









George Seymour Holdings

D. D.

H. Mapleton Chapman.

Sept. 2. 1881.

1877

...

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Thomas Michael Loome

THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

CLEARED FROM

THE CHARGE OF SCHISM.



THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND  
CLEARED FROM  
THE CHARGE OF SCHISM,  
BY THE DECREES  
OF THE  
SEVEN ECUMENICAL COUNCILS  
AND THE  
TRADITION OF THE FATHERS.

BY  
THOMAS WILLIAM ALLIES, M.A.,  
RECTOR OF LAUNTON, OXON.

---

SECOND EDITION, ENLARGED.

---

OXFORD,  
JOHN HENRY PARKER;  
AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.  
MDCCLXXXVIII.

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

OXFORD:

PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

TO THE  
REV. EDWARD COLERIDGE, M.A.,  
FERVENT IN LOVE, IN LABOURS UNWEARIED,  
FOR THE SACRED CAUSE  
OF OUR MOTHER THE CHURCH,  
THIS DEFENCE  
OF THE RIGHTS OF THE CATHOLIC EPISCOPATE  
IS DEDICATED BY THE AUTHOR,  
AS THE FITTEST OFFERING HE CAN MAKE  
TO THE GUIDE OF HIS YOUTH,  
AND THE FIRM FRIEND OF HIS MATURER AGE.

LAUNTON,  
*Feast of the Purification,*  
1848.



## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

---

SINCE the first edition of this work was published, a professed reply to it has appeared entitled, "The Unity of the Episcopate considered" &c. I may appear to some called upon to take some notice of this reply. Therefore, though in my opinion the second and enlarged edition of my book, which was nearly concluded before I saw Mr. Thompson's, is the best answer to him, I will here make some few more specific remarks upon his work.

In the first place its moral tone and temper are such, that I feel great regret at being on opposite sides of the argument with its author.

But, secondly, I cannot consider it in any respect an answer to my book. The author himself tells us: "*The object of these pages is not to adduce facts, or to reason from them, but simply to state principles, and to shew their natural connexion with a certain great primary Idea.*" p. 124. Now the object of my book is precisely what he disclaims, *to adduce facts and to reason from them*, and by them to shew that certain principles which are now set forth, and a certain great primary Idea, which is now made the basis of the whole Christian Church, were not held in ancient times, nor so long as the East and West were united in Communion. The proper refutation of my book would be to shew by this same unquestionable evidence of facts, that these principles, and especially this great primary Idea, were held from the beginning of the Church, and formed part of the divine deposit of the Faith. My work is simply histori-

cal, grounded upon the acts and witness of the Church, and upon the lives and writings of her Saints. My challenge was plain and straightforward: viz., the claim which you make is modern, unsupported, nay denied by the whole history of the Church down to the separation of the East and West. The proper answer to it is equally plain and straightforward, viz., this claim is the ancient original claim, and these are the documents on which it rests.

I can assure Mr. Thompson that I anxiously look for such a reply: and that, if it is not made, I shall be compelled to believe that it *cannot* be made.

But Mr. Thompson's reply consists in vigorously *asserting* and *reasserting*, and *asserting over and over again* the very primary Idea which is in dispute, *without any proof of its truth*. Had he *proved* it, he would, in my opinion, have done a great work: he would have settled the controversy for all sincere persons. But to *assert it* proves nothing.

In general, however, the author keeps most faithfully to his purpose "not to adduce facts, or to reason from them, but simply to state principles, and to shew their natural connexion with a certain great primary Idea."

The great primary Idea is, in Mr. Thompson's own repeated statements, this.

Christ "gave the one Episcopate to one, i. e. to St. Peter: *He gave it to him alone, whole and entire, and then He made the rest partakers of it in union with St. Peter, each receiving it whole and entire in union with him, who alone of all possessed it in himself, wholly, and in its fulness.* The Episcopate which He gave *first to Peter alone* He conferred—not another, or a similar Episcopate, but the same—on the whole Apostolic body, *with Peter at its head*; not on that body, as well as on Peter, (for then there would have been two sovereign powers,) *but on the body of which Peter was the head—in other words the root and source:*" p. 25.

And again: "It is *not* that the rest were taken into joint government with Peter, so as simply to be co-rulers, co-adjutors with him :'" p. 25.

"*Peter was complete in himself; the rest without him would have been incomplete, as is a body without its head.* In all things else they were his equals, that only thing excepted, which *he* was to *them* and not *they* to him. One only could be that which Peter was—the centre of the system, the keystone of the arch :'" p. 31.

"The keys were given to Peter personally ; but they were given because of the character and office with which he was invested, viz., *the headship of the Church.* In this character it was that the keys were given. They were given to the unity which began in him, and was centred in him. He was no longer a common person, or an individual Apostle, but, *the chief organ, or head, of a body—the origin and bond of corporate oneness :*" p. 37.

"*The Church was built on Peter singly, but on the rest of the Apostles, not singly, but as consolidated with that foundation which Christ laid in His chief Apostle.* It is one solid mass of which Peter is the first-laid stone, *and not the first laid only, but that on which the structure rests, and out of which it springs—the stone which is imperishable, and which cannot be moved out of its place :*" p. 40.

"On it Christ placed His Church, and *on the rest only as they were in solid union with it :*" p. 40.

"Peter represents the unity of that Body, and is himself *the ordained head and source of it.* He represents that *which also consists in, and depends upon, him.* He is the centre of unity, and its origin. Unity *begins* from him, *not merely in matter of time, but in its essence :*" p. 48.

The "*ultimate form*" of the "unity and universality of the Church" "*is in Peter :*" p. 49.

"As the unity of each particular Church exists in,

and depends upon, its Bishop, *so the unity of the Universal Church exists in, and depends upon, St. Peter, or his successor :*" p. 49.

"Each (Apostle) had what Peter had, with this only difference, that Peter had *of himself*, what they had *by being in union with Peter :*" p. 25.

"The mission of the Apostles was *extraordinary in them*, and (*except in the case of Peter*) *was to terminate with their lives :*" p. 23.

"The unity of the Episcopate, as originating in one, viz., Peter, *and existing in him alone*, or in the whole Episcopal Body *with its head :*" p. 59.

"The Catholic doctrine is—that Christ conferred the Episcopate, i. e. the full and universal power of governing the Church, upon the Apostles. He conferred it upon them, as I have said, not individually, but corporately, not separately, but collectively, and *in inseparable union with Peter :*" p. 60.

"The jurisdiction which the other Apostles possessed, they possessed *by union with Peter*, but the jurisdiction which Peter possessed *he possessed in himself*. The jurisdiction of the rest *depended upon their union with Peter, not Peter's jurisdiction upon his union with them :*" p. 66.

"When the Apostles founded Churches, they did not communicate to those whom they placed over them that Universal mission which they themselves had received, but conferred upon them a restricted and limited power. And moreover, in conferring it, they did it not of their single independent authority, but in virtue of their corporate union *with one as their head, viz., Peter :*" p. 67.

"The Church seems to have been possessed from the first with the simple primary Idea, that the Apostolic body *in indissoluble union with Peter, as its head*, composed the one Episcopate, and was the source of all authority and jurisdiction :"

p. 96.

“The whole Church *is in him* (the Pope,) *as each particular Church is in its Bishop.*” p. 97, note.

“What is this Apostolic or Episcopal body which is thus supreme? It is, as I have shewn, the Bishops of the Church *in union with Peter as their head; it is their union with their head, which constitutes their corporate existence.*” p. 135.

“*The Pope is not simply a member of that body, but he is that which gives to the body its corporate existence, and constitutes it a whole.*” p. 136.

“The Episcopate is one; *it was given to one, viz., Peter, by Christ Himself; the rest had part in it by union with Peter; they had part in the whole by union with him to whom the whole was given.* Now, one of the attributes of the Episcopate is infallibility; hence Peter, *who received it as a whole, received also in himself the power of infallible judgment.* But *to Peter were added the rest of the Apostles, who, in virtue of their extraordinary powers, were all personally infallible judges in matters of faith. Yet they were so, not separately, but only in union with Peter. Peter had singly that and all other attributes, of which they also had full possession as united with him.* But as has been shewn” (i. e. asserted) “in the case of sovereignty and universal jurisdiction, no Bishop, or union of Bishops, succeeded to the *extraordinary powers of any Apostle or number of Apostles.* It is only in their corporate capacity that the Bishops of the Church succeed to the Apostolic college, and to those attributes which are inseparable from the one Episcopate; *but the Pope, as successor of St. Peter, possessing all the personal prerogatives of the head of the Apostolic body, possesses in himself the fulness of the Episcopate, and with it the inseparable attribute of infallibility.*” pp. 144, 145.

“As Christ, when about to establish His Church, set up unity in one, viz., Peter, *so when He associated the other Apo-*

*stiles in this unity, and in the fulness of the Episcopate, He did not take away from Peter any part of that which He had already conferred upon him. By associating them with him, He did not make him divide amongst them that which he already possessed as a whole; but as he already possessed in himself the unity and fulness of the Episcopate, so he continued to possess it, as well as the supreme power which resides in that unity :”* p. 107.

Mr. Thompson’s great primary Idea is contained in that part of these quotations which is in italics: and it would seem as if constant repetition were intended to have the effect of proof. Now I admit that the Idea is simple enough to understand, and, moreover, of such immense importance that the truth or falsehood of it will decide the whole controversy between the Roman and other Communions. But on what *proof* does it rest?

The proof, I presume, in Mr. Thompson’s mind, though implied in his book rather than stated, is the passage of Matt. xvi. 18, 19. On the ground of this passage alone in Scripture can he assert that Christ “gave the one Episcopate to one, i. e. to St. Peter: He gave it to him *alone, whole and entire*, and *then* He made the rest partakers of it in union with St. Peter, each receiving it whole and entire in union with him, who alone of all possessed it in himself, wholly, and in its fulness :” p. 25. And the time at which Christ made the rest partakers of it of course can only be that marked in John xx. 21-3.

Now every part of Scripture, specially of our Lord’s own words, is full of inscrutable depth and meaning, and, if it is to be admitted as a Canon of Scripture interpretation, that whatever is said of Peter in the New Testament is said of the Bishop of Rome, as his single successor, and if, besides, our Lord did *confer* in these words the Episcopate on Peter alone, whole and entire, and *then* made the rest partakers of

it in union with St. Peter, so that His words would convey the Idea, that Peter alone of all possessed it in himself wholly and in its fulness, then, if *both* those premises are true, I might draw some such conclusion from them as Mr. Thompson does.

But, in the first place, it will be seen at great length in my book, that the greatest Fathers of the Church, St. Augustine, St. Cyril, and St. Chrysostome, did not suppose the Bishop of Rome to be intended at all, any more than any other Bishop, in this passage: nor in that of John, "Feed My sheep." St. Leo is the great author of this opinion, and the succeeding Popes after him; and in medieval times it was received generally in the West: but from the first time that this Idea and its consequences were presented to the Eastern mind, down to the present hour, it has, by the voice of its greatest Saints and Patriarchs, and the acts of Ecumenical Councils, firmly and consistently denied it. I mean it has maintained that the *same power of the keys was bestowed upon the Apostles and their successors, as upon Peter and his successors: not by virtue of their union with him, but in virtue of their corporate union in Christ, their sole Head.*

I conceive therefore that the first premiss is not proven, viz., that it is a Canon of Scripture interpretation that whatever is said of Peter in the New Testament is said of the Bishop of Rome as his single successor.

Neither is the second premiss proven, for these words of our Lord do not convey any such Idea as Mr. Thompson draws from them. And here I cannot sufficiently wonder at the oversight which he makes. He supposes that the words, "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be

bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," are not *a promise* of a power to be *hereafter* bestowed, but *a power then and there actually bestowed*. Whereas the power here promised to Peter, as to his brother Apostles in Matt. xviii. 18, was *first conferred on all the Apostles together*, by our Lord in the evening of the Resurrection. So that, following most strictly our Lord's words, *we find that Peter never for one instant possessed the Episcopate by himself: or before the rest of the Apostles*. The fulfilment of the promise made in Matt. xvi. to the Church represented by her first Apostle Peter, and in Matt. xviii. to the same Church in the person of all her Apostles, was given to all the Apostles together as described in John xx. 21-3. Peter *received* his Apostolic powers in the same and no other words as the rest of the Apostles: in receiving them he was no wise distinguished from them. Those words conveyed the power of jurisdiction as well as orders, which together make up the Episcopal character. "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them: and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." The Idea which Mr. Thompson has so elaborately and repeatedly expressed is, as regards these passages of Scripture, a pure fiction. It has absolutely no foundation. The Idea which he so pointedly rejects is the very one which our Lord's words convey: viz., that He bestowed the whole Episcopate on the Twelve as co-rulers, and in their persons on the whole undivided Episcopate of His Church, under Himself their sole Head: the breath of His mouth was their commission: His Spirit dwelling in them is the pledge of its continuance to the end. They hold it by corporate union not with Peter, that is, any more than with each other, but with Him. Before this commission on the

evening of the Resurrection the Episcopate did not exist—it had been *promised* to Peter, it had been *promised* to the Apostles: but the dispensation itself did not allow of its being *given* before our Lord rose from the dead. In the *promise* He had said—I *will* build—I *will* give—what ye *shall* bind shall be bound,—what ye *shall* loose shall be loosed. In the *fulfilment* He said, whosoever sins ye remit *they are remitted*: whosoever sins ye retain, *they are retained*. ἄν τινων ἀφήτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀφίενται αὐτοῖς· ἄν τινων κρατῆτε, κενράτηνται. Let Mr. Thompson, or any one else, shew when Peter ever received the Episcopate whole and complete in himself.

As regards holy Scripture therefore Mr. Thompson's primary Idea is a mere baseless assertion. As to antiquity, the immense preponderance of its testimony is likewise against it. In vain does Mr. Thompson try to torture a passage or two of St. Cyprian and of St. Augustine into his view: in vain, by resting exclusively on one or two expressions of St. Optatus and others, and *putting out of sight all that on the other side the Church did and spoke*, does he try to give it the witness of antiquity. I do not ask any body to believe my assertion; let him bear this primary Idea in his mind, and then see if the history of the Church down to the very division of the East and West will endure it. Mr. Thompson supposes that all who are not in the Roman Communion are smitten with blindness, and cannot enter into the true idea of unity. Being a convert of a few months standing he informs us what is "the Catholic faith" on that point. It may surprise him to learn that I began this inquiry with assuming that the Ultra-montane Idea was true, and that I have been beaten out of it step by step by the sheer and irresistible strength of facts: so that no one Idea seems to me so thoroughly contradicted by the whole history of the Church down to the

reception of the false Decretals, as that very primary Idea which he asserts.

It is indeed my full conviction, for which the grounds will be seen in the last chapter of my book, that the Pope's Universal Bishopric, and all the exaggeration of power attendant on it, were introduced into Western Europe under cover of a fraud, viz., under the pretended authority of those early Roman Pontiffs whose letters were forged in the false Decretals. When five hundred years later these Decretals were found to be supposititious, the system which had grown up under their shelter was too deeply rooted to be changed: the Bishops of Rome having once enjoyed a real plenitude of power would not be contented with that moderate portion which they possessed in the time of the Ecumenical Councils. They would have all or nothing, and the consequence has been the permanent estrangement of the East from the West, and a most grievous dislocation of the West itself. But how the denial of a claim, which really rests upon a fraud, can be a valid ground for imputing schism, I cannot conceive. That which the East and we have rejected, is, not the Pope's Primacy as it was understood and practised in the time of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, but the Universal Bishopric of which Nicholas I. laid the foundations, Gregory VII. reared the structure, and Innocent III. completed the building. God forbid that I should assert or believe that those illustrious Pontiffs were conscious of the fraud: I doubt not that they believed that the work to which they set themselves was a holy work, the work of God: but it is not the less true that Nicholas I. and the succeeding Pontiffs made use of the false Decretals to build up their spiritual monarchy, and that the new principles contained in them became the basis of Gratian's Decretum, and consequently of the Church's discipline in the West.

But, when this fraud was discovered, the defenders of the

Pope's unlimited power, the great school of St. Ignatius Loyola, set themselves with unexampled energy, skill, and unity of purpose, to build up the breach. Theirs are those very clever, but arbitrary, divisions which Mr. Thompson assumes to be "the Catholic Faith:" i. e. the separation of the Bishop's power into that of orders, and that of jurisdiction, allowing that all Bishops are equal as to the first, but restricting the last to the Pope: the asserting that St. Peter's power was ordinary, but that of the Apostles extraordinary: that St. Peter had a successor to all his power, but the Apostles none to theirs: that the Bishops are successors of the Apostles only as to orders, not as to jurisdiction: that the Pope's jurisdiction comes from Christ immediately, but that of other Bishops from the Pope: that the Apostles were equal to each other in all points but one, viz., that the exercise of all their powers depended upon union with Peter, which totally destroyed their equality.

These and such like are very clever, but wholly arbitrary, and moreover *ex-post-facto* defences of the plenitude of Papal power, which was really introduced by the belief of Western Europe in the authenticity of the false Decretals. It will be seen in the latter part of my book that Bossuet and Van Espen reject in the strongest terms propositions which Mr. Thompson considers part of the Catholic belief.

Mr. Thompson's great primary Idea, therefore, however often repeated, is based on no warranty of Scripture, but even condemned by the words and mode in which Scripture describes the institution of the Apostolate and Episcopate. How contrary it is to antiquity my whole book will shew. But, thirdly, it destroys, as I conceive, the unity of the Apostolate, and of the Episcopate. If St. Peter "alone of all possessed the Episcopate in himself, wholly and in its fulness," p. 25; if "he is the ordained head and source of the Body," and "represents that which also consists in and

depends upon him ;” if “unity begins in him not merely in matter of time but in its essence,” p. 48 ; if “the unity of the Episcopate exists in Peter alone, or in the whole Episcopal body *with its head*,” p. 59 ; if “the jurisdiction which the other Apostles possessed, they possessed by union with Peter : but the jurisdiction which Peter possessed, he possessed in himself,” p. 66 ; if “it was the union of the Apostles with their head, i. e. Peter, which constituted their corporate existence,” p. 135, and if, accordingly, the Pope “is not simply a member of that body, but he is that which gives to the body its corporate existence, and constitutes it a whole,” then it is quite evident that this is not “*Episcopatus unus cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.*” St. Peter’s power extinguished that of the other Apostles, as those of his successor extinguish the power of all other Bishops. St. Peter, according to the power here attributed to him, could depose the eleven, and elect another eleven : or the Pope depose the whole of his brother Bishops, and choose a fresh Episcopate. Venerable Brethren they may be called, but in point of fact, as Van Espen shews<sup>a</sup>, they would be simply Vicars ; and St. Peter first, and the Pope after him, the sole Bishop of the Church, the “*Universalis Episcopus*” in the very sense which St. Gregory reprobated as antichristian. Mr. Thompson’s view “of the Catholic Faith” is this, that if a thousand Bishops sat in a General Council on disputed points of faith or discipline, and nine hundred and ninety-nine gave their decision on one side, and the Pope, being the thousandth, on the other, the Pope’s decision would be that of the Church, and all Catholics would be bound to receive it as such : and in case the nine hundred and ninety-nine held out, the Pope might proceed to depose them, and name others in their stead. For the “ultimate form” of unity, and all the powers of the Episcopate, reside

<sup>a</sup> See below, ch. vi. § 8.

in him singly: and they, however many, without him are “not a body at all<sup>a</sup> :” but he without them possesses the gift of infallibility, the ultimate expression of the Church’s divine power.

Now it is very conceivable that our Lord might have appointed such a government of His Church as this: I do not find the Idea at all hard, as Mr. Thompson seems to suppose it; our Lord might have willed to leave a spiritual monarch on earth as His representative, with officers dependent on him, and owing all their powers to their corporate union with him: causing the ultimate form of unity to reside in the monarch himself, as His vicar, and all power of jurisdiction to flow from his person. All this is very conceivable, but is it *true*? Is it the spiritual government of which we see the institution in holy Scripture: and the working in the holy Church Catholic? Is it that “*Episcopatus unus cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*?” That government of which St. Cyril<sup>b</sup> wrote to a brother Patriarch, “One is the solicitude of Bishops, though we be divided by space?” Of which Pope St. Gregory wrote, “Surely Peter, the first of the Apostles, is a member of the holy Universal Church; Paul, Andrew, John, what else are they but the heads of particular communities? and yet all are members under one Head.” Who said likewise to a brother Patriarch, “I beg your Holiness to call me no more Universal Pope, because whatever is given to another more than reason requires is so much taken away from yourself. . . . For if your Holiness call me Universal Pope, you deny that you are yourself what you admit me to be, Universal. But this God forbid.” Is it that government of which even in 1054 Pope St. Leo IX. wrote, that his predecessors, “considering that the chief of the Apostles himself is not found

<sup>a</sup> See the assertion of Desirant, quoted by Van Espen, *infra*, p. 437. Mr. Thompson, however, goes far beyond him.

<sup>b</sup> Tom. vi. Epist. 205. D. *μία γὰρ ἡ τῶν ἱερέων φροντίς καὶ εἰ τοπικῶς διηρήμεθα.*

called Universal Apostle, utterly rejected that proud name (of Universal,) by which *their equality of rank seemed to be taken away from all Prelates throughout the world, in that a claim was made for one upon the whole*<sup>c</sup>?"

And this brings me to another point. The *equality* of the Episcopate, the 'par dignitas' of Pope Leo IX., is utterly destroyed by Mr. Thompson's theory. It is utterly futile to divide the Episcopate into two parts, orders and jurisdiction, allow all Bishops to be equal as to the first, but one only to hold the second, and term this still, "unus Episcopatus, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur." It may be a government of wonderful power from its concentration, and under which wonderful deeds have been done, but it is no longer one in which 'unus Episcopatus,' 'par dignitas' is held by a 'collegium,' as St. Cyprian says to the Pope. Nor that of which he wrote: "No one of us sets himself up to be a Bishop of Bishops, or by fear of his tyranny compels his colleagues to the necessity of obedience, since every Bishop according to his recognised liberty and power possesses a free choice, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another. But let us all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who singly and alone has the power both of setting us up in the government of His Church, and of judging our proceedings." Powerful words, which have received the approval of St. Augustine. The Papal government, on the contrary, is a most highly centralized absolute monarchy.

Now the sovereignty of the Church as instituted by our Lord lies in that one Episcopate which He instituted on the night of His resurrection: a body bound together in corporate unity with its Head, who is Christ Himself: the first member of this body, *primus inter pares*, Peter was, but not its head,

<sup>c</sup> "Quo videbatur *par dignitas* subtrahi cunctis per orbem præsulibus, dum uni ex toto arrogaretur."—Mansi xix. 640. C.

except indeed in that derived and imperfect sense in which the Primate of a particular Church is said to be its head. The very fault with which I should charge Mr. Thompson is, that he makes the Pope the Head of the Church in the sense in which Christ alone is her Head. I reject, as much as he can, the notion of each Bishop by himself being sovereign: I cannot but wonder that he should put such a meaning upon me, which was contrary to the tenor of my whole book. But I reject equally the notion, that one single Apostle, or one single Bishop, ever was, or is, sovereign, and possesses, or possessed, the whole Episcopate complete in himself. What Peter possessed, I would give to Peter's successor, because the Church did so; but this is a power which Peter cannot be shewn ever to have possessed: which destroys the equality and parity of his brother Apostles: as it destroys the unity and parity of the Episcopate. I entirely agree with Möhler's thoughtful words, that "Peter set forth his position by his acts<sup>d</sup>," and what follows from this is, that such as Peter was in the Apostolic college, Peter's successor was to be in the Episcopal. The same author says, "Whether the Primacy of a Church belongs to the essence of the Catholic Church was very long doubtful to me: I was even decided to deny it: since the organic binding together of all parts in a whole, which the Idea of the Catholic Church demands downright, and is itself, seemed to be fully attained by the unity of the Episcopate, as it was up to this point developed: on the other side it strikes the eye at once that the history of the first three hundred years is very sparing in materials which make all doubt utterly impossible<sup>e</sup>." He goes on to view St. Peter's Primacy, developed in the Acts of the Apostles, as foreshadowing that of his successor, in the whole Church: a beautiful and philo-

<sup>d</sup> "Petrus beurkundete faktisch seine Stellung." Einheit in der Kirche, § 67.

<sup>e</sup> Ib., § 69.

sophic view, which I readily accept. But the controversy in point is not this. It is whether that Primate, having at a certain point in the Church's history changed his Primacy into a Monarchy on the strength of forged documents, which change produced on two separate occasions a grievous rent in the Church, every Christian is bound to submit to that Monarchy, on pain of being guilty of schism, because the Church once allowed and accepted that Primacy.

These remarks are sufficient, I think, to shew, that Mr. Thompson's great primary Idea is baseless, and that his theory on the unity of the Episcopate in fact destroys that unity, by merging it in the monarchy of a single Bishop: it is, to use a similitude which he has taken up, as if the defender of the unity of the Godhead should destroy the distinction of Persons: whereas the one Godhead is that wherein the three Persons are One: and the one Episcopate is that wherein all Bishops are One.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER I.

### CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH UP TO, AND AT, THE COUNCIL OF NICEA.

#### SECT. I.

	Page
Introduction. Necessity of considering the question of Schism	5
A state of Schism involves the loss of all Christian privileges	7
The subject not to be treated controversially	9
Formularies of the English Church cannot be appealed to as the law in this matter, but the decision of the undivided Church	10

#### SECT. II.

State of the Church Catholic at the Council of Nicea	12
St. Leo's respect for the Nicene discipline	13
Supremacy of the Episcopate universally acknowledged	14
Metropolitcal system	16
Order of the Catholic Hierarchy	17
Canons of the Apostles	<i>ib.</i>
Of Antioch and Nicea	18
Roman Primacy	19
Testimonies to it quoted by Mr. Newman	20
Danger of one-sided quotation	21
Essential unity and equality of the Episcopate	<i>ib.</i>
Witnessed by St. Augustine, Origen, St. Basil, St. Chrysostome, and St. Jerome	23
Election and jurisdiction of Bishops	25
Witness of Pope Julius	26
Influence of Bishop of Rome in a case of disputed succession: St. Jerome	<i>ib.</i>
Points which modify St. Jerome's statement	27
Language of St. Basil on the other side	28
Inference from this language	30
Instances of general supervision exercised by the Bishops of the greater Sees	<i>ib.</i>

	Page
Witness of St. Basil respecting St. Athanasius	30
Of Pope St. Julius	31
Of St. Dionysius of Alexandria	32
Of St. Athanasius	<i>ib.</i>
Of St. Gregory Nazianzene respecting St. Athanasius	33
Of Tillemont respecting St. Basil	<i>ib.</i>
Of St. Basil respecting Peter of Alexandria	34
Of St. Chrysostome respecting St. Eustathius of Antioch	<i>ib.</i>
Of St. Gregory Nazianzene respecting St. Cyprian	<i>ib.</i>
Episcopal jurisdiction	35
Supreme authority of Provincial Councils in the first ages, according to De Marca	<i>ib.</i>

## SECT. III.

Witness of St. Cyprian to the self-government of the several Provinces and to the Roman Primacy	38
1. Appeal of Felicissimus	<i>ib.</i>
2. Deposition of Marcian	39
3. Controversy on rebaptization of heretics	41
Comment of St. Augustine	44
St. Cyprian supported by St. Firmilian	45
And by St. Dionysius of Alexandria	48
St. Basil on the question of Baptism	49
Remarks of Tillemont and Fleury	50
Judgment of St. Augustine in this question on St. Cyprian's conduct	51
Judgment of a General Council after the Pope's judgment	54
4. Case of Basilides	55
Summary of St. Cyprian's relation to the Roman Pontiff	56

## SECT. IV.

Pope St. Victor and the Asian Churches	57
Acts of St. Irenæus interpret his words	61
Testimony of St. Irenæus	62
Testimony of Tertullian	63
Testimony of the Emperor Constantine	64
Case of Paul of Samosata	65
Deposed by an Eastern Council	67
The West could not reconsider Eastern judgments	68
Case of Marcion	69
Answer of the Roman Clergy to his demand of being received by them	70
Summary of the Nicene Period	71

## CHAPTER II.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PATRIARCHAL SYSTEM FROM THE COUNCIL OF  
NICEA, A.D. 325, TO THE THIRD ECUMENICAL COUNCIL, A.D. 481.

## SECT. I.

	Page
Completion of the Patriarchal System	73
Beginning of the Roman Bishop's power of hearing Episcopal causes on appeal	74
Canons of the Council of Sardica	<i>ib.</i>
The Primacy in 347	76
The Supremacy in 1802	77
Two great Principles of the Patriarchal System	<i>ib.</i>

## SECT. II.

Great increase of influence to the Roman See founded on its orthodoxy	79
Letter of the Council of Sardica to Pope Julius	81
Letter of the Emperor Constantius to the Council of Rimini	<i>ib.</i>
Independence and self-government of the East	82
Circumstances preceding the Second Ecumenical Council	83
Schism of Antioch	84
Council of Constantinople summoned by Theodosius	<i>ib.</i>
Presided over by St. Meletius	86
St. Gregory of Nazianzum on the feeling of the East towards the West	88
Addition to the Nicene Creed by the Council	90
Canons of discipline	<i>ib.</i>
Fleury, Tillemont, and De Marca on the Second Canon	91
Fleury on the Third Canon	93
St. Leo disowns these Canons : strong proof of Eastern self-govern- ment	94
Council of Aquileia	<i>ib.</i>
And of Italy	95
Expressions of St. Ambrose	96
Answer of the Emperor Theodosius to the Italian Bishops	97
Second Council of 382	98
Their letter to the Western Bishops	<i>ib.</i>
Council at Rome in 382	101
Result from the above facts	103
Summary of the Second Ecumenical Council	105
Proof of Eastern self-government	106
Subsequent history of Flavian of Antioch	<i>ib.</i>
St. Chrysostome ordained Reader and Priest out of Communion with Rome	108

	Page
The line of Flavian carries on the succession	108
Conduct of St. Cyril towards Rome	<i>ib.</i>
Inference from the conduct of Atticus of Constantinople, Alexander of Antioch, and St. Cyril of Alexandria	109
Theophilus Patriarch of Alexandria	<i>ib.</i>
Result from these histories	111

## SECT. III.

Testimony of St. Augustine: the promises made to Peter not as a particular Apostle, but to the Church, of which he is therein the type	<i>ib.</i>
Peter the type of the Church: Christ the Rock	113
Peter a type of different classes of Christians	114
The keys given to the Church	115
Peter the type of returning penitents	<i>ib.</i>
The keys not given to Peter alone but to the Church	116
And the commission to feed the sheep	<i>ib.</i>
Peter the type of the life of faith: John of fruition to come	117
In what sense Peter was the figure of the Church	121
Sum of St. Augustine's testimony on the Scriptures alleged to prove the Supremacy	<i>ib.</i>

## SECT. IV.

Reference made to the Roman See throughout the West	121
Pope St. Innocent and the Councils of Milevi and Carthage	122
Right of receiving Reports possessed by the Roman See	124
This right of receiving Reports not bestowed by Councils	125
The two African Synods refer one of the <i>Majores Causæ</i> to the Pope	127
The Pope inferior to a General Council	128
The Pope only an individual Bishop: his heresy fatal only to him- self, not to the Church, according to St. Augustine	129
Force of this language	<i>ib.</i>
Contrast of his language respecting a General Council	130

## SECT. V.

Appeals from Africa to the Roman Pontiff	<i>ib.</i>
Case of Apiarius	131
The Pope sends Legates to Africa	132
Great Council at Carthage of 217 Bishops	133
They declare that they will maintain what has been ordered by the Nicene Council	<i>ib.</i>
Conduct of the Legate Faustinus	134
Speech of St. Augustine in the Council	135

	Page
Faustinus requests reference to be made to the Pope: the Council orders that the Bishops of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople, be applied to for genuine copies of the Nicene Canons	135
Restoration of Apiarius, and compromise	<i>ib.</i>
Letter of the Universal Council of Africa to Pope Boniface	136
They permit the Pope's rules to be observed till they have searched the statutes of the Nicene Council	<i>ib.</i>
Suspension of the dispute for seven years	138
The Sardican Canons quoted by the Pope for the Nicene	<i>ib.</i>
Second excommunication of Apiarius, and appeal to the Pope, who restores him	<i>ib.</i>
Letter thereupon to Pope Celestine from the Universal Council of Africa	139
Maintains the Nicene discipline	140
That Bishops are not to be judged by the Bishop of Rome, but by their own Metropolitans	141
Censures the sending of Legates <i>a latere</i>	<i>ib.</i>
Inference from the above history	142
Remarks of De Marca	<i>ib.</i>
Contrast of medieval claims	143
Judgment of Bossuet on this history	<i>ib.</i>
Importance of this case to the cause of the English Church	144

## SECT. VI.

St. Augustine on the Unity of the Church	145
His arguments against the Donatists	146
His sermons on the day of SS. Peter and Paul	148
Witness of St. Vincent of Lerins	<i>ib.</i>
Agreement of St. Basil	150
Bossuet on St. Vincent's rule	<i>ib.</i>
The Council of Jerusalem the type of all future Councils	151

## CHAPTER III.

## TESTIMONY OF THE GREEK FATHERS TO THE PATRIARCHAL SYSTEM.

## SECT. I.

Importance of the witness of the Greek Fathers	153
1. Witness of St. Basil the Great	154
Letters to St. Athanasius	155
Letter to Pope Damasus	156
To Eusebius of Samosata	157
To the Bishops of Italy and Gaul	158

	Page
To the Westerns	159
To the same	<i>ib.</i>
To the Bishops of Gaul and Italy	160
St. Basil's position and influence	161
Letter to the Count Terentius	162
To the Patriarch Meletius	163
Summary of St. Basil's conduct towards Rome	164

## SECT. II.

2. St. Gregory of Nazianzum	<i>ib.</i>
Parallel between Rome and Constantinople	165
His view of the Apostolic College	<i>ib.</i>

## SECT. III.

3. St. Athanasius : mention of Roman Bishops	166
Dilemma if Hosius was Papal Legate at Sardica	169
Letter of Pope Julius to the Eusebian Bishops	170
Most adverse to the present Papal claim	171
Constitution of the Church in 362 as instanced in St. Athanasius	172
How witnessed by "the History of the Arians"	173
Pope Damasus calls the Eastern Bishops sons	<i>ib.</i>
As Athanasius does the Bishop Rufinianus	174
Supreme power in Provincial Synods	175
Passage in the life of Pope Liberius	<i>ib.</i>
His interview with the Emperor Constantius	176
Inference from this narrative	179
Summary of St. Athanasius	180

## SECT. IV.

4. St. Chrysostome	<i>ib.</i>
Primacy of St. Peter : election of Matthias	181
Bossuet's interpretation of this	182
The Rock, Peter's confession	183
The Bishop of Antioch, being out of Communion with Rome, called Peter, as inheriting his seat	<i>ib.</i>
The Rock, Peter's confession	184
Interpretation of Matt. xvi. 16.	185
Stress laid on the confession of the Sonship	186
Interpretation of Luke xxii. 32.	<i>ib.</i>
Contrast between St. Chrysostome's interpretation and the late Roman one	187
Interpretation of John xxi. 15.	188
Agreement of St. Cyril	<i>ib.</i>
General view of these passages	<i>ib.</i>

	Page
John xx. 21, a grant to the whole Priesthood	189
The Real Presence as stated by St. Chrysostome	190
The Christian Priesthood	<i>ib.</i>
Superiority of spiritual to temporal power	191
Superiority of Christian to Jewish Priesthood	<i>ib.</i>
Authority of the Priesthood above that of natural parents	192
Inference from these passages	193
Contrast with the modern Roman claim of exclusive jurisdiction	<i>ib.</i>
St. Chrysostome ordained Reader, Deacon, and Priest by Bishops out of Communion with Rome	<i>ib.</i>
John xxi. 15. said to Priests	194
Matt. xvi. 16. applied to <i>all</i> the Apostles	<i>ib.</i>
Agreement of St. Chrysostome and St. Augustine: silence as to the See of Rome	<i>ib.</i>
Letter to Pope St. Innocent	195
He appeals to a Council and the Canon of the Church	196
Duplicates of his letter sent to the Bishops of Milan and Aquileia	<i>ib.</i>
Bellarmino's quotation of this letter	<i>ib.</i>
Another letter to Pope St. Innocent, and the Pope's replies	197
Letter of the Pope to the Church of Constantinople	<i>ib.</i>
He uses the same language as to a Council	<i>ib.</i>
Pope Innocent's letter to the Patriarch Theophilus	198
Conclusion from this history	<i>ib.</i>
Passage of St. Chrysostome about Rome	199
Eminence of Rome as the burial place of the Apostles Paul and Peter	<i>ib.</i>
St. Chrysostome's tone about Rome, and that of late Roman writers	200

## SECT. V.

5. Witness of St. Cyril of Alexandria	201
Matt. xvi. 16. The Rock, the Faith of Peter	<i>ib.</i>
The Apostles foundations of the earth	202
Christ the Rock	<i>ib.</i>
John xxi. a great mystery. The renewal of Peter's Apostolate	203
The commission of the Apostles to be Ecumenical Doctors given in John xx. 21.	205
Parallel descent of the Roman and other Sees	206
Bishops stand in the place of the Apostles	<i>ib.</i>
And are their full successors	207
Proved from Is. xxxii. 1.	<i>ib.</i>
And on John x. 1.	208
And on Is. xxxiii. 21.	<i>ib.</i>
And on Is. xxx. 25.	209
Inference from St. Cyril's teaching on these passages	<i>ib.</i>
His view of the Apostolic College, on Is. liv. 11.	210

	Page
The Apostles in their Priesthood take the place of the Levitical hierarchy	210
Aaron the type of Christ : Priests of the Apostles	211
Aaron the type of the Bishop : Priests of Presbyters	212
St. Cyril's actions corroborate his teaching	<i>ib.</i>
His letter to Atticus of Constantinople	213
His language herein, when out of Communion with the West	214
Inference from St. Cyril's conduct	<i>ib.</i>
Contrast with Bellarmine's language, approved by Mr. Newman	215
Conduct of St. Cyril in the case of Nestorius	<i>ib.</i>
His letter to Pope Celestine	<i>ib.</i>
Pope Celestine's answer to St. Cyril	216
Condemnation of Nestorius, and suspension of the sentence	217
Letter to Monks of Constantinople	<i>ib.</i>
Letter to John of Antioch	218
Value of the Pope's Communion	219
Letter to Juvenal of Jerusalem	<i>ib.</i>
Terms of St. Cyril's sentence of Nestorius	220
John of Antioch's letter to the other Patriarchs	221
Interference of St. Cyril in the Patriarchate of Antioch	222
Establishment of a fifth Patriarchate by St. Cyril and St. Proclus	223
Interference of St. Cyril with the Patriarchate of Constantinople	224
St. Proclus and St. Cyril act as supreme authorities	<i>ib.</i>
Another instance of general superintendence in the Patriarchs	225

## SECT. VI.

Summary of the testimonies of the Fathers. Scriptures claimed for the Roman See	225
What the prerogatives of Rome are which the fourth and fifth centuries allow	226
1. Witness as to these passages of Scripture	<i>ib.</i>
They intimate great gifts to the Church's rulers ; silence as to the See of Rome	227
Contrast of St. Bernard's language. He says just what is wanted for the Papal claim, and what the Fathers do not say	<i>ib.</i>
Had this claim existed, it must have been set forth in the documents of the first six centuries	229
2. Witness as to the writings and actions of the Fathers	<i>ib.</i>
Difference between Vicarius Petri and Vicarius Christi : the former the symbol of the early, the latter of medieval times	<i>ib.</i>
Primacy and monarchy opposed Ideas	230
General view of the Fathers	<i>ib.</i>

## CHAPTER IV.

THE PATRIARCHAL CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH AND THE ROMAN  
PRIMACY AT THE THIRD AND FOURTH COUNCILS, AND IN THE PON-  
TIFICATE OF ST. LEO THE GREAT.

