

upon all subjects; who felt a praiseworthy zeal to propagate information, and to advance the cause of learning. No society ever made greater efforts than the Christian Church did, from the fifth to the tenth century, to influence the world around it, and to assimilate it to itself."

That the Church did assimilate to itself Anglo-Saxon, Dane, and Norman, admits of no doubt; and that, to this assimilation, however imperfect, alone belongs the glory of placing the liberties of England on a permanent basis, and of creating a system of jurisprudence that will live centuries after Macaulay's New Zealander, to bless the world, only folly or ignorance would question. Any other position, as we have said, and essayed to show, is unhistorical and irrational.

MICHAEL HENNESSY.

ENGLISH KINGS AND ROMAN PONTIFFS.

England and Rome; a History of the Relations between the Papacy and the English State and Church, from the Norman Conquest to the Revolution of 1688. By T. Dunbar Ingram, LL.D.

Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment; by Lord Selborne.

IT is the misfortune of persons born in a National Church that they cannot grasp the idea of the Catholic Church. Their view is necessarily insular, fragmentary. Accustomed always to regard religion as opinionative,—for the logical reason that their Christianity is home made,—they argue about the Catholic Church as if it were only one of many churches which, eclectically, borrows some good points out of the others. In the two publications named above, we find the usual Protestant view of Roman corruptions. Mr. Ingram, who is a barrister, and who is well read in special grooves, holds a brief for the Anglican High Church Protestant party, and he does his duty to his client, and does it well. Lord Selborne thoroughly understands what he is writing about, within the limits of *ex parte* litigation. But neither the one nor the other can "take a bird's-eye view of the whole idea," because neither happened to be born inside the Church. Had they been born Catholics, or had they been converted to the faith, they might perhaps have reasoned in the following way:

The Catholic Church was founded by her Divine Lord, not for one race or nation but for the whole world. National Churches, therefore, integral in their own selves,—independent of the one supreme Teaching Authority,—are the exact opposite of the Idea, the Catholic Church. One God, one faith, one Visible, United Church is the Idea, as it is the fact, of Christianity. Now the very object of the Catholic Church being to unite all souls in one faith, the essential nature of the Catholic Church being divine, it follows that the Catholic Church and the world must be necessarily and always in antagonism. The Church represents obedience to the Divine Mind; the world represents obedience to the natural mind; hence it would be impossible in the nature of things that, through eighteen hundred and ninety-two years, the two powers should not be always in conflict. Just as a man's soul and body are always in conflict, each trying to persuade the other to its own side, so the spiritual and temporal powers must be always liable to get into conflict, since temporal powers are largely grounded on worldly principles. What wonder then that, in well-nigh two thousand years, there should have been well-nigh two thousand bitter struggles between the power which represents Almighty God and the power which represents original sin.

Yet both Mr. Ingram and Lord Selborne ignore a necessity which is at once the result of the activities of the Evil One, and of the exercise of the Church's power for his overthrow. If there were *not* perpetual conflicts, the Church would not be divine. Like her Founder, the Church is a Teacher; she instructs, she admonishes, she threatens; and when all gentle measures fail, she excommunicates, yet always in the hope of reconciliation. It is precisely with powers as with persons; with the collective force of a government as with its subjects. The Church is placed in the world to protect the nations against tyrants; to use all her spiritual weapons for their security; and, conversely, through eighteen centuries, bishops, priests and laity have looked to the Holy See to defend their liberties. Why, then, throw the blame on Catholic authority, because many natural misunderstandings have arisen between pontiffs and kings, between national hierarchies and their civil governors, between the often powerless religious orders and great nobles, seeing that the very object of the spiritual power, both as regards nations and individuals, is to bring good influences to counteract evil ones.

Nor is it any excuse to say: "But the spiritual power has not unfrequently been injudicious." Protestant critics forget that, during the Middle Ages, the tactical difficulties of the pontiffs were often cruel. Removed by immense distance from the scenes of conflicts, where feudal lords or worldly monarchs were running

riot; fearing to offend those in power lest they should injure the liberties of their dependents, and knowing well that their insistence on what was right must be tempered by at least the semblance of compromise, they were often made to seem to side with wrong from their eagerness to avoid harming whole communities. Mr. Ingram speaks of the moral corruptions of some of the clergy, such as the abuse of simony, of non-residence, of plural benefices, or the abuses in expectations and reservations, as though the ecclesiastical authorities were solely responsible for a state of things which was as world-begotten as it was infinitely regrettable. No one denies the existence of such abuses,—their magnitude has of course been over-stated, while the holy side of the Church's influence has not been dwelt upon,—yet the answer is that, for centuries, the feudal power was so dominant that the ecclesiastical power had to fight against great odds. A fair question is: If even the Catholic Church was often powerless in restraining the worldly propensities of great nobles, what would weak Protestantism have effected under the same conditions? Spiritual rule had to contend against brute force. Accepted principles had to contend against accepted facts. A distant pontiff had to decide on delicate questions, involving the class-privileges of established lords, and, while advancing every moral motive for reform, had to be careful not to foment social discord. In these days we can scarcely realize the whole difficulties of the very distant and solely spiritual Supreme Pontiffs. The refinements of pontifical tact were terribly tasked. It is scarcely fair of Mr. Ingram to bring so broad an accusation as "The Popes recognized no distinction between things secular and sacred." Such a remark betrays an animus which is unfitting in a careful writer, who should put the proper share of the blame on the right shoulders.

