have occurred to the early Christians. The method pursued by them was that which people would most naturally

adopt, without forecast or experience of its evils. They presumed that the church of one city must continue to be one. And when its members became too numerous to meet in one house, new congregations were assembled, and presbyters appointed in them, as belonging to, and carrying out its organization. It was the stem, and they were the branches, viewed as not having separate roots of their own, but as drawing their organism from it. There was only one church in one city, no matter how many congregations it might expand into.

It followed, almost inevitably, that the pastor of the original congregation became the presiding officer of the whole body of presbyters, and that the importance of his position increased with the number of congregations into which his church expanded. As he had become, in the first instance, sole pastor, by the act of his fellow-elders, who were also his co-pastors, gradually devolving the whole burden of duty upon him, or by the adoption of such an arrangement for convenience; so when other congregations arose out of his, their teaching elders still looked to him as in some sense their superior.

Christianity was first planted in cities, and the practices of the large city churches were naturally imitated in the smaller. And when congregations were formed in the suburbs of a city, what model more naturally followed than that of the system within the city? They were mission churches, still holding a filial relation to the original church within the walls.

The first bishop of Rome was, of course, like every other first bishop in those times, the pastor of a single congregation. Diocesan grew out of parochial episcopacy by such imperceptible process that it is perhaps impossible, in the case of any branch of the church, to say at what date the change was made, no historic importance being attached to the first step, and every succeeding one being not a change, but simply an extension of one already made.

When this system had fairly taken shape and grown to be familiar in the great cities and their vicinities, it was but consistent to appoint also a presiding bishop over a number of co-ordinate congregations in the little towns and villages in a district, and to carry out there the method of the city, and deny, for the sake of distinction, the title of bishop to all except to the pre-

siding bishop. When this step was reached, and the church reached it more or less completely about the middle of the third century, it is clear that a new ecclesiastical order had been created.

At that date there were great irregularities in the system; some bearing the name of bishop were still pastors of only one congregation, some were presiding ministers of several, and some had clergy bearing the title of bishop in congregations belonging to their charge, over whom they were beginning to arrogate the rights of a superior rank.

The church had admitted all this, not because it was scriptural, but supposing that it would be expedient. But now a lengthened debate arose on the pretensions of some bishops to superior rank.

Among the great cities, there were a few distinguished for political or commercial influence, or both. Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Alexandria, Rome, were from early time seats of flourishing churches. They were cities conspicuous for political or commercial importance. A church in such a city, if known at all to the general public, was necessarily more extensively known and observed than it would have been in any smaller or less important place. Among such conspicuous places the capital of the empire, of course, was the most conspicuous; and next to that must be the greatest commercial depot of the empire—provided the churches in them flourish only proportionately to the churches elsewhere. Accordingly, we find that Rome and Alexandria soon take their places as the most central points of ecclesiastical influence; and when the honours of the capital are divided between Rome and Constantinople, the honours of ecclesiastical distinction are divided also.

The Petrine character which has been claimed for the church of Rome, as another argument for its historic relation to Peter personally, is also a matter of growth subsequent to the days of the apostles; and is no less truly the native fruit of Rome. In no scriptural mention of that church does any peculiar Petrine feature appear, nor in the genuine writings of Clement, the first of post-apostolic authors, whose writings touch the matter. So far, the religious style is rather that of Paul. Nor does any thing peculiarly Petrine manifest itself in that church

until subsequent time, when other agencies, going to produce that same style of religion, had for at least two or three generations been at work. The practical and legal habits of Roman life and thought naturally gave forth such fruits, and when that style of doctrine was formed, it was a matter of course to seek authority for it in an apostle. And in that type into which the Roman church naturally grew, there is abundant reason for its preferring the authority of Peter rather than of Paul, so that when it had assumed that type, it was a matter to be expected that it should, after some way or another, claim the sanction of Peter, and overlook that of Paul, who had really so much to do with its instruction. By the latter part of the second century this character was already formed, and corresponding claims were beginning to be put forth. Accordingly, it is in the latter part of the second century that we first hear of the connection with Peter and of the presence of Peter in Italy. The first intimation of the thing occurs in a very dubious passage of Dionysius of Corinth, written about a hundred years after the death of Peter, and quoted more than a hundred and fifty years later by Eusebius. And of three assertions implied in that passage two we know to be erroneous, to such a degree that if we did not know better from other sources, we should be misled by them. And Dionysius himself bitterly complained of the way in which his writings were interpolated and their meaning altered. The claim of being founded by Peter became more common in the Roman church as the distance of time increased, and as it became less easy to be refuted. In short, there is no such basis for that claim, as history can rely upon: while on the other hand, the growth of all that constitutes Romanism is most clearly traceable to Rome.

By one step after another in the progress of conversion, the churches and pastors of the great cities increased in authority. Early Christians recognised only one church in one city. And such was inevitable, both in the nature of Christian affections and the universal style of government in the empire. The Roman municipal system prescribed such an organization. In the Roman system of government the municipal idea ruled so strongly as almost to forbid any other. Christianity, from the beginning accepted it in every great city of the empire. But

Rome was the chief of cities, the head of dominion, whose municipal system was the origin of the whole.