## SECT. I.

	Page
Roman Primacy at the Third Council . . . . .	231
Bossuet's account of it . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Judgments of Roman Pontiffs <i>de fide</i> reconsidered . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Pope Celestine consulted by St. Cyril . . . . .	232
His proceedings in consequence . . . . .	233
Ecumenical Council called by the Emperor . . . . .	234
Sentence of St. Celestine and St. Cyril suspended . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Course of proceeding as to the Faith . . . . .	235
Nestorius summoned as a Bishop . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Cyril's letter, approved by the Pope, examined . . . . .	236
Letter of Nestorius, disapproved by the Pope, examined . . . . .	237
Course of proceeding as to the person of Nestorius . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Nestorius deposed by a fresh judgment of the Council . . . . .	238
Arrival of the Papal Legates . . . . .	239
Proceedings reviewed and found Canonical . . . . .	240
Judgment of the Roman See reconsidered . . . . .	241
What Confirmation means . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Not St. Cyril, but Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip, Legates from Rome to the Council . . . . .	242
They represented the whole West . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Bossuet's conclusion from this Council . . . . .	243
Pope Celestine's letter to the Council . . . . .	244
Bossuet's inferences from this letter . . . . .	245
Contrast of De Maistre and his school . . . . .	246
Eighth Canon of the Council . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Application of this Canon by De Marca . . . . .	247
And by Theodoret . . . . .	248

## SECT. II.

Important Pontificate of St. Leo . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The Roman Pontiff represents St. Peter . . . . .	249
Peculiar privileges of Peter in the Apostolic College . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
All the Church's rulers invested with the figure of Peter . . . . .	250
Present government of the Church ascribed to him . . . . .	251
St. Leo's teaching to be compared with St. Augustine's . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The position of St. Leo in the Church . . . . .	252

	Page
System of appointing other Bishops Vicars of the Roman Bishop	253
History of St. Hilary of Arles	<i>ib.</i>
Case of Celidonius, according to Tillemont. St. Hilary goes to Rome : maintains that the Church of Gaul had the same rights as that of Africa : is overborne by the Pope : and leaves Rome secretly.	
Celidonius acquitted by St. Leo	254
St. Leo obtains an imperial edict	258
St. Hilary maintains his right in silence	259
Tendency of Patriarchal power to increase	<i>ib.</i>
Election and consecration of Bishops still free	260
Primacy of Rome stated by the Church of Arles	<i>ib.</i>
St. Leo's view of his own power as stated to the Bishops of his own Patriarchate	261
St. Leo's words the germ of the present Roman system, but not sup- ported by other parts of the Church	262
This government new	263
And not submitted to in Africa	<i>ib.</i>
Imposed by aid of the civil power	264
Words of St. Jerome opposed to it	<i>ib.</i>
And of St. Augustine, on Psalm xlv.	265
This government not allowed, nor even attempted in the East	266
Obedience of Synesius to his Patriarch, when out of Communion with Rome	267
Appeals from one Patriarch to another	268
Theodoret appeals to St. Leo	<i>ib.</i>
Athanasius of Perrha from Antioch to St. Proclus and St. Cyril	<i>ib.</i>
Peter from Antioch to St. Cyril	<i>ib.</i>
Eutyches appeals to Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem and Thessalonica	269
The Patriarchs the highest tribunal of appeal	<i>ib.</i>
Eastern Independence, and the Supremacy of the Canon	270
The Bishop of Rome's office in respect of the Canon	<i>ib.</i>
Canon alluded to by Socrates and Sozomen	271
Grounded on the letter of Pope Julius	272
This Canon not kept in two notable instances	<i>ib.</i>
Irregularities leading to the Council of Chalcedon	273
St. Leo's reference to the Canon	274

## SECT. III.

Bossuet's argument, and its bearing on the question in hand	275
The real question at issue	<i>ib.</i>
His account of the Council	<i>ib.</i>
The relative position of St. Flavian and St. Leo	276
The Emperor Theodosius calls a Council	277
Which Leo does not decline	<i>ib.</i>
He requests of the Emperor a fresh Council.	<i>ib.</i>

	Page
St. Leo grounds his right to hear an appeal on the Sardican Canons quoted as the Nicene	278
Theodosius refuses a new Council	<i>ib.</i>
But Marcian grants it	<i>ib.</i>
1. Deposition of Dioscorus	279
The Bishops severally pronounce judgment	280
Bishops of Rome and Constantinople mentioned in parallel terms	<i>ib.</i>
Bossuet's remarks on the mode of this judgment	281
This the first time the Bishop of Rome had presided at an Ecumenical Council	282
2. Examination of Pope Leo's letter	<i>ib.</i>
Judgments of the several Bishops	284
Gallic and Italian Bishops speak of this letter	285
Bossuet's deduction from this judgment	286
Discrepancy of Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius	<i>ib.</i>
St. Leo allows his letter to have been examined	287
Supreme authority of a Council over the Pope	<i>ib.</i>
3. Theodoret restored by the Council, after Pope Leo's judgment	289
Inference from this history	<i>ib.</i>
4. The passing of the 28th Canon	290
Passed a second time in spite of the Legates	292
Parallel privileges of Rome and Constantinople	293
Significant remarks of Tillemont on the mode in which the Canon was opposed at Rome	<i>ib.</i>
St. Leo's own language quite opposed to the present Roman claims.	294
What the injury was, and to whom done	296
Reason assigned to the Empress for rejecting the 28th Canon	<i>ib.</i>
The West rejects: the East maintains it	297
Greater power of hearing appeals granted to Constantinople, than at Sardica to Rome	<i>ib.</i>
Code of the ancient Church received and confirmed in the first Canon of Chalcedon	<i>ib.</i>
The Ecclesiastical constitution which it sets forth	298
Relation of the Council to St. Leo	<i>ib.</i>
The Pope successor of St. Peter, and head over the members	299
The Pope entrusted with the vine	300
Present power of the Saints attested by the Church Catholic	<i>ib.</i>
See of Constantinople second to Rome	301
Statement of the Pope's Primacy	302
Distinction between Primacy and Supremacy in the Council's language	<i>ib.</i>
Conclusion from the whole history	303

## CHAPTER V.

THE PATRIARCHAL CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH AND THE ROMAN  
PRIMACY FROM THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON TO POPE GREGORY  
THE GREAT.

## SECT. I.

	Page
Period succeeding the Council of Chalcedon . . . . .	304
State of the Church in the East after the beginning of the Mono- physite contentions . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Advance of the Papal claims in the West . . . . .	305
Affair of Timothy the Cat settled by the general consent of the Me- tropolitans and their Councils . . . . .	306
Great authority of the Bishop of Constantinople . . . . .	307

## SECT. II.

Schism between the East and West in the time of Acacius . . . . .	308
Pope Felix condemns Acacius . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Who resists, and the East and West are severed . . . . .	309
Pope Gelasius declares that he is carrying out the provisions of the Council of Chalcedon . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Eastern view of the Church's government from the beginning . . . . .	310
Pope Gelasius states his Primacy . . . . .	311
Remarks on this statement . . . . .	313
Distinction of ancient from medieval claims . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Pope Gelasius attributes his power of hearing appeals to the Canons . . . . .	314
His claim goes beyond that of Pope St. Innocent, rejected by the African Bishops . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Restoration of unity on the terms of Rome . . . . .	315

## SECT. III.

Pope Symmachus ordered by Theodorick to be tried by an Italian Council . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The Council acquits him without entering into the case . . . . .	316
Remarkable letter of St. Avitus . . . . .	317
Testimony to the Primacy . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The Episcopate itself injured in the person of the Pope . . . . .	318
Idea indicated in these words . . . . .	319
Statement of Ennodius in favour of the Council . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
His defence ratified by the Pope in Council . . . . .	320
His opinion that "the First See is judged by no man" passes into a dogma . . . . .	321

	Page
Yet is contradicted by a Roman Council in the year 378, and by the practice of Pope Sylvester . . . . .	321
Remarks on this incident . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>

## SECT. IV.

Pope Agapetus deposes Anthimus Patriarch of Constantinople, for heresy and irregularity . . . . .	322
The Patriarch of Jerusalem confirms the deposition . . . . .	323
Laws of Justinian give the force of law to the code of Canons ratified at Chalcedon, and establish, 1. the Primacy of Rome : 2. the supreme and final judgment of the several Patriarchs within their own limits . . . . .	323-6

## SECT. V.

Pope Vigilius and the Fifth Council . . . . .	327
The Council states that the letter of Pope Leo was approved after examination : which is admitted by Pope Vigilius . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Importance of this point . . . . .	329
State of things at the Fifth Council . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Judicatum and Constitutum of the Pope . . . . .	330
The Council issues a decree contradicting that of the Pope . . . . .	331
Censure of the Pope by the Council . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The Church's authority resides not in the Pope, but in the consent of the Episcopal College . . . . .	332
The Pope acknowledges his error . . . . .	333

## SECT. VI.

Popes excommunicated in early times . . . . .	334
Suspensions of Communion with Rome . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Pope Pelagius I. and St. Augustine on Apostolical Sees . . . . .	335
Testimony of the ancient Oriental Liturgies, 1. for the Real Presence : 2. against the Papal Supremacy . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Prayer for the Pope of Alexandria . . . . .	336
The Pope of Rome mentioned on those occasions only on which other Patriarchs were mentioned . . . . .	337
The Patriarch in the Eastern Liturgies occupies the same place as the Pope in the Roman . . . . .	338
The Pope of Rome not mentioned because the Patriarchs were supreme in their sphere . . . . .	339
Cumulative argument of the preceding facts . . . . .	340
Testimony of De Maistre to the Patriarchal government of the Eastern Church from the beginning . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Mode of arguing used by Roman writers . . . . .	341

	Page
Möhler's admission respecting the Primacy . . . . .	343
Gradual evolution of the Primacy according to Möhler . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Result from his admission . . . . .	344

## SECT. VII.

St. Gregory the Great : his statement of his own authority . . . . .	345
His ordinary jurisdiction . . . . .	346
The See of Peter in Alexandria and Antioch one with that of Rome . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
This view incompatible with a monarchy in Rome . . . . .	347
Main privilege of the Primacy is to maintain the Canon . . . . .	348
His interpretation of the two chief passages of Scripture . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Peter represents the Church . . . . .	349
The whole Church received the promise of the keys . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Peter in John xxi. the type of the Apostolic ministry . . . . .	350
Jurisdiction of the Church vested in the Apostles and their successors . . . . .	351
St. Gregory's ordinary teaching in accordance with the following particular testimonies . . . . .	352
Contest about the title Ecumenical . . . . .	353
The term Universal an injury to all the Patriarchs . . . . .	354
An injury and disruption of the whole Church ; destroys the position of other Bishops, and the Faith . . . . .	355
An anticipation of Antichrist . . . . .	356
Peter received the charge of the whole Church, but not the name Universal . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
If such an one falls, the whole Church falls with him . . . . .	357
Argument of Bellarmine compared with that of St. Gregory . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Term Universal a profane appellation invented by the first Apostate . . . . .	358
Pope Gregory desires not to be called Universal Pope . . . . .	359
Whether this title was given by the Council of Chalcedon . . . . .	360
Christ the Head of the Church : the term Universal an invasion of His rights, and an imitation of the Devil . . . . .	361
Peter, Paul, Andrew, John, equally members of the Church under the One Head . . . . .	362
Condemnation of the title Common Father . . . . .	363
Inference from these expressions . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Mr. Newman's assertion about the Pope's being universal Bishop, and retractation . . . . .	364
What Councils and Fathers say of it . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The bearing of St. Gregory's words on this . . . . .	365
Summary of the above letters . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Defence of the Church of England hence arising . . . . .	366
Ancient and modern signature of the Popes . . . . .	367
The present division ruinous to all . . . . .	368

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE PATRIARCHAL CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH, AND THE ROMAN PRIMACY, FROM THE TIME OF POPE ST. GREGORY TO THE DIVISION OF THE EAST AND WEST.

## SECT. I.

	Page
The Sixth Ecumenical Council. Balance of power in the Church altered, but the same constitution as at the Council of Nicea	369
Bossuet's account of this Council. Its importance to our cause	370
Insidious attempts of the Monothelite heresy leading to it	371
The Pope approves the doctrine of Sergius	372
Gives a wrong answer to all the three Patriarchs	373
His answer a proper decretal letter	<i>ib.</i>
And is so considered by the Sixth Council	374
Vain defence of the conduct of Honorius by Bellarmine and Baronius	375
The Lateran Council under Pope Martin condemns Pope Honorius tacitly	<i>ib.</i>
Two main points : 1. The Sixth Council held after a most express definition of the matter which it discussed by Pope Martin	376
Letters of Pope Agatho examined, as those of St. Leo	377
2. Condemnation of Pope Honorius by the Sixth Council	379
Pope St. Leo receives this condemnation	381
And repeats it to the Spanish Bishops, and the King of Spain	<i>ib.</i>
It is renewed by the Seventh Council : and sworn to by the Roman Pontiffs in the Liber Diurnus	382
Bossuet's summing up	<i>ib.</i>
The act of the Council in condemning Pope Honorius corresponds with the language of St. Augustine	<i>ib.</i>
Result of the condemnation of a Pope's decretal letter by an Ecumenical Council	383
Acts of the Council sent to the Five Patriarchal Sees	<i>ib.</i>

## SECT. II.

The Council in Trullo : its purpose	384
Four heads in which it limits the pretensions of the Roman See	385
1. The code of Canons, and decretal letters, which are to be received	<i>ib.</i>
Decretal letters of Eastern Primates inserted ; those of Popes excluded	386
2. Oriental view of clerical marriage	387
Second marriage subjects to deposition. Marriage after ordination, or with a widow, censured	<i>ib.</i>
None of the order of Sub-deacons, and upwards, allowed to marry after ordination	388

	Page
The passages of Scripture do not favour the Papal plenitude of power	434
Statement of the true doctrine	435
The Ultra-montane Papal Idea that which was rejected by St. Gregory	436
This the real Papal Idea : its merit and defect	<i>ib.</i>
It destroys the equality of the Episcopate	437
Two senses of the word Universal Bishop	<i>ib.</i>
Proof that the Papal Idea requires the reprehensible sense to be taken	438
1. Vicars are instituted by their Principal	<i>ib.</i>
2. Depend on their Principal's disposal	<i>ib.</i>
3. Receive a derived Jurisdiction	<i>ib.</i>
4. Are liable to be deposed by their Principal	439
5. Must give way to their Principal	<i>ib.</i>
6. And to those whom he delegates	440
7. Act in a diocese not properly their own	<i>ib.</i>

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### CHANGE IN THE WEST OF THE PRIMACY INTO A MONARCHY ; ITS CAUSES AND RESULTS.

#### SECT. I.

Bellarmino's doctrine the true logical development of the Papal Theory. Inconsistency of Bossuet's school	441
Bellarmino's doctrine contrary to the practice of the Church in the times of the Seven Ecumenical Councils	442
The Ultra-montane Theory formally condemned by the Council of Constance	443
If we accept it, we reject the whole history of the Church during eight hundred years	444
The Church of England appeals to that constitution of the Church Catholic, which St. Leo declared to be perpetual	446

#### SECT. II.

Circumstances which led to the rise of the proper Papal power	447
Vast and permanent effect of the false Decretals	448
Introduction of a new Canonical Jurisprudence by means of them, according to De Marca	449
Proofs of their forgery	<i>ib.</i>
Capitules of Pope Adrian	<i>ib.</i>

	Page
Account of the forgery and its proofs by Fleury . . . . .	450
Held to be authentic for eight hundred years . . . . .	451
De Marca's summary of their contents . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
1. No Bishop to be judged but in a Council convoked by the supreme Pontiff . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
2. Innovation as to deposed Bishops . . . . .	452
3. Appeal of Bishops to Rome in case the Metropolitan is suspected . . . . .	453
Gradual introduction of this new jurisprudence from the year 836 . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Efforts of Pope Nicholas I. to that effect . . . . .	454
Two chief points of this new jurisprudence . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The Gallican Bishops at last yield submission to the false Decretals, supposing them to be genuine . . . . .	455
Burchard makes use of them . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
And Ivo of Chartres in 1100 . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Gratian's Decretum follows about 1150 . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Decretals of other Popes and of Gregory IX. . . . .	456
Power taken from Provincial Councils and bestowed on the supreme Pontiff . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Effects of the false Decretals according to Pereira . . . . .	457
Dictates of Gregory VII. as well as Burchard's and Ivo's collection and Gratian's Decretum taken from them . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The latter the sole authority of the Canonists for five hundred years . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Growth of Papal principles . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Dictum of St. Leo given to Pope Vigilius, and wrought into a Papal axiom by the Decretum . . . . .	458
Father Coustant's account of the false Decretals, and their effects on discipline . . . . .	459
Fleury's testimony to the same . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
And Van Espen's . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Ancient discipline how affected by the false Decretals . . . . .	460
New principles introduced by them . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Their gradual establishment by the Roman Pontiffs, and admission by Councils and collectors of Canons . . . . .	461
Gieseler's statement of the motives which led to the forgery . . . . .	462

## SECT. III.

Antiquity believed to be followed in the Decretals, while it was departed from . . . . .	463
Principles of the Decretals carried out by St. Leo IX. and his successors . . . . .	464
Opposition of these principles to those of genuine antiquity on the following points . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
1. No Council to be held without the Pope's permission . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
2. Bishops not to be judged definitively but by him . . . . .	465
This contrary to all antiquity and indeed impossible . . . . .	466

	Page
3. Power to translate Bishops ascribed to the Pope . . . . .	467
4. And the erection of new Bishoprics . . . . .	468
5. The union and extinction of Bishoprics . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
6. The founding of Metropolitan Sees . . . . .	469
7. Vast extension of appeals to the Pope . . . . .	470
Ivo of Chartres and St. Bernard deplore this . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Description by the latter of the Papal Curia . . . . .	471
The Primacy of St. Leo and St. Gregory a very different thing from this . . . . .	472
Riches brought to Rome by this abuse of appeals not to be con- sidered . . . . .	473
The authority of the false Decretals established by Gratian's Decre- tum, which even went beyond them . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Immunity of clerks . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Pope Innocent's answer on this to the Emperor Constantine . . . . .	474
These principles quite unknown to the Greeks . . . . .	475
At the time of their greatest union with Rome they knew nothing of this discipline . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
System of Legations, arising from the increase of the Pope's power drawn from the false Decretals . . . . .	476
Pride, luxury, and avarice of the Legates . . . . .	477
Legatine Councils held instead of Provincial . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Diminution of the authority of Metropolitans . . . . .	478
Desire of Bishops and Metropolitans to obtain Legatine powers . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Fatal and continued effects of the aforesaid abuses . . . . .	479
Rigour exercised against heretics contrary to ancient practice . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Abuse of Indulgences . . . . .	480
This alteration of the Church's discipline introduced by negligence and ignorance . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Power attributed to the Pope by the Ultra-montanes grounded on the maxims of the Decretals and of Gratian . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Necessity of distinguishing the Primacy from this power . . . . .	481
Bishops, according to De Marca, may resume the power which they have so ceded . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>

## SECT. IV.

Conclusion from these statements of De Marca, Coustant, Pereira, Van Espen, and Fleury . . . . .	482
Summary of the argument of this book in Van Espen's language . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
The present institution, confirmation, and consecration of Bishops, contrary to the practice of the first eleven centuries . . . . .	483
The system of the false Decretals accounts for the difference between the government of the Church in our own time, and in that of St. Augustine . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Ninth century period of the transition from the Primacy to the Papal claim . . . . .	484

	Page
Causes severally tending to this :	484
1. Gradual subtraction of allegiance from the Eastern Emperors	<i>ib.</i>
2. Increase of temporal power leads to increase of spiritual, supported by the Carlovingian race for their own purposes	485
3. The right of the Pope to crown the Western Emperors	486
4. Separation of intercourse between East and West	<i>ib.</i>
Independent spirit of the East from the beginning	487
Uncontrolled power of the Roman Patriarch in the West	<i>ib.</i>
5. Influence of the great monastic Orders	488
6. The system of the false Decretals	<i>ib.</i>
How far their fraud extended	490
1. The Primacy of Rome incontestable	<i>ib.</i>
2. The Scripture promises to Peter, the giving of the keys, and the commission to feed the flock, not interpreted by the Fathers of the See of Rome	<i>ib.</i>
Existence of the Primacy from the beginning, but great variation in the amount of power attached to it. Universal Jurisdiction not comprehended in it. Power of receiving Episcopal appeals granted by the Council of Sardica	491
The system of the false Decretals developed in a complete overthrow of the ancient discipline, and in the substitution of a Monarchy for a Primacy. The Monarchy, therefore, in contradistinction to the Primacy, based upon a fraud. The Saints of the middle ages deceived in this point	492
The power of the Roman Pontiff denied by the English Church is not his Primacy, nor the authority allowed him by the Seven Ecumenical Councils, but his Monarchy	493
Great Saints who have maintained and illustrated the Papacy, as the champion of the liberties of the Church	494
Yet they do not annul the testimony of the Ecumenical Councils, and the undivided Church	495

## SECT. V.

This testimony of antiquity corroborated by a witness existing from the earliest times to the present, the Oriental Church	<i>ib.</i>
Force of her unbroken descent, and unchanged dogmatic system	496
She denies, and ever has denied, the monarchy as strongly as we	497
Stands in a free and equal position towards Rome	498
The Russian Church, born since the separation, an unimpeachable note of life in her	<i>ib.</i>
The Church of Christ One organized Body, with its Head, the God-man	500
Definition of St. Paul	501
Belief of the Saints	<i>ib.</i>

	Page
Testimony of St. Basil applicable to the English Church . . . . .	501
The state of separation provisional and temporary . . . . .	502
Internal state of the Church's three great divisions answers to what might be expected . . . . .	503
State of France . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
State of Spain, Portugal, and Italy . . . . .	504
Safety of the English Church lies in maintaining the whole deposit of the ancient Church . . . . .	505
Her claim only that of self-government . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
An alliance with Protestantism will destroy her . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Extreme danger of allowing heresy . . . . .	507

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THE writer of the following pages is more and more convinced that the whole question between the Roman Church and ourselves, as well as the Eastern Church, turns upon the Papal Supremacy, as at present claimed, being of divine right or not. *If it be*, then have we nothing else to do, on peril of salvation, but submit ourselves to the authority of Rome: and better it were to do so before we meet the attack, which is close at hand, of an enemy who bears equal hatred to ourselves and to Rome; the predicted Lawless One, the Logos, reason, or private judgment of apostate humanity rising up against the Divine Logos, incarnate in His Church. *If it be not*, then may we take courage; for the position of the Church of England being tenable, all the evils within her pale, which we are now so deeply feeling, will, by God's blessing, be gradually overcome. As to practical abuses in her, who will venture to say they are so great as in the Roman Church of the tenth century, when the First See was filled successively by the lovers of abandoned women, who made and deposed Popes at their will? Our cause being good, all that we have to deplore of actual evil should lead to more earnest intercession, more continued striving after that love which breathes itself forth in unity, but should not shake the confidence of any obedient heart in our mother's title. When the Donatists made the crimes

of individuals an excuse for breaking unity, St. Augustine reminded them, that the crimes of the chaff do not prejudice the wheat, but that both must grow together till the Lord of the harvest send forth His angels to make the separation.

The writer will not conceal that he took up this inquiry for the purpose of satisfying his own mind. Had he found the Councils and Fathers of the Church before the division of the East and West bearing witness *to* the Roman supremacy, as at present claimed, instead of *against* it, he should have felt bound to obey them. As a Priest of the Church Catholic in England, he desires to hold, and to the best of his ability will teach, all doctrine which the undivided Church always held. He finds by reference to those authorities which could not be deceived, and cannot be adulterated, that while they unanimously held the Roman primacy, and the patriarchal system, of which the Roman pontiff stood at the head, they as unanimously did not hold, nor even contemplate, that supremacy or monarchy which alone Rome will now accept as the price of her communion. They not only do not recognise it, but their words and their actions most manifestly contradict it. This is, in one word, his justification of his mother from the sin of Schism. If true, it is sufficient: if untrue, he knows of no other.

But should any opponent think these pages worthy of a reply, the writer warns him, at the outset, that he must in fairness discard that old disingenuous trick of using testimonies of the Fathers to the primacy of the Roman See in the episcopal and patriarchal system, in order to prove the full papal supremacy, as now claimed, in a system which is nearly come to pure monarchy. By this method, because the Fathers recognise the Bishop of Rome as successor of

St. Peter, they are counted witnesses to that absolute power now claimed by the Roman pontiff, though they recognise other Bishops, in just the same sense, to be successors of the holy Apostles; or though they call every Bishop's See the See of Peter, as the great type and example of the episcopate. What such an one has to establish in order to justify the Roman Church, and to prove that the English and the Eastern are in Schism, is, that Roman doctrine, as stated by Bellarmine, which is really the key-stone of the whole system, that "Bishops succeed not properly to the Apostles," Bellarmin. de Rom. Pont., lib. 4. 25; 4. 24; 1. 9. "for they have no part of the true apostolic authority," but that "all ordinary jurisdiction of Bishops descends immediately from the Pope," and that "the Pope has, full and entire, that power which Christ left on the earth for the good of the Church." Let this be proved on the testimony of the Eastern and Western Church, and if it be true, nothing can be more easy than to prove it, as the contradictory of it is attempted to be proved in the following pages, and all controversy will be at an end. We claim that it should be proved, for even De Maistre, who has put forward this theory with the least compromise, declares, De Maistre, du Pape, liv. I. ch. I. "There is nothing new in the Church, and never will she believe save what she has always believed."



# THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND CLEARED FROM THE CHARGE OF SCHISM.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### SECT. I.

THE course of events, for some time past, has been such as to force upon the most faithful sons of the Church of England the consideration of questions which they would rather have left alone, as long ago settled; for the nature of these questions is such, not to speak of their intricacy and painfulness, as almost to compel the student to place himself, as it were, *ab extra* to that community, which he would rather regard with the unreasoning and unhesitating instinct of filial affection. One of these questions, perhaps the first which directly meets and encounters him, is the charge of Schism brought against the Church of England on account of the events of the sixteenth century, and her actual state of separation from the Latin communion, which has been their result. Time was, and that not long since, when it might have been thought a sort of treason for one who ministers at the altars of the Church of England, and receives by her instrumentality the gift of Life, so much as to entertain the thought, whether there was a flaw in the commission of his spiritual mother, a flaw which, reducing her to the condition of a sect, would invalidate his own sonship. And certainly the treatment of such a question must be most painful to any one, who desires to be obedient and dutiful, and therefore to be at peace. How can it be otherwise, when, instead of eating his daily portion of food in his Father's house, he is called upon to search and inquire whether indeed he have found that house at all, and be not rather a fugitive or an outcast from it.

CHAP.  
I.  
Introduction. Necessity of considering the question of Schism.

CHAP. I. Such, however, is the hard necessity which is come upon us. Let no one imagine that it is our *choice* to speak on such subjects. We are in the case of a beleaguered soldier in an enemy's country; he may not think of peace; he must maintain his post or die; his part is not aggression, but defence: the matter at issue is the preservation of all that he holds dear, or extermination. The question of *schism* is a question of salvation.

But over and above the general course of events which forces us to reconsider this question, circumstances have taken place in the past year (1845) which we may boldly pronounce to be without a parallel in the history of the Church in England since she became divided from the Latin communion. Those who have followed with anxious sympathy that great restorative movement which, for twelve years, has agitated her bosom,—those who have felt with an ever increasing conviction, as time went on, and the different parties consolidated and unfolded themselves, that it was at the bottom a contest for the ancient faith delivered to the saints, for dogmatic truth, for a visible Church, in whom, as in a great sacrament, was lodged the presence of the Lord, communicating Himself by a thousand acts of spiritual efficacy, against the monstrous and shapeless latitudinarianism of the day; against the unnumbered and even unsuspected heresies which have infected the whole atmosphere that we breathe; against, in fine, the individual will of fallen man, under cover of which the coming Antichrist is marshalling interests the most opposite, and passions the most contradictory; and further, those not few nor inconsiderable, I believe, who, by God's grace, owe to the teaching of *one man* in particular a debt they never can repay,—the recovery, perchance, of themselves from some form of error which he has taught them to discern, or the building them up in a faith whose fair proportions he first discovered to them,—these will feel with deeper sorrow than I can express the urgency of the occasion to which I allude. For how, indeed, could the question, whether the Church of England be fallen into Schism, or continue to be, as from the laver of their regeneration they have been taught to believe, a member of that one sacred Body in which Christ incarnate

dwells,—how could this question be so forced upon their minds, as by the fact that her Champion, whom they had hitherto felt to be invincible, who had seemed her heaven-sent defender, with the talisman of victory in his hands, of whom they were even tempted to think

SECT.  
I.

Si Pergama dextra  
Defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent,

that he, who, fighting her battles, never met with his equal, unsubdued by any foe from without, has surrendered to his own doubts and fears; self-conquered, has laid down her arms, and has gone over to the camp opposed. Henceforth she has ranged against her those powers of genius and that sanctity of life, to which so many of her children looked as to a certain omen of her Catholicity. They felt that she who bore such children, must needs be the spouse of God. It is no wonder that many others, of no mean name among us, and whom we could ill afford to spare, have had their doubts and inquietudes determined by such a fact as this. For the first time, I repeat, in the history of the Church of England, have earnest and zealous children of hers, who desired nothing but their own salvation and the salvation of others, found no rest for the sole of their feet within her communion. Men who set out with the most single-minded purpose of defending her cause, nay, of winning back to her bosom alienated multitudes, of building her up in a beauty and a glory which she has not yet seen, and one, especially, who has been the soul of that great movement to restore her,—these have now, after years of hard fighting spent in her service, quitted her, and proclaim that all who value their salvation must quit her likewise.

These are some of the special circumstances which force upon the most reluctant the question of Schism. It was the privilege of other days to feed in the quiet pastures of truth. We have to seek the path to Heaven through the wilderness of controversy, where too often "the highways are unoccupied, and the travellers walk through byways." But it is a question which cannot be put off or thrust aside. No instructed Christian, who has any true faith or love, can bear the thought that he is out of the one fold of Christ. The question cannot be put off, for it will brood upon him

A state of Schism involves the loss of all Christian privileges.

CHAP.  
I.

in his daily devotions and labours; a doubt as to the justice of his cause will paralyse all his exertions. It cannot be thrust aside; for the imputation of heresy on another has no tendency to answer the charge of schism against oneself. It must be met openly, honestly, and without shrinking. The charge of Schism touches immediately the Christian's conscience, for this reason, that, if true, it takes away from his prayers, his motives, his actions, his sufferings, that one quality which is acceptable to Almighty God. Here it is most true, that "all, which is not of faith, is sin:" he who does not believe, at least, that he is a member of the one Church, whatever outward acts he may perform, cannot please his Judge. In the words of one who himself gave his goods to feed the poor, and shed his blood for the testimony of Jesus, "if such men were even killed for confession of the Christian name, not even by their blood is this stain washed out. Inexpiable and heavy is the sin of discord, and is purged by no suffering. He cannot be a martyr who is not in the Church; he can never attain to the kingdom, who leaves her with whom the kingdom shall be." "A man of such sort may indeed be killed, crowned he cannot be." Therefore the charge of Schism, when once brought before the reflecting mind, cannot be turned aside,—it must be met and answered: if it is not answered, at least to the conviction of the individual, it leaves upon the whole of his obedience the stain of insincerity, which is fatal. In this respect it is more pressing and imperious, more fatal, even than that of heresy. I observe this, because, in the comments I have seen on the painful departures of friends from among us, and in exhortations not to follow them, it has not seemed to be always recognised. When men leave us on the ground that we are in schism, surely all censure of them, and all defence of ourselves, is beside the mark, which does not meet and rebut this particular accusation. Under this no man can rest: it is useless, it is sinful, to ask him to rest, unless you can remove the imputation. To talk of "disappointment, or a morbid desire of distinction, or impatience under deficiencies, want of discipline, or sympathy in spiritual superiors," and such-like causes, as being those which have impelled a man to the most painful sacrifices,

S. Cyprian  
de Unit.  
Ecc. 12.

and "in the middle of his days to begin life again," is surely both untrue as regards the individual, and futile as to preventing others doing like him, when the ground of schism, among others, is alleged by himself, and is felt to lie at the bottom. Could we prove that the Church of England is clear both of enunciating heresy in her formularies, and of allowing it within her pale, it would in no respect answer this charge of Schism against her, except so far as the *à priori* presumption, that she who is clear of the one would be clear of the other also. But it would remain to be met and answered specifically.

Moreover, I must confess that this is a point on which I, for one, cannot write in the spirit of a controversialist. I must state, to the best of my poor ability, and to the utmost reach of my limited discernment, not only the truth, but the whole truth. I cannot keep back points which tell against us. Gibbon charges Thomassin with telling one half the truth, and Bingham the other half, in their books upon the ancient discipline of the Church. Whether this be true or not, I cannot, in my small degree, do likewise. I have found Bishop Beveridge, in his defence of the 37th Article, quote, in several instances, part of a paragraph from ancient Fathers, because it told for him, and omit the other part, because it told against him. And, in considering the celibacy of the clergy, it is usual to find Protestant writers enlarging on the fact, that St. Peter was married; and that the Greek Church has always allowed its parish priests to be married; while they keep out of view that St. Peter's marriage preceded his call, and that the Eastern Church never allowed those who were already in holy orders to marry, but only to keep those wives which they had taken as laymen. Or again, in deference to the circumstances of the English Church, writers conceal the fact, that the whole Church of the East and West, on the authority, as to the first point, of the express Word of God itself, has never allowed a person who married twice, or who married a widow, to be in holy orders at all. I have observed Bingham, when he treats of celibacy, alluding triumphantly to the biography of St. Cyprian, by Pontius, to prove that an ancient saint, martyr, and bishop, of the

SECT.  
I.

Subject not  
to be treat-  
ed contro-  
versially.

Bk. 4. c. 5.  
§ 5.

CHAP. I. third century, was a married man; but taking care to leave out the express notice of Pontius, that, from his conversion, he lived in continence. Those who wish to see on the Roman side another sort of unfairness alluded to in the Advertisement may look to the 6th Chapter of the 1st Book of De Maistre, on the Pope, where they will find a host of quotations to prove the Supremacy, which only prove at the outside the Primacy; and by far the greater number of them might be paralleled by like expressions which are addressed to other Bishops, but of which fact no mention is made. They are assumed in a sort of triumphant strain to prove the point in question, while, to the student of antiquity, their weakness, or, sometimes, their irrelevancy, only proves the reverse. This sort of disingenuousness is so common on both sides, that it may be said to be the besetting sin of controversialists. If, however, there be any question in which perfect candour is requisite, it is surely this of Schism. Would it not be a most miserable success to be able to deceive oneself, or others, as to whether one is or is not within the covenant of salvation? The special pleader in such a case is surely the most unhappy of all men; for he deprives himself of the greatest of blessings. He seems to win his cause, while he most thoroughly loses it; for if a man be indeed out of the ark of Christ's Church, what benefit can one possibly render him equal to that of bringing him within it? I write, then, with the strongest sense of responsibility on this subject, and shall not be deterred from making admissions, if truth require them, which seem to tell on the other side, and which have accordingly been shrunk from, or slurred over, by our defenders in former times.