And another truth which this class of writers overlook is that the Catholic Church has its human side and its divine side; its human side being its fallibility in worldly prudence, and its divine side its infallibility in faith and morals. Mr. Ingram does not say a word against the divine side of the Catholic Church; he only says a good deal against its human side. And wholly apart from the fact that he makes statements as to the human side which we should pronounce to be, in mild language, misapprehensive, we may say frankly that no one who is not a Catholic can distinguish between the human side and the divine side. The points of contact between the Church and the world are so confused by the noisy wickedness of the latter, that unless a man be both Catholic saint and theologian he cannot write down the definitions of such points. We have all seen a ship tumbled about by angry waves, the captain trimming his sails or changing his course; and though we may

know that the captain is a master of navigation, we know also that he cannot change the wind or sea, and that his science, his fortitude, his pure intention are no pledges that he may not be worsted. How much more difficult is the conflict of the Church with the world; the wind blowing from all quarters, not from one quarter; deception, mendacity, trickery, immorality, all contending together in human storm; while the spiritual power has to do two things apparently irreconcilable—insist on right principles and assuage enmities. In eighteen hundred years, while these conflicts have been going on,—conflicts between divine principles and human wickedness, between holy suggestion and stubborn pride, between the saintly diplomacy of Catholic authority and the crafty intrigues of secular statesmen or courtiers,—the wonder is, not that there have been some scandals, but that the Catholic Church has come out of the long fray with no worse injury than wordy blows.

II.

After all, what was the controversy which was always raging—the controversy between the spiritual and the temporal? Was it a controversy about the *possession* of spiritual powers, or a controversy only as to their *exercise*? It was the latter. No king or noble, before Henry VIII., disputed the Church's possession of spiritual powers—including the spiritual primacy of the Holy See. The whole controversy was always, as Father S. F. Smith, S. J., has clearly put it, on the question of the "frontiers" of the two powers. Those two powers, the spiritual and the temporal, were, as we have said, necessarily in conflict; the only grounds of quarrel being "where is the frontier line?" and "who shall judge its delicate limitations?" Now it is manifest to common sense that, since the powers of the Catholic Church are superior to the powers of earthly sovereigns—superior because the divine is above the human—therefore also the Catholic Church must be sole arbiter on the subject of the limitations of her spiritual frontier. This truth was normally admitted by kings and nations, as a truth which, in the abstract, was undeniable. But where the controversy derived its bitterness was from this pleading: that the temporal power would urge that the spiritual power had misunderstood what were the exact bearings of a particular case in dispute, and on this plea would proceed to contest, not the legitimacy of the spiritual power, but the legitimacy of its exercise under a misapprehension.

It was always an axiom with the Church, as it was an axiom with the Catholic States, that temporal sovereignties were independent as to things temporal. The Church never dreamed of interfering with temporal matters, any more than did Catholic States

with things spiritual. The whole dispute was always: "is this your province or is it mine?" or to put it with better accuracy: "have you sufficiently understood the premises, to make sure under which province this point comes?" And seeing that, up to the other day, the means of inter-communication were most difficult—no steam, no electricity, not even roads—it was a matter of course that the long intervals of inter-communication should be utilized "diplomatically" by worldly suitors. It was so easy to misrepresent the real issue. Two parties in a home-suit, each employing their advocates, could manage to confuse a cause at Rome so successfully, that it is a marvel how the pontiffs could have been so well informed as they were through the centuries of such long drawn out controversies.

This point being admitted, we may now ask the question, was there ever any controversy in which the pontiffs made the mistake of over-stepping their (acknowledged) spiritual power? After reading the two books mentioned above, it is a permissible inference, there was not. Misunderstandings, and a great many of them; withdrawals of censures, not made on assured grounds; errors of judgment as to the best time or means; all such "human side" of the Church's actions may be legitimately discussed; with the conclusion that there were sometimes grave mistakes; but in all English history (and it is of England that our two authors write), we may assert that there is no instance of a Pope stultifying his divine office, by confusing divine principles with human principles.

III.

If there were such an instance, when was it? Shall we say that we might look for incentives to such "stultification" in one or other of the five following grooves: (1) in the contests of a sovereign with a pontiff; (2) in the contests of a sovereign with English bishops; (3) in the contests of English bishops with a pontiff; (4) in the contests of English Catholics with their bishops; (5) in the contests of English Catholics with a pontiff. Let us run down English history, and briefly touch on such instances, as *primâ facie*, might afford pleas for accusation.