The world looked to Rome for the model and authority of government. And the church at Rome, in the first ages, largely blessed in respect to numbers and piety, became, from the almost irresistible current of events, a high authority among the churches. Accordingly, as the pastors of the different city churches became diocesan bishops, and then the bishops of the greater cities assumed a higher dignity among bishops, it was in the order of things that the bishop of Rome should begin to claim the supremacy which belonged to his city. The purer spirit of early Christian piety, by its very simplicity, held a check upon that ambition, and the recognised equality of Christians was adverse to it.

There was in the Roman municipal system itself that which fostered more or less the idea of independence in the several cities. The general government of the state was an expansion of the municipal, maintained by the imperial authority and support of the army. But early Christianity was possessed of no elements corresponding to these latter, and consequently had no organization comprehending the whole, and recognised no ecclesiastical emperor. Thus, while bishoprics arose in all great cities—and Rome was the greatest—no superiority of one city church was admitted over another city church in the earlier times. But under such a system of civil government as that of the imperial, it was in the nature of secular corruption that the church should approximate more and more thereto.

The great cities having become the seats of such bishoprics, a similar method was, in course of time, adopted for the rural districts. In the middle of the third century, Rome, Ephesus, Alexandria, Carthage, and Lyons, occupied places of distinguished eminence in the church. An aristocracy of such bishops was already forming. No supremacy of one was yet admitted over the others, although he of Rome was ambitious of such a position. He was effectively restrained by his brethren in both east and west, and his presumption condemned at once in Spain, Asia Minor, and Northern Africa, as a similar attempt had previously been reprov'd by the bishop of Lyons.

As time passed on, the civil style of the Roman government

entered more and more into that of the church. The episcopal aristocracy divided into two ranks, higher and lower, while many of the country bishops were not classed with either, still retaining the place of simple pastors of one congregation. By that process the church was prepared in the time of Constantine to shape itself to the proportions of his constitution for the empire. Then was Christianity formally wedded to Roman legislation, and, as the state religion, accepted a division of territory and of ranks and authorities corresponding to those of the state. In some respects, both were modified under the constitution of Constantine. The state was to be less directly subject to the will of one, and the church more under the control of a few. The civil rulers of the four prefectures were to have their correspondents in rank, if not exactly in the bounds of jurisdiction, in the highest archbishops, or ex-archs, of the church. In a short time, the bishop of Constantinople, called also New Rome, began to advance claims to a higher authority than the rest. Because his was the imperial city, he ought to hold imperial authority in the church. The claim was favoured by some of the emperors, and was entirely consistent with the system then in operation; but could not be admitted by the bishop of Old Rome, whose see had the advantage in antiquity of dominion. When the claim of supremacy, or of the rank of universal bishop, was advanced by the prelate of Constantinople, it was rejected by the church generally, and by none with stronger expressions of disapprobation than by his rival at Rome. But it was in the nature of the transformation then going on. Into this conflict for rank none could enter save the metropolitans of Old and New Rome. It was decided first in favour of the latter, and then of the former. The inheritance of a supremacy from Peter had nothing to do with the matter. It was a contest for rank growing out of the rank of the old and the new imperial cities. The bishop of Constantinople had no apostolic succession to claim, while the bishops of Antioch, of Ephesus, and of various Oriental cities, had historical succession from bishops appointed by apostles, yet the bishop of Constantinople was the first to obtain legal recognition as universal primate. And when afterwards the same honour was conferred upon the bishop of Rome, it was notori-

ously for the sake of obtaining political support in that quarter. Between these two dignitaries the question has never been settled. The eastern and western church ultimately separated, one accepting the rule of the Patriarch, and the other that of the Pope. Very different became their subsequent history, but it also grew out of the position of their respective cities. In the Greek or Oriental church were retained the forms of the empire, but the Latin spirit still made its residence in Rome. The spirit of the Latin empire had completely imbued the ecclesiastical system of the west.

After the time of Constantine, church government rapidly took on the likeness of that of the state. The forms of Christian worship were blended with many adopted from the heathen, and with no little of its spirit, and the originally simple discipline and rule of the church, with Latin law and the practices and ideas of Latin dominion. Upon the breaking down of the western empire, a new power was found to have assumed its place upon the old throne of the Cæsars at Rome, retaining many of the elements of their strength, in vital combination with new purposes, hopes, and aspirations. While the old territorial dominion was shattered, the spiritual was scarcely shaken, on the continent. As a general thing, it was either accepted or submitted to by the new nations who entered the bounds of its jurisdiction. It retained many features of the fallen empire; its firm basis in organization; its subordinate authorities and their ramification and mutual support; its elective, yet absolute head; its mingled strength and weakness; and inherited much of that impression of power which had been made upon the long-subject populations.

It was in the coronation of Charlemagne that the papacy reached the maturity of its earlier type. Reviving the ancient Jewish custom, according to which the king was anointed by the hands of the high-priest, the bishop of Rome assumed that his see had in some way inherited that primacy, which authorized him to dispose of imperial authority; as if, when Constantine withdrew and fixed his capital in the east, he had left the ruling power of the west resident in the bishop of Rome, or at his disposal.

According to that view, the Pope was superior to the highest

secular authorities, even in secular affairs. And in the circumstances of the case there was much to justify that view to the popular mind of the time. Rome had never ceased to be held as the seat of dominion in the west. And when the emperor withdrew, the bishop inherited the prestige. From the days of Theodosius, at least, the bishop had been the chief authority there. He had, moreover, been constrained by the force of circumstances to exercise the functions of a civil as well as of an ecclesiastical ruler. And some of the bishops had also evinced very superior ability on such occasions. Rome and the vicinity learned to look to the bishop as their chief magistrate.