Formula-  
ries of the  
English  
Church can-  
not be ap-  
pealed to as  
the Law  
in this mat-  
ter, but the  
decision  
of the  
undivided  
Church.

And this leads to another consideration. The charge of Schism against the Church of England is, that by rejecting the Papal authority in the sixteenth century, she lost the blessing of Catholic communion, and ceased to belong to that One Body to which salvation is promised. Now, in such a matter, the Church of England must be judged by principles which have been, from the first, and are still, recognised by all Christendom. Whatever obedience we may owe, in virtue of our personal subscription, to articles

or other formularies, drawn up in the sixteenth century, it is obvious they can decide nothing here. What I mean will be best shewn by an example. Suppose a person were to take the 6th Article, and set upon it a meaning, not at all uncommonly attributed to it in these days, viz., that the Church of England therein declares, that Holy Scripture is the sole standard of faith; and that every man must decide for himself, what is, or is not, contained in Holy Scripture; and that he, searching Holy Scripture for the purpose, can find nothing whatever said about the Papal authority;—it is obvious, that such a mode of arguing would be utterly inadequate either to terminate controversy, or, one would think, to quiet any troubled conscience: for, whether or no this be the meaning of the 6th Article, the whole Greek and Latin Church would reject with horror such propositions as the first two put together, as being subversive of the very existence of a Church, and of all dogmatic authority. It is a valid argument enough to an individual to say, You have signed such and such documents, and are bound by them: but if he is in doubt whether the documents themselves be tenable, they cannot be taken to prove themselves. The decision of a province of the Church in the sixteenth century cannot be quoted to prove that that decision is right, for it is the very thing called in question. It is the Reformation itself which is put on trial; it cannot appeal to itself as a witness; it must be content to bring its cause before a Law, whose authority all will admit,—and that Law, need I say, must be antiquity, and the consent of the undivided Church. And the Church of England, it must be admitted, has not shrunk from this appeal. Her often-quoted canon enjoins her ministers, in that part of their duty wherein most is left to their private judgment, “to teach nothing which they wish to be held and believed religiously by the people, save what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops, have collected out of that very doctrine.” Thus she spoke in the year 1571, and even if all that she has said and done be not in harmony with this Canon, it proves at least that she made, at the very commencement of her separate course, a most confident appeal to Tradition; an appeal,

SECT.

I

CHAP.  
I.

which is itself a most positive enunciation of the Traditional Principle. It states this with little less plainness than the contemporary Canon of the Council of Trent. "I also admit Holy Scripture in that sense which holy Mother Church has held and holds, whose office it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, nor will I ever interpret it, save according to the unanimous agreement of the Fathers." It is obvious, that the very existence of the Church of God depends on the faithful fulfilment of this rule. She had then passed through fifteen centuries of a chequered, but superhuman, and most marvellous existence. Her continuous life implies a continuity of principles, ruling her from the beginning; and any controversy which affects her well-being, as does that concerning the integrity or loss of a great member, must be judged according to those principles. The present position of the Church of England, as regards her isolation, may be merely a provisional one, I firmly believe that such is the fact; but if she is to claim the allegiance of her children as a part of the Catholic Church, it must be proved that such her position is tenable upon the principles which directed that Church when undivided. In short, I propose to meet honestly this imputation of schism by an appeal to the authority of the Eastern and Western Church: an authority, which no Roman Catholic can slight or refuse.

## SECT. II.

State of the  
Church  
Catholic  
at the  
Council of  
Nicea.

LET us go back to the first period at which the universal Church, emerging from the fires of persecution, is found acting as one body. United, indeed, it had ever been from the day of Pentecost, in charity, in doctrine, in sacraments, in communion. The Christian people, scattered throughout the wide precincts of the Roman empire, and speaking its various tongues, was one in heart and spirit—"A peculiar people," like none other: the Bread which they ate, and the Cup which they drank, made them One living Body. But so long as the Church was engaged in a fierce and unrelenting

conflict with the Paganism and despotism of the empire, she could hardly exhibit to the world her complete outward organization. So, although in the intervals of persecution important provincial councils had been held, and though it was felt to be necessary for discipline that local synods should take place twice every year, yet not until the year 325, at the Council of Nicea, does the whole Church meet in representation; the immediate cause of that assemblage being a heresy so malignant as to threaten her existence, and which could be repressed by no less energetic means. That is a strongly marked and important point in her existence, throwing light upon the centuries preceding, and establishing irremovable landmarks for those ensuing, at which we have full means for judging what her constitution and government were. As the decrees of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers established for ever the true doctrine concerning the Eternal Son, so do they offer an imperishable and unambiguous witness concerning the discipline and hierarchy of the Church. What was schism then, is schism now; what was lawful and compatible with Christian Sonship and privileges then, is so now.

Most solemnly, as a Priest of the Church in England, and in the name of that Church, do I quote the words of one of the greatest of St. Peter's successors, words the like of which are again and again to be found in his writings, and in those of the Popes his predecessors and successors from St. Sylvester to St. Gregory the Great. "Nor let any number of Priests, however greater, dare either to compare or to prefer themselves to those three hundred and eighteen Bishops, inasmuch as God has consecrated the Nicene Council with so great a privilege that, whether by fewer or by more ecclesiastical judgments be passed, *whatever differ from their appointment be utterly devoid of all authority.*" And again, "Those holy and venerable Fathers who, after condemning together with his impiety the sacrilegious Arius, passed in the city of Nicea laws of Ecclesiastical Canons *which are to last even to the end of the world*, live in their appointments both with us and through the whole world: and, if any encroachment be any where made contrary to their determination, it is immediately annulled: in order that the general

SECT.  
II.

S. Leo's  
respect for  
the Nicene  
Discipline.

S. Leon.  
Ep. 106.  
edit. Bal-  
lardini.

CHAP.  
I.

arrangements made for perpetual use be varied by no change: nor things fixed for the common advantage be drawn to private interest: and that, by the maintenance of those limits which the Fathers have appointed, no one may intrude on another's right: but each according to his ability spread himself forth in charity within his proper and legitimate boundaries." I call that holy Father and Pope, who lives with God, to witness, knowing that he would apply this first of all to the First See, as indeed he has expressly done, writing to the most numerous Ecumenical Council itself: "As to the maintenance of the statutes of the holy Fathers, which were fixed at the Synod of Nicea by inviolable decrees, I remind your holiness to take care, *that the rights of Churches as they were ordered by those three hundred and eighteen Fathers through Divine inspiration may continue.* Let not shameless ambition lust after any thing which is not its own: nor any one seek increase to himself by diminution of another. For however haughty vanity may lift itself up *upon assents which have been extorted*, and imagine that its own longings are to be established under the name of Councils, *whatever differeth from the Canons of the aforesaid Fathers will be null and void.* And your holiness, by reading the writings in which I have repelled the attempts of the Prelate of Constantinople, will be able to learn, *how reverently the Apostolic See follows their rules*, and that by the Lord's help I am the guardian of the Catholic Faith and the Constitutions of the Fathers." And in another place, "Whatever differs from their (the Nicene Fathers) rules and appointment, will never be able to obtain the consent of the Apostolic See."

Ep. 114.  
c. 2.

Ep. 119.  
ad Maxi-  
mum, c. 5.

Supremacy  
of the  
Episcopate  
universally  
acknow-  
ledged.

What then is the view they present us with? We find the Bishops throughout the whole world recognised, without so much as a doubt, to be the successors of the Apostles, invested with the plenitude of that royal Priesthood which the Son of God had set up on the earth in His own Person, and from that Person had communicated to His chosen disciples, and so possessed of whatever authority was necessary to govern the Church. Thus spoke a fresh and unbroken tradition, so universal and so unquestionable that no other voice was heard beside. Thus the Episcopal power may be safely recognised as of divine appointment: in truth it is

scarcely possible to have stronger evidence than we have of this. One of the most learned of those who are opposed to us on the charge of Schism, thus sums up the decisions "of all the Fathers and all the Councils of the first ages." "The Bishop represents Christ, and stands in His place on earth. As therefore the Priesthood of Christ embraces all sacerdotal authority and complete power to feed the flock, so that while we may indeed distinguish and define the various powers included in that fulness and perfection, yet it is a great crime to dissever and rend them in any way from each other, just as we distinguish without dividing the attributes and perfections of the Godhead itself; so the Episcopate in its own nature contains the fulness of the Priesthood, and the perfection of the Pastoral office. For Christ received the perfection of the Priesthood from His Father, when He was sent by Him. Moreover the perfection of the Priesthood, or both the Episcopal powers, (*i. e.* the Sacerdotal and the Pastoral,) He gave at once to His Apostles when He sent them, as He Himself was sent by the Father. Lastly, that same perfection they transmitted to Bishops, sending them as they themselves were sent by Christ." "Whence Bishops are Fathers by the most noble participation of divine Fathership which is on earth; so that here that expression of St. Paul is true—'From whom every Fathership in heaven and earth is named.' For no greater Fathership is there on the earth than the Apostolical and the Episcopal." He proceeds: "The Episcopate alone is a divine royalty and a spiritual sovereignty: which appears evidently in this, that a Bishop has never been, and will never be, consecrated, without at the same time giving to him a diocese, like a little kingdom, to govern or to conquer. Priests and Deacons are, and always have been, made, to whom neither subjects nor jurisdiction have at first been given. But the Bishop, embracing all the fulness of the Royal Priesthood of Jesus Christ, being His vice-gerent on earth, being even clothed with the authority and the person of Him Who is the first Principle in the Godhead, cannot receive the consecration which makes him Bishop without receiving at the same time the jurisdiction and the sovereignty which is inseparable from his character. 'And this is the eminence of the Episcopal dignity over the

SECT.  
II.

Thomassin,  
Discipline  
de l'Église,  
Pt. 1. 54.  
1. ch. 2.

CHAP. I

---

Sacerdotal, that the Sacerdotal neither includes nor demands any jurisdiction in itself, as being imperfect, and subject to the Bishop, at whose bidding it should be ruled, and move in accordance with his movements, not start forward out of its place; as the Canons have long ordered. But the Episcopal dignity, as supreme, and in its own nature perfect, necessarily embraces jurisdiction, nor exists without it, any more than the royal dignity, to which the holy Fathers everywhere compare the Episcopal dignity, can be conceived without sovereignty.'” And here, as before, he has been quoting that book of Petrus Aurelius, which was stamped, if I mistake not, with the approval of the whole Gallican clergy in the seventeenth century.

Metropoli-  
tical Sys-  
tem.

And this power of the royal priesthood was complete in every individual Bishop, who was within his Diocese the spouse of the Church, the successor of the Apostles and of Peter, the centre of unity; able, moreover, to communicate this authority to others, and to become the source of a long line of spiritual descendants. But hitherto we have considered the Bishop only in relation to that of which he is the centre and ruler, his Diocese: the Diocese itself is but a part of one vast organized body; the Bishop only a member of one undivided Episcopate. Accordingly we find, together with the apostolical authority admitted to be lodged in the person of each Bishop, a necessity inherent in the unity of Christ's body, that this authority should only be exercised according to a general law. Thus it was in the apostolic college, the type of the Episcopate: the power of each several Apostle was derived immediately from Christ his Head, but was to be exercised in communion with his brethren. As, then, there is the relation of the Bishop to his Diocese on the one hand, so there is on the other his relation to his Metropolitan and the fellow-Bishops of his province: the one corrects and counterbalances the other. Nor does the system of connection and subordination stop here: but in a higher sphere the Metropolitans have a Primate: so that while the unity and government of the Church lie in its whole Episcopate, yet a preponderating influence is exercised by certain Sees, viz. by Rome in the West, and by Alexandria and Antioch in the East. Under these leading

Bishops are a great number of Metropolitans; and others, again, like the Bishops of Cyprus, or of Africa, and, probably, of Britain, have their own Metropolitan, but are not subordinate to either of the three great Sees. Next to these, rank the Bishops of Ephesus, Cesarea, and Heraclea, who preside respectively over the provinces of Asia, Cappadocia, and Thrace, and were afterwards called Exarchs. And the source of this preponderating influence is to be traced to the fact that the Apostles laid hold of the principal cities, and founded Churches in them, which became centres of light to their several provinces, and naturally exercised a parental authority over their children. The three great Bishops, though not yet called Patriarchs, or even Archbishops, seem to have exercised all the power of Patriarchs. No general Council would be binding without their presence in person, or by deputy, or their subsequent ratification. Moreover, among these, the Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, has a decided pre-eminence. What the extent of that pre-eminence was, had not yet been defined; but it is very apparent, and acknowledged in the East as well as in the West. It does not seem, indeed, that his authority differed in *kind*, but only in *degree*, from that of his brethren, especially those of Alexandria and Antioch. The Apostolical Canons, more ancient than the Council of Nicea, and representing the whole East, say:—"The Bishops of every nation must acknowledge him who is first among them, and account him as their head, and do nothing of consequence without his consent; but each may do those things only which concern his own parish, (*i. e.* diocese,) and the country places which belong to it. But neither let him (who is the first) do anything without the consent of all, for so there will be unanimity, and God will be glorified through the Lord Jesus Christ." Canon 34. The 35th Canon says, "Let not a Bishop dare to ordain beyond his own limits in cities and places not subject to him. But if he be convicted of doing so without the consent of those persons who have authority over such cities and places, let him be deposed, and those also, whom he has ordained." The 37th, "Let there be a meeting of the Bishops twice a year, and let them examine amongst them-

S E C T.  
II.

Order of  
the Catho-  
lic Hierar-  
chy.

Canons of  
the Apo-  
stles.

CHAP. I. serves the decrees concerning religion, and settle the ecclesiastical controversies which have occurred." If we add that  
 Of Antioch. there is not in all these Canons, nor in those of Antioch, which re-enacted, and enlarged upon, the above regulations, a word respecting any authority of the See of Rome as an exception to this system, we have a sufficiently definite view, on this main point, of the early constitution of the Eastern Church. So likewise the Council of Nicea mentions the Sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome in precisely similar terms: —“Let the ancient customs be maintained, which are in Egypt and Libya, and Pentapolis; according to which the Bishop of Alexandria has authority over all those places. For this is also customary to the Bishop of Rome. In like manner in Antioch, and in the other provinces, the privileges are to be preserved to the Churches. And as a general rule this is manifest, that if any one be made a Bishop without the consent of the Metropolitan, the Great Council declares that he should not be a Bishop. If, however, two or three out of private contention, resist the general vote of all, being reasonable, and according to the Ecclesiastical Canon, let the vote of the greater number prevail.” In this Canon, (the 6th,) as in a mirror, the whole system of the ancient Church may be discerned. Not only the rights of the three great Metropolitans, but those of all others are therein recognised and confirmed. While a particular point in the administration of the great Egyptian Patriarchate, which might have seemed an infringement of the general rights of Metropolitans, is allowed by a reference to the similar practice in the proper Roman Patriarchate: viz. that the Bishop of Alexandria, and not the Metropolitans under him, should have the power to consecrate Bishops in the three provinces of his Patriarchate, for the Bishop of Rome does the same in his, i. e. in the suburbican<sup>a</sup> provinces, or

<sup>a</sup> What the suburbican provinces were we learn almost with certainty from a passage of history. The Emperor Valentinian, in 371, allowed the antipope Ursinus to go where he would save to Rome or the suburbican provinces. “Baronius gives the rescripts which were addressed as well to the Prefect Ampelius, as to Maximin, Vicarius of Rome: and it appears clearly enough from what Valentinian writes to

the latter, that the suburbican provinces are the same which were under the jurisdiction of the Vicarius of Rome. At least it is plain that one cannot understand all the West by this term without a strange absurdity, for the favour which Valentinian granted to Ursinus would have been to banish him from all his empire.”—Tillemont, *Hist. Ecc.* 8. 398.

in Italy, south of the province of Milan, in Sicily, and the Islands. There is then a Primacy involved in the way in which Rome is here mentioned, but assuredly no more than a Primacy: and the privileges (*πρεσβεία*) of all the Churches are put on the same foundation as those of the First: "Let the ancient customs prevail." This precedence or prerogative of Rome, to whatever extent it reached, was certainly, notwithstanding the famous 28th Canon of Chalcedon, not either claimed or granted, more especially in the West, merely because Rome was the imperial city. It was explicitly claimed by the Bishop of Rome himself, and as freely conceded by others to him, as in a special sense successor of St. Peter. From the earliest times that the Church comes before us as an organized body, the germ at least of this pre-eminence is observable. From the very first, the Roman Pontiff seems possessed himself, as from a living tradition which had thoroughly penetrated the local Roman Church, with a consciousness of some peculiar influence he was to exercise on the whole Church. This consciousness does not shew itself here and there in the line of Roman Pontiffs, but one and all, whatever their individual characters might be, seem to have imbibed it from the atmosphere which they breathed. St. Victor, and St. Stephen, St. Innocent, St. Leo the Great, and St. Gregory, are quite of one mind here. That they were the successors of St. Peter, who himself sat and ruled and spoke in their person, was as strongly felt, and as consistently declared, by those Pontiffs who preceded the time of Constantine, and who had continually to pay with their blood the price of that high pre-eminence, as by those who followed the conversion of the empire, when the honour of their post was not accompanied by so much danger. I am speaking now, be it remembered, of the feeling *which possessed them*. The feeling of their brother Bishops concerning them may have been less definite, as was natural: but, at least, even those who most opposed any arbitrary stretch of authority on their part, as St. Cyprian, fully admitted that they sat in the See of Peter, and ordinarily treated them with the greatest deference. This is written so very legibly upon the records of antiquity, that I am persuaded any one, who is even very slightly acquainted with them, cannot with

SECT.

II.

Roman  
Primacy.

## CHAP.

## I

Testimo-  
nies to it  
quoted by  
Mr. New-  
man.

sincerity dispute it. I cannot think Mr. Newman has the least overstated the fact, but I do not accept his conclusion, when he says, "Faint they (the ante-Nicene Testimonies to the authority of the Holy See) may be one by one, but at least they are various, and are drawn from many times and countries, and thereby serve to illustrate each other, and form a body of proof. Thus, St. Clement, in the name of the Church of Rome, writes a letter to the Corinthians, when they were without a Bishop. St. Ignatius, of Antioch, addresses the Roman Church, and it only out of the Churches to which he writes, as 'the Church which has the first seat in the place of the country of the Romans.' St. Polycarp, of Smyrna, betakes himself to the Bishop of Rome on the question of Easter;" (he *went*, it appears, to Rome, and the Pope, St. Anicetus, and he, not being able to agree as to the rule of keeping Easter, agreed to retain their several customs; a fact which is as much opposed to the present notion of the Roman Supremacy, as any fact can well be.) "The heretic, Marcion, excommunicated in Pontus, betakes himself to Rome. Soter, Bishop of Rome, sends alms, according to the custom of his Church, to the Churches throughout the empire, and, in the words of Eusebius, 'affectionately exhorted those who came to Rome, as a father his children.' The Montanists, from Phrygia, come to Rome to gain the countenance of its Bishop. Praxeas, from Africa, attempts the like, and for a while is successful. St. Victor, Bishop of Rome, threatens to excommunicate the Asian Churches. St. Irenæus speaks of Rome, as 'the greatest Church, the most ancient, the most conspicuous, and founded and established by Peter and Paul,' appeals to its tradition, not in contrast, indeed, but in preference to that of other Churches, and declares that 'in this Church every Church—that is, the faithful from every side, must meet,' or 'agree together, *propter potiorem principalitatem.*' 'O Church, happy in its position,' says Tertullian, 'into which the Apostles poured out, together with their blood, their whole doctrine.' The Presbyters of St. Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, complain of his doctrine to St. Dionysius, of Rome; the latter expostulates with him, and he explains. The Emperor Aurelian leaves 'to the Bishops of

Italy and of Rome' the decision, whether or not Paul, of Samosata, shall be dispossessed of the see-house at Antioch. St. Cyprian speaks of Rome as 'the See of Peter, and the principal Church, whence the unity of the Priesthood took its rise, . . . . whose faith has been commended by the Apostles, to whom faithlessness can have no access.' St. Stephen refuses to receive St. Cyprian's deputation, and separates himself from various Churches of the East. Fortunatus and Felix, deposed by St. Cyprian, have recourse to Rome. Basilides, deposed in Spain, betakes himself to Rome, and gains the ear of St. Stephen."

SECT.  
II.

"Development," &c.  
p. 22.

Danger of  
one-sided  
quotation.

Of some of these instances I shall have more to say, but I may say at once, that the fact that heretics, or other unquiet persons, when found out and condemned in their own country, fled where they were not known, and strove to interest the power of the First Bishop in their behalf, by offering him a field for the exercise of his authority, is one which I think may be pressed too far, and is not at all strong enough to support the gigantic fabric of the Supremacy. Their doing so, and his permitting it, were constantly objected to the Bishop of Rome as abuses, as in the time of St. Augustine, and long before, by the African Church, and by St. Hilary of Arles to Pope Leo, and, even in the ninth century, by Hincmar of Rheims, to Pope Nicholas. But, though I said these facts were not overstated as far as the mere letter, yet are they stated very unfairly, unless it is said that the like reference was continually made not only to the great Sees of the East, of which Constantinople could probably shew as many, but to Primates of the West also, as to the Archbishop of Carthage, whose interference, as well as that of Pope Stephen, was sought both by the Bishops of Gaul in the case of Marcian of Arles, and by the Bishops of Spain in the case of Basilides.

And further, it must be observed that the *extent* of this authority, in the Chief See, had not been defined; but, whatever it was, it did not interfere with the divine right of the Bishops to govern each in his own Diocese. They derived their authority by transmission from the Apostles, as the Bishop of Rome from St. Peter; the one was as much recognised as the other. They were not his *delegates*, but his

Essential  
unity and  
equality of  
the Episcopate.

CHAP. I. *brethren*. Frater and Co-episcopus *they style him*, as he styles them, for hundreds of years after the Council of Nicea; owing him, indeed, and willingly rendering him the greatest deference, but never so much as imagining that their authority was derived from him. This fact, too, lies upon the face of all antiquity, and is almost too notorious to need proof. If, however, any be wanted, it is found in the names which Bishops bore both then, and for a long time afterwards, and in their mode of election and their jurisdiction. For their names: "It must first be confessed," says a very learned Roman Catholic, who, in his humility, shrunk from the Cardinalate offered to him for his services to the papal See, "that the name of Pope, of Apostle, of Apostolic Prelate, of Apostolic See, was still common to all Bishops, even during the three centuries which elapsed from the reign of Clovis to the empire of Charlemagne;" and he adds presently: "These august names are not like those vain and superficial titles with which the pride of men feeds itself; they are the solid marks of a power entirely from Heaven, and of a holiness altogether Divine." Indeed, the view which every where prevailed was that so admirably expressed by St. Cyprian: "Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur." "The Episcopate is one; it is a whole in which each enjoys full possession." Or, "Each individual Bishop has an equal share in it as joint-tenant." "The meaning of this," says Dean Moehler, "in legal language is, when many become bail for such and such a matter, so that each individual answers for the whole, and not merely for the portion coming to him according to the number of the sureties; so that in case one or other of the sureties become even insolvent, his obligation likewise falls to the remainder." Or, as De Marca says, "As the body of the Church is one, divided into very many members through the whole world, so is there in it a single Episcopate, which is diffused every where by the concord of many Bishops: if these be considered as a Body, they hold the entire Episcopate as joint-tenants. Yet a certain portion of the flock is assigned to every Bishop, to guide and govern it individually, according however to that charity and communion which is due to the whole Body, lest, if unity be deserted,

Thomassin,  
pt. 1. lib. 1.  
ch. 4. De  
l'ancienne  
discipline  
de l'Eglise.

St. Cypr.  
de Unit. 4.  
Oxf. Tr.

Oxf. Fleury,  
tom. 3. p.  
93. n. 1.

Moehler on  
Unity, § 63.

De Concor.,  
lib. 6. c. 1.

that Bishop who departs from the Body should dry up like a stream which turns aside from its fountain, and wither like a branch cut off from the trunk and root." St. Isidore, of Seville, says: "Since also the other Apostles received a like fellowship of honour and power with Peter, who also were scattered throughout the whole world, and preached the Gospel; whom, at their departure, the Bishops succeeded, who are established throughout the whole world in the seats of the Apostles." St. Basil, congratulating St. Ambrose on his succession to the Episcopate, says: "Come then, O man of God, since not from men did you receive or were taught the Gospel of Christ, but the Lord Himself hath transferred you from among the judges of the earth to the seat of the Apostles, fight the good fight, heal the sicknesses of the people," &c. But Pope Symmachus, says Thomassin, (A.D. 498-514,) has expressed the equality and unity of the Episcopate and Apostolate between the Pope and all Bishops, by the highest and most sacred similitude which it is possible to conceive. "For inasmuch as after the likeness of the Trinity, whose power is one and indivisible, the priesthood is one in the hands of various prelates, how suits it that the statutes of the more ancient be broken by their successors?" He is speaking of his own predecessors, but his words cannot be limited to them. We are told by the same author: "Pope Hormisdas (A.D. 514-523) prescribed, and all the Bishops of the East subscribed, after the Patriarch John of Constantinople, a formulary of faith and of Catholic Communion, where, among other remarkable points, this is worthy of particular attention:—that as all Churches make but one Church, so all the thrones of the Apostolate, and all the Sees of the Episcopate, spread through all the earth, are but one Apostolic See, inseparable from the See of Peter." This is the view of St. Augustine, expressed again and again in his writings, especially when he is explaining those remarkable words of our Lord to St. Peter, on which Roman Catholics ground the *scriptural* proof of his Supremacy. "For it is evident that Peter, in many places of the Scriptures, represents the Church, (*personam gestet Ecclesiæ*.) chiefly in that place where it is said, 'I give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be

SECT.  
II.

Quoted by  
Thomassin,  
*ut sup.*

S. Basil.  
Ep. 197.

Quoted by  
Thomassin,  
Mansi viii.  
208, B.

Witnessed  
by St. Au-  
gustine,  
Origen,  
St. Basil,  
St. Chrysos-  
tome, and  
St. Jerome.  
S. Aug.,  
tom. 5.  
706, B.

CHAP. bound in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth,  
 I shall be loosed in Heaven.' What! did Peter receive those keys, and Paul not receive them? Did Peter receive them, and John and James not receive them, and the rest of the Apostles? Or are not those keys in the Church, where sins are daily remitted? But since in meaning hinted, but not expressed, (*in significatione*,) Peter was representing the Church, what was given to him singly, was given to the Church. So, then, Peter bore the figure of the Church: the Church is the body of Christ." So Origen: "But if you think that the whole Church is built by God upon Peter alone, what would you say about John the Son of Thunder, or each of the Apostles? Or shall we venture to say that the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter specially, but shall prevail against the rest of the Apostles, and the perfect? Does not what is said take place in the case of all and each of them, 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it,' and 'upon this Rock I will build My Church?' Are then the keys of the kingdom of Heaven given by the Lord to Peter alone, and shall none other of the blessed receive them? But if the expression, 'I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven' is shared also by others, why not both all which goes before, and all which follows after, said as if to Peter? For in this place indeed it seems to be said to Peter, 'What thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven,' and the rest: but, in the place in John, the Saviour giving the Holy Spirit to the disciples by breathing on them, says, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' and the rest."

Origen in  
 Matt., tom.  
 12. vol. 3.  
 p. 524.

S. Basil. 2.  
 573, A.

So again, "The spiritual ruler," says St. Basil, "is nothing else but he who represents the person of the Saviour, being made both a mediator of God and men, and making an oblation to God of the salvation of those who obey him. And this we are taught by Christ Himself, who appoints Peter after Himself shepherd of His Church. For, saith He, 'Peter, lovest thou Me more than these? feed My sheep.' While He grants the same power to all pastors and teachers in succession. And the proof of this is, that all bind and loose equally as he does." So St. Chrysostome: "But when I speak of Paul, I mean not only him, but also Peter, and James, and John, and all their choir. For as in a lyre there

S. Chrysa.,  
 tom. 2.  
 594, B.

are different strings, but one harmony, so, too, in the choir of the Apostles, there were different persons, but one teaching; since one, too, was the Musician, even the Holy Spirit, who moved their souls. And Paul signifying this, said: 'Whether, therefore, it were they or I, so we preach.'" How little, on the one hand, the pre-eminence of St. Peter's see derogated from the apostolicity of other Bishops, or, on the other hand, their distinct descent and jurisdiction hindered them from paying due deference to the Chief See, is apparent likewise in these words of St. Jerome: "But, you say, the Church is founded upon Peter; although in another place, this self-same thing takes place upon all the Apostles, and all receive the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, *and the strength of the Church is consolidated equally upon them*: nevertheless, for this reason, out of the twelve one is selected, that, by the appointment of a head, the occasion of Schism may be taken away." Thomassin doubts whether at the Council of Nicea, or even at that of Antioch, sixteen years afterwards, the name even of Archbishop was yet in use; the highest title used in those two Councils being that of Metropolitan. St. Epiphanius quotes a letter of Arius to Alexander, of Alexandria, in which he only gives him the quality of Pope and Bishop, but nowhere that of Archbishop.

SECT.  
II.

S. Jerome,  
tom. 2. 279,  
Vallarsi.

So much for the equality of the names of Bishops in the fourth century, which recognises the essential equality and unity of their office. The laws in force respecting their consecration and jurisdiction are as decisive. Every Bishop, after being elected by the Clergy and people, and the assembled provincial Bishops, was consecrated by the Metropolitan of his province, except, indeed, in the Patriarchate of Alexandria, and of Rome, where the Primate, as we have seen, and not the Metropolitans under him, consecrated all Bishops. Where a Metropolitan had no immediate superior, in case of a vacancy, the Bishops of his own province consecrated him, as in the case of Carthage. Whatever might be the particular privileges of Patriarchs and Metropolitans, as a general rule, no one Bishop had direct jurisdiction in the Diocese of another. The Bishops of the great Sees, specially Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, announced their accession to each other, together with a profession of the orthodox faith. But

Election  
and Juris-  
diction of  
Bishops.

CHAP. as for any jurisdiction emanating from Rome to the great  
 I. Bishops of the East, such a thing was never even imagined.

Witness of Pope St. Julius. Take a proof of this from the mouth of a Pope in the fourth century, on whose mind it is plain that the theory of Bel-larmine, and the later Roman Church, had never dawned.

S. Athanas. Apol. against Arians, § 30. Oxf. Tr. St. Julius, writing to the Eusebian Bishops, says, "Even supposing that Athanasius was in the position of a criminal after the Council" (of Tyre, which deposed him), "this appointment" (of Gregory the Arian, intruded on Alexandria), "ought not to have been made thus illegally and contrary to the Canon of the Church: but the Bishops of the province ought to have ordained one in that very Church, of that very priesthood, that very clergy, and the Canons received from the Apostles ought not thus to be set aside. Had this offence been committed against any one of you, would you not have exclaimed against it, and demanded justice as for the transgression of the Canons? Dearly beloved, we speak honestly, as in the presence of God, and declare that this proceeding was neither pious, nor lawful, nor ecclesiastical." Let us even rest the whole question on this important point, for it is absolutely necessary to the Papal theory; and I do not think any vestige of such a doctrine can be found in the first eight centuries. At least, let it be shewn; for, to assert it in the face of Canons which imply, nay, set forth palpably a system the very reverse of it, is merely begging the whole question. That in cases of difficulty, or disputed succession, or heresy, or schism, the voice of the Bishop of Rome would have great weight, is, indeed, indisputable. When the ship of the Church was in distress, whom should we expect to see at the rudder but St. Peter? Thus St. Jerome, himself baptized at Rome, naturally looks to Rome in this difficulty. Mr. Newman says: "The divisions at Antioch had thrown the Catholic Church into a remarkable position; there were two Bishops in the See, one in connexion with the East, and the other with Egypt and the West,—with which, then, was Catholic Communion? St. Jerome has no doubt upon the subject. Writing to St. Damasus, he says: 'Since the East tears into pieces the Lord's coat, and foxes lay waste the vineyard of Christ, so that among broken cisterns, which hold no water, it is difficult

Influence of Bishop of Rome in a case of disputed succession.

Develop-ment, p. 279.

*to understand where the sealed fountain and the garden inclosed is, therefore by me is the chair of St. Peter to be consulted, and that faith which is praised by the Apostle's mouth, thence now seeking food for my soul where of old I received the robe of Christ. . . . Whilst the bad children have wasted their goods, the inheritance of the Fathers is preserved uncorrupt among you alone. There the earth from its fertile bosom returns the pure seed of the Lord a hundred fold: here the grain buried in the furrows degenerates into darnell and tares. At present the Sun of Righteousness rises in the West; but in the East that fallen Lucifer hath placed his throne above the stars. You are the light of the world: you the salt of the earth: you the vessels of gold and silver: but here the vessels of earth or wood await the iron rod and the eternal flame.' Therefore, though your greatness terrifies me, yet your kindness invites me. From the Priest the sacrifice claims salvation; from the Shepherd the sheep claims protection. Let us speak without offence: I court not the Roman height: I speak with the successor of the Fisherman, and the disciple of the Cross. I, who follow none as my chief but Christ, am associated in communion with thy blessedness; that is, with the See of Peter. On that rock the Church is built I know. Whoso shall eat the Lamb outside that house is profane. . . . I know not Vitalis (the Apollinarian); Meletius I reject; I am ignorant of Paulinus. Whoso gathereth not with thee, scattereth; that is, he who is not of Christ is of Antichrist."*

The words  
in italics  
are left out  
by Mr. N.

Considering all the circumstances of the case, no one can wonder at St. Jerome's application. When it is remembered that the Roman See, up to that time, save for the fall of Liberius, had been free from all suspicion of heresy, and that the Arian controversy was the one in question, and that he himself, of full manhood, had been baptized, and had lived at Rome, the force of his language is hardly surprising. Indeed he calls himself in this letter "a man of Rome;" and in this and the following he appeals to Damasus, as if he were his own Bishop, as well as Bishop of Rome. Undoubtedly this modifies the force of his words: that is, as soon as you look at the particular circumstances under which they were written, the very expressions which seemed most effective

Points  
which modify  
St.  
Jerome's  
statement.

CHAP. I. lose their edge. No student of antiquity can doubt that all the West—and St. Jerome was a Western colonised as it were in an unknown land—looked to the See of Peter as the main pillar of the Church's faith and discipline. This is the feeling his words express: but could there be a greater unfairness than to apply their bare letter to a state of things totally changed? or to consider expressions proving the *primacy* of Rome, as claimed in the fourth century, to prove equally a *supremacy* as claimed in the nineteenth, which is as different from the former as one thing can well be from another.

Language of St. Basil on the other side.

But further, how much St. Jerome's western education and connections influenced his mind, may be seen also from this. St. Basil the Great at this very time supported St. Meletius in the See of Antioch with the whole weight of his authority. If St. Jerome had no doubt that Catholic Communion was on the side of that claimant of the See of Antioch who was recognised by the Pope, St. Basil was not at all of the same mind. Writing to Peter of Alexandria in the year 377, he says, "Dorotheus on his return related to me the conversation which he had had with your Excellency in presence of the most reverend Bishop Damasus (of Rome); and he grieved me by saying that our most religious brethren and fellow-ministers Meletius and Eusebius (of Samosata) were reckoned amongst the Arians, whose orthodoxy if nothing else recommended, the war at least waged against them by the Arians gives no slight proof of their uprightness to those who form a right judgment of things." But to this very Eusebius he had written the year before, in reference it would seem to this rejection of Meletius and Eusebius at Rome, and the same year as St. Jerome's application to Damasus, "You have already yourself fallen in with the news of the West, as the brother Dorotheus related all to you. And, as he is setting out again, what sort of letters ought to be given to him? For perhaps he will accompany the good Sanctissimus, who is very zealous, and going about the whole East, getting subscriptions and letters from all the more distinguished. For myself, then, I do not see what one should send by him, or how agree with those who send: but if you should find shortly any coming to me, have the

S. Basil. Ep. 266.

Ep. 289.

goodness to instruct me as to this. It occurs to me to use Diomed's language, SECT.  
II.

Why should we gifts to proud Achilles send ?

Or strive with prayers his haughty soul to bend ?

For indeed haughty tempers, treated with attention, are wont to shew more than their usual arrogance. And if the Lord should be gracious unto us, what other support do we need? But if the wrath of God remain upon us, *what help can we find in Western pride?* They who neither know, nor endure to learn, the truth: but, pre-occupied with false suspicions, are doing now just what they did before in the case of Marcellus, quarrelling with those who give them report of the truth, and giving their own support to heresy. For I myself, without concert with any, was minded *to write to their leader*: nothing indeed about ecclesiastical matters, except so much as to hint, that they neither know the truth of what is going on among us, nor accept the way by which they might learn it; but generally, about the duty of not attacking those who are humbled by temptations, and of not taking pride for dignity, a sin which of itself is sufficient to make enmity with God." A great advocate of Papal authority says of St. Basil here: "He is altogether to be censured as accusing for this reason the Pontiff Damasus, and all the Western Church, as likewise the Pontiff Julius on account of Marcellus, as if they were guilty of committing a crime, establishing heresy, and being ignorant of the truth." For which he assigns this reason, that "Basil's vision was distorted by anger," and that "Basil, being prone to anger through frequent fasting, as students are, thus cried out." On which passage of Christian Wolf, quoted by Bossuet, he exclaims: "We easily despise Wolf passing his decree on such a man: but we cannot think it of slight importance what, by the admission of Wolf, Basil thought. Nor does it here matter whether Basil blamed them with reason or not. But at least it was clear that the confirming of heresy was roundly and flatly, without any excuse, without any attempt to modify, imputed by Basil to two decrees of Roman Pontiffs De Fide."