The first contest on which Anglicans lay stress is in regard to the keeping of Easter in the sixth century. (This was before the time of the Norman kings, but since the contest is assumed to come under the category of "the contests of English Catholics with a pontiff"—more accurately of the scattered British Catholics with a missionary—we may discuss the case as included within our argument). It will not be necessary however to say much about it, for the subject was alluded to in a recent paper in this

REVIEW (under the title of "The Anglican Theory of Continuity"), and we need therefore only make the following remark: The Roman pontiffs never insisted on the abandoning of national *customs*, provided only such customs were thoroughly Christian. Thus Pope St. Gregory himself, who sent Augustine to England, charged him, "You know the custom of the Roman Church in which you were brought up. It pleases me that if you have found anything in the Roman, or the Gallican, or any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make observance of the same." And again, the same Pope said, "Where the faith is one, differences of custom do not damage Holy Church." Now this "liberality" is misunderstood by such Anglicans as confuse local customs with points of faith. The contest of the Britons with Augustine, while it is sufficiently explicable by the angry times in which they lived, was no more "a contest of English bishops with a pontiff," or of English or British Catholics with a pontiff, than would have been the refusal of British priests to wear the tonsure—like the Roman priests; to fast on Saturdays as well as on Fridays—like the Romans; or to place a cross on the front instead of on the back of a Mass-vestment, according to the "custom" still preserved throughout Italy. Not one Anglican in a thousand cares to remember such distinctions; to note the difference between national habits and Catholic faith; just as not one Anglican in a thousand cares to note the historic fact, that the British Easter was the original Roman Easter. And it is perhaps well that we should begin our survey with an example of a contest which obviously did not rest on faith or morals; for we have to show that no contest in English history ever rested upon either (that is, upon definitions of either); all contests being as to limitation of frontier; as to the over-stepping of the frontier by either litigant.

Before, however, we come to the Conquest, let three remarks be made, in regard to the early kings and the early Church. (1) In the Calendar of the Old English Church, we find the names of (about) three hundred canonized saints; more than half of whom were of royal birth or connection. Now canonization has always been Rome-conferred; and we may be quite sure that no prince would have been canonized, nor indeed any person of either sex or of any degree, unless he, or she, had been loyal to the Holy See. (2) Monasteries and convents were built all over England for a long while before the time of the Conquest; and from these religious houses were diffused religion and education; Glastonbury Ely, Ramsey, Malmesbury, with many others, suggesting memories of early pontifical jurisdiction. Now these religious houses were approved, and often endowed, by the kings in whose domin-

ions they were established. So that their existence may be said to show two things—both of them very pertinent to our argument—that the religion of early England was Roman Catholic, and that the early English kings were of the same faith. (3) It was before the Conquest that St. Dunstan, Abbot of Glastonbury, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, reproved the vices of the tyrant king Edwy; and subsequently the same archbishop reproved Edwy's successor, Edgar; and even obliged him, by way of penance, to lay aside his crown for seven years, to fast twice a week, and to distribute copies of the Holy Scriptures to every county. Now we shall not be straining a point if we go so far as to say, that such a fact proves that all England was Roman Catholic. To imagine that any Archbishop who was an "Anglican" could have ventured to inflict such chastisement upon his king, is as absurd as to suppose that a king who was a Protestant would have submitted to such outrageous presumption. To gravely argue such an "Anglican case" would provoke a smile. We therefore conclude that a king's obedience to an archbishop proves all that we have any need to prove in our argument. Just as the sanctity which could merit canonization; and the canonization itself, Rome-conferred; with the existence of religious houses all over England, were sufficient evidence of the Roman pontiffs' jurisdiction, so the bold defiance of a king by an archbishop, with the subsequent submission of that king to the imposed penance, are proof positive that the spiritual power was Roman Catholic.

We come now to the days of the Norman conquest. In the historic resistances of the archbishops Anselm, Winchelsea, and Thomas à Becket, who all warred with the sovereigns of their day, we find no contest as to doctrine, as to morals, nor even to discipline; we find only pretexts set up by the temporal power for the evasion of the acknowledged rights of the spiritual power. In the case of St. Anselm, let it be first asked, who were his enemies, who his friends? King William Rufus was his chief enemy; a would-be emperor, autocrat and tyrant. Yet even he wrote to the Pope that "he deferred to and obeyed his sacred commands with humility" . . . and that in the matter of appeals to the pontiff he only claimed that "no cleric belonging to his kingdom should pass beyond the borders of his kingdom on account of any *civil cause*, unless he had previously ascertained whether he could obtain his rights by the king's authority." This same king who quarrelled with St. Anselm, in regard to the limits of appeals to the Holy See, also quarrelled with him because he had recognized Pope Urban as the true Pope; King Rufus pretending to nominate the *Apostolicus*, just as the Emperor of Germany claimed to do so. Here was no sort of assumption of spiritual authority, or of