At the basis of this new power lay a crude composite idea formed of elements Hebrew, Heathen, and Christian, put together without any original intention to mislead, or to justify error, and, indeed, without any determinate purpose, by the force of circumstances unforeseen. Many to this day fail to discriminate between the dead types and the living truth which they typified. Heathen Rome had been accustomed to a splendid religious ritual, at the head of which was the high-priest; the high-priest of the Jews had been a chief power in the Jewish state, not always second to the king, sometimes his superior, and latterly held the place of king. Christianity had now taken the place of both, and, accordingly, the bishop of the old imperial city became, in the growth of this idea, a Pontifex Maximus, better entitled to all the honours and power of the office than either of his predecessors. Then the tradition that Peter founded the church at Rome was magnified into a claim of supremacy over the churches. And from the doctrine of supremacy in the church, the crude thinking of that time inferred a right to supremacy in the state. Because, it was assumed, the state is only an institution of man's device, and the church is appointed of God, therefore the church is higher than the state, and all the authorities of the state ought to be subject to the chief authority of the church. Pepin's application for papal sanction in usurping the throne of France, and Charlemagne's acceptance of the imperial crown at the hand of a Pope, went to mature and confirm the notion. There was no solid basis for it, no written documents upon which the claim could be

authoritatively established and defended in case of attack. For the time, popular conviction served the purpose. But by-and-by that lack was made up. A document professing to be from the hand of Constantine the Great was fabricated, in which that monarch appears as conferring all his western dominions, with all their honours, upon the Pope, that the papal may be superior to the imperial dignity, and somewhat later, though published earlier, came forth the papal decretals, professing to be original productions of popes of the first three centuries, embodying all the highest pretensions to absolute authority over the churches. And the right of the popes to civil, as well as to ecclesiastical sovereignty, was established on written documents professedly coming down from what were deemed the proper sources. It is a remarkable testimony to the state of intelligence in the middle ages, that those barefaced and clumsy fabrications passed as genuine, even with the most learned, for hundreds of years.

From the recognition of Pepin as king of France, in the middle of the eighth century, until the latter part of the ninth, the papacy was well sustained by the ability of the popes, and the general recognition of their authority by the western emperors and the people. Pepin, Charlemagne, and Lewis, were docile sons of the church, and the subsequent division of their empire conferred the greater proportionate power upon the papacy, which maintained its integrity. This was the first period of papal supremacy over the western, or Latin church, and by far the most successful in the enjoyment of authority neither overstrained nor resisted. It consisted of a little over one hundred years.

The Christian mind of the west was fully disposed to admit and sustain all the claims which the papacy yet put forth, and to bow with unqualified reverence to the Pope, as the divinely commissioned head of the church. Never were popes seated on a more secure and peaceful throne than that which they occupied from the middle of the eighth to the latter part of the ninth century. But security gave occasion to presumption. The papal chair had become one of the highest objects of worldly ambition. Party tactics were employed in disposing of its honours and emoluments. Persons were thereby elevated to the sacred

office who were every way unqualified. The degeneracy was rapid and continued long. Papal elections fell into the hands of the basest parties. For one hundred and fifty years they were controlled by almost any other motive than the interest of the church, and during the greater part of that time by a party in which certain lewd women were the chief actors. A century and a half of papal profligacy, with hardly an exception, save the four years of Sylvester II., must have shaken its dominion more seriously had it occurred at any other period. But the state of popular intelligence was at its lowest ebb. The most humble degree of scholarship was rare. A man who could read a foreign tongue, or knew a little mathematics, was thought to be in league with the devil. News travelled slowly and reached very few points. The priest of a parish, the bishop of a diocese, was the immediate object of reverence to his people. The ecclesiastical system was strong in its own laws and practices, and went on of itself. The Pope was conceived of as far away in Rome, a sort of mythical perfection, and the head of all. But of his personal character, or the moral and religious nature of his immediate surroundings, the great public were slow to learn any thing. And thus the companions of debauchees and the favourites of harlots occupied the seat of authority in the church, and received the allegiance and reverence of Christian Europe. But even in the tenth and eleventh centuries, such a course of profligacy could not be carried to such a length without impairing the authority to which it belonged, and gradually sending its reputation abroad, to some extent, among the nations. In Italy the scandal became notorious, and it soon spread into the adjoining portions of Germany. Papal elections had been entirely in the hands of Italian parties, mostly of Rome and its vicinity. The emperor was induced to interpose, and put a check upon their shameless proceedings. Some improvement in the character of the popes was effected thereby. But the Romans became jealous, and a conflict arose between them and the emperor, in the course of which sometimes one and sometimes the other prevailed; and sometimes the conflict between them was fully as disgraceful as the preceding pornocracy.