*αὐτῶν τῷ  
κορυφαίῳ.*

Bossuet,  
Gall. Or-  
thod. No.  
65.

A year earlier writing to Dorotheus about a projected visit of his brother, St. Gregory of Nyssa, to Rome, he had said,

CHAP.  
I.  
Ep. 215.

“For my part I do not see who are to accompany him, and I know that he is entirely without experience in ecclesiastical matters: and, while he would be sure to meet with respect and to be valued by a considerate person, I know not what advantage could arise to the whole Church from the intercourse of such a person, who has no mean adulation in his nature, *with one high and lifted up, sitting on I know not how lofty a seat, and so not able to catch the voice of those who tell him the truth on the ground.*”

Inference  
from this  
language.

Surely these words give us in the most unsuspecting form St. Basil's tone of mind about the Roman See. It is quite impossible that a saint, for instance, of the medieval or later Roman Church, a St. Bernard, or St. Francis de Sales, could have written thus. It is plain that he did not so much as conceive the present doctrine of the Roman Supremacy. It was not an idea presented to his mind and rejected, but one which literally had never crossed it. What Mr. Newman says of writers of St. Basil's age respecting the theology of Luther and Calvin is true of Basil himself respecting the Roman Supremacy. He is “as unconscious of its existence as of modern chemistry or astronomy.” There could be only one reason for this, as for the other, that it had not yet appeared in the Church. His words, and all his tone of thinking, are a complete but indirect denial of the notion, that he was bound to accept the decision of the Bishop of Rome in doctrine, or in a case of disputed succession, as conclusive.

Church of  
the Fathers,  
p. 285.

Instances  
of general  
supervision  
exercised  
by the  
Bishops of  
the greater  
Sees.

Compare, then, further, the words of St. Jerome to Pope Damasus with those of St. Basil to St. Athanasius on the same subject of this distracted Church of Antioch: on the one hand a Western monk, sojourning in the East, but baptized at Rome, a Roman in heart and feeling, and intimate with its Bishop: on the other hand the Exarch of Cesarea, only inferior in rank to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. Which uses the stronger and more deferential language? St. Jerome to the Bishop of Rome, or St. Basil to the Bishop of Alexandria? “For the rest of the East perhaps you have need of the co-operation of a greater number, and must wait for the Westerns. But that the Church of Antioch be well ordered manifestly depends on your piety: to manage some, to quiet others, and to restore

Witness of  
St. Basil.  
Ep. 66.

strength to the Church by agreement. For you yourself know better than any one can tell you, that, like the most skilful physicians, you must begin the cure with the most vital parts. And what can be more vital than Antioch to the Churches of the whole world? If this could be restored by concord, nothing prevents but *that as a strong and healthy head it should procure soundness to the whole body*. For in truth the weaknesses of that city need your wisdom and evangelical sympathy. For it is not only cut in twain by heretics, but distracted too by those who pretend that they are of one mind with each other. To make these parties one, and bring them into the harmony of one body, belongs to Him alone who by His unspeakable power invests the dry bones with nerves and flesh again. Yet the Lord ever works great things by instruments worthy of Him. Here, too, then again I trust that there is a fitting sphere for the services of one so high-minded, in allaying popular disturbances, putting a stop to parties having their several Bishops, bringing all to mutual subjection in love, and restoring its ancient strength to the Church." Had a Western Bishop applied the above expressions about Antioch to Rome, or those concerning Athanasius to a Roman Bishop, he could not have escaped being quoted in proof of the Roman Supremacy. "The presbyters of St. Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, complain of his doctrine to St. Dionysius of Rome, the latter expostulates with him, and he explains." "Why," says Pope Julius, in his letter to the Eusebians preserved for us by St. Athanasius, "was nothing said to us concerning the Church of the Alexandrians in particular? Are you ignorant that the custom has been for word to be written first to us, and then for a just sentence to be passed from this place." The note under Mr. Newman's editorship says, "in the passage in the text the prerogative of the Roman See is limited, as Coustant observes, to the instance of Alexandria; and we actually find in the third century a complaint lodged against its Bishop Dionysius with the Pope." If this be the case, the fact will hardly go to prove the present Papal Supremacy. But, surely, its proper interpretation is, that not merely the Patriarchs, but Bishops generally, were wont to inspect each other's conduct, appeal to the Canons,

SECT.  
II.

Mr. Newman on Development.

Of Pope St. Julius.

Lib. of Fathers, vol. 13. p. 56.

CHAP.  
I

Of St. Dionysius of Alexandria, Euseb. Hist. 7. 30.

specially those of Nicea, as a rule above them all, which I find St. Leo and other Popes perpetually doing, intercede in cases of apparent injustice to persons, and assume even a severer tone of censure, if the matter related to errors of doctrine. Thus this same Dionysius of Alexandria, when appealed to in the case of Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, "wrote to Antioch, esteeming the leader of error not worthy even of being named: nor did he address him at all, but the whole Diocese:" a course of proceeding which in ordinary circumstances would have been a violation of all Ecclesiastical rule. But here the faith was in danger. Only just before St. Julius had said in the letter above quoted, "Supposing, as you assert, that some offence rested upon those persons," (St. Athanasius and Bishops from other parts of the Church,) "the case ought to have been conducted against them not after this manner, but, according to the Canon of the Church, word should have been written of it to us all, that so a just sentence might proceed from all. For the sufferers were Bishops and Churches of no ordinary note, but those which the Apostles themselves had governed in their own persons." Just so, as in the case above, the Exarch of Cesarea entreats the Patriarch of Alexandria, himself holding the second See, to interfere and terminate the distractions of the third See. Just so St. Athanasius himself, hearing that certain monks of Cappadocia were angry with St. Basil for refraining, through consideration of circumstances, from calling the Holy Spirit God, writes to the Priest Palladius, thus. "As you have told me about the monks at Cesarea, which I also learnt from our beloved Dianius, that they were grieving and resisting our beloved Basil the Bishop, I thank you for the information: but I have pointed out the fitting course to them, to be obedient, as children to their father, and not to resist what he approves. For, if he were suspected of not holding the truth, they would do well to resist him: but if they feel confident, as we all feel, that he is the pride of the Church, fighting for the truth, and instructing those who have need, they should not resist such an one, but rather accept his good conscience. For, from what the beloved Dianius told me, they seem grieved without reason. For he himself, as I am sure, be-

Of St. Athanasius, S. Athanasii, Ep. ad Palladium.

comes weak to the weak that he may gain the weak; but let our friends, looking at the end his truth has in view, and the discretion he uses, glorify the Lord, who has given to Cappadocia such a Bishop as every country wishes to have." Just so Basil, writing to congratulate Peter of Alexandria on his succeeding St. Athanasius, begs him, "to inform me constantly of your affairs, and to *undertake the care of the universal brotherhood* with the same tenderness and the same zeal, which that most blessed man shewed to all that love God in truth."

SECT.  
II.

S. Basil.  
Ep. 133.

"Soter, Bishop of Rome," says Mr. Newman again, "sends alms, according to the custom of his Church, to the Churches throughout the empire, and in the words of Eusebius 'affectionately exhorted those who came to Rome, as a father his children.'" As Basil says, "This dignity, in which I now am, makes all my adopted children." And St. Gregory of Nazianzum says of St. Athanasius, "Having gone through the whole suite of sacred offices, to pass over intervening events, he is entrusted with the presidency over the people, *which is the same as saying with the rule of the whole world.*" And I cannot say whether he received the priesthood as the reward of his virtue, or to be the source and life of the Church. For She, fainting through thirst of the truth, was like Ishmael to be refreshed, or like Elijah to be revived, when the earth in the drought was cooled by the stream, and from her exhaustion to be brought back to life." And St. Basil says to the same great saint, "Send to me the letters of the Bishops—which I will not give them before I receive their answers: otherwise 'let me bear the blame for ever.' Surely this was subject for no greater fear to him who originally said it to his father, than now to me who say it to you my Spiritual Father." I allege these passages, which might be multiplied without end, only to shew how very weak a foundation such things are whereon to build the Supremacy. "St. Basil's actions," says Tillemont, "shew him to us I say not as a particular Bishop, or a mere Metropolitan, or as Exarch or Patriarch of several Provinces, but as a saint who enjoyed the Episcopate in full possession without wronging the authority of his brethren: who did not limit his charity to his jurisdiction, but regarding himself as successor of the Apostles, as Bishop of all the Churches, ex-

Euseb. Hist.  
4. 23.

S. Basil.  
Ep. 337.  
Of St. Gregory  
Nazianzene.

S. Greg.  
Nazianz.  
Orat. 21.  
t. 1. 389, D.

S. Basil.  
Ep. 82.  
Gen. 43. 9.

Of Tillemont,  
Tillemont,  
9. 170.

C H A P. I. tended his cares everywhere where the name of Jesus Christ extended, and considered all Christians as his own people, since he carried them all in his heart." This is just what may be said of St. Cyprian, St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostome, and other great Bishops, and of course of the Bishops of Rome. So St. Basil says to Peter of Alexandria: "It was with reason, and like a spiritual brother taught true love by the Lord, that you censured me for not informing you of all things both small and great which take place here. *For it is your duty to take care of what goes on here, as it is mine to refer our affairs to your love.*" So St. Chrysostome makes it part of the praise of St. Eustathius of Antioch that not only in his own Diocese "did he use this foresight, but sent abroad in all directions men to instruct, exhort, converse, defend the approach against the enemy." (the Arians.) "For well had he been instructed by the grace of the Spirit, that it is the duty of one set over a Church not only to provide for that which has been entrusted to him by the Spirit, but for the whole Church throughout the world. And this he learnt from the sacred prayers. For if, said he, we should offer prayers for the Catholic Church from one end of the earth to the other, much more must we shew our vigilance for the whole of it, and care alike for all Churches, and be solicitous for all." And of St. Cyprian St. Gregory of Nazianzum says: "he becomes a Pastor, and the best and most approved of Pastors: for he presides not only over the Church of Carthage, nor over that Africa which from him and through him is renowned till now, but also over all the West, I may almost say, the Eastern and Southern and Northern coast." Now is it fair to apply instances thus arising and expressions thus occurring of a general supervision by the Roman Pontiff to prove his Supremacy, while parallel instances in the case of other Bishops are put out of sight? If a writer, with all the stores of antiquity, and all the labours of modern Roman controversialists, open before him, and having to render an account of a great change in his own opinions, can produce no stronger indications of the Papal Supremacy from the ante-Nicene period than these, what is the conclusion to which every man must come who goes by the facts of history?

But to recur to the point of jurisdiction at the time of the

Of St. Basil.  
S. Basil.  
Ep. 266.

Of St. Chrysostome.  
S. Chrys.  
tom. 2. 607,  
B.

Of St. Gregory Nazianzene.  
S. Greg.  
Naz. Or.  
21. § 12.  
tom. 1. 445.

Nicene Council. It is beyond question, both from the acts of that Council, and from the Apostolic Canons, which represent the Eastern Church in the second and third centuries, that, whatever the pre-eminence of Rome might consist in, there was no claim whatever to ratify the election of Bishops out of the Roman Patriarchate, then comprising Italy, south of Milan, and Sicily. Even differences, any where arising, were to be settled in Provincial Councils. "It is necessary to know, that, up to the Council of Nicea, all ecclesiastical affairs had been terminated in the Councils of each Province; and there had been but very few occasions in which it had been necessary to convoke an assembly of several Provinces. The Council of Nicea, even, only speaks of Provincial Councils, and orders that all things should be settled therein."

SECT.  
II.  
Episcopal  
Jurisdiction.

Thomassin,  
pt. 1. liv. 1.  
ch. 8.

"The better to understand," says De Marca, Archbishop of Paris, "the order of Episcopal jurisdiction, it is necessary before-hand to lay down that the Church in the beginning suited herself to the civil arrangement of the Roman Empire, and therefore appointed Bishops in the chief cities of each country, but assigned the first place and the confirmation of every thing to the Bishop of the Metropolis of the Province, with the Council of his colleagues. Thus Episcopal ordinations and Ecclesiastical judgments took place by the Council of each province with the authority of the Metropolitan, so that it was not allowed to appeal from the judgment passed in a Provincial Council. . . ."

De Marca,  
de Concord.  
lib. 7. ch. 1.  
§ 2. 5; ch.  
2. § 1-5.

"That supreme authority of Provincial Councils in passing judgment did not prevent the communication of Bishops of different provinces, who gave each other mutual assistance against the enemies of the Church. But in those ancient times was especially conspicuous the remarkable and pre-eminent care of the Roman Church in decreeing remedies against schisms and heresies in conjunction with other Provincial Synods. . . ."

"That custom, which assigned to the Councils of each several Province the supreme power of ordaining or deposing Bishops, was committed to writing and confirmed by the Fifth Canon of the Nicene Council to this effect: 'Respecting those who have been deprived of Communion, whether of the clergy, or of the laity, by the Bishops of each Province, let

CHAP.  
I.

judgment prevail according to the Canon which declares that those who have been rejected by some be not received by others. . . . It was agreed that Councils should be held twice every year in each Province, that such questions might be examined in a general assembly of all the Bishops of the Province.' This Canon confirms the authority of each Province in judging by definitive decree Ecclesiastical causes which regard the clergy or laity; and by consequence the same right is established as to the correction and deposition of Bishops, though that case is not stated in the Canon in express words. Certainly there can be no doubt that this is the meaning of the Canon, that in this general law should be comprehended judgments against Bishops, inasmuch as the Nicene Council no where else mentions them. Besides this argument there is the plain and express authority of the second Ecumenical Council, and also of the Council of Africa, and of Pope Innocent the First, who declare that they consider Episcopal judgments to be embraced in that Nicene Canon. In fact the second Canon of the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople bears plain witness that the administration and government of the Churches was committed to every Province respectively by this Nicene Canon. Now under the word administration the Fathers of Constantinople comprehend judgments against Bishops as much as other points of Ecclesiastical policy and government."

"The sentence of the Council of Africa is most plain in approval of what I have written: it is easy to collect from the words of the Fathers of that Council, that they were of the same mind with Cyprian, since they use almost the same words in a similar cause. For they say in their letter to Pope Cœlestine: 'The Nicene decrees have most plainly committed both the clergy of inferior rank and the Bishops themselves to their own Metropolitans. For they have ordained with great wisdom and justice that all matters should be terminated in the places where they arise, and that the grace of the Holy Spirit would not be wanting to each several Province.'"

See Cou-  
stant, Epist.  
Pont. Rom.,  
p. 749.

"Innocent the First in his letter to Victricius Bishop of Rouen supports the same interpretation . . . ch. iii. 'But if any causes or contentions arise among the clergy, either of

superior or inferior rank, my sentence is, that according to the Nicene Council the judgment be terminated by the assembling of all the Bishops of that Province. Nor let any one be allowed, (without prejudice, however, to the Roman Church, reverence to which in all causes should be observed,) to leave those Priests who in that Province by divine permission govern the Church of God, and to fly to other Provinces.'

"The same truth may be collected from the Canons of the Council of Antioch, which was held in the year 341, and whose authority was received in the Council of Chalcedon, and then in the whole Church. For that Council, being desirous entirely to remove the difficulties which very often occurred in the carrying out of the Nicene Council as to the deposition of Bishops, uses words which plainly shew that the definitive judgment belongs to the Council of each several Province. On this supreme authority rests the fifteenth Canon, which declares that a sentence passed by the voices of all the Bishops of a Province cannot be rescinded by other Bishops. 'If any Bishop accused of certain crimes be condemned by all the Bishops of the same Province, and all with one accord pass the same decree against him, let him not be judged again by others, but let the accordant sentence of the Bishops of the Province stand good.'" . . . He then quotes the 14th Canon, adding, "These Antiochene Canons prove abundantly that the trials of Bishops were wont of old to take place by the supreme authority of the Bishops of the Province, even though on account of a diversity of judgment it were necessary to call in several Bishops of a neighbouring Province. This was not done in order that any appeal or revision might be entertained against the first judgment, inasmuch as that was not yet passed, but rather was allowed to stand over after each several person had given his sentence. So that the extraordinary assembly took place in order that the first decree might be passed, for the revision of which there was no place."

The following are instances which bear out the very important assertions of Thomassin, and De Marca.

CHAP.  
I.

## SECT. III.

Witness of  
St. Cyprian  
to the self-  
government  
of the se-  
veral pro-  
vinces and  
to the  
Roman Pri-  
macy.

1. Appeal  
of Felicis-  
simus.

AND first, the testimony and conduct of St. Cyprian will exhibit the self-government of the Church's several provinces, as well as illustrate the Roman Primacy, to which Mr. Newman claims him as a witness. And such he is beyond doubt. × In his fifty-fifth letter, which begins, "Cyprian to his brother Cornelius, greeting;" he complains bitterly to that Pope that Felicissimus and his party "dare to set sail, and to carry a letter from schismatical and profane persons to the See of Peter, and to the principal Church, whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise; nor consider that they are the Romans whose faith had been praised by the preaching of the Apostle, to whom faithlessness can have no access." This Mr. Newman considers a pretty strong testimony in his "cumulative argument" for the authority of Rome. It would be as well, however, to go on a little further, and see what was the cause of St. Cyprian's vehement indignation. It was, that Felicissimus ventured *to appeal to Pope Cornelius*, when his cause had already been heard and settled by St. Cyprian, at Carthage. "But what was the cause of their coming and announcing that a pseudo-Bishop had been made against the Bishops? For, either they are satisfied with what they have done, and persevere in their crime, or, if they are dissatisfied, and give way, they know whither they may return. For, since it has been determined by all of us, and is both equitable and just, that the cause of every one be heard there where the crime has been committed, and *to every shepherd a portion of the flock is allotted, which each one rules and governs, as he is to give an account of his doings to the Lord*, it is certainly behoving that those over whom we preside should not run about, nor break the close harmony of Bishops with their deceitful and fallacious rashness, but should plead their cause where they may find both accusers and witnesses of their crime; *unless to a few desperate and abandoned men the authority of the Bishops seated in Africa seem less*, who have already judged concerning them, and have lately condemned, by the weight of their

18. × This is done by  
as LXI in the  
Library of 115  
Folios  
of 100. 1844.

sentence, their conscience, bound by many snares of crimes. Their cause has been already heard, their sentence already pronounced: nor is it becoming to the judgment of priests to be reprehended by the levity of a fickle and inconstant mind, when the Lord teaches and says, 'Let your conversation be yea, yea; nay, nay.'" Let any candid person say, whether he who so wrote to one whom he acknowledged as the successor of St. Peter, could have imagined that there was a Divine right in that successor to re-hear not only this, but all other causes; to reverse all previous judgments of his Brethren by his single authority; nay, more, to confer on all those Brethren their jurisdiction "by the grace of the Apostolic See<sup>b</sup>."

Another letter of St. Cyprian to another Pope, St. Stephen, will set forth both his view of the Primacy, and of the Episcopal relation to it. He wishes St. Stephen to write a letter to the people of Arles, by which their actual Bishop Marcian, who had joined himself to the schismatic Novatian, might be excommunicated, and another substituted for him. This alone shews how great the authority of the Bishop of Rome in such an emergency was. But the tone of his language is worth considering. It is just such incidents as these which are made use of by Roman Catholic controversialists in late times to justify the full extent of Papal power now claimed. "Cyprian to his Brother Stephen, greeting. Faustinus, our colleague at Lyons, dearest Brother, hath more than once written to me, signifying what I know has certainly been reported to you also, both by him and by the rest of our Brother-Bishops in that Province, that Marcian

2. Depo-  
sition of  
Marcian.

Epist. 67.  
De Marci-  
ano Arela-  
tensi.

<sup>b</sup> Of a passage in this letter, De Maistre says (Du Pape, liv. i. ch. 6): "Resuming the order of the most marked testimonies which present themselves to me on the general question, I find, first, St. Cyprian declare, in the middle of the third century, that heresies and schisms only existed in the Church because all eyes were not turned towards the Priest of God, towards the Pontiff who judges in the Church *in the place of Jesus Christ*." A pretty strong testimony, indeed, and one which would go far to convince me of the fact. Pity it is, that when

one refers to the original, one finds that St. Cyprian is actually speaking of himself, and of the consequences of any where setting up in a See a schismatical Bishop against the true one. After this, who will trust De Maistre's facts without testing them? The truth is, he had taken the quotation at second hand, and never looked to see to whom it was applied. It suited the Pope so admirably that it must have been meant for him. But I recommend no one to change their faith upon the authority of quotations which they do not test.

CHAP.  
I.

of Arles, has joined himself to Novatian, and has departed from the unity of the Catholic Church, and from the agreement of our body and priesthood . . . . This matter it is our duty to provide against and remedy, most dear Brother, we, who considering the divine clemency, and holding the balance of the Church's government, so exhibit to sinners our vigorous censure as not to deny the medicine of Divine goodness and mercy to the restoration of the fallen and the healing of the wounded. Wherefore it behoves you to write a very explicit letter to our fellow Bishops in the Gauls, that they may not any longer suffer our order (*collegio nostro*) to be insulted by Marcian, obstinate, haughty, the enemy both of piety to God, and of his brethren's salvation. . . . For, therefore, most dear brother, is the numerous body of Priests joined together in mutual concord, and the bond of unity, that *if any one of our order* attempt to make a heresy, and to sever and lay waste the flock of Christ, the rest may fly to the rescue, and, like useful and merciful shepherds, collect the Lord's sheep into a flock. . . . For, although we are many shepherds, yet we feed one flock; and we ought to collect and cherish all those sheep which Christ sought with His own blood and passion. . . . For we must preserve the glorious honour *of our predecessors*, the blessed Martyrs, Cornelius and Lucius," (the last Popes,) "whose memory we indeed honour, but which you much more, most dear Brother, who are become their successor, ought to distinguish and preserve by your weight and authority. For they being full of the spirit of God, and made glorious Martyrs, determined that reconciliation was to be granted to the lapsed, and set down in their letters, that, after a course of penitence, the advantage of communion and peace was not to be refused them. *Which thing we all have everywhere entirely determined.* For there could not be in us a difference of judgment in whom there is one spirit." Now, might it not be stated, that St. Cyprian wrote to Pope Stephen, to request him to depose Marcian, Bishop of Arles? But how much is the inference from this fact modified by the language of Cyprian himself? It is just such a letter as an Eastern Primate would have written to the Patriarch of Alexandria, or of Antioch, to request his interference at

Antecessorum nostrorum.

Vicarius et successor.

a dangerous juncture. It bears witness, not to the present Papal, but to the Patriarchal, system. It tallies exactly with the spirit of him who wrote elsewhere, to the lapsed, "Our Lord, whose precepts and warnings we are bound to observe, regulating the honour of the Bishop, and the constitution of His Church, speaks in the Gospel, and says to Peter, 'I say unto thee that thou art Peter,' &c. Thence, according to the change of times and successions, the ordination of Bishops and the constitution of the Church has descended, *so that the Church is established upon the Bishops, and every act of the Church is directed by the same, its governors.* This being established by divine law," &c. It is evident that, if the See of Peter, so often referred to by St. Cyprian, means the local See of Rome, it also means the See of every Bishop who holds that office, whereof Peter is the great type, example, and source.

S E C T.  
III.

St.Cyp. Ep.  
29.

But it was reserved for a more celebrated controversy fully to bring out St. Cyprian's view of the relation of the Bishop of Rome to the rest of the Episcopal body: I mean, of course, the controversy whether heretics should be admitted into the Church by rebaptization or by the imposition of hands. I most fully believe, be it observed, that Cyprian acknowledged the Roman Primacy, that he admitted certain high prerogatives to be lodged in the Roman Pontiff, as St. Peter's successor, which did not belong to any other Bishop. It is this very thing which makes his conduct the more remarkable. He took a very strong view on one side of the controversy in question: and St. Stephen took an equally strong one on the other. St. Stephen, we all know, turned out to be right. That fervent Pontiff, it may be remarked, when St. Cyprian would not give up his view, seemed inclined to treat him much as St. Gregory the Seventh did a refractory Emperor, or St. Innocent the Third, the dastard tyrant John. This may be very satisfactory to the modern defenders of Papal omnipotence, but St. Cyprian's conduct is not so at all. St. Cyprian called a Council of Bishops of the Provinces of Carthage and Numidia; they attended to the number of seventy-one, and decided that heretics should be rebaptized. St. Cyprian informs the Pope of the decision of himself and his colleagues. After

3. Controversy on rebaptization of heretics.

CHAP. I.  
Ep. 73. saying that they had found it necessary to hold a Council, he proceeds—"But I thought I ought to write to you and confer with your gravity and wisdom concerning that especially which most belongs to the authority of the priesthood, and to the unity alike and dignity of the Catholic Church derived from the ordering of a Divine disposition. . . . This, most dear Brother, we have brought to your knowledge on account both of the honour we share with you, and of our single-hearted affection, believing that what is both religious and true is acceptable to you also according to your true religion and faith. But we know that some are unwilling to give up an opinion they have once imbibed, nor easily change their mind; but, without interruption to the bonds of peace and concord with their colleagues, retain certain peculiarities which have once grown into usage among themselves." (Such is the manner in which St. Cyprian mentions a judgment deliberately expressed by a Pope on a matter of high discipline, which involved a point of faith.) "In which matter we too do violence and give the law to no one, inasmuch as *every Bishop has the free choice of his own will in the administration of the Church, as he will give an account of his acts to the Lord.*" St. Stephen received this decision of the African Council so ill, that he would not even see the Bishops who brought it, nor allow the faithful to offer them common hospitality. So important in his eyes was the matter in dispute. St. Cyprian reports his answer in a letter to his Brother-Bishop Pompeius, in which he says, "Although we have fully embraced all that is to be said concerning the baptizing of heretics, in the letters of which we have sent to you copies, most dear Brother, yet, because you desired to be informed what answer our Brother Stephen sent me to our letters, I send you a copy of his rescript, after reading which you will more and more mark his error, who attempts to assert the cause of heretics against Christians and against the Church of God. For amongst other either proud or impertinent or inconsistent remarks, which he has written rashly and improvidently, &c. . . . But what blindness of mind is it, what perverseness to refuse to recognise the unity of the faith coming from God the Father and the tradition of Jesus

Ep. 74.

Christ our Lord and God. . . . But since no heresy at all, nor indeed any schism, can possess outside (the Body) the sanctification of saving Baptism, why has the harsh obstinacy of our Brother Stephen burst forth to such a degree?" &c. . . . "Does he give honour to God, who, the friend of heretics and the enemy of Christians, deems the Priests of God, maintaining the truth of Christ and the unity of the Church, worthy of excommunication?" St. Stephen had inflicted this on the African Prelates, until they should give up their judgment on the point in question. . . . "Nor ought the custom, which has crept in *among certain persons*, to hinder truth from prevailing and conquering. For custom without truth is but old error." . . . "But it is hurried away by presumption and contumacy that a person rather defends his own perverseness and falsity than accedes to the right and truth of another. Which thing the blessed Apostle Paul foreseeing, writes to Timothy and warns, that a Bishop must not be quarrelsome, nor contentious, but gentle and teachable. Now he is teachable, who is mild and gentle to learn patiently. For a Bishop ought not only to teach, but also to learn, because he teaches better who daily improves and profits by learning better." Even as I copy this language used concerning a Pope by a great Bishop and Martyr of the third century, who elsewhere writes, "That our Lord built His Church upon Peter being one, and though He gave to all the Apostles an equal power, yet in order to manifest unity He has by His own authority so placed the source of the same unity as to begin from one;" I feel the contrast to be almost overpowering with the tone in which the first Patriarch of the Latin Church, however good his cause might be, would now venture to address the Supreme Pontiff. Towards the conclusion of this letter he says, instead of admitting that the Pope's judgment terminated the matter—"This now the Priests of God ought to do, preserving the Divine precepts, so that if in anything truth has been shaken and tottered, we may return to the fountain-head of the Lord, and to the Evangelical and Apostolical tradition, and that the rule of our acting may spring thence, whence its order and origin arose."

SECT.  
III.

De Unit.  
Ecc. Oxf.  
Tr. § 3.

After receiving the Pope's rescript, and his excommuni-

CHAP.  
I.

cation, St. Cyprian convoked another Council of the three Provinces of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania, which was held at Carthage on the 1st of Sept. 256. It was attended by eighty-five Bishops, among whom were fifteen Confessors, beside Priests and Deacons, and a great part of the people.

Op. St. Cypri.  
p. 329. ed.  
Baluz.

St. Cyprian opened it, observing: "It remains for us each to deliver our sentiments on this matter, judging no one, nor removing any one, if he be of a different opinion, from the right of Communion. *For no one of us sets himself up to be a Bishop of Bishops, or by fear of his tyranny compels his colleagues to the necessity of obedience, since every Bishop according to his recognised liberty and power possesses a free choice, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another. But let us all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who singly and alone has the power both of setting us up in the government of His Church, and of judging our proceedings.*" The Bishops delivered their judgments *seriatim*, finishing with St. Cyprian, and unanimously ratified what they had agreed upon before, that heretics should be admitted into the Church by Baptism, and not merely by the imposition of hands: and thus an African Council of the third century treated a judgment of the Pope, and his sentence of excommunication until they altered their practice.

Comment  
of St. Au-  
gustine.

But these last words of St. Cyprian are so remarkable in themselves, and have such a bearing on the present Papal claims, that they deserve further notice. Now, lest we should imagine that St. Cyprian was hurried away by the ardour of his defence of a favourite doctrine, and his sense of the Pope's severity, into unjustifiable expressions concerning the rights of Bishops, it so happens that we possess the comment of the greatest of the Fathers on these very words. St. Augustine, writing 140 years after, and fully agreeing with the judgment of Pope Stephen, as had the whole Church finally, quotes the whole passage. "It remains for us each to deliver our sentiments on this matter, judging no one, nor removing any one, if he be of a different opinion, from the right of Communion.' There he not only permits me without loss of Communion further to seek the truth, but even to be of a different judgment. 'For no one of us,' saith he, 'sets himself up to be a Bishop of Bishops, or by fear of his

Tom. 9. p.  
110.

tyranny compels his colleagues to the necessity of obedience.' What can be more gentle? What more humble? Certainly no authority deters us from seeking what is the truth: 'since,' he says, 'every Bishop according to his recognised liberty and power possesses a free choice, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another:' certainly, I imagine, in those questions which have not yet been thoroughly and completely settled. For he knew how great and mysterious a sacrament the whole Church was then with various reasonings considering, and he left open a freedom of inquiry, that the truth might by search be laid open. . . . I cannot by any means be induced to believe that Cyprian, a Catholic Bishop, a Catholic Martyr, and the greater he was the more in every respect humbling himself, that he might find grace before God, did, especially in a holy Council of his colleagues, utter with his mouth other than what he carried in his heart, particularly as he adds—'But let us all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who singly and alone has the power both of setting us up in the government of His Church, and of judging our proceedings.' Under appeal then to so great a judgment, expecting to hear the truth from his colleagues, should he offer them the first example of falsehood? God avert such a madness from any Christian, how much more from Cyprian. We possess then a free power of inquiry, admitted us by Cyprian's own most gentle and true language."

Who can conclude otherwise than that St. Augustine in the year 400, as St. Cyprian in the year 256, was utterly ignorant of any such power as is now claimed for the See of Rome, under cover of that original Primacy to which both these great saints have borne indubitable witness? For the words of St. Cyprian, attested and approved by St. Augustine, contain the most explicit denial of that power lodged in the See of Rome as distinct from an Ecumenical Council, by which alone, if at all, the Church of England has been declared schismatical and excommunicate.

These are Bishops of the West speaking, but the East also must give its voice. St. Dionysius of Alexandria, and many other Eastern Prelates, among the rest Firmilian, Metropolitan of Cesarea, in Cappadocia, supported St. Cyprian

St. Firmilian.

CHAP.  
I.

S. Cyp. Ep.  
75.

on the question of rebaptization. The latter had been informed of St. Stephen's strong judgment and decided proceedings in the matter, who had threatened to separate the Bishops of the East also from his communion, if they did not comply with his rule. Firmilian wrote a long letter to Cyprian, which contains very remarkable expressions. He alludes in it more than once to the Primacy of St. Peter, and to that of Stephen as descending from him. "But what is the error, and how great the blindness of him (*i. e.* the Pope) who says, remission of sins can be given in the meetings of heretics, nor remains in the foundation of the one Church which was once fixed by Christ upon the rock, may be hence understood, because to Peter alone Christ said, Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven; and again, in the Gospel, when on the Apostles alone Christ breathed and said, Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye remit they are remitted, and whose ye retain, they are retained. *Therefore the power of remitting sins was given to the Apostles and the Churches which they, being sent by Christ, set up, and to the Bishops who have succeeded them by ordination in their stead. . . .* And here I am justly indignant at this so open and manifest folly of Stephen, because, glorying as he does in the rank of his Episcopate, and maintaining that he holds the succession of Peter, upon whom the foundations of the Church were laid, he introduces many other rocks, and sets up new buildings of many Churches, while he affirms, on his own authority, that Baptism is in them. . . . Nor does he perceive that the truth of the Christian rock is clouded over by him, and in a manner abolished, who thus betrays and deserts unity. . . . You Africans can say against Stephen, that, when the truth became known to you, you relinquished an erroneous custom. But we join custom also to truth, and to the custom of the Romans oppose a custom indeed, but that of truth, holding from the beginning this which has been delivered down from Christ, and from the Apostles." He had said before, "One may know that those who are at Rome do not in all things observe what has been delivered down from the beginning, and vainly allege the authority or

the Apostles, even by this, that in celebrating Easter, and in many other sacred rites, one may see there are among them certain variations; nor are all things there kept as they are kept at Jerusalem; just as in very many other provinces also, according to the diversity of places and names, there are variations; nor yet on this account have the peace and unity of the Catholic Church ever been departed from. Which now Stephen has dared to do, breaking peace towards you, which his predecessors always kept with you, in reciprocal love and honour; casting, too, shameful reproach (infamans) on the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, as if they had handed this down," &c. The letter concludes with an apostrophe to Stephen, which only a regard to truth induces me to quote, so painful is its vehemence, though it proves *ex abundantia* the point we are upon: "And Stephen is not ashamed to assert this, that remission of sins can be given through those who are themselves in all their sins. . . But thou art worse than all heretics; for whilst many, acknowledging their error, come to thee thence to receive the true light of the Church, thou assistest the errors of those so coming. . . Nor understandest that their souls will be demanded at thy hand, when the day of judgment is come, who to the thirsting hast denied the Church's draught, and hast been the cause of death to those who would live. And moreover thou art indignant! See with what ignorance thou venturdest to censure those who strive for the truth against falsehood. For who had most right to be angry at another; he who supports the enemies of God, or he who argues for the truth of the Church against him who supports God's enemies? except that it is evident that the ignorant are also passionate and wrathful, whilst, through lack of wisdom and discourse, they readily betake themselves to passion, so that it is of none other than thee that Holy Scripture says, 'The passionate man prepares quarrels, and the wrathful man heaps up sins;' for what quarrels and dissensions hast thou caused through the Churches of the whole world! But how great a sin hast thou heaped upon thyself, when thou didst cut thyself off from so many flocks; for thou hast destroyed thyself. Do not be deceived. Since he is the true schismatic who has made himself an apostate from

CHAP. I. *the communion of the Church's oneness; for whilst thou dost fancy that all can be excommunicated by thee, thou hast excommunicated thyself alone from all. . . .* This salutary advice of the Apostle how diligently hath Stephen fulfilled! preserving humility of feeling and lenity, *in his first rank*, (primo in loco.) For what could be more humble or gentle, than to have disagreed with so many Bishops throughout the whole world, breaking peace with one and the other on various grounds of discord, now with the Eastern, as we are sure you are aware, now with you in the South; episcopal deputies from whom he received with such patience and mildness, that he did not even admit them to an interview; moreover, so mindful of the claims of charity and affection, that he charged the whole brotherhood, that no one should receive them into his house?" &c.

St. Dionysius.

In another place we have preserved to us the opinion of St. Dionysius of Alexandria on St. Stephen's mode of acting with the Eastern Churches. And this opinion is the more important because this same eminent Bishop is quoted by Mr. Newman as a witness to the Papal Supremacy, in that he explained to Dionysius, Bishop of Rome, certain points on which he was accused. Writing, then, to Philemon, a Priest of the Roman Church, he says, as Eusebius has preserved for us his words: "This too I have learnt, that not the Bishops in Africa alone have now introduced this custom, but long ago also in the times of the Bishops our predecessors, in the most populous Churches, and in Councils of the Brethren at Iconium, and Synada, and in many places, this was determined on: to overturn whose resolutions, and so to throw them into strife and contention, I do not venture. For thou shalt not remove, saith He, thy neighbour's landmark, which thy fathers have set."

Euseb. l. 7. c. 7; referred to by Launoy.

Here I think it is pretty plain, 1st, that St. Dionysius disapproved of St. Stephen's conduct: 2ndly, that he acknowledged no power in his See different in kind from that of other Sees: 3rdly, that he sets forth indirectly the original Episcopal constitution of the Church.