refusal of that authority to the chief chair, but only a vain, imperial claim to be so mighty that every one must bow down to his authority. Be it remembered that in those times, in England, there were two absolutely independent jurisdictions; each one employing its own means to defend itself from real or from apparent encroachment. The kings used their prohibitions, to prevent hasty recourse to Rome; the pontiffs, in extreme cases, used excommunication, when all other means of settlement had been exhausted. In the subsequent contest about investiture, between St. Anselm and King Henry (and in regard to which Pope Gregory VII. had legislated) the archbishop refused to allow King Henry to confer investiture, or even so much as to hold communion with those clerics to whom he, the king, had given investiture; because the Pope had already legislated on the matter, to avoid confusion of spiritual with temporal claim. The whole country was with St. Anselm in his resistance; mere courtiers only were on the side of King Henry. But the point to be observed is that bishops, priests, and laity were convinced that to receive investiture at the hands of a layman, even though that layman were the king, was the confusing of the temporal with the spiritual; and this confusion was always sought to be avoided by the whole action of the pontiffs in early times. No lay authority denied the spiritual power; no spiritual authority denied the lay power; the contest was between ambitious worldly governors, who desired to magnify their own importance, and faithful clergy who saw the danger that was imminent, and endured persecution to avoid it.

To take a later case in history, when Pope Boniface VIII., A.D. 1261, forbade the English clergy to yield to the royal demands on Church property, until the consent of the Holy See had been obtained, Archbishop Winchelsea at once promulgated the Bull. But it appeared good to the English bishops that some concession should be made, because the war with Scotland was occasioning great ravages. Accordingly the bishops represented to the Holy See that some exception might be made in the present need; and the necessary concession was therefore granted. Here was the illustration of three truisms, always transparent in English history: (1) that the Pope claimed all spiritual legislation; (2) that the civil power admitted the claim in principle; (3) that the pontiffs were always willing to grant reasonable concessions, when the whole truth of any case had been put before them.

Every one knows that St. Thomas à Becket was a martyr-champion of the rights of the Holy See; but for what particular right was it that he stood up? Now here we may touch lightly on some "legal" points, by way of estimating the sublime martyrdom of St. Thomas. "The Angel of the Church's liberty," as St.

Thomas has been well called, may well excuse us for dwelling one moment on certain of the major, special difficulties of his career.

IV.

Such words as appeals, investitures, prohibitions, provisors, stir up a confused storm in the mind, when we remember their uses in English history. More wrath has been expended over those uses, and more misapprehension has surrounded their exact force, than have disturbed any other branches of law, whether ecclesiastical or civil. Appeal is a simple word, and every one knows what it means; but we may begin by observing that the very custom of appeal proves the universal recognition of the Pontificate. In the present day there is no spiritual head of the "Established" Church; so there can be no question of purely spiritual appeal, and no question of "prohibitions," on special grounds. In Catholic times the co-existence of two headships, the one purely spiritual and independent, the other purely temporal and independent, necessarily led to occasional friction in *practice*, though seldom to any friction in *principle*. The king had no equal or superior in temporal matters; the Pope had no equal or superior in spiritual matters; prohibition meaning the preventing of carrying "mixed" causes to Rome, on the ground of their being partly temporal causes. William the Conqueror and his two sons introduced certain new "customs"—"wicked customs and liberties," as Matthew of Paris called them, and "dignities detestable in God's eyes," for the simple reason that their worldly greed and pride were in excess of their Catholic aspirations. And from their example arose constant petty controversies, which had scarcely been heard of till the eleventh century; such as questionings as to the authentication of Papal Bulls; as to the rights of presentation to benefices; as to the precise province of an appeal made by clerics: "was it purely spiritual, or also temporal?" And from this temper on the part of a few of the English kings arose the necessity for some of the pontiffs to remonstrate—as did Pope Martin V., A.D. 1426, when he wrote to Archbishop Chicheley about the statutes of provisors and *præmunire*—because "the king had sanctioned laws concerning churches, clerics, and the ecclesiastical state; drawing spiritual and ecclesiastical causes to himself, just as if the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were put in his hands." Thus both sides sometimes contended, not on the divine right of the pontiff, and not on the temporal right of the civil power, but on the points of limitation or application. The clergy too were sometimes so hard driven, in having to obey tyrants in the temporal order, while also obeying pontiffs in the spiritual order, that it was difficult for them to act with sublime fortitude. As some of St. Anselm's clergy

said to him in their grievous dilemma: "We cannot rise to a sublimity of life like yours, or join you in making scorn of the world." Just as the Catholic clergy in the days of Queen Elizabeth had to choose between apostasy and martyrdom, so was it in a minor degree with the Catholic clergy, throughout the reigns of the more worldly of the English monarchs. Yet even these worldly monarchs do not appear to have lost the faith; they only did—what is quite common in the present day—confess to principles while leading faithless lives. These worldly kings did not say "we repudiate the Pope's authority," or "we consider the temporal power to have jurisdiction over the spiritual power" (as both Henry VIII. and Elizabeth boldly affirmed, equally by their deeds and by their words); they only said: "We find it convenient for our self-pleasing, that we should determine the legal exercise of that spiritual power, which, as Catholics, we of course venerate and obey."