Such corruption at the head was not without injurious effects

upon the whole body of the church. It was indispensable to the dignity and perpetuation of the papal power that vigorous measures of reform should be adopted. The appointment of German popes, and the interference of the German emperor, were also unpopular at Rome. The work of reforming the elections, and restoring the papacy to its place of former respectability, was undertaken by Hildebrand, a young Roman monk, who appears in history in connection with the pontificate of Gregory VI. and as a leader in the Italian party. Four great objects did he propose to himself and consistently keep in view throughout his public career: namely, to reform the papal elections and regulate them on firm ecclesiastical principle; to complete the organization of the clergy, and make the whole dependent upon Rome and separate from ordinary social relations; to wrest all ecclesiastical authority out of the hands of laymen, and to establish the supremacy of the papacy over both church and state. His success, although far from complete within his own lifetime, was certainly surprising; and his policy, consistently followed by others, ultimately realized almost the whole design. Circumstances, both internal and external, were favourable, and the ambition of a long series of gifted popes improved them to the utmost. And the culmination of all was reached in the peculiarly fortunate pontificate of Innocent III. His successor, Honorius III., peacefully enjoyed the fruit of that success. That summit of prosperity extended to about thirty years. Then, and then alone, did the papacy really seem to approximate to the summit of its ambition. Monarchs and nobles of the west were either docile, or were reduced to obedience; the clerical organization was in the utmost completeness it ever attained; the papal cause was sustained and defended by the ablest class of scholastic theologians; the canon law had reached the verge of maturity in the recently published Decretum of Gratian, in which the papacy was at last furnished with a scientific code of its own, a rival to the civil law; the crusades were still hopeful, and by the misdirection of the fourth, Constantinople had been brought under Latin rule, and for a time furnished to the Pope plausible ground for treating the Patriarch as a subject. Moreover, the great mass of the nations was so deeply sunk in ignorance and superstition as to be entirely sub-

missive, and the most reliable allies of the Pope in giving effect to his authority. An exception, it is true, there was. In that belt of country, running from the Pyrennees, round the gulf of Lyons to the Alps and the valley of the Po, a young literature was rising in the form of popular song, associated with views of the religion of Christ somewhat simpler than those presented by Rome. By order of Innocent III. the alarming freedom was extinguished in blood and desolation. And yet, terrific as it was, that crusade against the Albigenses failed to effect its desired end. Its triumph was more apparent than real. It laid waste Provence, but was ineffectual to crush out the new life, which, beneath the frozen soil during that dreary winter, was striking deep its roots, and preparing to send forth its blade to meet the coming spring. Ere the lapse of an hundred years, the Pope was an exile in that very country desolated by the crusade. A child born in the pontificate of Honorius III. lived to see the first effective blow stricken at the papacy itself, under which it began its long protracted decline.

When Boniface VIII. attempted to deal with Philip the Fair of France, as his predecessors had dealt with many sovereigns, he found that a new combatant had entered the field against him, and that the forces formerly his own were divided. The system of which he was the head embraced, and largely consisted of a vast mass of Hebrew and heathen notions and observances, and of practices and pretensions of its own, gradually accumulated; but its great strength lay in what it contained of Christian doctrine and of Roman legislation, together with the prestige of Rome. And in Rome, at the date when ecclesiastical took the place of civil superiority, the civil law was still in full force. The canon law grew up after its example, and in the course of time assumed precedence. It was upon the basis of law that the papal see sought to erect its supremacy. And where genuine laws were not found to suit, such as would suit were fabricated. During the long period when the civil law was almost unknown in the west, the fabrications passed for real. Ecclesiastical Rome was sustained upon the impression existing in the public mind that her authority was created by law both civil and canonical. For a long time, and that the time when the papacy was strongest,

civil law, as a separate branch of knowledge, was almost lost sight of in western Europe. All that was practical in government, was that which had in one way or another received the sanction of the church.

Had the popes consistently observed the alliance of their proper authority with the civil law, their prosperity might have extended to a greater length. But security in power tempted absolutism. Measures of aggrandizement were taken on the most questionable principles of canon law. So strong and broad was the basis in popular belief that the structure long withstood the shock of such imprudences. At the summit of its greatness the papacy realized, in the ruling conviction that it was sustained by law, all the practical benefits of a real legal right. And that popular conviction was no doubt largely due to another doctrine, inculcated with more obvious solicitude, that the Pope, as occupying the chair of St. Peter, was the vicar of God, and miraculously defended from error. The local laws of separate countries could not be accepted as counterbalancing, when they did in any way differ from the universal law of the church, which was also that of the empire. In all the great claims of mediæval Rome we find this union of Christ—or rather the apostles—and the empire, the chair of Peter, the donation of Constantine—the doctrines of Scripture, the sanction of the emperor, until all finally merge in the decrees of councils and decisions of popes. In that union lay its power. The papacy, notwithstanding the profligacy into which it sank in the tenth and eleventh centuries, as well as at many other less protracted periods, never beheld a successful attack upon the system whereby it governed, until the revival of the study of civil law showed how far it had departed therefrom. And the most notable feature in the history is the weight which the public mind immediately attached to the civil law, even where it was proved to be at variance with the will of a Pope, and the claims of his order. Philip the Fair and his lawyers were sustained by the people of France, both lay and ecclesiastic. The great elements of papal strength had begun to part company; and as soon as they were publicly proved to have done so, even on a few points, the structure began its decline.

The obstinacy of Philip might have been resisted by Boniface, as that of Henry IV. by Gregory VII., or that of King John of England by Innocent III., had his cause not been put upon the foundation of the civil law, and had it not been shown that the Pope had transcended his authority as granted by the law. When the papacy arrayed itself against the empire, it committed an act of infatuation, overthrew its own natural ally, and left itself no friendly power wherewith to counterbalance the throne of France; but when it ventured to defy the civil law it committed suicide, violating one of the fundamental elements of its own being. The lawyers became its first successful opponents.