The words of St. Basil the Great convey the same impression. In his Canonical letter to St. Amphilocheus, which has ever been of authority in the Eastern Church, he says,

“It seemed good to the ancients, Cyprian, I mean, and our Firmilian, to subject all these to the same decision, the Cathari, and Encratitæ, and Hydroparastatæ: because the beginning of the separation took place through a schism, and they who revolted from the Church had no longer the grace of the Holy Spirit upon them. For His communication failed them by the succession being cut off. For the first seceders indeed had ordination from the Fathers, and by the imposition of their hands possessed the spiritual gift: but those who broke away, becoming laymen, had authority neither to baptize, nor to ordain, being no longer able to convey the grace of the Holy Spirit to others, from which they had fallen themselves. Wherefore they (the Fathers) bade those who came from them to the Church, as being baptized by laymen, to be purified by the free Baptism of the Church. But since some in Asia have altogether decided, as a matter of dispensation to a great number, that their Baptism be received, let it be received. But we must know the drift of that bad act of the Encratitæ: for, in order to bar their way back to the Church, they attempted, later, to occupy the ground with their own Baptism: by which they have also broken their own custom. I judge therefore, since there is nothing distinctly decided about them, that we ought to reject their Baptism, and if any one has received it from them, baptize him at his reception into the Church. If however this should stand in the way of the general dispensation, we should again comply with the custom, and follow the Fathers who have admitted this mode of dealing by dispensation in our matters. For I fear, lest, while we desire to make them shrink from baptizing, we may hinder those who are in the way to salvation through the severity of our rule. But if they keep our Baptism, let us not regard that. For we are bound not to acknowledge this in them, but to be scrupulous in our servitude to the canons.”

SECT.  
III.  
S. Basil,  
tom. 3. p.  
269. E.

*οικονομία.*

It is clear, I suppose, first, that St. Basil did not censure St. Cyprian or St. Firmilian for their conduct in this matter: secondly, that he never so much as imagined that the decree of Pope St. Stephen could settle the question by authority: thirdly, that he held it to be a subject matter in which the proper authority, *i.e.* Bishops in Council, might dispense:

CHAP. I. fourthly, that he held the Canon, *i. e.* the regulation of Bishops in Councils, to be a supreme authority to which all Christian men owe not merely observance, but, it is his own word, scrupulous servitude.

Tillemont  
His. Ecc. 4.  
160.

Liv. 7. sec.  
32.

Concerning this remarkable history Tillemont says that Pope St. Sixtus, therefore called by Pontius that "good and peace-loving Priest," probably restored communion between his own See and that of Carthage. "As for the terms on which this peace was made, there is much appearance that it was as St. Dionysius and St. Cyprian demanded, that is, that each Bishop was left to act according to his discretion and light, until God should discover the truth in a more clear and authentic manner." Which is as much as to say that the Bishop of Rome's decision, in opposition to that of other great Prelates, was not a clear and authentic manner. Fleury observes: "It is not known what was then the issue of this dispute. It is certain that it still continued under Pope St. Sixtus, successor of St. Stephen: this is seen by the letters that St. Dionysius of Alexandria wrote him; and it does not appear that St. Cyprian or Firmilian changed their mind. Still St. Cyprian is counted among the most illustrious martyrs, even in the Roman Church, which names him in the Canon of the Mass, in preference to Pope St. Stephen; and the Greeks, in their Menologium, honour the memory of Firmilian. With reason, since we shall see him preside over the first Council of Antioch, against Paul of Samosata; and the Fathers of the second Council, writing to the Pope, name Firmilian, of happy memory, as they do Dionysius of Alexandria. Why the error of St. Cyprian and St. Firmilian hurt not their sanctity is, that they always preserved on their part the unity of the Church, and charity, and that they maintained in good faith a bad cause, which they believed good, *and upon which there had not yet been a decision received by unanimous consent of the whole Church.* Thus St. Augustine speaks of it, *not counting as a final decision the decree of Pope St. Stephen, though true in its matter, and clothed with all the force that he could give it. No one of the ancients has accused these holy Bishops of obstinacy for not having obeyed this decree.* The decision of Pope St. Stephen respecting the baptism of heretics has prevailed, because it

was the most ancient and the most universal, and consequently the best. . . . At length this question was entirely set at rest by the authority of the universal Council, that is to say, at the latest, at the Council of Nicea." Most fair and just: St. Cyprian and St. Firmilian may have innocently erred in such a matter; but what of the way in which they treated the Pope? Could they be ignorant of the constitution of that Church of which they were Primates, Saints, and one a Martyr? If his decision was final, must they not have known it? If his primacy involved their obedience, must they not have rendered it? But if they were his deputies, as the present Roman claim would have it, who can express their rashness? Had they been right, and the Pope wrong, according to the present tenets of the Latin Church, obedience had been better than sacrifice. In truth, they would have anticipated the noble submission of the Archbishop of Cambrai, and yielded at once to the chair of St. Peter, whatever had been their conviction as to the truth of their views; but the Archbishop of Carthage, the sternest defender of Ecclesiastical unity and discipline which even the Church of the Fathers produced, knew not that he had any such duty towards the See of St. Peter; and St. Dionysius of Alexandria at the time, as well as St. Basil of Cesarea one hundred and twenty years later, knew it as little.

Nay, and St. Augustine knew it not either. It was no more the belief in his day, than in St. Cyprian's. The Donatists alleged against him in the question of Baptism the authority of Cyprian in this great Council of Carthage. This leads him to make a very important statement—"You are wont to object against us Cyprian's letters, Cyprian's judgment, Cyprian's Council: why do you assume the authority of Cyprian for your schism, and reject his example for the peace of the Church? But who is ignorant that canonical holy Scripture, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, is contained in its own certain limits, and is so preferred to all subsequent letters of Bishops, that no doubt or discussion at all can be held concerning it, as to whether that be true or right, which is acknowledged to be found written in it: but that the letters of Bishops which either have been or are written after the confirmation of the Canon, may be repre-

SECT.  
III.

Judgment  
of St. Au-  
gustine on  
this ques-  
tion.

Tom. 9. 97.  
G.

CHAP.  
I.

hended both by the reasoning, peradventure more full of wisdom, of some one in that matter more skilled, and by the weightier authority and more learned judgment of other Bishops, and by Councils, if haply there has been in them any deviation from the truth; and that Councils themselves, holden in particular regions or provinces, yield beyond all question to the authority of plenary Councils, which are made out of the whole Christian world: and that former plenary Councils themselves are often corrected by subsequent ones, when by some practical experience what has been hidden is laid open, and what lay concealed is recognised, without any puffing up of sacrilegious pride, without any haughty exhibition of arrogance, without any strife of livid envy, with holy humility, with Catholic peace, with Christian charity." Here, where, in a *dignus vindice nodus*, we should have expected some mention of the Chief See, and St. Peter's rights, all is referred to the voice of Bishops in Council,—that See, in which, according to Bellarmine, the plenitude of all the power resides which Christ left in His Church, is not even spoken of. He proceeds—"Wherefore holy Cyprian, the more exalted, the more humble," (in a matter for which he was excommunicated by the Pope, and in which, if the present Papal theory be true, his conduct was to the last degree insolent and unjustifiable,) "who so loved the example of Peter as to say,—'Shewing, indeed, an instance to us of concord and patience, that we should not pertinaciously love our own opinion, but should rather count for our own any useful and sound suggestions, which at times are made by our brethren and colleagues, if they be true and lawful:' he sufficiently shews that he would most readily have corrected his judgment, had any one pointed out to him that the Baptism of Christ might be given by those who had gone out" (from the Church) "in the same manner that it could not be lost when they went out: on which point we have already said much. Nor should we ourselves venture to make any such assertion, were we not supported by the unanimous authority of the whole Church: to which he too, without doubt, would yield, if the truth of this question had at that period been thoroughly sifted, and declared, and established by a plenary Council. For if he praises and extols Peter for

having with patience and harmony suffered correction from a single younger colleague, how much more readily would he himself, with the Council of his province, have yielded to the authority of the whole world, when the truth was laid open? because, indeed, so holy and so peaceful a soul might most readily agree to one person" (*i. e.* the Pope), "speaking and proving the truth: and this, perhaps, was really the fact, but we know not. For not all which at that time was transacted between Bishops could be committed to posterity and writing, nor do we know all which was so committed. For how could that matter, involved in so many clouds of altercations, be brought to the clear consideration and ratification of a plenary Council, unless first for a long time throughout all the regions of the world it had been thoroughly tried, and made manifest by many discussions and conferences of Bishops on the one side and on the other? But wholesome peace produces this, that when obscure questions have been long under inquiry, and, through the difficulty of ascertaining them, beget various judgments in brotherly discussion, until the pure truth be arrived at, the bond of unity holds, lest in the part cut off the incurable wound of error should remain." He considers Pope Stephen here, even when he was right, as one of many *brethren*, who had a right to be deferentially heard, but no more. In fact his controversy with the Donatists has led him in a great number of passages to speak of this dispute between St. Stephen and St. Cyprian. Now it is remarkable, 1st. that in not one of these does he censure St. Cyprian for not having obeyed the judgment of St. Stephen: 2nd. in not one does he intimate that a letter from the Bishop of Rome ought to be obeyed: 3rd. he does continually excuse St. Cyprian for having been wrong in a point which was afterwards settled against him by a plenary Council: this, and not his resistance to the Pope, as has been most falsely stated, being "that spot of his most pure breast which he covered with the fervour of his charity:" this that which "if there was any thing in him to be amended, the Father purged with the pruning-hook of his passion." 4th. He as continually attributes to a plenary Council the power of settling such disputed points, asserting that St. Cyprian would have yielded to it the obedience

CHAP.  
I.

which he refused to St. Stephen. I select two passages out of many quoted by Launoy. To the Donatist Bishop Gaudentius he writes, "Answer me if you can this short question. While Cyprian was rebaptizing those who came from the heretics, being Bishop of the Church of Carthage, Stephen being Bishop of the Church of Rome received heretics in the same baptism which they had had given them out of the Church, and both, pursuing this different practice, remained in Catholic unity." He here plainly assigns no more authority to Stephen than to Cyprian. In another he sums up his opinion thus. "Wherefore rendering due reverence, and paying meet honour, so far as in me lies, to the peace-loving Bishop and glorious Martyr Cyprian, I yet venture to say, not on the strength of my own judgment, but on that of the universal Church, strengthened and confirmed by the authority of a plenary Council, that he formed an opinion concerning the rebaptizing of schismatics and heretics contrary to that which truth afterwards brought to light." I do not think that stronger and clearer evidence respecting St. Augustine's view as to the power of the Roman See, both *de jure* and *de facto*, can be desired than this matter presents. And how can the Church government under which St. Augustine lived and died render schismatical and exclude from the pale of salvation those who now maintain it?

Tom. 9. 670,  
G; 9. 162.  
E.

So, in another place, arguing with these same Donatists, he distinctly considers the case of the judgment of the Roman Pontiff being erroneous. "The Donatists," says he, "chose with a double purpose, to plead their cause with Cæcilian before the Churches across the sea; being doubly prepared, that if they could by any skilfulness of false accusation have overcome him, they might to the full satiate their desire: but if they failed in this, might continue in the same perversity, but still as if they would have to allege, that they had suffered in having bad judges: this is what all evil suitors cry, though they have been overcome by the plainest truths: as if it might not be answered them and most justly retorted,—Let us suppose that these Bishops who judged at Rome," (Pope Melchiades and a Council of Gallic and Italian Bishops,) "were not fair judges; there still remained a plenary Council of the universal Church, where the cause might

Tom. 2. 96.  
F.

Judgment  
of a general  
Council  
after the  
Pope's  
judgment.

have been tried even with those very judges, so that had they been convicted of false judgment their decision might be reversed." SECT.  
III.

Nay, it appears, the cause of the Donatists, after being decided by Pope Melchiades, was reheard, and that, not by a plenary Council, but by other Bishops of the West, deputed by Constantine. "Know," says St. Augustine, Tom. 2. 229.  
C. "that your first ancestors carried the cause of Cæcilianus before the Emperor Constantine. Demand this of us, let us prove it to you, and if we prove it not, do with us what you can. But because Constantine dared not to judge in the cause of a Bishop, he delegated the discussion and terminating of it to Bishops. This took place in the city of Rome under the presidency of Melchiades, Bishop of that Church, with many of his colleagues. They having pronounced Cæcilianus innocent, and condemned Donatus, who had made the schism at Carthage, your party again went to the Emperor, and murmured against the judgment of the Bishops in which they had been beaten. For how can the guilty party praise the judge by whose sentence he has been beaten? Yet a second time the most indulgent Emperor assigned other Bishops as judges, at Arles, in Gaul, and from them your party appealed to the Emperor himself, until he too heard the cause, and pronounced Cæcilianus innocent, and them false accusers." Did he who wrote these words mean to censure Constantine for granting a second hearing after the judgment of Pope Melchiades?

"Basilides," says Mr. Newman, "deposed in Spain, betakes himself to Rome, and gains the ear of St. Stephen." 4. Case of  
Basilides. This, however, is only half the case. It comes to the knowledge of St. Cyprian that he has done so. Let us take Fleury's account. "As Basilides and Martial still endeavoured to force themselves back upon their Sees, Felix and Sabinus, their legitimate successors, went to Carthage with letters from the Churches of Leon, Asturia, and Merida, and from another Felix, Bishop of Sarragossa, known in Africa as attached to the faith, and a defender of the truth. These letters were read in a Council of thirty-six Bishops, at the head of whom was St. Cyprian, who answered in the name of all by a letter addressed to the Priest Felix, and to the" Fleury, liv.  
7. 23.

CHAP. I.  
Ep. 68. S.  
Cypriani.

faithful people of Leon and Asturia, and to the Deacon Lœlius, with the people of Merida." In this letter he says, "Wherefore, according to Divine tradition, and Apostolic observance, that is to be kept and observed, which is observed by us also, and generally throughout all the Provinces, that in order rightly to celebrate ordinations, the nearest Bishops of the same Province should meet together with that people for whom the head is ordained, and the Bishop should be chosen in the presence of the people, which is most fully acquainted with the life of every one, and has observed the conduct of each individual from his conversation. And this we see was observed by you in the ordination of our colleague Sabinus, so that, according to the suffrage of the whole brotherhood, and the judgment of the Bishops, who were either present, or had sent you letters about him, the Episcopate was conferred upon him, and hands laid upon him in the place of Basilides. Nor can it invalidate a rightful ordination, that Basilides, after the detection of his crimes and the laying bare his conscience even by his own confession, going to Rome deceived our colleague Stephen, who was far removed and ignorant of the thing as it was really done, that he might make interest for an unjust restoration to that Episcopate from which he had been rightfully deposed. It comes to this, that the crimes of Basilides have been rather doubled than wiped away, since to his former sins, the crime of deceit and circumvention has been added. *Nor should he be so much blamed, who through negligence was over-reached, as the other execrated, who fraudulently deceived.* But if Basilides could over-reach men, God he cannot," &c. If the appeal of Basilides to Stephen proves the Roman Primacy, what does the subsequent appeal of the people of Leon, Asturia, and Merida, to Carthage, prove? And if the restoration of Basilides by Stephen, proves that he possessed that power, what does the subsequent pronouncing of that restoration void by Cyprian and his Brother Bishops, without even first acquainting Stephen, prove?

Summary  
of St. Cy-  
prian's rela-  
tion to the  
Roman  
Pontiff.

In truth, all the acts of St. Cyprian's Episcopate, of which I have given several in illustration, are an indisputable assurance to the candid mind that he treated the Roman Pontiff simply as his brother,—his elder brother, indeed,—

holding the first See in Christendom, but, individually, as liable to err as himself. And it is equally clear that St. Augustine, a hundred and forty years later, did not censure him for this. What we have seen, is this. In the matter of Fortunatus and Felicissimus, Cyprian rejects with vehement indignation their appeal to Rome: in the case of Marcian of Arles, having, as well as Pope Stephen, been appealed to by Faustinus Bishop of Lyons, and his colleagues, he writes as an equal to Pope Stephen, almost enjoining him what to do: in the question of rebaptizing heretics, he disregards St. Stephen's judgment, and the anathema which accompanies it; and how strong St. Firmilian's language is we need not repeat, who declares that St. Stephen's excommunication only cut off himself: in the case of Basilides, he deposes afresh one whom Stephen had restored.

SECT.  
III.

SECT. IV.

“St. Victor, Bishop of Rome,” says Mr. Newman, “threatens to excommunicate the Asian Churches.” The fact is unquestionable, as Mr. Newman states it. But the bearing of this fact it is impossible to see, without going into the circumstances, and taking note how the Asian Churches themselves, and how other Bishops, received St. Victor's act. Let us take then the original account in Eusebius. “About this time (A.D. 193) no small controversy arose, because the Dioceses of all Asia,” (*i. e.* the Province of Ephesus,) “as from a more ancient tradition, thought they were bound to keep the fourteenth day after the full moon for the festival of the Passover which brought salvation, on which the Jews were ordered to sacrifice the lamb. As if it were necessary absolutely on this day, whichever day of the week it might fall upon, to terminate the fast. Whereas it was not the custom of the Churches throughout all the rest of the world to keep it in this manner, they following a custom which has prevailed even to this time from Apostolical tradition, that the fast should not terminate on any other day but that of the resurrection of our Saviour. So then Synods and meetings

Pope St.  
Victor and  
the Asian  
Churches.

Eusebius,  
5. 23—5.

CHAP. I. of Bishops took place. And all with one accord by their letters set forth the Ecclesiastical rule to all countries, that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection from the dead should be celebrated on none other but the Lord's day, and that on this alone we should observe the termination of the Paschal fast. There is extant still a writing of the Bishops then assembled in Palestine, over whom presided Theophilus, Bishop of the Diocese of Cæsarea, and Narcissus of that of Jerusalem. And of the Synod at Rome in like manner another, about the same question, bearing the name of the Bishop Victor. And of the Bishops in Pontus, over whom Palmas as the most ancient was set. And of the Dioceses of Gaul, whereof Irenæus had the care. And further of those in Osrhoene and the cities there. And, separately, one of Bacchyllus, Bishop of the Church of the Corinthians, and of a great many others, who, giving the same opinion and judgment, put forth one sentence. And these came to one decision, that which we have mentioned."

Here then is a most unsuspecting description of the Church's Constitution in action, from a writer of the fourth century. And, independent of his own authority, St. Victor had on his side a very strong case, in the unanimity of so many parts of the world. What follows? "But the Bishops of Asia, who persisted that they ought to maintain the ancient custom delivered down to them, were presided over by Polycrates: who himself in the letter which he wrote to Victor and the Church of the Romans, thus sets forth the tradition which had come to him. "We then celebrate the genuine day, neither adding thereto, nor taking away therefrom. For in Asia two great luminaries (*στοιχελια*) have gone to their rest, which shall rise again on the day of the Lord's advent, when He cometh with glory from heaven, and shall raise up all the saints: namely, Philip, one of the twelve Apostles, who rests in Hierapolis; and two of his daughters, virgins, who attained old age: and another daughter of his, who was inspired by the Holy Spirit, and rests in Ephesus: moreover, John who reclined on the Lord's bosom, who became a Priest wearing the circlet, and a martyr, and doctor. He rests in Ephesus. Moreover Polycarp, both Bishop and Martyr in Smyrna; and Thræseas, Bishop and Martyr of

Eumenia, who rests in Smyrna. Why should I mention Sagaris, Bishop and Martyr, who rests in Laodicea; and the blessed Papius, and Melito the Eunuch, who did all things by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who lies in Sardis, waiting for the visitation from heaven, when he shall rise from the dead. All these kept the fourteenth day for the Passover, according to the Gospel, varying nothing, but following according to the rule of faith. And I, Polycrates, that am the least of you all, according to the tradition of my kinsmen, sundry of whom I follow. Seven of my kinsmen were Bishops, and I the eighth, and my kinsmen always kept for the day that on which the people avoided leaven. I then, brethren, having been the Lord's disciple sixty-five years, and having conferred with my brethren throughout the world, and having studied all holy Scripture, am not alarmed at what I am threatened with. For those greater than I have said, we must obey God rather than men." He proceeds to speak respecting all the Bishops present with him and concurring in opinion, thus: "I might have spoken of the Bishops present with me, whom you called upon me to convoke, and whom I convoked accordingly: whose names were I to write they would be a great number. And they, having seen me, humble as I am, agreed with my letter, knowing that I do not disgrace my gray hairs, but have always lived under the law of the Lord Jesus Christ."

Thus the answer of the Archbishop of Ephesus to St. Victor in the second century is precisely similar in tone to that of the Archbishop of Carthage in the third to St. Stephen. Could Polycrates have acknowledged in the Roman See any authority different *in kind* from that of other Bishops, such as the Supremacy? Could he have said distinctly to the power which could cut him off from the Church of God and the covenant of salvation, "having conferred with my brethren throughout the world, and having studied all holy Scripture, I am not alarmed at what I am threatened with:" i. e. excommunication from Rome. Eusebius proceeds, "Thereupon Victor, Bishop of the Roman city, endeavours to cut off from the common unity the Dioceses of all Asia in a body, together with the neighbouring Churches, as heterodox, and proscribes them by letter, proclaiming all

CHAP.  
1.

the brethren in those parts to be utterly separated from communion. However these measures did not please all the Bishops. They exhort him therefore on the other side to pursue peace and unity and love towards his neighbours. Their writings too are extant, very severely censuring Victor. Among whom also Irenæus, writing in the person of the brethren over whom he presided in Gaul, maintains indeed that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection should be celebrated only on the Lord's day, but he charges Victor in becoming terms, at great length, not to cut off whole Churches of God, which keep the tradition of ancient custom, and he sums up thus: 'For not only concerning the day is there a dispute, but also respecting the sort of fast. For some consider they ought to fast one day, some two, some more; some measure out forty continuous hours for their day. And there is this variation in the observance not merely in our time, but long before in the time of our predecessors, who, as it seems, not always governing with strict accuracy, handed down to those after them the custom which had grown up naturally, or from the peculiar habit of the place. But none the less all these kept at peace, as we do now, with each other. And the diversity of the fast sets off the harmony of the faith.' He then adds a narration which I will insert as belonging to the subject, to this effect. 'Likewise the elders before Soter, who presided over the Church which you now direct, Anicetus, I mean, and Pius, Hyginus and Telesphorus and Xystus, neither kept it thus themselves, nor permitted those with them to keep it: but, not the less, though they kept it not themselves thus, they preserved peace with those who came to them from the dioceses where it was thus kept. Yet to maintain the observance among those who observed it differently, shewed the greater opposition. Yet never were any cast out on account of this matter. But the elders before you, who kept it not themselves, sent the Eucharist to those from the Dioceses who kept it. And when the blessed Polycarp sojourned in Rome in the time of Anicetus, they had some slight points of controversy with each other which were soon settled, but about this main point they would not persist in strife: for neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to keep it, as having always kept it so

with John the disciple of our Lord, and the other Apostles with whom he had lived, nor could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to keep it after his way, alleging that he was bound to maintain the custom of the elders before him. Such being the state of matters they communicated with each other: and in the church Anicetus yielded the celebration of the Eucharist to Polycarp out of respect, and they departed from each other in peace, enjoying the peace of the whole Church, both of those who kept it one way, and of those who kept it the other.' This is what Irenæus says, bearing out his name, and a peace-maker in temper, exhorting and mediating for the peace of the Church. He also wrote not to Victor alone, but to very many other rulers of Churches to the like effect respecting the question moved.

SECT.  
IV.

"But the Bishops in Palestine whom we have just mentioned, Narcissus, and Theophilus, and with them Cassius, Bishop of the Church in Tyre, and Clarus of that in Ptolemais, and those assembled with them, have spoken at great length concerning the tradition which had come down to them by succession from the Apostles concerning Easter, and they sum up thus at the end of their letter. 'Endeavour to send copies of our letter to every Church, that we may not be charged with those who easily lead astray their own souls. But we declare to you that they in Alexandria celebrate the same day as we do: for letters go from us to them, and from them to us, so that we keep the holy day with one accord at the same time.'"

I suppose that the actions of St. Irenæus towards the Apostolic See of the West are a comment upon his words respecting it: and that when he calls Rome, as Mr. Newman quotes, "the greatest Church, the most ancient, the most conspicuous, and founded and established by Peter and Paul," appeals to its tradition not in contrast indeed, but in preference to that of other Churches, and declares that "in this Church, every Church, that is, the faithful from every side must meet," or "agree together *propter potioem principalitatem*," he really means what he says, and what his actions indicate, that the Bishop of Rome was first among his brethren: and he does not mean a totally different thing, which his words are quoted to prove, namely, that the

Acts of St. Irenæus interpret his words.

CHAP.  
I

Bishop of Rome stood in the same relation to him and to all the other Bishops of the world as he himself stood in to his own presbyters at Lyons. If he did mean this latter thing, he selected the strangest words to express it, and he exemplified it by the strangest actions which I can well conceive. But what excuse to allege for Polycrates, who absolutely refused to listen to the Bishop of Rome's decision, or for the other Bishops throughout the world who met and discussed the matter in virtue of their own authority, and gave their judgment, as binding upon their people, by the same authority, and requested, as the Bishops of Palestine, that copies of their letters might be sent everywhere, instead of looking to a sentence from Rome, I cannot imagine: unless it be what Mr. Newman suggests that "all authority necessarily leads to resistance." P. 24. In that point of view, certainly, the first four centuries supply the strongest sort of "cumulative argument" to the Roman Supremacy, for they are nothing else but a perpetual denial of it: only that the idea does not seem to have presented itself to the great Councils and writers of that time.

Testimony  
of St. Irenæus.

But the truth of the matter is that Irenæus, in the very passage quoted by Mr. Newman to prove the authority of Rome, is a most unambiguous witness on our side, viz., that Rome was indeed a great and Apostolical Church, but not possessed of any authority different *in kind* from other Churches, especially Apostolical Sees. To manifest this, it needs but to quote the passage in full. "All who wish to see the truth may look back in every Church on the tradition of the Apostles made manifest through the whole world: and we can give the catalogue of those who were set up by the Apostles as Bishops in the Churches, and of their successors to our times, who neither taught nor knew any such thing as these in their madness imagine. For had the Apostles known secret mysteries, which they taught to the perfect separately and unknown to the rest, they would have communicated them especially to those, to whom they committed even the Churches themselves. For they desired that those whom they left for their successors, committing to them their very own place of rule, should be exceedingly perfect and blameless in all things: on whose upright conduct great advantage

S. Irenæi  
cont. Hæer.  
lib. 3. cap.  
8.

would follow, while the most grievous calamity would attend their fall. But, since it would be very long in such a volume as my present to enumerate the successions of all the Churches, by pointing out the tradition received from the Apostles, and the faith declared to men, which through the succession of its Bishops reaches even to our times in the Church, the greatest, most ancient, and known to all, founded and set up at Rome, by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, we confound all such as in any manner, either through their self will, or vain glory, or through blindness and bad intention, make private conventicles. For to this Church on account of its superior rank, (or origin,) ἀρχήν. it is necessary that every Church should assemble, that is, the faithful on every side, in which the tradition from the Apostles has been ever preserved by those who are on every side. So then the blessed Apostles" (not Peter alone) "having founded and built the Church, put into the hands of Linus the office of Bishop."

This whole passage is elucidated by the contemporary passage of Tertullian to which Mr. Newman has referred, and which, quoted in full, bears witness for the Episcopal, and against the Papal system. "Come now, thou that wilt exercise thy curiosity to better purpose in the business of thy salvation, go through the Apostolic Churches, in which the very Sees of the Apostles, at this very day, preside over their own places; in which their own authentic writings are read, speaking with the voice of each, and making the face of each present to the eye. Is Achaia near to thee? Thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast the Thessalonians. If thou canst travel into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. *But if thou art near to Italy, thou hast Rome, where we also have an authority close at hand.* What a happy Church is that, on which the Apostles poured out all their doctrine with their blood; where Peter had a like passion with the Lord, where Paul hath for his crown the same death with John; where the Apostle John was plunged into boiling oil, and suffered nothing, and was afterwards banished to an island."—"If these things be so, so that the truth be adjudged to belong to us, as many as walk according to this rule, which the Churches have handed

Testimony  
of Tertul-  
lian.

Tertullian  
de præsc.  
hæret. 36,  
37. Oxf.  
Tr.

CHAP.  
I.

down from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God, the reasonableness of our proposition is manifest, which determineth that heretics are not to be allowed to enter upon an appeal to the Scriptures, whom we prove, without the Scriptures, to have no concern with the Scriptures." As to what he says of Rome being an authority close at hand, he means that Africa had no Apostolic Church, but had received the Gospel from Italy: so in another place he says, "What the Romans, *close at hand*, trumpet forth, to whom both Peter and Paul left the Gospel, sealed moreover with their own blood."

Tertullian  
adv. Marc.  
4. 5, quoted  
in Oxf.  
Tert., p.  
470.

Testimony  
of the Em-  
peror Con-  
stantine.  
Eusebius,  
de vita  
Const. 3.  
19. 18, 19.

Here we may state that the Paschal controversy was only settled at the Nicene Council. The Emperor Constantine, in one of his circular letters to the Churches on that occasion, preserved for us by Eusebius, says, "Since by the general prosperity I have experienced how great is the goodness of Almighty God towards me, I have made this before all other things the scope of my actions, that the most blessed nations of the Catholic Church may preserve one faith, and sincere love, and concordant worship of Almighty God. *But since this matter could not otherwise take firm and stedfast order, without discussion being had of all that belonged to our most holy worship in an assembly of all or at least the greater number of Bishops*, therefore having collected together the greater number I also was present as one of you, for I will not deny that in which I most rejoice, that I am your fellow-servant: all points therefore met with the fitting inquiry until that the decision which was agreeable to the Judge of all was brought forth into light in the harmony of unity, so that no ground for diversity of opinion or doubtfulness of faith was any more left. Where, too, after inquiry concerning the most holy day of the Passover, it seemed good by common consent that all men everywhere should observe it on the same day.—And since it is a fitting order which all the Churches of the West and of the South and of the Northern parts of the world observe, and some of the Eastern; for which reason all were then of opinion that this was right: I too engaged that it would be agreeable to your prudence, that what is kept with one concordant judgment in the city of the Romans, and Italy, and Africa, in all

Egypt, the Spains, the Gauls, the Britains, Libya, all Greece, the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Cilicia, may be willingly accepted by your prudence also, *when you consider that not only the number of the Churches in the above-mentioned countries is the greater*, but that this it is most pious for all in common to agree upon, which likewise strict reason seems to demand:” &c.

I presume that the actions and the words of Constantine agree together in making the supreme power of the Church to reside in the concordant voice of her Bishops. He who convoked the Nicene Council thus bears witness to the principles which governed it, and the whole Church, at the period of its assembling.

The same Constantine writes to the Proconsul Anulinus to grant immunity from public offices to all clerks within the province intrusted to him “who give their ministry to this holy religion in the Catholic Church, over which Cæcilianus” (Bishop of Carthage) “presides.” Just as the Council of Nicea in its Synodal Epistle to the Church of Alexandria writes that certain persons should do nothing “without the consent of the Bishops of the Catholic and Apostolic Church who are under Alexander,” (Bishop of Alexandria.) Expressions which, taken as Mr. Newman chooses to take certain words of Ambrosiaster speaking of the “Church being God’s house, whose ruler at this time is Damasus,” in an absolute instead of a relative sense, would prove the supremacy of the Bishops of Carthage and Alexandria.

Euseb., lib.  
10. c. 7,  
quoted by  
Launoy.

On De-  
velopment,  
p. 174.

“The Emperor Aurelian leaves ‘to the Bishops of Italy and of Rome’ the decision whether or not Paul of Samosata shall be dispossessed of the See-house at Antioch.” It was very natural that he should do so, as from their very distance they were more likely to be impartial judges than any in the East. But let us see what testimony to the Papal authority the course of the proceedings themselves taken against Paul of Samosata renders, for what the Church did is more important than the decision of a heathen Emperor. Eusebius writes, “Xystus, having presided over the Church of the Romans eleven years, is succeeded by Dionysius, of the same name with him of Alexandria. And at the same time, Deme-  
trianus of Antioch being dead, Paul of Samosata succeeds to

Case of  
Paul of Sa-  
mosata.

Eusebius,  
Hist., 7.  
27—30.

CHAP.  
I.

the Episcopate. But as he held low and grovelling doctrines respecting Christ contrary to the teaching of the Church, as if He were in nature a mere man, Dionysius of Alexandria being invited as to a Council, alleging at once his old age and weak health, delayed coming, but gave by letter his judgment on the question. But the other Pastors of the Churches hastened all to Antioch from different quarters, as against one who laid waste the flock of Christ. The most eminent of these were, Firmilian Bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia; Gregory and Athenodorus, brothers, Bishops of the Churches in Pontus: also Helenus of the Diocese of Tarsus, and Nicomachus of Iconium. Moreover Hymenæus of the Church in Jerusalem, and Theotecnus of the adjoining Cesarea, and Maximus the eminent Bishop of the brethren at Bostra. Numberless others also, together with presbyters and deacons, might be mentioned as then assembled for the same cause in the afore-mentioned city, but of these the above were the most conspicuous. All, then, assembling many various times, discussions and questionings were mooted at each Council, wherein the party of the Samosatene endeavoured still to conceal and veil the points on which he was wrong, while the others were zealous to lay bare and drag forth to the light his heresy and blasphemy against Christ. Meantime Dionysius dies in the twelfth year of the reign of Gallienus, having held the bishopric of Alexandria seventeen years, and is succeeded by Maximus. But Gallienus, after a reign of fifteen whole years, is succeeded by Claudius, who after two years is followed by Aurelian. In whose time a Council of the greatest number of Bishops was assembled, and the leader of the heresy at Antioch was convicted and distinctly condemned by all of error, and driven out from the whole Catholic Church. The person who chiefly convicted and refuted his evasions was Malchion, an able man, who was also head of the Hellenic Sophistical school at Antioch, and for his pre-eminent orthodoxy in the faith of Christ was honoured with the presbyterate in the Church there; this man held a disputation with him in the presence of short-hand writers, which is still extant, and was alone able to convict that disingenuous and deceitful one. So then the assembled Pastors, writing a letter in their joint names to Dionysius Bishop of

the Romans, and to Maximus Bishop of Alexandria, send it abroad to all the Provinces: thus they make their zeal known to all, as well as Paul's perverse heresy, and the way in which they had convicted and questioned him. Moreover they related the whole life and conversation of the man. For which reason it will be well to give here at large their expressions in order to record them. The letter:—

'To Dionysius, and Maximus, and all our fellow-ministers throughout the world, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, and to the whole Catholic Church beneath the heavens, Helenus, and Hymenæus, and Theophilus, and Theotecnus, and Maximus, Proclus, Nicomas, and Cælian, and Paul, and Bolanus, and Protogenes, and Hierax, and Eutychius, and Theodorus, and Malchion, and Lucius, and all the rest that with us inhabit the neighbouring cities and nations, Bishops, and Presbyters, and Deacons, and the Churches of God, send greeting in the Lord to the beloved brethren.' They then insert a full account concerning Paul of Samosata, concluding, 'We have therefore been compelled to cut off this man that set himself against God and would not yield, and to appoint in his place another Bishop for the Catholic Church, by the providence of God, as we are persuaded, namely Domnus, son of the blessed Demetrian, who formerly with distinction presided before this man over the same Diocese, and is adorned with all the qualities that befit a Bishop, and we have made this known to you, in order that you may write to him, and receive letters of Communion from him. But let this man write to Artemas, and those who are of the mind of Artemas communicate with him.' And so much for this account. So then upon Paul falling at once from the right faith and his bishopric, Domnus, as I have said, succeeded to the ministry of the Church of Antioch. But inasmuch as Paul would by no means give up the See-house, the Emperor Aurelian being appealed to gave a most just decision, ordering the house to be given to those to whom the Bishops in Italy and the city of the Romans should appoint it," i. e. the Bishops of the Provinces of Milan and of Rome, assembled in Council, not the Pope as distinct from them.

Thus the Bishop of the third See is deposed by a Council of his own and the neighbouring Provinces, and though the

οἷς ἀν οἱ  
κατὰ τὴν  
Ἰταλίαν  
καὶ τὴν Ῥω-  
μαίων πόλιν  
ἐπίσκοποι  
τοῦ δόγμα-  
τος ἐπι-  
στέλλοιεν.

CHAP.  
I.

Bishop of the second See was invited to attend, the Bishop of the first, doubtless on account of his distance, is not applied to. No more complete case of Eastern self-government can be found than this, of which Mr. Newman has quoted one isolated and comparatively immaterial point in behalf of the present Papal Supremacy. It took place about fifty years before the Council of Nicea, and thus we see that the rule which in the fifth century the Popes wished to have recognised, that a Patriarch should not be deposed without the co-operation of the first See, was not originally observed. But, further, in the middle of the fourth century this rule was not known. "We must remark," says De Marca, "that the Orientals considered it thoroughly illegal that Western Bishops, even in a plenary Council, should attempt to reconsider judgments passed in Oriental Synods, because it was plain that by such proceeding the authority of these Synods would be infringed. And thus it is scarcely credible that they were minded to admit the authority of the single Roman Pontiff to be greater than their own, especially as they had lately made a schism against him, and excommunicated him, as being the head of those who had ruined the laws of the Church, 'as the head and chief of the bad, inasmuch as he first opened the door of communion to criminal and condemned persons, and made a way for others to break the divine laws.'

De Marca,  
de Concor.,  
lib. 7. c. 4.

"For the Orientals in those times (A.D. 341) contended for this as a certain and undoubted rule of Ecclesiastical discipline, that matters judged in the East could not be reconsidered in the West, nor *vice versa*. For thus the Council of Antioch affirmed in its letter to Pope Julius, in which the Bishops quote the case of the condemnation of Paul of Samosata decreed by the Oriental Bishops, which the West received, and confirmed by its assent, without fresh examination: as likewise the East received and confirmed by its approbation the condemnation of Novatus passed by a Western Synod. But Pope Julius, in his answer to this letter of the Council of Antioch, does not absolutely deny that the authority of Eastern Councils is supreme, but merely dwells on the case of Athanasius, and exposes the judgment passed against him in the Council of Tyre. He asserts the nullity

of this, because charges against Athanasius and his Presbyter Macarius were received in their absence by delegated judges, the acknowledged enemies of Athanasius, and challenged by him: it followed that this judgment was not impartial, but of one side, and consequently ought not to be executed, so that in receiving Athanasius to his Communion he had done nothing contrary to the Canon, inasmuch as the sentence of excommunication was null. He further pressed on points belonging to the case, namely, that the falsehood of the accusation was proved on the authority of the acts; that a great many Eastern Bishops had not withheld Athanasius from their Communion, though sentence of condemnation had been passed against him: that moreover the Eastern Bishops were unwilling to meet, though they had by their legates consented that Pope Julius should summon all Bishops to Rome to consider the case of Athanasius. In fine, he says that no attempt was made against the statutes of the Nicene Council by a subsequent Synod reconsidering what another had determined. Herein he alludes to the Synod of Alexandria, at which a hundred Bishops were present, and Arius was condemned, whose cause was considered entirely anew at the Nicene Council.