And now, to return to St. Thomas à Becket. We only left him that we might the better apprehend the quarrels, which the Norman kings were the first to generate, between Church and State. It was A.D. 1161, when Henry II., the first Plantagenet, appointed his Chancellor, Thomas à Becket, to be archbishop in succession to Archbishop Theobald, who had just died. (The appointment or selection rested with the king, subject to the after-approval of the pontiff.) Annoyed, that his gay and brilliant chancellor became instantly transformed into an ascetic churchman, the king was wroth beyond control when the new archbishop boldly declared himself to be the champion of the ancient liberties of the Church. The "new customs" of the Conqueror and his two sons, which Henry II. chose to call "the ancient laws and customs of the kingdom," were repudiated by Archbishop à Becket, in those plain simple words which conveyed the whole mind of the Catholic Church on the subject: "The spiritual authority of my archbishopric I hold from the Pope, the temporal revenues from the king." Henry had resolved to bring all causes into the Royal Court, equally those of clerics and of laymen; and he summoned the bishops to submit to the "Constitutions of Clarendon," which decreed these four detestable impieties: (1) the king was to dispose of all benefices; (2) to enjoy the revenues of all benefices while vacant; (3) to prevent any cleric from leaving the kingdom without his leave; (4) to insist that appeals from the Primate should be made to the Crown, not, as heretofore, to the Holy See. Armed knights, with drawn swords, stood in the antechamber of the bishops to compel obedience to these new impious statutes. Under fear most of the bishops consented. The Archbishop stood firm in his refusal. "I appeal to the decision of the Pope," he affirmed;

“and under the protection of the Catholic Church and the Apostolic See I now depart.” The king banished him straightway from the kingdom. For seven years the Archbishop remained in exile; and then, under a feigned promise from the king, was restored to his country and to his See. Within a very few months of this restoration, the king uttered the too memorable words: “Of all the cowards in my service, is there not one that will rid me of this turbulent priest?” The answer was the terribly historic crime—not surpassed for sacrilege in English history—which secured for the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket a world’s homage. And then, in the following year, the king stood in Canterbury Cathedral, with his hand on the Book of the Gospels on the high altar, and swore to abolish all “customs” contrary to the liberty of the Church, and do penance for his own share in the Archbishop’s murder.

Now, three points come out here in such clearness that it is enough to note them without adding any comment: (1) Archbishop à Becket was a saint, and he therefore knew what was the mind of the Catholic Church; (2) the Pope had the power—which the whole Christian world conceded to him—of compelling a king’s submission to the Holy See; (3) the king, in doing penance at the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket, not only confessed to his faith in the Pope’s supremacy, but proved that the faith of the whole nation was at least as earnest as his own, since he had to humble himself in the eyes of all his subjects.

Let us now take a glance at another instance of a similar kind—the contest of King John with the Holy See. Perhaps, in this instance we shall trace, even more emphatically, the faith of all Christendom as well as of Britain. The archbishopric of Canterbury being vacant, some of the monks, at the king’s command, elected as primate John de Gray, while another party in the same monastery chose their sub-prior, Reginald, and sent him to Rome for confirmation. The pontiff rejected both candidates, and chose in their stead Stephen Langton, whom he consecrated A.D. 1207. John swore that Langton should never re-enter England, and proceeded to seize the lands of the monks of Canterbury. He threatened to pluck out the eyes and to cut off the noses of all who should go to Rome to make appeal; and so mad was he in his hatred of holy things, that the pontiff, as the only resource that was left to him, placed the kingdom of England under an interdict.

For six years two national evils went on—the one the spiritual consequences of the interdict, the other the king’s tyranny over his subjects. At length, the pontiff excommunicated the rebel king, who, being worsted in his battle with Philip of France, had

to submit to the conditions which were imposed upon him. Standing in the open air, outside the west door of the cathedral, the king swore to abolish all the "new customs," and to restore the ecclesiastical laws of St. Edward. The cathedral doors were then thrown open to the faithful—the first time after six years of interdict—and High Mass was celebrated in thanksgiving.