The next blow, and it followed fast in time as in logical succession, was suffered in the removal from Rome. Both were aimed at the same vital part, and inflicted a deadly wound, which, though subsequently healed to some extent, exposed an incurable weakness. The papacy can never flourish elsewhere than in Rome, and in Rome only in as far as that city retains the prestige of ancient or existing empire.

The defeat of Boniface VIII. in his controversy with the king of France, the retraction of his successor, and the removal of the pontifical chair to Avignon, wrought an immediate and serious reduction of power, which was further aggravated, at the end of seventy years, by the succeeding schism, during which antagonist popes, two or three at a time, divided the ecclesiastical allegiance of Europe, and presented the scandalous exhibition of men, claiming to be infallible vicars of God, excommunicating and anathematizing one another. The Council of Constance, in superficially healing these injuries, impaired the papal strength in another way. In assuming to decide upon the right of popes to reign, and to put down one and set up another, it declared a general council to be the supreme power in the church, which the new Pope was constrained to admit, in order to hold his own election valid. By those events of the fourteenth and early years of the fifteenth century, popular effects were produced, which the recuperated papacy never overcame. Multitudes had been emancipated from its spiritual fetters, who could never be reduced to them again; and ideas

had got abroad which could not be recalled. Demands for reform of ecclesiastical abuses were heard from every quarter, and did not cease until, as reform was not granted by authority, it was seized by force. Nearly a half of its jurisdiction thus reft from Rome within one generation failed to suggest either a purer practice or a wiser policy. The Council of Trent, called in that emergency, determined her position more adverse to reform and unscriptural than before. Reactionary influences, chiefly in the hands of the new order of Jesuits, restored the papal strength to some degree, by exacting a more implicit obedience on the part of the nations which still recognised it, and exercising a more cruel severity towards dissenters within their grasp. Furious was the wrath evinced by the declining despot against all intelligence, scriptural piety, and freedom.

But reaction found its limits, and the success of Protestant countries put a check upon violence, beyond which it was not permitted to go. The middle of the seventeenth century saw its utmost extent, and the early part of the eighteenth found it again in decline. It had leagued itself with tyranny in the state, and unintentionally, but by natural process, with social hypocrisy and practical unbelief, to degrade the industrial classes of every nation under its jurisdiction. The issue was a third disaster to the papacy. Philip the Fair had attacked the secular supremacy, the council of Constance shook the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Pope; the Reformation rejected both, and the European revolution, in the end of the eighteenth century, decided that both had been overstrained within the area which still recognised them. A revolution carried, like that, to an extreme, will always recoil. And the papacy, profiting thereby, enjoyed a few years of reactionary prosperity again, within narrower bounds and under stronger external restraint. But the reflux was brief. And the revolution of 1848 fell like the hand of death upon the staggering athlete. Rome herself rejected her Pope, as the embodiment of an obsolete system, and the feeble reaction was effected and is sustained only by a foreign army. More than once before has Rome endeavoured to shake off the papal incubus; but now that purpose has more pertinacity and consistency and is of much higher significance. Accustomed to be a seat of power, Rome

sees her importance dwindling away, the Pope is one of the pettiest of sovereigns. His sway is obsolete. Its restoration is hopeless. The state of the world is changed since kings humbly obeyed his command, and deemed themselves honoured to kiss his foot, and is not likely to return to that same infatuation. Italy, in the meanwhile, has become free and united. Rome alone, humbled under an effete despotism and foreign arms, writhes beneath the pity of the civilized world. Rome—the old imperial Rome—in this humiliating attitude before the nations whom she one time ruled, has a motive now for rejecting her ecclesiastical master very different from that of the days of Arnold or of Rienzi.

This system, of which the Romish hierarchy is the head, is appropriately designated Latin Christianity; inasmuch as its peculiar features are due to its connection with the Latin branch of the Roman empire. By those features it is distinguished from Greek and Oriental Christianity, on the one hand, and from Protestantism, on the other. It has long ago forfeited the right to be called catholic. In ancient times the catholic church was that which held to the whole body of revealed truth, and recognised all believers in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ as belonging to its communion, no matter where they lived, in the east or in the west, within the empire or beyond it, and was thereby distinguished from societies of errorists and narrow exclusive sects. That primitive and beautiful catholicity did not long withstand the union of church and state. The church soon partook of the division of the empire into East and West, and into Prefectures. Differences on points of doctrine and of government ensued. The Eastern church divided her jurisdiction with heretics, and the Western, although suppressing heretical sects, sank into a course of internal degeneracy. Before the tenth century, primitive catholicity was no more. The church had separated into Greek, Oriental, and Latin. And so far from being catholic, in the sense of embracing all believers in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Latin church had adopted a new term of communion, excluding all who could not submit to the authority of the Pope, and recognise his claims. Every succeeding step in its history went to degrade it more and more from the standard of

a catholic church. In the deep degeneracy of practice, the whole body of revealed truth could not be consistently retained. And with a traditional reverence for Augustin, the Latin church gradually sank towards the doctrines of his opponent Pelagius. The additional errors, which received its sanction, narrowed its character even as a section. The multitude of dissenting bodies, which arose in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, such as to defy coercion, all exclaimed against the departure from the true catholic standard, and demanded return to it. Notwithstanding the efforts of some to comply, the Latin hierarchy, upon the whole, obstinately persisted in making their church more exclusively Romish. And after the Reformation had proved the effect of that policy, the Council of Trent drew around them still more closely the limitations of a sect, which have been further contracted by the edicts of later popes, until within our own day, when the Romish church occupies such a position as would exclude from her communion the greatest divines and the best Christians of both ancient and mediæval times. The Latin church has long ago ceased to be catholic. It is narrowly Romish, and the most exclusive of sects. There is sound meaning in the popular use of the adjective *Roman* as qualifying catholic when applied to that system of which the Pope is the head. The catholic church must now be sought wherever they are who worship God in spirit and in truth, according to His Holy Word.