“But we must observe that Julius does not assert that he had restored Athanasius and the other Bishops to their Churches, for this was the main point, reserved to the cognisance of the Synod which Julius had convoked at the instance of the Eastern Legates, though the Orientals afterwards denied that they had thus empowered the Legates.”

Thus it would appear that the Eastern Bishops in the middle of the fourth century relied on the case of Paul of Samosata to prove not that the Pope alone, but that the Pope with the whole West, had no right to revise a sentence of an Eastern Council. Mr. Newman on the other hand sees a proof of the Papal Supremacy in the Emperor of the day ordering it to be left to the arbitration of “the Bishops of Italy and of Rome” who should possess the See-house.

“The heretic Marcion, excommunicated in Pontus, betakes himself to Rome.” Bellarmine quotes this instance to prove the Supremacy of the Roman Pontiff by the right

Case of  
Marcion.

CHAP.  
I.De Rom.  
Pont., lib. 2.  
c. 21.

of appeal exercised to him, much in the same way as Mr. Newman. "In the year of Christ 142, under the Pontificate of Pius the First, Marcion, excommunicated by his own Bishop in Pontus, came to Rome, that he might be absolved by the Roman Church, as Epiphanius relates, *Hæres. 42.*" Now that they both quote this instance is not a little remarkable, considering what St. Epiphanius does say. "Marcion was of Pontus, born of a father a Bishop of the Catholic Communion. Afterwards falling in love with a certain virgin, and inducing her by his deceits to consent, he cast down her as well as himself from the hope of the heavenly life. On account of this deed of shame he was expelled from the Church by his own father, a particularly religious man, burning with the love of truth, and excellent in the administration of the Episcopal office. Much and long as Marcion had entreated him, and requested to be put on penance, he could not prevail on his father by any supplications. In truth that excellent aged Bishop had suffered the greatest pain through this matter, because his son had not only fallen, but inflicted ignominy and shame on himself. So then when Marcion saw that he could not by any arts gain what he wanted, not enduring the reproaches and derision of his own countrymen, he withdrew from the town, and betook himself to Rome after the death of Pope Hyginus, who was the ninth presiding over the Church from the Apostles Peter and Paul. As soon as Marcion arrived there, he went to the Elders, who had been taught by the disciples of the Apostles, and were yet living, and besought them without effect that he might be received into Communion. Wherefore stung with envy, because he had not obtained the chief place there, nor even entrance into the Church, he was induced to fly for refuge to the heresy of the impostor Cerdon." Then, after describing some conversation of Marcion with the chief Roman Clergy, Epiphanius adds: "Wherefore addressing them openly he said, Why have you refused to receive me? They replied, *We cannot do this without the permission of your excellent father*: since one is our faith, and one the agreement of our minds; *we cannot oppose our excellent fellow-minister, your father.* But the other bursting out in greater wrath, and stung with pride and envy, contrived a schism, and set up a

heresy of his own, and, said he, I will rend asunder your Church, and introduce into it a lasting schism.”

SECT.  
IV.

The point of discipline to which the Roman Clergy in the middle of the second century thus expressly avowed that their own See, like every other, was subject, is contained in the 5th Nicene Canon, quoted above. Also in the 53rd Canon of the Council of Eliberis, A.D. 305: and in the 16th Canon of the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, and in the 16th Canon of Sardica. It was acted upon universally throughout the Church, from the Bishop of highest rank to the lowest: it sets forth in a striking manner, as the Roman Clergy observed, the unity of Christ's body. When the Roman Bishop in the case of Apiarius attempted to infringe it, he met with the most decided resistance from St. Aurelius, St. Augustine, and the Council of Africa. It is a Canon evidently necessary for the peace of the whole Church, and bearing witness to the essential unity and equality of the Episcopate: I am sorry to add, what truth compels, that its violation by the Roman See in after times, and specially during the middle ages, bitterly though fruitlessly complained of by contemporary Bishops, as Hincmar of Rheims and Ivo of Chartres, has been a great instrument of tyranny and corruption, but a great means at the same time of erecting a spiritual monarchy.

Here it is sufficient to ask, which is the stronger proof, the flight of the profligate Marcion to Rome in behalf of the Supremacy, or the answer of the Roman clergy in denial of it?

Such are the illustrations afforded by the preceding centuries to what I have stated was the unquestioned constitution of the Catholic Church at the time of the Council of Nicea; viz. that while the three great Sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch exercised a powerful but entirely paternal influence on their colleagues, that of Rome having the undoubted Primacy, not derived from the gift of Councils nor merely from the rank of the imperial city, but from immemorial tradition as the See of St. Peter; yet, at the same time, the fulness of the priesthood, and with it all power to govern the Church, were acknowledged to reside in the whole Episcopal Body. “The Bishop,” says Thomassin, Summary of the Nicene Period. Liv. i. ch. 2. sect. 5.

CHAP.  
I.

quoting with approbation a Greek writer, as representing the doctrine of the early Fathers, and of the universal Church since, "is the complete image in the Church on earth of Him who in the holy Trinity alone bears the name of Father, as being the first principle without principle, and the fruitful source of the other Persons, and of all the divine perfections. . . . The Bishop communicates the Priesthood, as He who is without principle in the Godhead, and is therefore called Father." And as the Bishop was supreme in his own Diocese, so, in what concerned the Province, was the Metropolitan with his Council of Suffragans. The same 6th Canon of Nicea which ratifies the rights, derived from immemorial custom, of the three chief Bishops or Metropolitans, the Roman, the Alexandrine, the Antiochene, proceeds in general words to confirm the privileges of all the rest. "In like manner, with regard to Antioch, and *in the other Provinces*" (i. e. not comprehended under the three great Sees above mentioned) "let the privileges be preserved to the Churches. And as a general rule this is manifest, that if any one be made a Bishop without the consent of the Metropolitan, the great Council declares that he should not be a Bishop." The Apostolic Canons, which at least express the character of the Eastern Church up to the Nicene Council, fully exhibit this order of things. The Nicene Council, whose provisions of discipline in St. Leo's words are to last till the end of the world makes it the law of the Church for ever. The great Council of Antioch in 341 further elucidates and defines it: the Provincial Councils of Ancyra, Neocæsarea, Gangra, and Laodicea, whose Canons, with those of Antioch, were taken into the Code of the Church Catholic at the Council of Chalcedon, are so many illustrations of it. The conduct and words of St. Polycarp, St. Polycrates, St. Irenæus, Tertullian, the Emperor Constantine, St. Cyprian, St. Firmilian, Eusebius, the Eastern Bishops in the case of Paul of Samosata, Origen, St. Basil, St. Athanasius, St. Augustine, St. Gregory of Nazianzum, Pope St. Julius, St. Dionysius of Alexandria, St. Chrysostome, which I have instanced, and an innumerable multitude of other cases, exhibit it in full life and vigour; while, on the other side, there is absolutely nothing to allege.

See De  
Marca, De  
Concor.,  
lib. 1. c. 3.  
§ 6—8.

## CHAPTER II.

## SECT. I.

THE history of the Church during the three hundred years following the Nicene Council is but a development of this constitution. The problem was, how to combine in the harmonious action of One organized Body those Apostolical powers which belonged to every Bishop as joint-tenant of the one Episcopate. The Patriarchal system was the result. As the Church increased in extent, her rulers would increase in number. This multiplication, which would tend so much to augment the centrifugal force, was met by increased energy in the centripetal: the power of the Patriarchs, and especially of the Bishop of Rome, grew. It is impossible, in my present limits, to follow this out, but I propose to give a few specimens, as before, in illustration.

In so vast a system of interlaced and concurrent powers as the Church of Christ presented, differences would continually arise; and in so profound a subject-matter as the Christian revelation, heresies would be continually starting up: to arrange the former, and to expel or subjugate the latter, the Bishops, says Thomassin, having already more than once appealed to the Christian Emperors for the calling of great Councils, saw the danger of suffering the Imperial authority to intervene in Ecclesiastical causes, and sought to establish a new jurisprudence on this head. "The Council of Antioch (A.D. 341), and that of Sardica (A.D. 347), which were held almost at the same time,—the one in the East, the other in the West,—set about this in a very different manner, aiming, however, at the same end. The Council of Antioch ordered that Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, who should have been condemned by a Provincial Council, might recur to a larger Council of Bishops;" (Archbishop De Marca explains this somewhat differently;) "but that if they carried their complaints before the Emperor they could never be re-established in their dignity." "One must in good faith admit, that this regulation had much conformity with what had

SECT.  
I.  
Completion  
of the Pa-  
triarchal  
System.

Liv. 1. ch. 3.  
§ 8.

CHAP.  
II.

Beginning  
of the  
Power of  
hearing  
Episcopal  
causes on  
appeal.

been practised in the first ages of obscurity and persecution, for it was in the same way that extraordinary Councils had been held, such as were those of Antioch against Paul of Samosata, Bishop of that great city. It was the Metropolitans and Bishops of the neighbourhood who assembled with those of the Province where the flame of a great dissension had been kindled. The Council of Sardica, urged by the same desire to break through the custom which was introducing itself, of having recourse to the Emperor for judgment of spiritual causes of the Church, bethought itself of another means, which was not less conformable to the practice of the preceding centuries, and which had, beside that, much foundation in the Holy Scriptures. For Jesus Christ, having given the Primacy, and the rank of Head, to St. Peter, above the other Apostles, and having given successors as well to the Apostles, to wit, all the Bishops, as to St. Peter, to wit, the Roman Pontiffs; moreover, having willed that His Church should remain for ever one by the union of all Bishops with their Head, it is manifest, that if the Bishops of a Province could not agree in their Provincial Council, and if the Bishops of several Provinces had disputes between each other, the most natural way to finish these differences was to introduce the authority of the Head, and of him whom Jesus Christ has established as the centre of unity of His universal Church."

Accordingly, at the Council of Sardica, attended by St. Athanasius, then in exile, and about a hundred Western Bishops, after the secession of the Eastern or Arian portion, Hosius proposed, "If two Bishops of the same Province have a disagreement, neither of the two shall take for arbitrator a Bishop of another Province: if a Bishop, having been condemned, feels so assured of his right, that he is willing to be judged anew in a Council, *let us honour, if you think it good, the memory of the Apostle St. Peter*: let those who have examined the cause, write to Julius, Bishop of Rome; if he thinks proper to order a fresh trial, let him name judges; if he does not think that there is reason to renew the matter, let what he orders be kept to. The Council approved this proposition. The Bishop Gaudentius added, that, during this appeal, no Bishop should be ordained in place of him

Fleury, liv.  
12. 29.  
Conc. Sard.  
Can. 3, 4, 7.

who had been deposed, until the Bishop of Rome had judged his cause." SECT.  
I.

“To make the preceding Canon clearer, Hosius said, ‘When a Bishop, deposed by the Council of the Province, shall have appealed and had recourse to the Bishop of Rome, if he judge proper that the matter be examined afresh, he shall write to the Bishops of the neighbouring Province to be the judges of it; and if the deposed Bishop persuade the Bishop of Rome to send a Priest from his own person, he shall be able to do it, and to send commissioners to judge by his authority, together with the Bishops; but if he believes that the Bishops are sufficient to settle the matter, he will do what his wisdom suggests to him.’ The judgment which Pope Julius, together with the Council of Rome, had given in favour of Athanasius and the other persecuted Bishops, seems to have given cause to this Canon, and we have seen that this Pope complained that they had judged St. Athanasius without writing to him about it.”

“To this Council,” says Archbishop de Marca, “is owing the first origin of the right of the supreme Pontiff, as to the canonical judgments of Bishops. Although, if we look closer into the matter, and do not go beyond the words of the Canons, it will be plain that nothing is there laid down against the supreme authority of Provincial Councils confirmed by the Nicene Canon.” He then draws a distinction between appeal and revision. “The former transfers the entire cognisance of the cause to the superior judge, who discusses and decides the question in his own tribunal. But a revision leaves the definitive judgment to the former jurisdiction, on the condition that new judges be added to the former.” “But the right sought in that Council for the Roman Bishop is utterly different from the right of appeal, inasmuch as nothing more is granted to him than the power to decree the revision of a cause. That is, the Council appoints that if a condemned Bishop appeals to the Roman Pontiff, it should be in his power to reject the appeal, by which the sentence of the Provincial Bishops will be confirmed, or to admit it. In which case the Roman Bishop is bound to send back the entire case to the Bishops of the Province, and their neighbours, for them to take cognisance

De Marca,  
de Concor.,  
lib. 7. c. 2.  
§ 6—8.

CHAP. II. of the cause in the presence of the delegate of the supreme Pontiff, if he think good to send one. Moreover, the force of an appeal is, to suspend in the interim the previous sentence. Which is otherwise in a revision. For that retreat to the Apostolical See did not prevent the sentence of deposition being in the meanwhile committed to execution.

“But the words of the Canon prove that the institution of this right was new. If it please you, says Hosius Bishop of Corduba, who presided over the Council, let us honour the memory of the Apostle St. Peter. He says not, that the ancient tradition was to be confirmed, as was wont to be done in matters which only require the renewal or explanation of an ancient right.”

This last observation is of great importance.

De Concor.,  
lib. 6. c.  
14. § 2.

“But as to excommunicated priests and laymen,” says De Marca elsewhere, “no alteration was made, because their causes were not of such weight as that the Roman Pontiff could be appealed to, as neither in the East were they allowed appeal to the Patriarchs, as is plain from the Canons of Nicea, the sixth of Antioch, and the ninth of Chalcedon.”

Such is the modest commencement of that power of hearing Episcopal causes on appeal, which has been the instrument of obtaining the wonderful authority concentrated for a long series of ages in the See of Rome. However conformable to the practice of preceding centuries, as Thomassin says, this may have been, this power is here certainly *granted* by the Council, *not considered as inherent in the See of Rome*. And this one fact is fatal to the present claim of the Supremacy. To use De Maistre’s favourite analogy, it is as though the States General or Parliament conferred his royal powers on the Sovereign who convoked them, and whose assent alone made their enactments law. Accordingly, like the whole course of proceedings in these early Councils, it is incompatible with the notion of the Pope being the monarch in the Church. We may safely say, history offers not a more wonderful contrast in a power bearing the same name, than that here conferred on Pope Julius in 347, and that exercised by Pope Pius the Seventh in 1802. On the bursting out of the French revolution, out of a hundred and thirty-six Bishops more than a hundred and thirty remained

faithful to God and the Church: some offered the testimony of their blood; the rest became Confessors in all lands for Christ's sake, in poverty, contempt, and banishment. After ten years, the civil governor, who had lately professed himself a Mahometan, proposes to the Pope to re-establish the Church, but on condition of himself nominating to the Sees, and those not the ancient Sees of the country, but a selection from them, to the number of eighty. Thereupon the Pope requires those eighty Bishops and Confessors who still survived, and whom he acknowledged to be not only blameless, but martyrs for the name of Christ, to resign into his hands their Episcopal powers. Of his own single authority he abolishes the ancient Sees of the eldest daughter of the Western Church, constitutes that number of new Sees which the civil power permits, and treats as schismatics those few Bishops who disobey his requisition. I do not presume to express any blame of Pope Pius; I simply mention a fact. But it seems to me, certainly, that those who would entirely recognise the power and precedence exercised by Pope Julius, are not necessarily schismatics because they refuse to admit a power not merely greater in degree, but different in kind, and to set the High Priesthood of the Church beneath the feet of one, though it be the First of her Pontiffs.

The restrictions under which, according to the Council of Sardica, the Pope could cause a matter to be reheard, are specific. Much larger power is assigned in the fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon, to the See of Constantinople, in the ninth Canon, which says, "If any Bishop or Clergyman has a controversy against the Bishop of the Province himself (*i. e.* the Metropolitan), let him have recourse to the Exarch of the Diocese, or to the throne of the Imperial city of Constantinople, and plead his cause before him."

But, between these two Councils of Nicea, A.D. 325, and Chalcedon, 451, the whole Patriarchal system of the Church had sprung up, and covered the provinces of the Roman Empire with as it were a finely reticulated net. The system may be said to be built on two principles, recognised and enforced in the Apostolic Canons, and consistently carried out, from the Bishop of the poorest country town up to the primatial See of Rome. These principles are, "the authority

Two great principles of the Patriarchal System.

CHAP.  
II.  
Thomassin,  
part I. liv.  
1. ch. 40.  
§ 2.

of the Metropolitan over his Bishops in important and extraordinary affairs, and the supreme authority of Bishops in the ordinary government of their particular bishoprics. With this distinction, that the Metropolitan even cannot arrange important and extraordinary affairs but with the counsel of his suffragans, whilst every Bishop conducts all the common and ordinary affairs of his Diocese without being obliged to take the advice of his Metropolitan." This latter principle, it will be seen, expresses the essential equality and unity of the High Priesthood vested in Bishops by descent from the Apostles, to which St. Cyprian bears such constant witness, so that it may be said to be the one spirit which animates all his government: while the former, leaving this quite inviolate, builds together the whole Church in one vast living structure. For as the Bishops of the Province have their Metropolitan, and their spring and autumn Councils under him, so the Metropolitan stands in a like relation to his Exarch or Patriarch; and of the five great Patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, who are found at the Council of Chalcedon to preside over the Church Catholic, that of Rome has the unquestioned Primacy, and is seen at the centre, sustaining and animating the whole. "The most important of all the powers, of Metropolitans, Exarchs, and Patriarchs, was the election of Bishops, the confirmation and consecration of Bishops elected. For all the other degrees of authority were founded on this one, which rendered the Metropolitan the Father, Master, and Judge of all his suffragans." "And so that famous Canon of the Council of Nicea, (the 6th,) which seems in appearance only to confirm the ancient right of the first three Metropolitans of the world to ordain the Bishops of all the Provinces of their dependence, establishes in effect all the rights and all the powers of the Metropolitans, because it establishes the foundation on which they all rest. 'If any one be made a Bishop contrary to the sentence of his Metropolitan, the great Synod declares that he should not be a Bishop.' Nothing is juster than to found the right of a holy and paternal rule on the right of generation. For by ordination the Bishops engender not children indeed, but Fathers, to the Church." This system continued unimpaired in the

Idem, ut  
supra.

whole Church, at least to the time of the great division. It offers, I think, an unanswerable refutation to what must be considered the strongest argument of the Roman Catholics for the Supremacy, that there could be no unity in the Church without it, as a living organized body; history says, there *was* unity, with five co-ordinate Patriarchs, and an Episcopate twice as numerous as that of the present Latin Communion. In the Latin Church itself this system was only gradually overshadowed by another system which sprang from the excessive development of one of its parts; in the Greek and Russian Church, it continues down to this day; whatever Ecclesiastical constitution we still have ourselves, is a part of this system. And by reference to, and under cover of this, which if not strictly of divine right, as is the High Priesthood of Bishops, approaches very nearly indeed to it, and was the effluence of the Spirit of God ruling and guiding the Church of the Fathers, we must justify ourselves from the damning blot of schism. We cannot, dare not, do this upon principles such as “the right of private judgment”—“The Bible alone is the religion of Protestants,”—and the like, which lead directly, and by most certain consequence, to dissent, heresy, and anarchy. God forbid that they who profess to be members of the One holy Catholic Church should, urged by any unhappiness of their provisional and strange position, take up Satanic and Anti-christian arms. No! if we may not hope for that system under which Augustine and Chrysostome laboured and witnessed, we will have nothing to do with those who destroy dogmatic faith altogether, and break up the visible unity of the Church of Christ into a multitude of atoms. *Quot homines, tot voluntates.* We cannot so relapse into worse than a second heathenism, and with the unity of Pentecost offered us, deliberately choose the confusion of Babel.

SECT.  
I.

## SECT. II.

BUT over and above his natural eminence in the Church, which I have attempted to describe, a concurrence of events in the fourth century tended to give a still greater moral

## CHAP.

## II.

Great increase of influence to the Roman See founded on its orthodoxy.

weight to the voice of the Bishop of Rome. While the other great Sees of the Church were vexed with heresy or schism, his, save in one short period of shame, was providentially exempted from both. The same century witnessed Cæcilianus of Carthage, judged and supported by Pope Melchisedes, while the Donatist schism all that century long rent Africa in twain; and St. Athanasius, of Alexandria, when driven from his See, and persecuted by the whole East, received and justified by Pope Julius; and St. John Chrysostome, too good by far for a corrupt capital and a degenerate court, in life protected, and in death restored, by Pope Innocent. We have seen St. Jerome appeal to Pope Damasus, to know which of three competitors for the Patriarchal throne of Antioch was the right Bishop. But it is impossible to describe the confusion and violence which the Arian heresy, and the cognate heresies concerning the Person of our Lord, wrought throughout the Church and Empire. It may be said that the whole period of fifty-six years between the First and Second Ecumenical Councils was one long struggle, amid the throes of which the Catholic faith and the constitution of the Catholic Church alike took form and consistence. That detestable heresy, which seemed at one time by the aid of the civil power to have pushed the Church to the very verge of destruction, which banished her first and her second Bishop, and possessed the See of her third, in the end only served to bring out and develop the unity of her faith and of her Communion. Through this whole struggle, save at one unhappy moment when Liberius fell, the Roman Pontiff was beheld immovable, supporting with his whole authority the true faith, and moulding the whole West together, in his defence of Athanasius, to resist that fatal influence which tyrannised over the East. The natural and deserved result was a great extension of his power and influence. Still it cannot be doubted in whose hands the real government of the Church at this time lay. The defence, and the oppression, of Athanasius and the Catholic faith, were alike attempted by the assembling of great Councils of Bishops. The growing distinction between the two great divisions of the Church, the East and the West, likewise becomes at this time more apparent. While the West willingly ranges itself

under St. Peter's See, and even acknowledges in it a Primacy over the whole Church, the East is much more concerned to maintain its own independence and self-government. Thus on the one hand the Council of Sardica, intended to be Ecumenical, but reduced by the departure of the Easterns to the rank of a Western Council, addresses Pope Julius in the most magnificent terms of honour. "Thou, therefore, most beloved Brother, though separated in body hast been present in the union of mind and will, and honourable and necessary was the excuse assigned for thy absence, lest schismatic wolves should steal or treacherously plunder, or heretical dogs yell with rabid fury in their madness, or at least that serpent the devil spread the poison of his blasphemies. *For this will appear best and most highly fitting, if the Priests (i. e. Bishops) of the Lord out of every Province make reference to the head, that is, the See of Peter the Apostle.*" Thirty years later, in 378, a Council of all the Bishops of Italy, assembled at Rome, besought the Emperors Gratian and Valentinian to issue a general edict, of which they suggested the terms, in order that Bishops might not for the future be compelled to approach the Emperor on every occasion. And at this Synod's entreaty a decree was passed by the Emperors, that Pope Damasus, with a Council of five or seven Bishops, should judge accusations at Rome, and that the accused should be compelled by the Præfecti Prætorio, the Proconsuls, or Vicarii, to quit those Churches, from which they were deposed, or to present themselves to the judgment of the Roman Pontiff. If the accused were in distant provinces, the whole cognisance of the cause should belong to the Metropolitan. But if the accused be a Metropolitan, he must of necessity go to Rome to be judged, or take those Bishops for judges whom the Pope assigns. If the Metropolitans should happen to be suspected by the accused, they may at their option appeal to the Roman Pontiff, or to a Council of fifteen neighbouring Bishops. The Emperors likewise decree that whatever has been decided by the Roman Pontiff, or by the judges nominated by him, or by the Metropolitan, or likewise by the Council of fifteen Bishops, is to be final, and not to be on any pretext reconsidered.

SECT.  
II.

Mansi, 3.  
40. B.

ad caput,  
id est, ad  
Petri Apo-  
stoli sedem.

See the  
Council's  
petition,  
Mansi, 3.  
624-7, and  
Gratian's  
rescript,  
627-9.

On the other hand the Eastern mind is discerned in the

CHAP.  
II.

Mansi, 3.  
297. C.

letter of the Emperor Constantius to the Council of Rimini, called by St. Athanasius universal, comprising four hundred Bishops from Illyria, Italy, Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Great Britain, and attended by the Legates of Pope Liberius: "Reason," says he, "does not allow any decree to be passed in your Council concerning Eastern Bishops. You will be therefore bound to consider those points only which your gravity knows to pertain to you. . . It behoves you to decree nothing against the Easterns, or if you will pass any decree against them in their absence, your usurpation will be null and void. For that decree cannot be valid, to which force and effect are refused at present by our commands."

Independence and self-government of the East.

But to set the real and original independence and self-government of the East in the clearest light we need not appeal to the words of an Emperor under the influence of heretics, however truly those words convey the Eastern mind: we have but to relate the conduct, decrees, and letters of the Second Ecumenical Council. The two great defenders of the faith in the East had been taken to their rest, St. Athanasius in 373, St. Basil in 379. From the beginning to the end of their Episcopate they had laboured, prayed, and suffered for the recovery of the Eastern Church out of the confusion and violence wrought by the Arians. But they were not allowed to see on earth the fruit of their toils and sorrows. Yet it may be that what was denied to their labours in the body, was granted to their intercessions before God. He who had permitted the family of the great Constantine to be infected with the taint of Arianism, who suffered the apostate Julian and the heretic Valens to exert all their force and fraud against the true faith, raised up in due time the Catholic Emperors Gratian and Theodosius, finally to overthrow that fearful heresy, which had only flourished through support of the civil power. One of the first results of the death of Valens in 378 was the restoration of the banished Bishops by Gratian. Among these St. Meletius returned to Antioch, and was received with universal joy. But Paulinus, the Bishop supported by Rome and Egypt, continued his division. He had remained unmolested at Antioch during the banishment of Meletius, on account, it would seem, of the small number

of his adherents. The vast majority, who recognised Meletius as Bishop, and enjoyed the Communion of the East, save Egypt, wished that he and Paulinus, in order to terminate the schism, should govern conjointly, and the survivor be sole Bishop. St. Meletius, with the utmost charity, made the offer, but Paulinus would not accede to it. In the meantime Meletius acted as Bishop of Antioch, and consecrated Diodorus to be Bishop of Tarsus, John of Apamea, and Stephen of Germanicia, and others. These promotions would have given unmixed satisfaction save that the schism of Antioch, spreading itself through the rest of the East, caused new Bishops to be appointed in many cities where there were already Bishops who chose to communicate with Paulinus rather than Meletius.

In the autumn of 379 St. Meletius presided at a great Council of the East held at Antioch, which received a letter of Pope Damasus, and confirmed it with their signatures. Of course St. Meletius was most desirous to be in Communion with the West; he who was ready to forego his own right in order to have peace with his rival Paulinus, was not likely to disregard the intercommunion of the different members of Christ's Body. But there is not the slightest appearance of subjection to a superior power in his conduct.

The Emperor Theodosius, on the 28th Feb., 380, published a law recognising for Catholics those only who held the faith of Pope Damasus and of Peter of Alexandria. On the 10th Jan., 381, he ordered that all the Churches held by the heretics should be taken from them and given to the Catholics. But who was the Catholic Bishop of Antioch? Meletius and Paulinus were both orthodox: the former had most of the people, and the East, in his Communion; the latter Rome and Alexandria. The former with extreme moderation renewed the offer to Paulinus of governing the Church conjointly with him on the condition that the survivor should be sole Bishop. But Paulinus would not accept the offer; so the general Sapor, who was entrusted with the execution of the imperial decree, gave the Churches to St. Meletius, and left Paulinus to govern those which had been separated since the banishment of St. Eustathius in 330.

CHAP.  
II.

At last, however, Paulinus consented that the survivor of himself and Meletius should govern the whole body of the faithful at Antioch. But it does not appear that the Bishops of the East generally consented to this arrangement.

Tillemont,  
S. Melet.  
art. 15. tom.  
8. p. 371,  
from whom  
the preced-  
ing account  
is mainly  
drawn.

“After this agreement St. Meletius wrote to the Westerns to ask afresh for their Communion: *doubtless they did not refuse it him, though we have not positive proofs of this.* But we find that they wrote to Theodosius begging him to confirm the agreement made between Meletius and Paulinus, and to employ his authority for causing that, when one of the two died, the Churches should be put into the hands of the survivor, without any one attempting to make a successor.”

Whatever agreement was made between Paulinus and Flavian “it seems that minds still continued estranged, as well between the Christians of Antioch, as even between those of the East and West.”

In the mean time the Emperor Theodosius was earnestly desirous to deliver the Eastern Church throughout its whole extent from heresy. What course then did he pursue? Did he use his influence with Gratian, and his own imperial power, to call an Ecumenical Council of the East and West? Or did he appeal to the Bishop of Rome to declare by Apostolical authority the true faith, and to arrange the schism which had so long divided Antioch between Meletius and Paulinus, and to appoint a new Bishop to the vacant See of Constantinople. Much as the West desired to have an Ecumenical Council sit at Alexandria, or at Rome, as the wish is expressed by St. Ambrose, the Emperor pursued neither of these two courses. He called a full Council of the East, and of the East alone, to sit at Constantinople, in the summer of 381. Neither the Pope nor the West in general, had any participation in this Council. Cardinal Orsi, the Roman historian, says: “Besides St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Peter of Sebaste, there were also at Constantinople on account of the Synod many other Bishops remarkable, either for the holiness of their life, or for their zeal for the faith, or for their learning, or for the eminence of their Sees, as St. Amphilochius of Iconium, Helladius of Cesarea in Cappadocia, Optimus of Antioch in Pisidia, Diodorus of Tarsus, St. Pelagius of Laodicea, St. Eulogius of

Orsi, Ist.  
Ecc. 18. 63.

Edessa, Acacius of Berea, Isidorus of Cyrus, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Gelasius of Cesarea in Palestine, Vitus of Carres, Dionysius of Diopolis, Abram of Batnes, and Antiochus of Samosata, all three Confessors, Bosphorus of Colonia, and Otreius of Melitina, and various others whose names appear with honour in history. So that perhaps there has not been a Council, in which has been found a greater number of Confessors and of Saints. But above all St. Meletius was pre-eminent, both for the dignity of his See, and for the excellency of his virtue. There was among them, says Gregory of Nazianzum, speaking of the Bishops who were present at this Synod, a man of great piety, of simple frank manners, full of God, of quiet bearing, firm at once and prudent. And who knows not the Bishop of Antioch of whom I speak? In whom the name well agreed with the person, and the person with the name, both his name and manners being equally flavoured with honey. And having exposed himself to many violent tempests, and being exercised in many noble combats for the Holy Spirit, he had cleansed the stain contracted by him in permitting himself to be promoted by strangers. . . .

“Theodosius had found it more easy to repress in the East the fury of the heretics, than the rivalry of the Catholics, and to put down external wars against the Church, than intestine discord. The three principal Churches of the Eastern empire, that of Antioch, that of Constantinople, and that of Alexandria, were in confusion and disorder. The first through the two parties of Paulinus and Meletius; the second through the illegitimate ordination of Maximus; the third through the opposition made by some to that of Timotheus, who had succeeded his brother Peter, just before dead, with the common consent of all the Bishops of Egypt. And yet such was the power and authority of his opponents, that, as the flame could not be extinguished by the authority of the Council then sitting, the Fathers of the Synod of Aquileia, suggested to the Emperor to grant, that for this and other matters another, and that Ecumenical, might be held at Alexandria. So the Emperor Theodosius, anxious to remedy such disorders, and to give a Bishop to the city of Constantinople, and to confirm the Nicene faith, and to

CHAP.  
II.

bring back the heretics to the profession of the said faith, and to the unity of the Church, called the Bishops of the East and of Egypt to Constantinople for the celebration of the Synod to the number of 150. And as the good prince did not despair of the conversion of the Macedonians, he invited them too to the Council, and they came to the number of 36, chiefly from the Hellespont, among whom Eleusius of Cyzicum, and Marcianus of Lampsacus, held the first place."

Now it is obvious that if ever the Pope and the Western Bishops had a right to interfere in the internal regulation of the Eastern Churches, it was on an occasion like this. For they had throughout taken the side of Paulinus, at Antioch, and besides it hardly seemed compatible with the unity and coherence of the parts of Christ's Body that difficulties respecting the three great Sees of the East should be settled without their concurrence. What they said about it we will see hereafter. At present to proceed.

Orsi, Ist.  
Ecc. 18.  
64, 65.

"The head, the director, and the guide of this sacred assembly so long as he lived, was St. Meletius, and after his death St. Gregory, and lastly, after his resignation, Nectarius. The matter, with which the Fathers judged they ought to begin their sessions, was that of providing the said city of Constantinople with a legitimate Bishop. The inquiry into the ordination of Maximus could not cost them much difficulty. They easily perceived and set forth the indignity of it, and stamped it as an insolent and impertinent attempt, and declared that he neither was nor had ever been Bishop, nor could those promoted by him be received as being in any order of the clergy, and they nullified all the acts of his pretended Episcopate. The usurper driven out, it was further not difficult to make up their minds as to the person who was to fill this See, and the pastor suitable to be given to this flock. All was the work of the industry, labour, sufferings, unwearied diligence, and excellence, of Gregory of Nazianzum. He had as it were raised up from the dust and from its ashes that Church, had re-established that throne on the ruins of Arianism, and with danger of his own life called back from their dispersion, and rescued from the jaws of wolves the wandering sheep, and drawn together anew

and enlarged the fold. Who could dispute his claims, or equal him either in holiness of life, or in fervour for the faith, or in eminence of doctrine, or in power of eloquence? But if the Fathers found no difficulty in the choice of the person, they experienced a very great one in overcoming his repugnance, and prevailing on his modesty. And they determined not to let themselves be moved by his cries, nor softened by his tears and groans, in order not to fail in their duty, to crown his merits, and to provide in the best way for the good of the Church. St. Meletius, being come to Constantinople principally for this purpose, availed himself of the authority, which the profound veneration and old friendship that St. Gregory entertained for him, gave him over his spirit, to subdue his resistance. And it was he who tied the knot of this spiritual marriage, blessed it, and crowned it: while the other Fathers and specially St. Gregory of Nyssa, applauded this great solemnity with their eloquent discourses.

“But the exultation of such a festival was too soon interrupted, and turned into sorrow, by the death of St. Meletius, whom God appeared to have brought to Constantinople to present him here a spectacle to the world, and that all nations might admire in his person a perfect model of Episcopal dignity, and be witnesses of his piety, his zeal, his candour, his wisdom and modesty, his love of peace, and of the Church’s unity. Of which specially Gregory of Nazianzum gives most ample testimony, saying that he died full of years and merit, and was carried away by troops of angels, after having given many charges to his friends, which had only peace for their object.” The whole East mourned over his death: his body was carried in triumphal procession with torches lighted and psalms sung from Constantinople to Antioch, being borne within the walls of cities, by special law of the Emperor, contrary to the custom of the Romans. Such in his life and in his death was St. Meletius, whose intercession before God St. Chrysostome, his disciple and spiritual son, publicly invoked in his sermon beside his tomb five years after his death: whom a triple banishment suffered in the cause of the Holy Trinity could not induce St. Jerome to speak of with respect: whom Pope Damasus

CHAP. II. and the Roman Church almost to the last slighted and avowed, refusing him their Communion and accepting his rival.

Rejected, however, as he had been at Rome, reluctantly, if it all, received by her, and that not singly, but in conjunction with Paulinus, he was undisputed president at Constantinople of that great Council which arranged the affairs of the Eastern Church without Rome's participation. His death was the beginning of trouble. In vain St. Gregory, now become president, exhorted the younger Bishops not to elect a successor to him, but to recognise Paulinus to be Bishop of both parties. In vain Gregory offered to resign his own See, if they would not listen to him; they chose rather that he should resign it, than themselves receive Paulinus, as it were from the hands of Rome and the West, as Bishop of Antioch. He has left us, in his poems, a long address which he made to them, beseeching them for the sake of peace, and the reunion of the West, which was now, as it were, strange to them, to suffer Paulinus for his few remaining years to be sole Bishop. "This," he says, "can be the only deliverance from evils. For either, which is most to be wished, we shall gain that which is foreign, (for the West, as I see, is now foreign to us,) or, at least, harmony for the city," (i. e. Antioch,) "so great a people and so long worn down." He ridicules their argument against him. "Consider what fine reasoning this was. Our affairs must correspond with the course of the sun, *taking their beginning from that quarter*, where God shone forth to us in a covering of flesh. What then? Let us learn not to look at the sky's revolutions: but consider that the flesh of Christ is the first-fruits of all our race. But if He rose in the quarter, one may say, where there was the greatest audacity, as there likely easily to be put to death, whence His resurrection, and then our salvation, ought not those who think thus, to yield to such, as I said, who had formed a wise judgment?" Here the point was, not whether the Pope was supreme<sup>b</sup>, but

Poems on  
his Life,  
I. 1635.