Shortly afterwards the English barons exacted from King John the "Great Charter," which was to secure English liberties. Of this Charter, it suffices to name only the concessions which, directly or indirectly, affected religion; namely, that the Church was to be free in all things spiritual, and to enjoy her old liberties as before the Conquest. Needless to enter here into the story of the misunderstanding between the Pontiff, the king, and his barons, or to detail the horrors of the king's enmity against the bishops, the barons, and the poor monks; the wretched tyrant died in the heat of his antagonism, so that peace came by his death to the Church and nation. We trace here, as in the instance of St. Thomas à Becket, the grand historic fact of English faithfulness. We are told by Anglican writers—of whom we have specially referred to two—that the Reformation was but a recurrence to that demand for freedom which was almost national in its range and its emphasis, for, did not the conqueror, his two sons, Henry II., and King John, all try to get the better of the pontiff? Shallow reasoning! The kings referred to represented only themselves; they did not represent the clergy, the people, or even the barons; their only supporters were the worldly courtiers who looked for favor, or the unmanly minority who preferred perfidy to persecution. But let us go a little into the details of this last controversy between King John and his clergy and the pontiff: (1) The pontiff claimed the right, and had the power, to choose whom he would for an English primate. (2) The pontiff claimed the right and had the power, to put England under an interdict for six years. (3) King John had to submit to the spiritual power, *because* the whole English nation believed in it. (4) The barons, when they insisted on "Magna Charta," insisted also on the spiritual *and* temporal liberties which the Church had enjoyed before the Conquest. (5) The barons and the people, like the bishops and the clerics, were all agreed as to the two main points in dispute—that the spiritual power was independent of the temporal power; and that the spiritual power must determine its own limits. Nor can any one justly accuse the spiritual power of having been tyrannical; for, its efforts were wholly in the direction of securing popular liberties, as had been the case in Henry the Second's quarrel with St. Thomas à Becket, or William Rufus's, or Henry the First's quarrel with St. Anselm.

V.

But *all* the English kings were not wilful ; the majority of them were faithful to their religion. Mr. Ingram—whose book has been briefly noticed—assumes that the pontiffs were often encroaching on the temporal power ; so that the temporal power had often to act on the defensive. In the same way, Lord Selborne seems to start with a sort of postulate, that the Holy See needed always to be kept in check. A good many English Catholic kings thought otherwise. We might do well, perhaps, to go back to pre-Norman times ; to the often disturbed but always loyal “ Early English Church.” We have already said something about these times, but they are so instructive that we may do well to recur to them. Just before the Norman conquest—we may take instances as they occur to us—Catholic Wales set the world good examples. “ Howel the Good ” went to Rome to beg of the Pope a benediction on his new laws, ecclesiastical and civil. And, not far off, the Dukes of Brittany, about the same period, paid such obedience to the Head of God’s Church that their ambassadors put on record this declaration : “ Our forefathers, from the hour they became Christians, were never guilty of apostasy ; they lived up to Rome’s laws ; and to the commands of the Roman See they never offered opposition.” The kings also of the Saxon Heptarchy were always loyal—the exceptions were so rare that they proved the rule. “ I, Wiltred, an earthly king, . . . forbid to all kings our successors, and to ealdormen and all laymen, any lordship whatever over the churches.” And so, too, Kenulf, King of Mercia, wrote that he deemed “ it fitting to incline the ear of his obedience, with all due humility, to the pontiff’s holy commands.” The Anglo-Saxon “ Chronicle ” says that, A.D. 780, “ King Alfwold sent to Rome for a Pall and invested Eanbald as archbishop.” Moreover, a score of witnesses attest that the Pope’s writ ran in England and that the Saxon hierarchy executed it religiously. Ten kings of the Saxons crossed the Alps to pay homage to the Supreme Ruler of the Church : Cœadwalla, Ine, Offa, Cœnred, Offa, Siric, Burhed, Eardulf, Ethelwulf, and Canute the Dane. So also did the Queens Frythogithe and Ethelburga. King Cœadwalla went to Rome to be baptized. The Anglo-Saxon “ Chronicle ” notices that, A.D. 853, “ King Ethelwulf sent his son Alfred to Rome, and Pope Leo consecrated him king and took him for his son at confirmation.” St. Edward, the last of the Saxon kings, being unable to go to Rome, begged a commutation of his vow from the Holy See, and the result was the historic Westminster Abbey. It should be mentioned that, A.D. 808, Eardwulf, King of Northumbria, being deposed, went to Rome to plead his cause with the Pope, and the