In reaching the position which it now occupies, the Romish church has departed, in a great measure, from the true object of Christian worship, dividing between God and a multitude of creatures what is due to God alone. In this respect, it differs as much from the practice of the early catholic church as from the teaching of Holy Scripture. The practice of creature worship was gradually introduced, and in the face of much opposition. Several ancient councils declared against it, and after it was introduced, a long continued warfare was waged against it, which did not come to an end until near the middle of the ninth century. The decision of the second Council of Nice in 787 A. D., confirmed by that of the Council of Constantinople in 842, determining image worship to belong to Christian orthodoxy, was one in which both the Greek and Latin churches were con-

cerned, but it took effect most completely in the latter; and succeeding centuries added largely to the objects of adoration.

At the head of this system of creature worship stands the Virgin Mary. A commendable respect for the memory of one so highly honoured among women existed in the church from the beginning. In the latter part of the fourth century it reached the length of calling her the Mother of God. But the Collyridians, a small sect who made offerings to her as a divine person, were condemned as heretics. And great numbers dissented from the use of the blasphemous epithet which was becoming common. It was one of the points on which the Nestorian controversy turned in the second quarter of the fifth century. The greater weight of the church decided in favour of it; but the dissentients were numerous enough to take from the catholic church the whole jurisdiction of the further east, from the western borders of Armenia and Mesopotamia. In the increase of veneration paid to saints and their images during the succeeding four hundred years, the Virgin Mary had the larger share, including the institution of various festivals in her honour. By one of those festivals, introduced about the close of the sixth century, she was regarded as having been raised from the grave by angels, and carried bodily to heaven. By the tenth century, hymns began to be written to her praise. In the thirteenth century those productions had accumulated to such a number that a regular psalter was composed or compiled for the worship of Mary alone. It consisted of one hundred and fifty psalms, parodied chiefly from the scriptural psalms, and applying to the Virgin Mary the epithets and praises which Scripture pays to God. The book long passed, and among Romanists perhaps still passes, under the name of Bonaventura. Also, during the same period, one day of the week, namely, Saturday, was set apart to her worship, and a special service prepared for it. It was hardly an additional step in the progress of this idolatry, when the *Ave Maria*, in connection with the use of the Rosary, became a daily prayer. From that time onward, in the Latin church, Mary received more worship than God. True scholastic theologians distinguished between the kinds of worship. To God it was *Latria*; to the saints, *Dulia*; and to the Virgin Mary, *Hyperdulia*.

But, practically, there could be no difference in the popular mind. Mary was now the Queen of Heaven instead of Christ, contemplated as the most effective mediator, and worshipped more frequently, and with more ardent devotion than God. But it was reserved for our own day to behold the crowning act of this idolatry, in the promulgation of the dogma of the immaculate conception.

On the subject of the sacraments vague notions certainly prevailed, and unguarded language was used by writers of the fourth and fifth centuries. And, as the reign of ignorance closed in, that unguarded language was accepted in all its breadth, and rhetorical figures were construed into doctrines. In the end of the sixth century, Gregory I. held that the sacrificial death of Christ was truly repeated in the sacrifice of the mass, and the forms of expression touching the Lord's Supper in the liturgies, were shaped more in favour of transubstantiation. But that doctrine was, for the first time, fully advanced about the middle of the ninth century. It was controverted and refuted by the best theologians of the time. Two hundred years wrought a great change of opinion. At the end of that interval, the same doctrine was again assailed by Berengarius of Tours, when the church, both clergy and laity, were almost unanimous in defending it. Transubstantiation was asserted to be the doctrine of the church, and in 1215 A. D. it was accepted as such by the fourth Lateran Council. Adoration of the elements, held to have passed through that change into the substance of the body of Christ, was almost inseparable from that doctrine, and the withholding of the cup from the laity very naturally consequent upon it. It was more difficult to account for the retaining the use of it for the clergy.

In like manner, the Romish number of the sacraments was the fruit of gradual growth. And not until the influence of Peter Lombard determined it, was it conclusively limited to seven, as subsequently sanctioned by the Council at Florence, in A. D. 1439.

The doctrines of Theology and Anthropology held their ground more firmly as embodied in the ancient symbols of the church and writings of the fathers, especially of Augustin; but in that department the practical heresy of the Latin church

has also been great and progressive. Pelagianism, when it appeared in the early years of the fifth century, was generally condemned by the provincial councils and highest ecclesiastical authorities, and completely refuted by Augustin, who was held by the catholic church as having defined the true meaning of Scripture on the points in dispute. Especially in the Latin church was Augustinianism accepted as catholic orthodoxy. And yet the prevailing doctrine of the middle ages tended more or less towards Pelagianism. Subsequently to the Reformation, Augustinianism, when revived by the Jansenists, was condemned, and its advocates suppressed by papal authority, under the influence of the Jesuits.

An early question touching the state of the soul after the death of the body, agitated for many ages, at last, about the beginning of the seventh century, settled down into the admission of an intermediate state. Under the schoolmen it became a well-defined doctrine. That intermediate state consisted of three regions, of which the most important was Purgatory, in which "the souls of all pious persons, who died without having made full satisfaction for their sins," were to be purified from all remaining defilements; and out of which they could be delivered by means of private masses and indulgences.