<sup>b</sup> Yet we have been told lately, "The party of Meletius never for a moment denied the Supremacy of the Pope, but on the contrary moved heaven and earth to acquaint him with the real

facts of the case, and to obtain a decision in their favour . . . . The dispute between Paulinus and Meletius was at length amicably terminated; and it was not till after this that St. Meletius

whether the East, by allowing Paulinus, after the death of Meletius, to be Bishop of Antioch, might not seem to concede some precedence in the West which it seems they were very unwilling to allow. St. Gregory says in express words that it was the jealousy between the East and West which made the schism at Antioch so dangerous. "It is, he says, rather a division of doctrine than of countries and climates which makes East and West. For these are united, if not at their extreme, yet at least at their intermediate parts, but there is nothing by which their inhabitants once severed are bound; nor is piety the cause, (anger, a ready liar, invents this,) but contention for the Bishops' seats." This jealousy proved too strong for all the efforts of the "peace-loving man." The Eastern Bishops, either at this Council, or when they returned home, elected Flavian to succeed Meletius at Antioch. Presently the Egyptian Bishops, with their Patriarch Timotheus, arrived: and they began to express their disapproval of Gregory's own appointment. This afforded him the opportunity he desired for insisting on resigning his own See. He was at length allowed to do so. For his successor the Bishops and the Emperor made a remarkable choice of an old man, unbaptized, of decent and gentle character indeed, but who did not redeem the strangeness of his election, like St. Ambrose, by the apostolic vigour and divine purity of his subsequent life. Such as he was, however, the Council elected Nectarius, and he became their president. Certainly, whatever spirit animated the Eastern Bishops, they shewed that they were determined to manage their own affairs, and elect their own Patriarchs, without interference from the West.

S E C T.  
II.

On his Life,  
l. 1560.

But they did far more than this. They executed, of them-

was called to the Council of Constantinople, at which time he was in full Communion with Rome."—*Dublin Review*, Dec. 1844, p. 644. As if Meletius was received at Constantinople as Bishop of Antioch, because some agreement had been made between him and Paulinus, which Rome had recognised. He sat as President of the great Council of the East in Antioch in 379, when the Pope did not acknowledge him, and the Communion and recognition of the Catholics in the three Exarchates of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus, he had en-

joyed throughout. But there is a way of stating the facts of history, which, without asserting a literal untruth, conveys a most untruthful impression. A candid person would be greatly embarrassed to discover anything but disproof of the Papal Supremacy in the whole affair of the schism of Antioch: but when we come to consider the election and maintenance of Flavian in spite of Rome, it is really too audaciously counting upon our ignorance to use such language.

CHAP.  
II.

selves, the highest function of the Church Catholic: they added important articles, not indeed to the meaning, but to the elucidation, of the Nicene Creed. "In relation to the Incarnation of our Saviour Christ the Nicene Creed only said: He came down from heaven, was incarnate and made man, suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended into heaven, and shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

Fleury, 18.  
§ 6.

But the Creed of Constantinople said thus: "Who came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man. He was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate: He suffered and was buried; and He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures. He ascended into heaven: He sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and dead; Whose kingdom shall have no end." The Nicene Creed only said, "We believe also in the Holy Ghost," without mentioning the Church. But the Creed of Constantinople was to this effect, "We believe likewise in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; Who spake by the Prophets: we believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church: we acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins: we look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen." Although the truths contained in the articles added to the Nicene Creed by the Council of Constantinople were held implicitly before, yet the fact of their expression and insertion into the Creed is of the highest importance, as it betokens the highest authority in the Church. It is the Creed of the Council of Constantinople which has since been recited, under the name of the Nicene Creed, at the celebration of the holy Mysteries, by the Greek, the Roman, and the English Churches, with the addition, after many centuries, in the West, of the words 'and from the Son:' which addition by the Pope's authority, without the consent of the East, has ever since been alleged as a ground of the great division.

Canons of  
discipline.

The Canons of discipline which the Council past are these: "Canon 1. The Bishops who, by the grace of God, assembled in Constantinople, from different Provinces, in pursuance of the summons of the most religious Emperor Theo-

dosius, have decreed as follows. That the faith of the 318 Fathers who assembled at Nicea in Bithynia, is not to be made void, but shall continue established:” they proceed to anathematise certain heresies. SECT.  
II.

Canon 2. The Bishops must not go beyond their Dioceses, and enter upon Churches without their borders, nor bring confusion into the Churches; but, according to the Canons, the Bishop of Alexandria must have the sole administration of the affairs of Egypt, and the Bishops of the East” (i. e. Antioch) “must administer the East only, the privileges, which were assigned to the Church of Antioch by the Canons made at Nicea, being preserved; and the Bishops of the Asian Diocese must administer the affairs of the Asian only, and those of the Pontic Diocese the affairs of the Pontic only; and those of Thrace, the affairs of Thrace only. Moreover Bishops may not without being called go beyond the bounds of their Diocese for the purpose of ordaining, or any other Ecclesiastical function. The above-written Canon respecting the Dioceses being observed, it is plain that the Synod of each Province must administer the affairs of the Province, according to what was decreed at Nicea. But the Churches of God which are among the Barbarians must be administered according to the customs of the Fathers which have prevailed.

Canon 3. The Bishop of Constantinople shall have the Primacy of honour after the Bishop of Rome, because that Constantinople is new Rome.

Canon 4. With respect to Maximus the Cynic and the disorder which took place in Constantinople on his account, it is decreed that Maximus neither was nor is a Bishop, and that those who have been ordained by him are not in any rank whatever of the Clergy; and all things which have been done either about him or by him are made void.”

Here Fleury observes, “In this (the second Canon) we find the whole plan of the Eastern Church: first of all the two Patriarchs, as they have since been called, viz., of Alexandria and Antioch, whose privileges were very different: the Bishop of Alexandria had the government of all the Churches of Egypt, including Libya and Pentapolis; the Bishop of Antioch only enjoyed certain privileges; but the Ecclesiastical government of the Diocese of the East, of which

Fleury, 18.  
§ 7. Oxf. Tr.

CHAP.  
II.

Antioch was the capital, is attributed in general to all the Bishops of the East, amongst whom there were several Metropolitans. The chief Bishops of the three other great Dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, afterwards assumed the name of Exarchs; the Bishop of Ephesus was Exarch of Asia; the Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, of Pontus; and the Bishop of Heraclea had had the Exarchy of Thrace, but at that time it was swallowed up by Constantinople. However in all this the Council of Constantinople, in the same spirit as that of Nicea, professed to establish no new thing, but only to confirm ancient customs. All the order of the Ecclesiastical hierarchy was regulated and confirmed by ancient tradition. This Canon, which gives to the Councils of particular places full authority in Ecclesiastical matters, seems to take away the power of appealing to the Pope granted by the Council of Sardica, and to restore the ancient right."

May we not rather say that it could hardly take away what had never existed, for the Council of Sardica resulted in being only a Western Council, whose Canons were not then received in the East, nor even, as we shall see presently, by the African Bishops in St. Augustine's time.

Tillemont,  
9. 489.

Tillemont is more guarded than Fleury here: he says, "The Council seems likewise to reject, whether designedly or inadvertently, what had been ordained by the Council of Sardica in favour of Rome. But as assuredly it did not affect to prevent either Ecumenical Councils, or even general Councils of the East, from judging of matters brought before them, so I do not know if one may conclude absolutely that they intended to forbid appeals to Rome. It regulates proceedings between Diocese and Diocese, but not what might concern superior tribunals."

With the light, however, that we have besides as to the views and principles professed by the Eastern Bishops at this Council, there can be little doubt that their very object was to forbid appeal to Rome. Accordingly De Marca says, "This Canon assigns to the complete Synod of each Diocese (i. e. Patriarchate) the supreme authority to rule and administer all Ecclesiastical matters of the Provinces contained in that Diocese, under the direction, however, of the Primate

De Concor.,  
lib. 6. c. 16.  
3.

or Exarch of the Diocese." Elsewhere he says that the three latter Dioceses, "the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian, which obeyed their own Exarchs, were assigned to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constantinople, to constitute the Council of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, according to the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon. And so *as those Synods of Dioceses were subject each to their own Patriarch, their authority must have been entirely supreme, nor could it be that they depended on any other jurisdiction whatsoever.*"

S E C T.  
II.

Lib. 6. 20. 1.

And again, "this Canon decrees how Canonical judgments, either in the deposition of Bishops, or in other causes incidentally arising, are to be settled among the Easterns. But the order which it prescribes in these matters is full of prudence, and tempered with wonderful consideration. For first the rights of the Provinces, and the privileges of the most illustrious Churches, are preserved by that Canon according to the Nicene Canons. Next, new remedies are provided for condemned Bishops, far more convenient and easy than those which the Council of Antioch had devised, on the suffrages of the judges being divided, or than approaching the Emperor to obtain a new Council. For in that Council the limits of jurisdictions are appointed according to the division of the Dioceses of the Empire: *and the authority of each several Diocese in all judgments passed on discipline is decreed to be supreme.*" . . . "I find all these regulations greatly in behalf of the Church's dignity, who was delivered by the authority of this Canon from asking of the Emperor Councils for the purpose of judging the complaints of deposed Bishops, so that Diocesan Synods were turned into ordinary Synods, having been before extraordinary, and not to be convoked without the Emperor's letters. Indeed as these Canons established a new form of exterior polity in the Church, though the change was for the better, the Council asked a confirmation of such an innovation from the Emperor Theodosius, as appears from its Synodical letter, *but not from the Roman Council, though it sent likewise to it another Synodical letter.*"

Lib. 7. c. 5.

Liv. 18. § 7.

"The third Canon," says Fleury, "is the most remarkable Canon of the whole Council, and whether this was a new honour granted to the Bishop of Constantinople, or whether

CHAP.  
II.

he was already in possession of it, the consequences were of great importance; and instead of a mere dignity it soon became a very extensive jurisdiction."

Strong  
proof of  
F stern  
self-govern-  
ment.

Remarkable enough it is that when, in the Council of Chalcedon, appeal was made to this third Canon, the Pope St. Leo declared that it had never been notified to Rome. As in the mean time it had taken effect throughout the whole East, as in this very Council Nectarius, as soon as he is elected, presides instead of Timothy of Alexandria, it puts in a strong point of view the real self-government of the Eastern Church at this time: for the giving the Bishop of Constantinople precedence over Alexandria and Antioch was a proceeding which affected the whole Church, and so far altered its original order; one in which certainly the West might claim to have a voice.

Tillemont goes on: "It would be very difficult to justify St. Leo, if he meant that the Roman Church had never known that the Bishop of Constantinople took the second place in the Church, and the first in the East, since his legates, whose conduct he entirely approves, had just themselves authorised it as a thing beyond dispute, and Eusebius of Dorylæum maintained that St. Leo himself had approved it." The simple fact is, that, exceedingly unwilling as the Bishops of Rome were to sanction it, from this time, 381, to say the least, the Bishop of Constantinople appears uniformly as first Bishop of the East. The Popes for a long time evidently feared that he would not stop there, but attempt to take from them the Primacy of the whole Church.

Now before summing up the striking points of this Council let us see how it was received by the West.

Council of  
Aquileia.

Two months after it a Council was held at Aquileia, presided over by St. Valerian, and St. Ambrose. The latter, refuting in it two Arianising Bishops, says incidentally: "Because in former times a Council was held in this manner, that the Orientals should hold a Council for the parts of the East, and the Occidentals in the West; we, being in the West, have assembled at the city of Aquileia, according to the Emperor's injunction. Moreover, the Prefect of Italy has also written, that, if the Orientals chose to meet us, they might do so: but because they are acquainted with this

S. Ambros.  
2. 788.

custom, that for the Easterns a Council should be held in the East, for the Westerns, in the West, they determined not to come." This Council expresses a desire that an Ecumenical Council should be held in Alexandria. The West afterwards wished this Council to be held at Rome. In this same year 381, there was another Council in Italy, at which St. Ambrose presided, and we have an important letter written by him in its name to the Emperor Theodosius. News had been brought of what had been done at Constantinople. He complains that a successor to Meletius had been appointed, contrary to right and Ecclesiastical order: that this was done by the consent and advice of Nectarius, whose own appointment lay open to heavy objections, on account of the prior consecration of Maximus. Moreover that Gregory likewise claimed the priesthood of the Church of Constantinople contrary to the tradition of the Fathers. He proceeds, "It was our judgment therefore that nothing should be ordered without due consideration in that Council which it seemed that the Bishops of the whole world were required to attend. But at this very time what are they, who avoided a general Council, said to have done at Constantinople? For knowing that Maximus had come into these parts to plead his cause in a Council: (which, even if a Council had not been proclaimed, would have been according to the law and custom of our ancestors: as both Athanasius of holy memory and but lately Peter, Bishops of the Church of Alexandria, and most of the Orientals, did, who seem to have had recourse to the judgment of the Roman Church, of Italy, and of the whole West:) knowing, as I said, that he was willing to try his cause against those who denied his being a Bishop, certainly they ought to have awaited our sentence also upon him. *We do not assume to ourselves the prerogative of examining such things, but we ought to have a share in their examination.*" Then complaining that Maximus had been rejected, he proceeds: "Inasmuch as we learn that Nectarius has just been ordained at Constantinople, we see not that our Communion with the Eastern countries remains firm. Nor do we see how this can be maintained, unless either he who was first ordained, (Maximus) be restored to Constantinople, or at least a Council of ourselves and the Orientals be held in

SECT.  
II.

Council in  
Italy.

S. Ambros.  
Ep. 13.

CHAP. II. the city of Rome respecting the ordination of the two. For, may it please your Majesty, it does not seem too much to ask that they should undergo the consideration of the Prelate of the Roman Church, and of the neighbouring and Italian Bishops, when they so far waited for the judgment of Ascholius alone as to invite him to Constantinople from the Western parts, (i. e. Thessalonica.) *If there was consideration for this single one, how much more should there be for so many.* As for ourselves, having received instructions from the most blessed Prince, the brother of your Piety, to write to your gracious Majesty, we require that the judgment may be common, and the consent unanimous, where the Communion is one."

Si quid uni  
huic reser-  
vatum est,  
quanto  
magis pluri-  
bus reser-  
vandum  
est?

Here St. Ambrose, complaining of a violation of the Canons, demands that, in a case of so much moment to the welfare of the whole Body of Christ, as the appointment of the Bishops of Constantinople and Antioch, when the succession was disputed, the Easterns should not decide by themselves, but sit in common Council with the West. St. Basil the Great, we shall find hereafter, says just the same, as to the holding of a joint Council, but that was on a matter of faith. Does he so much as hint that there was a sovereign authority at Rome whom they were bound to obey? Does he not expressly exclude such a notion, in terms indeed which shew that he never so much as imagined it, where he says, "We (i. e. the Westerns) do not assume to ourselves the prerogative of examining such things, but we ought to have a share in their determination." And perhaps still more in that reference to Ascholius, "If there was consideration for this *single one*, how much more should there be for *so many*," the "so many" being the Bishop of Rome and the Western Bishops. How much easier had it been to say, "Your Majesty knows that in such cases the voice of the Bishop of Rome must be heard: that the decision of the Apostolic See is decisive and final." On the contrary he lays the decision upon the consent of numbers, and the harmony of the East and West. It would be impossible to state more exactly that very constitution of the Church Catholic which we claim at present. He tells us, too, quite incidentally, why St. Athanasius resorted to the West, a fact so much relied on by

Roman Controversialists, i. e. as recognising that a final decision, in disputed matters, lay in general agreement. SECT.  
II.

But what was the reply to the request of St. Ambrose and the Italian Bishops, moderate as it was? "Theodosius answered this letter, and undeceived the Bishops of Italy, by informing them what Maximus was, and how different his ordination was from that of Nectarius. He represented to them, that these affairs, and that of Flavian's, ought to be judged in the East, where all the parties were present, and that there was no reason to oblige those of the East to come into the West. This appears by the second letter of St. Ambrose, (14th,) and of the Bishops of Italy, in which they return thanks to the Emperor for having reconciled the Churches of the East and West, and removed the misunderstanding which had divided them. They excuse themselves for their writing to him, by pleading the desire which they had for a reunion, and of putting an end to the complaints of the Eastern Bishops, who thought themselves neglected," (i. e. by the Western Church.) "For, said they, we did not require a Council for our own interest, since all the West is at peace." They say, likewise, "We put together our objections, not to pass sentence, but to inform you: as those who sought for a judgment, not who sent you one of their own." Tillemont says likewise, "As the Bishops of the Vicariate of Italy in particular had written several times to Theodosius, this prince wrote back to them that the reasons they had alleged were not sufficient to assemble an Ecumenical Council, that the affairs of Nectarius and Flavian were in the East, and all the parties there present, and so ought to be judged there without carrying the matter to the West, and changing by innovations the bounds which their fathers had placed: that this was not a reasonable request: that assuredly the Prelates of the East had some cause to be offended at it, and even that whatever judgment was passed in the absence of the parties would always leave place for fresh difficulties. That for the affair of Maximus they had shewn a little too much warmth against the Easterns, or too much readiness in believing the falsehoods palmed upon them."

Fleury. 18.  
17. Oxf. Tr.

S. Ambros.  
2. 818.

Tillemont,  
10. 150.

But the letter of the Italian Bishops had further results, which the Cardinal Orsi shall set forth to us. "Theodosius,

Orsi, lib. 18.  
82.

CHAP.  
II.

having received the letter of the Synod of Aquileia, and heard the complaints of the Western Bishops against the resolution taken at Constantinople to give Meletius a successor contrary to the right of Paulinus to succeed him alone in the government of the whole flock, and contrary to the opinion of Timothy and the other Bishops of Egypt, and having received the request made to him for permission to hold, for the re-establishment of concord, an Ecumenical Council at Alexandria; did not delay to call together the Bishops of his empire at Constantinople in order to hear their opinion respecting these matters. But, while they were assembled there, the letters of the Western Bishops reached them, inviting them to remove to Rome, to attend a great Council which was preparing there. And Gratian too must have written to them, or to Theodosius himself, since we find that the Orientals were invited at one time by the letters of the Occidentals, at another time by the letters of Gratian. But the Bishops assembled at Constantinople refused, says the historian (i. e. Theodoret) too partial to their side, and biassed strongly in favour of Flavian, to undertake such a journey, whence they did not expect to draw any advantage. However they wrote a letter to inform them fully of the storm that had been some time ago raised against the Churches, pretty plainly marking their past neglect: and moreover they introduced a short exposition of Apostolical doctrine both against the errors which attacked the Trinity, and against those which had arisen respecting the Incarnation

Ib., 18. 83. of the Word." A little further he says: "It is plain from this letter that the present Synod was for the greater part composed of those same Bishops who had held the preceding Council the year before in the same city of Constantinople." They write thus:

Letter to  
the Western  
Bishops.

"To our most honoured lords and pious brethren and fellow-ministers, Damasus (of Rome,) Ambrose (of Milan,) Britton (of Treves,) Valerianus (of Aquileia,) Ascholius (of Thessalonica,) Anemius (of Sirmium,) Basilius, and the other holy Bishops assembled in the great city of Rome, the holy Synod of orthodox Bishops assembled in the great city of Constantinople, greeting in the Lord. It is surely superfluous to inform your Piety, as if it were in ignorance, and to

relate the multitude of sufferings brought upon us by the tyranny of the Arian faction. For on the one hand we do not think that your Piety considers our affairs as so trifling a matter, as to need information about what demanded sympathy. Nor on the other hand were the storms that raged around us so slight as to be unnoticed. Add to which, so recent is the time of persecution, that its remembrance is still fresh not only to the sufferers, but to those who through love make the situation of those sufferers their own." . . . "We have need of long quiet, and much time and toil for the restoration of the Churches, just as after a long sickness, that by gradual treatment we may thoroughly cure the body of the Church, and bring it back to its ancient soundness of piety." . . . . "Since however it is a proof of your brotherly love that, assembling a Synod by God's will at Rome, you have invited us too as your own members through the letters of the most religious Emperor, so that, though we were condemned to bear tribulation alone, yet, in the present agreement of the Emperors in the cause of piety, you may not reign without us, but we also, according to the Apostle's expression, may reign together with you, we could indeed have wished, if possible, that, all together leaving our Churches, we might yield either to our desire or to the necessity of the case. For who will give us the wings of a dove, that we may flee away and be at rest beside you? But since this course would entirely strip the Churches just at the beginning of their recovery, and the thing altogether was impossible to the greater number; for we had assembled at Constantinople in consequence of your letters of last year after the Synod at Aquileia sent to the most religious Emperor Theodosius, being only prepared for going as far as Constantinople, and having the consent of the Bishops remaining in the Provinces only to this Synod, but not suspecting the necessity of a more distant journey, nor indeed having heard anything about it before we were come to Constantinople. Besides this, the time appointed was very short, not allowing of preparation for a longer journey, nor of communicating with the Bishops of our Communion who remain in the Provinces, and of receiving their consent. Since these and many other reasons prevented the going of the greater

CHAP.  
II.

number, as the next best thing we have done this, for the settling of affairs and the shewing of our love to you, we have besought the most reverend and excellent brethren, our fellow-ministers, the Bishops Cyriacus, Eusebius, and Priscianus, cheerfully to go to you, through whom we shew to you our desire of peace and unity, and declare our zeal for the sound faith." Then follows a statement of their faith as to the Trinity and the Incarnation. They proceed. "This then is a summary of the faith which we have set forth without shrinking. About which you will be still more gratified, if you have the goodness to read the volume drawn up at Antioch by the Synod there assembled, and that last year put forth in Constantinople by the Ecumenical Synod: in which we have at greater length confessed our faith, and have subscribed an anathema of the newly-invented heresies. But as to the management of particular matters in the Churches, both an ancient fundamental principle, as ye know, hath prevailed, and the rule of the holy Fathers at Nicea, that in each Province those of the Province," i. e. the Bishops, "and if they be willing, their neighbours also, should make the elections according as they judge meet. In accordance with which ye know both that the rest of the Churches are administered by us, and that Priests of the most distinguished Churches have been appointed. Whence in the, so to say, newly-founded Church of Constantinople, which by the mercy of God we have snatched as it were out of the jaws of the lion, from subjection to the blasphemy of the heretics, we have elected Bishop the most reverend and pious Nectarius, in an Ecumenical<sup>d</sup> Council, with common agreement, in the sight both of the most religious Emperor Theodosius, and with the consent of all the Clergy and the whole city. And those," the Bishops, "both of the Province and of the Diocese<sup>e</sup> of the East, being canonically assembled, the whole accordant Church as with one voice honouring the man, have elected the most reverend and religious Bishop Flavian to the most ancient and truly Apostolical Church of Antioch in Syria, where first the venerable name of Christian became

<sup>d</sup> Observe, this Council so called by the Greeks before it was received by the West.

<sup>e</sup> It must be remembered that Dio-

cese, in the language of this time, means the several Provinces comprehended in a Patriarchate. It was the civil term.

known: which legitimate election the whole Synod hath received." (And this notwithstanding the Bishop Paulinus, who was received by Rome and the West, had survived St. Meletius, and was then alive. So that they would not, even when such an opportunity occurred, accept the Bishop in Communion with Rome—a fact on the one side, which I suppose may weigh against those words of St. Jerome on the other, "I know not Vitalis; Meletius I reject; I am ignorant of Paulinus." It seems that though the test of Communion with Rome satisfied St. Jerome, it did not satisfy an Ecumenical Council.) "But of the Church in Jerusalem, *the mother of all Churches*, we declare that the most reverend and religious Cyril is Bishop, both as long since canonically elected by those of his Province, and as having struggled much against the Arians in different places. *Whom, as being lawfully and canonically established by us, we invite your Piety also to congratulate*, through spiritual love, and the fear of the Lord, which represses all human affection, and accounts the edification of the Churches more precious than sympathy with, or favour of, individuals. For thus, by agreement in the word of faith, and by the establishment of Christian love in us, we shall cease to say what the Apostle has condemned—I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas. For all being shewn to be Christ's, who in us is not divided, by the help of God we shall keep the body of the Church unrent, and shall stand with confidence before the tribunal of the Lord."

SECT.  
II.

Assuredly Gieseler is fully borne out by original documents in saying that the Council of 381, whereof here the Council of 382 is the spokesman, "arranged without any reference to the West the affairs of the Oriental Church, and was even quite openly on the side of the party of Meletius, rejected by the Westerns; just so the interference attempted by the Italian Bishops in the matter of Maximus, the counter-Bishop of Constantinople, remained quite disregarded."

Gieseler,  
tom. 1.  
pt. 2. p. 205.

But we have yet to hear the Roman account of the great Synod held at Rome to which the Bishops above were invited and refused to go. Cardinal Orsi says: "In this interval of time was held the great Council of Rome, to which, as has been stated above, the Bishops of the East too had

Orsi, Ist.  
Ecc. 18. 88.

CHAP.  
II.

been invited: of whom, however, a great part, assembled at Constantinople, had excused themselves from undertaking that journey by the letter which they sent by three of their colleagues with the character of Legates. Other Bishops, however, of the Eastern empire did not fail to attend, as St. Epiphanius, from the island of Cyprus, and Paulinus from the Diocese of the East, recognised in the West for the Bishop of Antioch: and St. Jerome joined them in their passage through Constantinople, probably called to Rome by St. Damasus, for the purpose of consulting him, as one well informed, through the long sojourn he had made in those regions, of the state of affairs, and of the dissensions and disputes of the East. It is believed that there also came Timothy of Alexandria with the other Bishops both of Egypt and Arabia. And on the side of the West we know there were present the Bishops of the two chief cities of Illyria, Anemius of Sirmium in the Western division, and Ascholius of Thessalonica in the Eastern: St. Ambrose of Milan, metropolis of Italy, and Britton of Treves in the Gauls. So that this Council might perhaps have passed for Ecumenical, had the deputies of that of Constantinople been charged to give their consent, and not rather to oppose whatever might be determined in it unfavourable to the Easterns, which was perhaps the principal object of this great assembly. How little the Bishops of the East were disposed to see the ordinations of Nectarius and Flavian carried before the judgment of another Synod, however numerous or authoritative, the Fathers might well understand not only from the synodical letter of those of Constantinople, but besides from a letter of the Emperor Theodosius. As this has been lost we may understand it by that which St. Ambrose had written back to him in his own name and that of the other Bishops of Italy. The letter of the Emperor contained the answer to that written to him by the Synod of Italy, to complain of the ordination of Flavian, as Bishop of Antioch, against the right of Paulinus singly to succeed St. Meletius; and of Nectarius as Bishop of Constantinople in place of Maximus believed by them to have been unjustly expelled from that See; and to demand of him permission to assemble in an Ecumenical Council, to restore concord between the Bishops of the two

S. Ambros.  
Ep. 14.  
quoted  
above.

empires. Theodosius seems to have taken the side of the Orientals, both in not approving that matters of such a nature should be judged of contrary to the injunction of the Canons out of Provincial Synods, or of the great Dioceses of the East, and respecting the ordination of Nectarius in place of Maximus, unworthy usurper of the Episcopal dignity. With respect to this second point the Bishops of Italy had withdrawn their opposition, confessing that they had been taken in by the falsehoods of the Cynic, as they might besides have heard from St. Damasus or St. Ascholius the circumstances of his sacrilegious ordination. But, so far as the demand made by the Synod to examine therein the causes of the Orientals, they had claimed in that not to have overpassed the limits set by the holy Fathers, and to have followed the example of St. Athanasius, who was, they say, a pillar of the Catholic faith. We may infer that the sentiments of the other Fathers in the Roman Council were not different from theirs; for though we have not its acts, nevertheless it is believed that it was there resolved to continue to communicate with Paulinus as the only Bishop of Antioch, and to have no intercourse with Flavian, nor with Diodorus of Tarsus, nor with Acacius of Beroëa, as chief authors of his election; that the ordination of Nectarius was allowed there, as they were induced to pass over its defects by the urgency of not putting fresh obstacles in the way of the concord so much desired, at a time in which the Bishop of Constantinople had reached such a degree of power, that on him depended in great part the regulation of great affairs belonging to the Church through the whole extent of the Eastern Empire."

SECT.  
II.

Here then is the whole East, in the year 381, long before the schism, announcing to the Bishops of Rome, Milan, Treves, Aquileia, Thessalonica, Sirmium, and the West, the election of its Patriarchs, and exercising as an ancient incontestable right that liberty of self-government, according to the Canons, for continuing to do which very thing, and for nothing else, the Latin Church accounts both the Greek and English Church schismatic. And this right of self-government is admitted by the Synod of Rome itself in the case of Nectarius freely, the objection to him being not that he was

Result from  
the above  
facts.

CHAP.  
II.

---

lected without the Pope's authority, but that Maximus had a previous claim on his See. The Westerns were indeed so far committed to support Paulinus, that they could not give him up; and undoubtedly the election of Flavian by the Easterns could only be excused by their determination not to seem to admit that the West had any superior authority to their own. St. Gregory of Nazianzum plainly says that such was their motive, while he disapproves of the course pursued for other reasons. St. Ambrose, on the other side, as distinctly says, that the Westerns assumed no prerogative of examining these great causes, but ought to have a share in their examination, where there had been some great informality. Now granting that the Eastern Church, as its own rituals to this day declare, always acknowledged St. Peter's Primacy, and that his Primacy was inherited by the Bishop of Rome, it is apparent at once that it never received, nay, most strongly abhorred the slightest appearance of, that system of centralization of all power in Rome, which St. Leo seems to have had before his eyes. Its most holy and illustrious Fathers never submitted to this domination. That is saying little. So far as I can see of their mind, I believe they ignored it. I know not how else St. Basil could have spoken of the Pope, and of Western pride, in such terms. I know not how St. Gregory of Nazianzum could have received the See of Constantinople from the hands of St. Meletius and the Eastern Bishops. I know not how after his voluntary cession he could have presently acknowledged Nectarius. I know not how Gregory of Nyssa, and Peter of Sebaste, the great Basil's brothers after the flesh, and inheritors of his spirit, and St. Amphilochius of Iconium, his much loved friend, and St. Cyril of Jerusalem, could have sat in this Council of 381. I confess that I cannot understand the drift of plain words, if the Synodical letter of the Council of 382, happily preserved to us by Theodoret, be not written as from equals to equals: and then the fact that this letter was admitted by the Roman Council is conclusive. Yet Bellarmine will have it that Bishops, who so wrote and so acted, received their jurisdiction from Rome: and, what is far more important, if they did not, the present Papal theory falls to the ground.

But now I must very briefly sum up the remarkable events which I have been lately reviewing. S E C T.  
II.

1st. A Council is held by the Emperor Theodosius at Constantinople, neither called nor acceded to by the Pope, neither attended by him nor any Western Bishop, except St. Ascholius, whom they summoned as an Eastern. Summary  
of Second  
Ecumenical  
Council.

2nd. This Council is presided over, first by Meletius, as Bishop of Antioch, whom Rome after a long rejection scarcely, if at all, endured, preferring his competitor Paulinus; secondly, after his death by Gregory, a Bishop of Constantinople, whom the authority of Meletius chiefly had placed in that See; thirdly, after the voluntary cession of this Bishop, by his successor Nectarius, likewise elected by the Bishops there present, and the Emperor, under very unusual circumstances, inasmuch as he was actually unbaptized.

3rdly. This Council chooses rather to perpetuate a schism in the great Church of Antioch, than to accept Paulinus, an aged man, for Bishop of the whole flock, lest it should seem therein to defer to the authority of the West.

4thly. This Council, of its own authority, adds most important articles to elucidate the Nicene Creed, and its Creed becomes henceforth the heirloom of the Church Catholic, and the symbol of the unity of East and West.

5thly. It not only passes Canons of discipline expressing the whole plan of the Eastern Church, and setting forth its government by its own Provincial and Patriarchal Synods, but it alters in an important point what had been the unquestioned hierarchical order of the Church Catholic up to that time, and gives to the Bishop of Constantinople, the See most jealous of the power of Rome, the second place in the ecclesiastical rank, which had hitherto been enjoyed by the Bishop of Alexandria, the most attached of all the East to the Bishop of Rome.

6thly. This Council is received as Ecumenical by the Popes, and the whole Church of East and West. That great Council of Rome, held the next year, in a sort of opposition to it, has so passed away that its acts can only be inferred; the Council of Constantinople, complained of by the Synod of Aquileia, and the Bishops of Italy, and admitted for the

CHAP.  
II.

sake of peace by the Synod of Rome, is the second great Council of the universal Church, though it was composed of Eastern Bishops alone. I am aware that Pope Leo said the Roman Church had never received its Canons of discipline.

De Marca,  
De Conc.,  
&c. lib. 3.  
c. 3. § 5.

“It is not to be concealed,” says Archbishop de Marca, “that the Canons of the Second Council were never carried to the Roman Church, nor received by it, as Leo in his letter to Anatolius bears witness.” Therefore Canons, regulating the government of the whole East, were in force without the Pope’s authority. Now put side by side with these facts that other fact, that for many hundred years the conduct of the Roman Church rests upon the Idea that the Pope is the source of jurisdiction to all Bishops, their common Father, and the root of their authority, the sole vice-gerent of our Lord and Saviour, and the Roman Church the mother and mistress of all Churches.

Proof of  
Eastern  
self-govern-  
ment.

I know not what facts could prove the Eastern self-govern-ment, or what facts could disprove the present Roman Supremacy, so far as regards the authority of the fourth century, if these do not. The resistance offered by the African Church to the progress of Papal power in the time of St. Augustine is slight compared to the positive assertion of equality, so vigorously carried out into action, by the Ecumenical Council of 381.

Subsequent  
history of  
Flavian.  
Theodoret,  
5. 23.

Respecting Flavian, made Patriarch of Antioch by the above Council, I shall add the following chapter of Theodoret. “In Antioch the great Meletius was succeeded in the Episcopate by Flavian, who with Diodorus had undergone there many conflicts for the salvation of the flock. Paulinus indeed wished to take the headship of the Church. But the assembly of Priests” (i. e. the Council of Constantinople) “refused, saying that it fitted not that one, who had not accepted the offer of Meletius, should after his death take his seat: that, on the other hand, he who had been distinguished by so many labours, and exposed himself most of all to danger for the flock, ought to become their pastor. This set the Romans and Egyptians for a very long time in enmity with the East. For neither was the enmity terminated with the death of Paulinus (A.D. 388). For when after him Evagrius took his Seat, they continued hostile to

the great Flavian, and this though Evagrius had been ordained contrary to Ecclesiastical rule. For Paulinus alone ordained him, transgressing many Canons at once. These do not permit a dying Bishop to ordain his successor, and they require all the Bishops of the Province to be called together. And again they forbid that a Bishop should be consecrated without three Bishops. But nevertheless choosing to consider none of these things, they" (i. e. Rome and Egypt) "accepted the Communion of Evagrius, and attempted to gain the hearing of the Emperor against Flavian, who, being often troubled by them, called him to Constantinople, and bade him go to Rome. But Flavian, alleging the winter, and promising at the beginning of spring to fulfil his command, returned to his country. But when the Bishops of Rome, not only the admirable Damasus, but his successor Siricius, and his again, Anastasius, earnestly pressed the pious Emperor, saying that he overthrew the tyrants who rose against himself, while he left alone in their tyranny those who made bold against the laws of Christ, he again sent after Flavian, and urged him to go to Rome. Then the most judicious Flavian, with commendable freedom, said: If, O Emperor, any accuse my faith as not being orthodox, or assert that my life is unworthy of the priesthood, I will take my accusers themselves for judges, and accept the judgment which they give. But if it be this Seat and Primacy for which they are contending, I will neither plead nor resist those who wish to take it, but I will yield of myself, and give up my office. Therefore, O Emperor, give the throne of Antioch to whomsoever thou wilt. The Emperor, in admiration of this courage and wisdom, bade him return to his country, and feed the Church committed to him. After a long time the Emperor, having again gone to Rome, had to suffer again the same accusations from the Bishops for not putting down the tyranny of Flavian. In answer he bade them declare what sort of tyranny it was, saying, I am Flavian, and stand to plead his cause. Upon their replying that they could not plead with an emperor, he exhorted them for the future to join the Churches together in harmony, to give up their enmity, and quench their senseless rivalry. That Paulinus had been long dead, and Evagrius not lawfully ordained, and the Churches

CHAP.  
II.

of the East maintained Flavian in his Episcopate: but besides the East, the whole Diocese of Asia, and of Pontus, and of Thrace also, were in Communion and connection with him: nay, all Illyria recognised him to be first of the Bishops of the East. The Bishops of the West, yielding to these representations, engaged to give up their enmity, and to receive the deputies who should be sent to them. The divine Flavian, learning this, sent to Rome certain distinguished Bishops, as well as Presbyters and Deacons of Antioch; at the head of all was Acacius, Bishop of Beroea in Syria, renowned everywhere over sea and land. He with the rest came to Rome, and terminated the long enmity of seventeen years, and obtained peace for the Churches. The Egyptians, learning this, gave up their enmity, and accepted union. At this time Innocent presided over the Church of the Romans, being successor to Anastasius: he was a man of sagacity and prudence: and over the Church of Alexandria, Theophilus, whom I have mentioned before."

A.D. 398.

St. Chrysostome ordained Reader and Priest out of Communion with Rome.

This happy peace is said to have been the first fruits of St. Chrysostome's Episcopate, who was himself the spiritual child of these two great Bishops Meletius and Flavian, having been ordained Reader by the one, and Priest by the other, when neither of them was acknowledged at Rome.

S. Cyril, tom. 6. Epist. p. 203. D.

Thus the line of Paulinus and Evagrius, exclusively recognised at Rome, did not hand on the succession, and Atticus, Patriarch of Constantinople, writing to St. Cyril to persuade him to replace in the Diptychs the name of St. Chrysostome, observes that no injury had arisen from "*Paulinus and Evagrius, the ringleaders of the schism in the Church of Antioch*, being after their death for the peace and harmony of nations inscribed in the Diptychs."