Pope sent his legate back with the restored king. Bede says that the Roman pilgrimage—a pious practice in early times, though accompanied by fearful hardships and risks—was accomplished by crowds, noble and ignoble; and always, too, with the commendation of the king. It is told also in the “Chronicles” that for some reason, in 889, no Roman pilgrimage was made, “except that King Alfred sent two couriers with letters.” And while we are thinking of Saxon times, let it be mentioned that Kings Egbert and Oswy—so says Bede—“sent presents to the Apostolic Pope, and many presents of gold and silver.” So, too, King Kenulf, of Mercia, despatched to Rome an annual sum of 365 mancuses, to “support the poor and to supply oil for the numerous lamps in St. Peter’s.” Ethelwulf, King of Wessex, lavished gifts on the pontiffs, and sent four dishes of silver gilt for Pope Benedict III.; and in his last will he ordered a continuance of his gifts, “in honor of St. Peter, specially to buy oil for the lights of the church.” The Anglo-Saxon “Chronicle” records that the alms of King Alfred were carried four times to Rome with much ceremony; and William of Malmesbury writes that King Ethelwulf “went to Rome and there offered to St. Peter that tribute which England pays to this day;” alluding to what we now call Peter’s Pence. King Canute, the Dane, was inexorable as to this Roman money, enjoining his subjects to pay “the Peter’s Pence, according to the ancient law,” the legislation of the last of the Saxon kings mentioning “half a mark” as the tax to be imposed by “Danish law,” payment to be received between the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul and the festival known as *Ad vincula*.

Now, all this was before the time of the Norman Conquest, when the “new customs,” so much approved by Anglican writers, were supposed to curb the Anglo-Roman communications. They did not curb them. The communications went on as in the old time. Besides, William the Conqueror was not so bad as he is painted. Collier, the Anglican historian, says that, “though he took care to make the most of his crown, and, it may be, strained his prerogative too far upon the Church in some cases, yet he never carried the point so far as to depose any Bishop.” Nor did the Conqueror ever interfere with the Church’s liturgy or doctrine, or with the exercise of her purely spiritual discipline; he only “parted the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions,” ordering that “no cause relating to the discipline and government of the Church should be brought before a secular magistrate.” And so satisfied was the pontiff with William’s loyalty to the Holy See that he wrote to him in the most flattering terms. Indeed, the Conqueror appears to have alternated between admirable loyalty and worldly pride. His two sons leaned rather to the worldly pride. Still, even they

never disputed the Pope's supremacy. Had we space to run down the line of English kings we should find that, with but very few exceptions, they all admitted, and also acted upon, Catholic principles, their only temptation being to exaggerate their own sovereignty by claiming the right to define papal limitations.

VI.

There can be no better proof that "the temporal" and "the spiritual" were always kept distinct in Catholic times, and that the kings of the middle ages never presumed to touch the spiritual,—and so preserved the Catholic unity of belief,—than the clean sweep of Catholic doctrine which followed on the Reformation, which was the usurpation of the spiritual by the temporal. As long as the English kings obeyed the Pope in things spiritual (merely showing a little temper in their diplomacy), doctrine was never touched in the least particular; but the moment the Pontiff's primacy was repudiated, away went the whole body of Catholic truth. Mr. Ingram is our authority for this last fact, though he fails to draw the inference which should be patent. He says: "The whole outward aspect of religion was altered, as it were, *in a moment*, and the ancient practices, however innocent and inoffensive, were banned as superstitions. Customs and ceremonial consecrated by immemorial antiquity, and endeared by a thousand associations, were scornfully repressed. Contemporaneously with the changes in *discipline and doctrine*, England presented a scene of havoc and desecration, never before witnessed in a Christian country." The inevitable consequence of repudiating Christ's vicar! But we may at least gather this one satisfaction from the hideous consequences of the apostasy, that they *proved* that, in all the controversies of the Catholic kings, there was no idea of disobedience to the pontiff. We may use the word *proved*, because the argument stands thus, to put it in a perfectly legitimate form: Disobedience to the spiritual authority of the Pope generated the thousand sects of English Protestantism; just as it shivered into atoms the Church of England, leaving the Church *in* England perfectly united. But no schism, no sectarianism, had ever afflicted the Church in England so long as Catholics remained steadfast to the Holy See. Therefore (1) the consequence of disobedience was infinite division, and (2) conversely, the unity which prevailed throughout the middle ages *proved* the faithfulness of kings and people to Roman Catholicism.

The strange thing is that writers of marked ability should insist that "Protestant principles" were largely English all down the long centuries of the ages of faith while yet there was no division, no heresy (Wickliffe's riot, A.D. 1360, was not a heresy in

a doctrinal sense; we might call it an ecclesiastical socialism, and it came to nothing in the way of causing any schism); yet when they have to confess that Elizabethanism wrought chaos, they wholly dissociate the chaos from the disobedience. We have nothing to do with the private "views" of Protestant writers; but we are content to take our stand on this simple reasoning: The rejection of the papal supremacy begat chaos—chaos in all doctrine and all discipline; there was not a suspicion even of chaos in doctrine or in (spiritual) discipline during the whole of the ages preceding the Reformation; therefore we assume that there could not have been disobedience, in any sense that can be doctrinally called spiritual, in the conduct of kings and people during those ages.

VII.