From the practice in the early church of re-admitting backsliders into communion upon intercession of confessors, the idea arose that confessors and martyrs had influence as intercessors with God. They were held to have done more good works than necessary for their own salvation, and, therefore, to have some merit to spare, which was available for others, who had too little. In the course of scholastic discussion, this idea was more fully developed and defined. According to its more mature form, as thus ripened, it presented a vast treasury of merit accumulated by the piety of the saints. Of that treasury the Pope had the disposal, and in the distribution it was reasonable that his agents should be paid for their trouble, or that some holy design should be carried forward by way of compensation.

When these doctrines were once established, and people were persuaded of the existence of Purgatory, and the efficacy of masses to rescue the souls there confined, and the virtue of

treasured merit in the gift of the Pope, the market of indulgences was fully prepared. The system sanctioned by papal authority as early as the thirteenth century, it continued in full force, and to increase in boldness, activity, and shamelessness, until the Reformation. The prerogative of God to pardon sin was openly arrogated, and its exercise proffered for money. A lower depth could not well be attained in that direction. After the Reformation, the extravagance of that abuse was abated, but the error has not been retracted nor abandoned. It is still one of the features by which Romanism differs from ancient catholicism.

In like manner the tradition, which, in course of time, was elevated as an authority above revelation, was, in the main, from the time of the Council of Chalcedon, Latin tradition. After the difference between the eastern and western churches, on the Procession of the Holy Spirit and other points, in 879 A. D., there was little intercourse between them; and the subsequent development of the Latin church became more exclusively Romish. The Reformation, returning to the old ground of the primitive church catholic, left the reactionary Latin branch in a still narrower Romanism. Although still containing much doctrinal truth, that church is now so thoroughly adulterated and sectionalized that it is beyond reformation by ordinary means. It needs to be completely taken down and rebuilt with sounder material. It contains valuable grains of gold, but so impracticably imbedded in earth and quartz that the whole mass must be ground to powder and subjected to living water, that the pure metal may be separated from the baser particles, and made available for its proper purposes.

Another feature of Latin Christianity is the relation which it advocates between the church and the state. On that point it differs from the Greek and Oriental doctrine, as well as from that which is generally held by Protestants, and entirely from the primitive catholic church.

Whatever may be said about the methods of sustentation in the early church, there can be no dispute about the fact that it held no such relation to the civil authority as to be in any sense a recognised partner in government. The primitive

church catholic had, in that sense, nothing more to do with the state than any other subject of it. But when Constantine established his constitution for the general government, the church was comprehended as a part of the plan, ecclesiastical jurisdiction was made parallel with the civil, and the empire distributed accordingly; ministers of the gospel belonged to the organization as truly as lawyers and soldiers, and bishops were a class of the nobility of the empire. In short, the church was constituted after the manner of a department of state, of which the great metropolitans were prime ministers, and the emperor himself was the head. Such continued to be the relation until the downfall of the empire in the west; in the east it continued throughout, and is recognised as the true relation between church and state to this hour. In the west a change was brought about by the dismemberment of the civil authority, in the course of repeated barbarian invasion. The church meanwhile held its ground. Most of the invaders were professing Christians, and recognised the ecclesiastical authority, while overturning the civil. And when they finally settled upon the lands of their conquest, the outlines of church government remained nearly as before. The system not only stood the shock, but, like a framework of iron, embraced the various invading nations, and moulded them to its own forms. But the head of the system, as far as the west was concerned, was no longer the emperor at Constantinople, but the hierarch of the old capital, the bishop of Rome. And very naturally, in such an order of events, did the idea suggest itself to him that the church should be the highest among the powers of earth; that instead of being a department under the state, it should hold the state as a subordinate authority. That principle once adopted, was never lost sight of. It became the dominant idea of the Latin church. For it took, at the same time, a practical shape. Not merely was the ecclesiastic to be superior to the civil, but it was the Romish church which was to wield that superiority. Every effort of the most gifted popes was put forth to secure the realization of that claim. In their success, it was loudly asserted, and often intemperately exercised, and in their depression, it was never abandoned; and even at the present time, it is clung to with the grasp of desperation. It

was one of the intolerable evils against which the Reformation protested.

Thus, while the Eastern churches holds to the superior authority of the state over the church, and Protestants either agree with them, or advocate the coördination of powers, or return to the position of the primitive church, in the entire separation of church and state, the Latin church adheres to their union, with the superiority of the ecclesiastical over the civil.

In the religion of Christ, the governing principle is the fundamental one of human society. Love to man, as subordinate to love of God, is the far-reaching law which is to shape all the relations of life aright. It is a religion formed for society. And whatsoever goes to divide, or in any degree to impair, the unity and harmony of society, belongs to the contradictory of the gospel of Christ. In the Romish church, since the earliest date of its mediæval history, the governing element has been monastic. In this remark we have less reference to the monastic orders than to the essentially monastic spirit of the Romish ecclesiastic system. Although, it is also true, that from Gregory I., in the end of the sixth century, down through the middle ages, the popes who did most to advance the interests of their see were actually taken from the cloisters; and of the men who otherwise devoted themselves with the greatest zeal and success to the defence or extension of the cause, the greater number were regular monks. The church through all that time, and through the church the world, was ruled by monks.