The recent decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (August 2, 1892), in the appeal against the judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury respecting the ritualism of the Anglican Bishop of Lincoln, is sufficient proof, if one were wanting, of the awful consequences of the rejection of the final spiritual authority of the Holy See. An Anglican bishop was accused by lay promoters of being "Roman Catholic" in certain excesses of his ritual. Barred by a statute of the Arches Court, the promoters had to carry their cause to the Judicial Committee, who referred them to the Archbishop's Court for a judgment. But that court had been obsolete for two centuries. It was, however, resuscitated for this occasion, and, when resuscitated, the Bishop of Lincoln disputed the jurisdiction of even this resuscitated court of the archbishop. He however subsequently accepted it, while the promoters appealed unsuccessfully against it. Thousands of pounds have been expended to obtain a judgment, and the judgment includes these two items: (1) The words of the hymn called *Agnus Dei* are "not likely to be abused to any kind of *idolatrous adoration* except by those who would make for themselves other opportunities for it"; and (2) It appears to be suggested that the eastward position at the Holy Table is significant of the act of the priest being a *sacrificial* one. The archbishop has pointed out that, *in his opinion*, this view is erroneous. Here, then, we have the "judicial" ultimate: (1) That there is no "idolatrous adoration" in the Church of England; (2) That Anglican priests do *not* perform a "sacrificial" act during any part of what is called the Communion Service; (3) That the Archbishop of Canterbury has expressed his "opinion" that this is so.

Now contrast this particular strife, and its issue, with any strife, and its issue, during the Middle Ages. We have these three

grand distinctions: (1) A civil court tries a purely spiritual cause; (2) A civil court decides against "idolatrous adoration" and against the "sacrificial" character of the Anglican priesthood; (3) The archbishop is declared by this civil court to hold "opinions" which are in harmony with this judgment. Needless to say that no civil court in the Middle Ages, no civil court in the days of the early Church, would have even conceived the possibility of claiming such a jurisdiction, or of judicially affirming such heresies. While as to any Catholic archbishop holding "Protestant opinions," so flatly contradictory of the Catholic faith, well, from the time of Augustine to that of Warham, there was not one who could have even pictured such insanity. Imagine Archbishop Lanfranc (A.D. 1072) who wrote, "Verily, is it not ingrained in the consciences of all Christians that, in respect to St. Peter's successors no less than to himself, they must tremble at their threats, and yield joyful acclamation to their lofty graciousness?" or Archbishop Anselm (A.D. 1092) who wrote, "It is certain that he who does not obey the the ordinances of the Roman Pontiffs is disobedient to the Apostle Peter;" or St. Thomas of Canterbury (A.D. 1167) who wrote, "Who doubts that the Roman Church is the head of all the churches and the source of Christian doctrine?" or Archbishop Peckham (A.D. 1281) who wrote, "The Apostolic See has power to set aside rights (*dominari juribus*) and can do what is for the welfare of the Christian people"; or Archbishop Winchelsea (A.D. 1296) who wrote to the Pope, "Robert kisses the sacred foot, with all promptitude to obey the papal mandates and precepts;" or Archbishop Bradwardine (A.D. 1349) who wrote, "I will commit myself to that ship which can never perish, the ship of Peter; for in it our only Head and Master, Christ, in safety sat and taught;" or Archbishop Warham (A.D. 1532) who wrote, "I neither intend to consent, nor with a clear conscience could consent, to any statute passed, or hereafter to be passed, in the Parliament, derogatory to the rights of the Holy See;" imagine all, or any one, of these Catholic English primates assenting to the wild heresies of the "Judicial Committee," or to its usurpation of jurisdiction in spiritual matters! And the testimonies of these archbishops (all English archbishops were the same) is proof positive that the faith of the nation was Catholic in every sense of the word; and that therefore the faith of the English kings must have been in harmony with that faith—at least sufficiently to make them *respect* the national faith. When we read in such Anglican books as we have noticed, that "the accession of Edward I. put an end to the alliance between the papacy and the crown of England"; or that, "At the time of Henry's accession, the Reformation was already in existence, and silently

working and fermenting in the minds of all men, popes, cardinals, and laymen" (two statements which are hazarded by Mr. Ingram) we can but think, "You wish these things to have been so, but you mistake the merely natural weaknesses of the human side of many Catholics for the interior faith and assured certainty of a whole nation. The "human side" of a good many Catholics has been always apparent. Human nature is not uprooted by the Catholic faith. Not all the Seven Sacraments can wholly obliterate the old leaven of the world, the flesh and the devil. But enough has been said to show that the entire English nation, kings, archbishops, clerics and laity, from the second to the sixteenth century of Christianity, "committed themselves," in the language of Archbishop Bradwardine, "to that ship which can never perish, the ship of Peter; for in it our only Head and Master, Christ, in safety sat and taught."

ARTHUR F. MARSHALL.