It would be the height of injustice to deny the value of the services done to the world by monks during the middle ages; but it was a woful state of the world which had need of them: and it was a state which the madness of their early predecessors had done much to bring about.

By the dominance of the monastic spirit, the ministers of religion were cut off, as far as men discharging duties among men could be cut off, from society, and with all their interests merged in the system of ecclesiastical government. An ecclesiastic was to have no relations to the world in which he lived, except through his duties to Rome.

Eastern monachism became wildly fanatical, and betook itself to the desert. Western monachism took a more practical turn, and became an organization of celibates, separated from society for the purpose of ruling it, and establishing their system in it. Upon the basis of that broad platform, various orders arose in conformity with their respective rules of severer asceticism; the greater number, no doubt, men of piety, according to their knowledge. A few ambitious minds in each generation were enough to turn the earnest convictions of the many to the account of the worldly power, which such a system was capable of wielding.

When the monastic spirit pervaded the whole body of the clergy, and entered into all the instructions of the church, it was inevitable that the best institutions of intellectual culture should also be monastic, and the work of education as well as of religion was made a ground of separation from common society. The number of orders increased, and as long as the severity of their discipline secured popular respect, the whole system was strengthened thereby. The profligacy of the papacy, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, was counterbalanced by the virtues of Cluny. And the coöperation of the revived papacy with the revived monasteries, and the more general and severe enforcement of monastic principles upon all ecclesiastical ranks, built up the power of mediæval Rome to its highest prosperity. And consistently, the relaxation of order, and the dissoluteness of monks, first provoked the tongue of popular censure. After the Reformation, the Romish reaction was instituted, and carried forward by the new order of Jesuits, and declined in their overthrow. Their restoration attended the new reaction, and their depression once more brought it to an end. The motive and ruling power, or agency in the papal system, has all along been monastic—the *esprit du corps* of a body of men harmonized in interest separate from general society. In this respect, consequently, its spirit is directly antagonist to that of Christ.

But, enough: the peculiarities, whereby Latinism in the church has gradually compressed itself into the bounds of a section, are not to be exhausted in an article. And yet, although the Latin church has no claim to be regarded as the

church catholic, the relations which it held to the world, and to revealed religion, during the middle ages, rendered it by far the most interesting and important section for that period. It alone maintained an ecclesiastical superiority above the adaptations, conveniences, or impositions of the civil government; and, even at its worst estate, bore testimony to the existence of a religious power, which the state had never made; and, while accumulating error in its practical operations, it still preserved, in the works to which it professed allegiance, the fullest exposition of truth. In keeping up the aggressive spirit and work of Christianity, in publishing to the nations, wherever access to them could be secured, the way of salvation, as then understood, and in surrounding them by its own laws and authority, it acted as an important check upon absolute heathenism: and it always contained a great number of faithful witnesses for the truth, in opposition to the vices by itself contracted and persisted in. As educator of the young nations of Western Europe, and while remaining in harmony with them, it received as well as gave support, energy, and enterprise, not elsewhere then existing in the church: and even from the depths of its lowest degeneracy, it sent forth the Reformation.

So well defined, so naturally limited, and of such varied interest, is the subject which Dean Milman has chosen for the most extensive of his works. It is also a subject, which in all its important proportions belongs to the past. In order to exhibit them truly in its maturity, and green old age, it was not necessary to follow it into the protracted feebleness of senility. And, when speaking of a work on church history, it is not unnecessary to add that it is not a text-book; that it is not a graduated series of ecclesiastical annals, nor an argument from history, nor an attempt to preach history; but a genuine work of historic art, in which the proportions and relations of the subject are symmetrically exhibited. The author justly accepts the papacy as the centre of interest, and his guiding line. He opens with the pontificate of Damasus, but enters into the full current of his narrative only with the first half of the fifth century, a period which began with Innocent I., and closed with Leo I., the real founders of that singular power.

He consistently dwells upon those features by which Latin Christianity went on to differ more and more from primitive catholicism, and finally separating entirely from the East, became a section. The larger part of the work is properly expended upon the period lying between the middle of the eleventh century and the opening of the fourteenth, during which Latin Christianity was both most exclusive and most successful. The narrative contracts as it enters the period when councils assumed authority over the Pope, and the northern mind began to overbalance the Italian: and comes to an end, on the verge of the Reformation, when that northern, or Teutonic element, put a check upon the further development of the Latin, and seriously curtailed the dimensions of its reign. A new division was then made of Christendom, with the predominance of a new civilization, upon the basis of a free gospel.

As thus treated, the subject is possessed of symmetry and completeness; but it is not yet the whole of Latin Christianity. Its long decline, with alternate sinkings and revivings, its fierce wars with Protestantism, its futile, and yet prolonged and sometimes alarming strife with the civilization of the modern world, and the spirit of intelligence and liberality, remains, when it shall have accomplished its final fall, an interesting, though different style of theme for some future pen.

By Rev. S. Drew (of Buffalo?)

ART. III.—*Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature.* By THOMAS H. HUXLEY, F. R. S., F. L. S., Professor of Natural History, &c. London. American edition, New York, 1863.

It is the object of Professor Huxley to prove that man is so related, in structure and other physical aspects, to the ape-tribe, that both are to be placed in the same division of the great class of mammals. The order, Primates, of Linnæus, is the Professor's place of man in nature. He adds, also, the probability that man was *developed* from the ape family by