So the unjust condemnation of St. Chrysostome by Theophilus leads to the suspension of Communion between the Church of Rome on the one side, and the Churches of Antioch, Constantinople, and Alexandria, on the other. At length Atticus at Constantinople, and Alexander at Antioch, restore the name of St. Chrysostome to its due honour, and re-establish Communion with the West. But the Bishops of Alexandria and their Patriarchate do not yield so soon. Not only does Theophilus die out of Communion with Rome, on

account of his unjust persecution of that Saint, but St. Cyril succeeds not merely to his office but to his principles likewise. For at least five years after his accession to the Patriarchal rank he prefers being out of Communion with Rome before seeming to cast any reflection upon the conduct of his uncle Theophilus.

Now the conduct of all the three great Eastern Bishops is decisive at least as to their having no notion whatever of an Ecclesiastical monarchy fixed at Rome. Yet this is in the fifth century, of which, and of the fourth, Mr. Newman tells us that "the simple question is, whether their clear light may be fairly taken to illuminate the dim notices of the preceding." If the illustrious president of the third Ecumenical Council, "the Doctor of the world," as he is still termed in the East, chose rather to be out of Communion with Rome for five years, than to give up a certain view respecting the conduct of St. John Chrysostome, would he have ever purchased her Communion at the price of admitting that his own jurisdiction over the Patriarchate of Alexandria was derived from her? Yet St. Cyril is a Doctor of the Church Catholic in the eyes of Rome, and those who now defend the Ecclesiastical Constitution under which St. Cyril lived, are termed by her schismatic Greeks, or English rebels.

Concerning the Patriarch Theophilus Tillemont in his life has the following passage: "What is certain is that he died separated from the Communion of the Roman Church, having deserved this just excommunication by what he had done against St. John Chrysostome. Charged with this fearful weight he went to render account of his actions to the justice of God, which perhaps was in his case the more rigorous, because, if he did any good, he seems to have been recompensed in this world, both by the credit he enjoyed during his life, and by the esteem which men shewed for him after his death. I do not speak of Atticus," (Patriarch of Constantinople,) "who, writing to St. Cyril, calls Theophilus his holy father and a man equal to the Apostles. He was cited in the Council of Ephesus with the title of most holy Bishop. The Eastern Bishops of the same Council declare that they desire to tread in the steps, and ever to follow the doctrine, of Athanasius, of John, of Theophilus, and of the

SECT.  
II.

Inference  
from the  
conduct of  
Atticus,  
Alexander,  
and St.  
Cyril.  
Develop-  
ment, p.  
179.

Tillemont,  
II. 495.

CHAP.  
II.

other illustrious masters of the Church: and, writing to St. Cyril, they cite the blessed Theophilus as our common father. Alypius, a priest of Constantinople, praises St. Cyril for having imitated and equalled his uncle, the blessed Theophilus. Paul, Bishop of Emesæ, having set forth before the people of Alexandria the faith of the Incarnation, 'Here, says he, is what the blessed Athanasius, and the great Theophilus, the pillars of the Church, have taught us.' The people in answer called him son of Theophilus and of Athanasius. Theodoret, though very zealous for the memory of St. Chrysostome, does not fail to write to Dioscorus, to employ for defence of the faith against heretics the writings of the blessed Theophilus and Cyril: and in fact he cites Theophilus in his third dialogue, though he does not call him saint, or blessed, as he does the rest. St. Proterius of Alexandria calls him his most happy father and bishop, and cannot endure that it should be said of a man so watchful, so beloved of God, so full of the knowledge of the Scriptures, that he failed through want of care and diligence to mark Easter on its true day. He is quoted also in the fifth Council with the title of saint and of blessed memory. The Council of Myra in Lycia in 458 extols the labours of Theophilus and of St. Cyril of holy memory, and calls them princes of the orthodox and genuine faith. Vincent of Lerins among the Latins calls him St. Theophilus, a prelate illustrious by his faith, his life, and his knowledge. St. Leo himself, bound as he was to support the conduct of the Roman Church in respect to him, fails not to put him with St. Athanasius and St. Cyril among the most excellent pastors that the Church of Alexandria had had, and to call him a Bishop of holy memory. He also quotes his writings among those of the saints, without giving him, however, the title of saint, as others. Pope Gelasius also approves the writings of the blessed Theophilus." St. Leo's words respecting him are, "that Church which at the very commencement of the Gospel had for its founder the blessed Mark, disciple of the most blessed Apostle Peter, in all things agreeing with the teaching of his master, and which afterwards, in times nearer to our own age, had for most excellent prelates Athanasius, Theophilus, and last of all Cyril."

I give these two narratives for the purpose of asking two questions. SECT.  
II.

1st. Did Theodoret, that same Bishop who appealed to Pope St. Leo against the outrageous violence of Dioscorus, and in his letter to the Papal Legate Renatus stated that his "most holy throne has the first place over the Churches throughout the universe on many grounds," or did the Emperor Theodosius, or Flavian Patriarch of Antioch, or Atticus Patriarch of Constantinople, or Theophilus Patriarch of Alexandria, or his nephew and successor St. Cyril, did all these hold either the Roman Supremacy, or that Communion with Rome under all circumstances, that is, if she broke the Canon, was necessary to salvation?

Result from these histories.

*ἡγεμονίαν.*  
Theodoret, tom. 4. Ep. 116, p. 1197, quoted in 'the faith of Catholics.'

2nd. Did the many authorities, who, after his death mention with such high praise, or rank among the saints, Theophilus, who died excommunicated by the Roman Church, hold the consequences of that excommunication in itself to be so severe as they are now represented to us? In other words, did they hold that excommunication by the Roman Church differed *in the nature of its authority* from that by the Alexandrine, or the Antiochene, or the Constantinopolitan?

### SECT. III.

"THE writers of the fourth and fifth centuries," says Mr. Newman, "fearlessly assert, or frankly allow, that the prerogatives of Rome were derived from Apostolic times, and that because it was the See of St. Peter." I confess that these words set me upon the search, and that I have found such testimonies in abundance; but then they are invariably to the Bishop of Rome *as holding the first See, not as Episcopus Episcoporum: they bear witness to the Patriarchal system, not to the Papal.* For instance, all lovers of truth would be obliged to Mr. Newman to point out, in all the works of St. Augustine, a single passage which is sufficiently distinct and specific to justify the Papal claims, nay, which does not consider the Pope the first Bishop, and *no more.* It is little to say I have searched for such in vain. But in a

Testimony of St. Augustine. The promises made to Peter not as a particular Apostle, but to the Church of which he is therein the type.

CHAP.  
II.

Western Father, whose extant writings are so voluminous, and whose personal history is almost a history of the Church during the nearly forty years of his Episcopate, and who continually gives judgment on all matters concerning the Church's government and constitution, it would seem impossible but that such a testimony should be found, if a thing so wondrous as is the Papal power then existed. On the contrary, St. Augustine, continually explaining those often cited passages of Scripture, on which mediæval and later Roman writers ground the Papal prerogatives, that is, Thou art Peter, &c., Feed My sheep, &c., says specifically, that Peter represents the Church. One of these passages I have already quoted. Take another. "And I say unto thee, because thou hast said to Me; thou hast spoken, now hear; thou hast given a confession, receive a blessing; therefore, and I say unto thee, that thou art Peter; because I am the Rock, thou art Peter; for neither from Peter is the Rock, but from the Rock, Peter; because not from the Christian is Christ, but from Christ the Christian. And upon this Rock I will build My Church; *not upon Peter, which thou art, but upon the Rock which thou hast confessed.* But I will build My Church, *I will build thee, who in this answer representest the Church.*" Again, in a passage which conveys that old view of Cyprian, that every Bishop's chair is the chair of St. Peter. "For as some things are said which would seem to belong personally to the Apostle Peter, yet cannot be clearly understood unless when they are referred to the Church, which he is admitted, in figure, to have represented, on account of the Primacy which he held among the disciples,—as is,—I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven;—and if there be any such like." Again, "One bad man represents the body of the bad: as Peter represents the body of the good, nay, the body of the Church, but in the person of the good. *Were not Peter a type of the Church the Lord would not say unto him,* I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven. *If this be said only to Peter, the Church does not do this.* But if it is wrought in the Church also, that what

S. Aug.,  
tom. 5.  
1097. B.

Tom. iv.  
1215. E.

Tom. 3. 2.  
633. D.  
quoted in  
Oxf. Tertullian,  
p. 499.

are bound on earth are bound in heaven, what loosed on earth, loosed in heaven, because, when the Church excommunicates, the excommunicate is bound in heaven, where he is reconciled by the Church, the reconciled is loosed in heaven, if this is wrought in the Church, Peter, when he received the keys, signified the holy Church.”

Again : “The Gospel just read is of the Lord Christ who walked upon the waters of the sea, and of the Apostle Peter, who, walking there, through fear lost his footing, and sinking from want of faith rose again by his confession. It teaches us to consider the sea the present world, but the Apostle Peter the type of the one only Church. For this Peter, first in the order of the Apostles, most ready in the love of Christ, often answers singly for all. He it was, at the question of the Lord Jesus Christ, whom men said He was, when the disciples gave in answer the various opinions of men, and the Lord again inquired and said, But whom say ye that I am, Peter it was who answered, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. One for many he gave the answer, being the oneness in the many. Then the Lord said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven. Then He added, And I say unto thee. As if He would say, because thou hast said unto Me, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, I also say unto thee, thou art Peter. Simon he was called before : but this name of Peter was given him by the Lord, and that in figure, to signify the Church. For because Christ is the Rock, Peter is the Christian people. For the Rock (Petra) is the chief name. Therefore Peter is from Petra, not Petra from Peter : as Christ is not called from the Christian, but the Christian from Christ. Thou art therefore, saith He, Peter, and upon this Rock which thou hast confessed, upon this Rock which thou hast recognised, saying, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, I will build My Church : that is, upon Myself the Son of the living God, I will build My Church. Upon Me I will build thee, not Me upon thee.”

SECT.  
III.

---

Tom. 5.  
415, 416.  
Peter the  
type of the  
Church :  
Christ the  
Rock.

Is it for nothing, I would ask here, that God directed Augustine, so largely endowed by His grace among the Saints and Fathers of His Church, thus pointedly to exclude

CHAP.  
II.

that very interpretation on which late Roman writers build? Is it not a great witness and beacon-light of the truth that he speaks so often so uniformly and so decisively on this passage, seeing in it the deepest spiritual meaning, and that a meaning opposed to the one set on it by modern Rome?

He proceeds, "For men, wishing to be built on men, said, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, that is, Peter. And others, who would not be built upon Peter, but upon the Rock, said, I am of Christ. But when the Apostle Paul found that he was selected and Christ despised, Is Christ, saith he, divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye baptized in the name of Paul? As not in the name of Paul, so neither in that of Peter, but in That of Christ, that Peter might be built upon the Rock, not the Rock upon Peter." . . . . "Let us, contemplating this member of the Church, distinguish what is of God, what of ourselves. For then shall we not be shaken, then shall we be founded on the Rock, be firm and stable against winds, rains, and streams, that is, the temptations of the present world. But look on that Peter, *who was then our type*. One moment he has faith; another moment he is shaken: one moment he confesses the Immortal; at another fears His death. Wherefore, as the Church of Christ hath strong ones, so too hath she weak: she can neither be without the strong, nor without the weak. Whence the Apostle Paul saith, we that are strong ought to bear the burdens of the weak. In that Peter said, 'Thou art Christ the Son of the living God,' he is a type of the strong: in that he trembles and totters, and will not have Christ suffer, fearing death, not recognising the Life, he is a type of the Church's weak ones. So that in that one Apostle, that is, Peter, first and chief in the order of the Apostles, in whom the Church was figured, there was to be a type of both kinds, the strong and the weak: because without both the Church exists not."

Peter a  
type of  
different  
classes of  
Christians.

Tom. 4.  
1310. D.

Again, commenting on the 43rd verse of the 119th Psalm, "Take not the word of Thy truth utterly out of my mouth. He says, out of his mouth, because the unity of the Body speaketh, among whose members they also are reckoned, who for a moment through denial have failed, but repenting have afterwards recovered their life, or even, renewing their

confession, carried off the palm of martyrdom which they had lost. Not therefore utterly . . . . was the word of truth taken out of the mouth of Peter, in whom was the type of the Church, because though for a moment he denied through the confusion of fear, yet by weeping he was restored, and by confessing afterwards crowned. So then the whole Body of Christ speaketh, that is, the universality of the holy Church, in which whole Body, whether, though very many denied, yet stedfast ones remained, who contended even to death for the truth, or because, even out of those who had denied, many were restored, the word of truth was not taken utterly out of his mouth. But for what he says, Take not away, we must understand, Suffer not to be taken away, as we say in praying, Lead us not into temptation. And the Lord Himself said to Peter, I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, that is, that the word of truth be not taken utterly out of thy mouth.”

SECT.  
III.

And elsewhere on the words, When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren, “Clearly hath he strengthened us by his Apostolate, by his martyrdom, by his letters.”

Tom. 5. 980.  
A.

Again, “No where should the bowels of mercy so prevail as in the Catholic Church, so that, like a true mother, she neither proudly insult her children when in sin, nor be hard to pardon them when corrected. For not without reason out of all the Apostles doth Peter represent this Catholic Church: for to this Church were the keys of the kingdom of heaven given, when they were given to Peter. And when it is said to him, it is said *to all*, Lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep. Therefore the Catholic Church ought willingly to pardon her children when corrected and confirmed in piety, inasmuch as we see that pardon was granted to Peter himself representing her, both when he lost courage upon the sea, and when with carnal feeling he drew back the Lord from His Passion, and when he cut off the servant’s ear with the sword, and when he thrice denied the Lord Himself, and when he afterwards fell into a superstitious dissimulation; and so he was corrected, and strengthened, and carried on even to the glory of the Lord’s Passion.” And thus, he proceeds, “The Catholic Church received into her maternal bosom” the Bishops who had Arianized, “as it were Peter

Tom. 6. 260.  
B. E.

The keys  
given to the  
Church.

Peter the  
type of re-  
turning  
penitents.

CHAP.  
II.

after the tears of his denial admonished by the crowing of the cock, or as it were the same after his evil dissimulation corrected by Paul's voice."

Tom. 5. 240.  
F.

Again: "For Peter himself, to whom He entrusted His sheep as to another self, He willed to make one with Himself, that so He might entrust His sheep to him; that He might be the Head, the other bear the figure of the Body, that is, the Church; and that, as man and wife, they might

Tom. 5.  
1194. E.

be two in one flesh." Again: "The Lord Jesus chose out His disciples before His Passion, as ye know, whom He named Apostles. Amongst these, Peter alone almost

Meruit.

everywhere was thought worthy to represent the whole Church. On account of that very representing of the whole Church, which he alone bore, he was thought worthy to hear, I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of

The keys  
not given  
to Peter  
alone but  
to the  
Church.

heaven. *For these keys not one man but the unity of the Church received.* Here, therefore, the eminence of Peter is set forth, because he represented the very universality and unity of the Church, when it was said to him, I give to thee,

what was given to all. For that you may know that the Church has received the keys of the kingdom of God, hear what in another place the Lord says to all His Apostles: Receive the Holy Ghost. And presently: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted to him; whosoever ye retain, they are retained. This belongs to the keys concerning which it was said, What ye loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven; and what ye bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven. But this He said to Peter. That you may know that Peter then represented the whole Church, hear what is said to him," &c. "For deservedly, after His resurrection,

Tom. 5.  
1195. E.  
And the  
commission  
to feed the  
sheep.

the Lord delivered His sheep to Peter himself to feed; *for he was not the only one among the disciples who was thought worthy to feed the Lord's sheep.* But when Christ speaks to

Tom. 3.  
pars 2. 607.  
E. 608. D.  
quoted by  
Launoy.

one, unity is commended; and to Peter above all, because Peter is the first among the Apostles." Again, "Therefore to Peter, whom He wished to make a good shepherd, He saith, not in the person of that individual Peter but as in His own Body, Peter, lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep. This He saith once, this twice, this a third time so as even to cause him sorrow:" and further on, "Understand then how

the Lord Jesus Christ is both Door and Shepherd: Door by opening Himself, Shepherd by entering through Himself. And indeed, Brethren, in that He is a Shepherd He hath bestowed this on His members: for both Peter is a shepherd, and Paul a shepherd, and the other Apostles are shepherds, and good Bishops are shepherds." Again: "As in the Apostles, the number itself being twelve, that is, four divisions into three,"—(he seems to mean, that there was a mystical universality betokened in the number four, as a mystical unity in the number three,)—"and all being asked, Peter alone answered, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And it is said to him, I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, *as if he alone had received the power of binding and loosing; the case really being, that he singly said that in the name of all, and received this together with all, as representing unity itself; therefore one in the name of all, because unity is in all.*" Lastly, commenting on the following words of the last chapter of St. John's Gospel, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou Me:" he is led to explain the two states of life which the Apostles Peter and John represent. It is a view so deep and spiritual, so beautiful and striking, that, besides its bearing on the subject we have in hand, it well deserves contemplation for its own sake.

"This doth the Church that is blessed by hope in this calamitous life: which Church the Apostle Peter in virtue of the Primacy of his Apostolate represented, being the type of its universality. For, as to his own proper person, by nature he was a single man, by grace a single Christian, by more abundant grace a single, but at the same time the first, Apostle. But when it was said to him, I will give to thee, &c., he represented the whole Church, which in this world is shaken by divers temptations, as it were storms, streams, tempests, and falleth not because it is founded upon the Rock, whence Peter received his name. For the Rock (Petra) is not called from Peter, but Peter from the Rock, as Christ is not called from the Christian, but the Christian from Christ. For therefore saith the Lord, upon this Rock I will build My Church, because Peter had said, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. Therefore saith He,

SECT.  
III.

Tom. 3.  
pars 2.  
800. G.

S. Aug.  
tom. 3. p. 2.  
822—824.

Peter the  
type of the  
life of faith:  
John of  
fruition to  
come.

CHAP.  
II.

upon this Rock which thou hast confessed I will build My Church. For the Rock was Christ, upon which foundation Peter too himself is built. For other foundation can no man lay beside that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus. The Church therefore which is founded on Christ, received from Him in Peter's person the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that is, the power of binding and loosing sins. For what the Church is properly in Christ, that is Peter typically in the Rock: by which type Christ is understood to be the Rock, Peter the Church. This Church therefore, which Peter typified, so long as She dwells among evils, by loving and following Christ is delivered from those evils. But She follows Him the more in those who contend for the truth even unto death. Yet it is said to her as a whole, Follow Me, for which whole Christ suffered: concerning whom the same Peter saith, Christ suffered for us leaving to us an example that we may follow His footsteps. See wherefore it was said to him, Follow thou Me. But there is another deathless life, which dwelleth not in evils: there shall we see face to face what here is seen as in a glass darkly when great advance is made in the vision of the truth. Two lives are there therefore which the Church knoweth to be from God declared and recommended to her, of which the one consisteth in faith, the other in sight; one is in the time of our pilgrimage, the other in the eternity of our dwelling place; one in labour, the other in rest; one in journey, the other in home; one in the work of action, the other in the reward of contemplation; one escheweth evil, and doeth good, the other hath no evil which to eschew, but a great good to enjoy; one fighteth with the enemy, the other reigneth without an enemy; one is brave in adversity, the other feeleth no adversity; one setteth a rein on carnal lusts, the other is enwrapt in spiritual delights; one is anxious through solicitude to conquer, the other secure in the tranquillity of victory; one receiveth help in temptations, the other without any temptation hath its joy in the helper Himself; one succoureth the indigent, the other is there where it findeth no indigence; one pardoneth another's sins in order to have its own pardoned, the other neither suffereth what has need of pardon, nor doeth what it asks to be pardoned; one is

scourged by evils that it may not be puffed up in blessings, the other in so great a sea of grace is free from all evil, so that without any temptation of pride it adheres to its supreme good; one discerneth good and evil, the other seeth only good: one therefore is good, but as yet wretched, the other better, and blessed. The former is typified by the Apostle Peter, the other by John. Here the former continueth unto the end of this world, and there findeth its own end: the latter is put off for its completion till after the end of this world, but in the world to come hath no end. Therefore is it said to one, Follow Me: but to the other, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou Me. For what means this? as far as I feel, as far as I understand, it meaneth, Follow thou Me by bearing like Me temporal evils, let him tarry until I come to bestow eternal goods. Which may be said more plainly thus, Let perfect action follow Me moulded by the example of My passion: let contemplation that is begun tarry till I come, to be perfected when I have come. But let no one separate those distinguished Apostles: for in that whereof Peter was a type, both were, and in that whereof John was a type, both were to be. Typically, the one followed, the other tarried: but by faith both endured the present evils of this our misery, both waited for the future goods of that blessedness. Nor they alone, but the universal holy Church, the Bride of Christ, doeth this, She that is to be deliver'd out of those temptations, She that is to be preserved in that happiness. Which two lives Peter and John typified respectively: but in this life both temporally walked through faith, as both through sight shall eternally enjoy the other. *Therefore for all saints inseparably belonging to the Body of Christ Peter the first of the Apostles received the keys of the kingdom of heaven for binding and loosing sins, in order to guidance through this most stormy life; and for the same all saints in order to the unbroken repose of that most secret life did John the Evangelist recline on the bosom of Christ. Since it is neither the former alone but the whole Church which bindeth and looseth sins: nor did the latter for himself alone imbibe from the fountain head of the Lord's bosom those sublime truths which by his preaching he was to give forth*

CHAP. again, concerning God the Word in the beginning with  
 II. God, and the rest concerning the Godhead of Christ, and the Trinity and Unity of the whole Godhead, truths which in that kingdom shall be contemplated face to face, but now, until the Lord's coming, are to be seen in a glass darkly: but rather the Lord Himself diffused through the whole world that very Gospel to be imbibed by all His own, each according to their several capacity."

Tom. 1. 82. In after times reviewing his earlier works he observes, that in a book written in his presbyterate "I said in a certain place concerning the Apostle Peter that the Church is founded on him as on a rock: which meaning is also sung by the mouth of many in the verses of the blessed Ambrose, where he says of the cock, 'At his song the rock of the Church himself wipes away his crime.' But I know that I have afterwards in very many places so expounded the Lord's saying, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church,' as to be understood of Him whom Peter confessed, saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And so Peter, named from this Rock, would typify the person of the Church, which is built upon this Rock, and hath received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. For it was not said to him, Thou art the Rock (Petra), but, Thou art Peter (a stone). But Christ was the Rock, whom Simon confessing, as the whole Church confesses Him, was called Peter. But of these two meanings let the reader choose the more probable."

Which is the view this great Father preferred is evident from his frequent exposition of it. But he is throughout one and consistent in interpreting the Rock, the giving of the Keys, the words, I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and the commission to feed the sheep and the lambs. Throughout them all he considers Peter the type of the whole Church, never taking him as distinct from his brother Apostles, but expressly rejecting that notion, when it occurs. So entirely is this the case that he takes the special promise in Matt. xvi. 16, made to Peter, as made to the Church herself. Thus, "Where remission of sins is, there is the Church. How the Church? For to her was said, I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," &c.

Tom. 3. 2.  
 900, E.  
 quoted by  
 Launoy.

“It is asked,” says Bossuet, “in what sense was Peter the figure of the Church? As a naked sign? or as a certain part of the Church? or as her superior? We answer with readiness that Christ was pleased that the Church should be figured in Peter as in the Chief. But that he represented the Church in such a sense as to include her whole power and authority as inherent in, and present to, himself, *which is peculiar to an Universal Council*, no Saint whatever, not Augustine, not any other of the holy Fathers, imagined.”

SECT.  
III.  
Def., lib. 8.  
c. 19.

See Mr.  
Thompson  
asserting  
the con-  
trary, p. 48,  
49.

It may likewise be observed, that while on the one hand amid the spiritual meanings so deep and wide-spreading given to these most remarkable passages of Scripture there is a total silence as to the office and function of the Bishop of Rome in the whole Church being shadowed out by these expressions to Peter, on the other hand there runs through this oft-repeated exposition an indirect but specific denial of the present Roman doctrine, that all spiritual jurisdiction throughout the whole Church is derived from the See of Rome. Thus the negative and affirmative argument from St. Augustine is equally strong. It is indeed the doctrine of all antiquity that the power of the keys, which involves jurisdiction, is inherent in the Episcopal character, as well as the sacerdotal power, and is part of the inheritance received by all Bishops from Christ through the Apostles.

Sum of St.  
Augustine's  
testimony  
on the  
Scriptures  
alleged to  
prove the  
Supremacy.

I may remark here, that St. Leo the Great does apply the passages concerning the Rock and feeding the sheep both to St. Peter personally, as distinct from the other Apostles, and to the Roman Pontiffs, as his successors, distinct from all other Bishops. St. Augustine's different application is the more remarkable.

#### SECT. IV.

THE strongest expressions respecting the power of the Roman See, which I have been able to find in the works of St. Augustine, are contained not in his proper works, but in two letters of Pope St. Innocent, written in answer to the synodical letters of the Council of Milevi,—“who thought fit

Reference  
made to the  
Roman See  
throughout  
the West.

CHAP.  
II.

Fleury 23,  
30. Oxf. Tr.  
S. Aug.,  
tom. 2. 618.  
B.

S. Aug.,  
tom. 2. 635.  
F.

likewise to communicate their judgment to the Pope St. Innocent in order to join the Apostolical authority to their own." Their own words are,—“What we have done, Sir and Brother, we have thought good to intimate to your holy charity, that the authority of the Apostolical See may also be added to what we, in our mediocrity, have ordered, to protect the salvation of many, and also to correct the perversity of some.” They were writing concerning a point nearly touching the common faith, i. e., in condemnation of Pelagius. The Pope, in his answer, praises them, that “in inquiring concerning these matters, which it behoves to be treated with all care by Priests, and especially by a true, just, and Catholic Council, observing the precedents of ancient tradition, and mindful of Ecclesiastical discipline, you have confirmed the strength of our religion not less now in consulting us, than by sound reason before you pronounced sentence, *inasmuch as you approved of reference being made to our judgment, knowing what is due to the Apostolic See, since all we who are placed in this position desire to follow the Apostle himself, from whom the very Episcopate, and all the authority of this title sprung. Following whom we know as well how to condemn the evil as to approve the good: as, for instance, that guarding, according to the duty of Priests, the institutions of the Fathers, ye resolve that those regulations should not be trodden under foot, which they with no human but divine voice decreed: viz., that whatever was being carried on, although in the most distant and remote Provinces, should not be terminated before it was brought to the knowledge of this See: by the full authority of which the just sentence should be confirmed, and that thence all other Churches might derive what they should order; whom they should absolve; whom, as being bemired with ineffaceable pollution, the stream, that is worthy only of pure bodies, should avoid; so that as from their parent source all waters should flow, and through the different regions of the whole world the pure streams of the fountain well forth uncorrupted.*” And in like manner to the Bishops of Numidia, at the same Council. “Ye do, therefore, diligently and becomingly consult the secrets of the Apostolical honour, (that honour, I mean, on which beside those things that are without, the care of

Tom. 2. 639.  
B.

all the Churches awaits,) as to what judgment is to be passed on doubtful matters, following in sooth the direction of the ancient rule, which you know, as well as I, has ever been observed in the whole world. But this I pass by, for I am sure your prudence is aware of it: for how could you by your actions have confirmed this, save as knowing that throughout all Provinces answers are ever emanating as from the Apostolic fountain to inquirers? Especially, so often as a matter of faith is under inquiry, I conceive that all our Brethren and fellow-Bishops ought not to refer, save to Peter, that is, the source of their own name and honour, just as your affection hath now referred, for what may benefit all Churches in common, throughout the whole world. For the inventors of evils must necessarily become more cautious, when they see that at the reference of a double Synod they have been severed from Ecclesiastical communion by our sentence."

There is certainly an indefiniteness about these expressions, which may be made to embrace any thing; but they do not fairly mean more than that supervision of the faith which belonged to the office of the first of the Patriarchs. Moreover, they come from a Pope; in St. Augustine's mouth, they would have much more force. They shew us, besides, what a tendency there was in the power of the Patriarch continually to increase, as being the centre of appeal to so many, not only Bishops, but Metropolitans. Nay, at this very time, within less than a century, a rival power had grown up in the East, in the See of Constantinople, which, from a simple bishopric, under the Exarch of Heraclea, had begun to push aside the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch; and, by virtue of the Imperial residence at or near Constantinople, to exercise as great an influence through the whole East, as Rome did in the West. If this happened where there was no Apostolic See to build upon, but simply the privileges of the royal city, how much more in the case of Rome, which stood alone in the West the single object of common reverence; for, "who knows not," says this same Pope Innocent, "or observes not, that what has been delivered by Peter, the chief of the Apostles, to the Roman Church, and is kept until now, ought to be retained

Innocent I.  
Epist. 25,  
ad Decen-  
tium. Cou-

CHAP. II. by all; nor ought any thing to be brought in or superinduced thereon, which hath no authority, or seemeth to derive its precedents elsewhere? Especially since it is manifest, that over all Italy, the Gauls, Spain, Africa, and Sicily, and the interjacent islands, no one formed Churches except those whom the venerable Apostle Peter or his successors made Priests. *Or let them find documents that any other Apostle be found to have been, or have taught, in these Provinces.* If not, they ought to follow that which the Roman Church keeps, from whom they undoubtedly had their origin; lest, while they eagerly follow foreign statements, they seem to neglect the fountain-head of their institution." The admission that another Apostle's teaching, had it existed, might have been legitimately appealed to in favour of varying customs, is remarkable. We see, likewise, that the Pope, on the Patriarchal theory, was the common father of the whole West, in which however the British Isles are not mentioned.

De Marca,  
de Concor.,  
lib. 7. c. 12.

De Marca, explaining the above three passages of St. Innocent, says, "The right which he claims for his See, he derives entirely from the Canons of the Nicene Council," not those of Sardica. "The sixth Nicene Canon preserved to the Roman Church the privileges of which it was then in possession, in like manner as to the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch, and the others of high dignity. But it does not explain in what those privileges consisted, nor to what Provinces they extended. Moreover it ascribes all to *custom*, which at such a distance of time can with difficulty be traced, because new Canons have entirely changed the ancient form. Thence it is that we have much labour at present to discover those rights. However, we may affirm that the two Italian Dioceses" (i. e. that of Rome in ten Provinces, and that of Milan in seven), "entirely obeyed during those times the ordinances of the Apostolic See, inasmuch as they constituted its Patriarchal Synod, as I have elsewhere shewn. But the other Provinces of the West were bound to send reports to it, as to the See in which dwelt the chiefship of the Apostolic See, and whence the faith had been disseminated into the Provinces. The faith then had, as it were, been formed in the womb of Rome. But the Churches of the

other Provinces of the West were like colonies depending on that city. In which they resembled the Italian Churches.”

“That subjection of Western Provinces not belonging to the Patriarchal Synod of Rome, consisted not merely in a certain reverence and obedience to the Apostolic See, but chiefly in that they were bound to report to the Roman Pontiffs on the more difficult and doubtful questions which arose. In this the supreme Pontiff exercised a certain imperial right, which proves his supreme authority; *for they are mistaken who look for it in the appeals of Bishops, which were not received in the ancient Church.*

“But the better to understand the particularity of that right of *report*, we must remark that the term was derived from the civil law; where we read that the chief magistrates of Provinces made reports to the sovereign, when the arising of a doubtful point required it. . . . But in the Church there were two kinds of causes in which the use of reports was necessary: that is, so often as there was question of points of controverted faith, or of any point of doubtful discipline not yet defined with sufficient clearness in the Canons. . . . That right of the Apostolic See to receive reports from Councils, Innocent ascribes to the Canons, and to ancient custom,” to the Canons in the second of the above extracts, and to ancient tradition and the Canons in the first.

The Bishops of Rome from the earliest times, by a right not bestowed by any Council, but inherent in their See, as that of the Apostle Peter, exercised a supervision of faith and discipline over the whole West. This was the special function of their Primacy: by this they were the centre of unity to all the West. Thus they were connected with the Bishops of Africa, Spain, Gaul, Britain, and Illyricum, who did not form part of their original Patriarchal Synod, but who were accustomed to make reports to them, and receive decisions from them, on the *majores causæ*, defined above by De Marca to comprise points of controverted faith, or points of doubtful discipline.

This right of receiving reports not bestowed by Councils.

From the time of Pope Siricius (A.D. 385) downwards we possess a regular series of letters addressed by the Popes to the most distant Bishops of the West: and in the first of these letters they refer to the practice of consulting them,

CHAP.

II.

Constant.  
Epist. Rom.  
Pont. 749.

and receiving decisions from them, as very ancient. Thus St. Innocent says to Victricius, Bishop of Rouen: "If any causes or contentions arise between Clergy, as well in the greater as in the minor orders, let the strife be arranged, according to the Nicene Council, by assembling the Bishops of that Province: (5th Canon:) nor let any one be allowed, without prejudice however to the Roman Church, reverence to which in all causes ought to be maintained, to leave those Priests (Bishops) who in that Province by divine will govern the Church of God, and to betake himself to other Provinces. Which if perchance any one should presume to do, let him be removed from his rank in the Clergy, and judged by all guilty of the wrongs done. *If the greater causes intervene, let reference, after the judgment of the Bishops, be made to the Apostolic See, as the Council orders, and as blessed custom requires.*"

The sixth Canon of the Nicene Council orders this, because it requires the privileges of the Churches to be maintained, and this had been from the earliest times the special privilege of the Roman Church in the West, like to that exercised by the See of St. Mark in Egypt, and by the See of the Apostle Peter in the East.

The power of judging Episcopal causes on appeal was, as we have seen, bestowed upon the Roman Bishop by Councils, or decrees of the imperial power: not so this power of issuing decisions on doubtful points of faith and discipline. This was the proper power of his Apostolate and Primacy: in virtue of this he received the decrees of Provincial or General Councils, and transmitted them to the Bishops of the West, or even, if they were contrary to the Canons or the Faith, refused his consent to them, as St. Leo did to the second Council of Ephesus. A very great and important power, the germ no doubt of much that the Papacy became after the time of Pope Nicholas I., a power, likewise, which, duly exercised, was of great moment to the well-being of the Church, even an instrument in God's hands for keeping her one kingdom of faith and love, for preventing her dissolution into as many Satrapies as she has Bishops, for preserving in the several nations, her component parts, a lively sense of her being one organized and proportioned body, needing unity

of will, due growth, and cohesion of members: but at the same time a limited and exceptional power, not without its parallel in the East, not overriding custom and tradition, its own basis, and by no means involving the authority of a monarch: in fine, the exhortation or correction of an elder Brother, not the command of a Father.

From the above letter, says De Marca, "a very remarkable rule is deduced, that it was not the intention of the Roman Bishops in giving answers after consultation to prescribe new laws by these answers, or introduce new statutes, but only to recall the minds of Christians to the observance of the Canons and of ancient tradition. 'Not,' says Innocent, 'that new precepts be enjoined, but that we desire what has been neglected through the negligence of certain persons be observed by all, being, however, things of Apostolic usage, and ruled by the appointment of the Fathers.' Hence it is that Leo I. somewhere writes that his decrees and those of his predecessors, were drawn from the discipline of the Canons: 'promulged,' he says, 'from the rules of the Canons.'

SECT.  
IV.

De Marca,  
de Concor.,  
lib. 7. c. 18.

Constant.  
p. 747.

"Those answers, however, are not to be so taken, as if they were in the place merely of simple advice, but as decisions drawn from the Canon or tradition, to the observance of which the Bishops were bound. For this reason Siricius charges Himerius to take care that his answers be carried to the Bishops of the Province of Tarragona, and also to those living in the other four Provinces of Spain, namely in that of Carthage, now of Toledo, that of Andalusia, Lusitania, and Gallicia. 'We now,' says Siricius, 'more and more incite the mind of your brotherhood to preserve the Canons, and to hold the decretal Constitutions, that you cause to be brought to the knowledge of all our Bishops our answers to your consultations.'"

Constant.  
p. 637.

The two African Synods, therefore, of Carthage and of Milevi, A.D. 416, at which latter St. Augustine was present, having passed a decree censuring the Pelagian heresy, made a report of it to the Bishop of Rome, as being one of the *majores causæ*, concerning, that is, a point of faith. And St. Innocent returned the answer above quoted, in terms, says St. Augustine, becoming the Apostolic See: and two

CHAP. II. great Provincial Councils having thus spoken, and their judgment having being confirmed by the Apostolic See, all the authority that was needed for crushing an incipient heresy had been exercised. Accordingly St. Augustine ob-

Tom. 5. 645. C. serves in a sermon, "Refute gainsayers and bring opponents to us; for already two Councils on this matter have been sent to the Apostolical See; replies from whence have also been received. *The cause is terminated*: would that the error may presently terminate likewise."

Tom. 10. 492. F.

One other greater authority there was in the Church, that of a General Council, but elsewhere he had said, "Was there need of a Council being called together that an error plainly destructive might be condemned? As if no heresy were ever condemned without the calling together of a Council; the fact being that very few are found which entailed such a necessity in order to condemn them, and that there are many, nay, incomparably more, which deserved to be censured and condemned in the place where they sprung up, and might thence be made known through the rest of the world for avoidance. But their pride, which exalts itself so much against God, that it would glory not in Him, but in its free-will, is seen to catch at this glory likewise, that a Council of the East and West be assembled on their account." St. Augustine, then, speaks of such a Council as having a superior authority to the Pope. Now it so happens that though no such Council was called on account of the Pelagian heresy, yet that the Third Ecumenical Council, fifteen years after this, did ratify the Papal judgment. In their relation to Pope Celestine they say, "The account of what was done at the deposition of the impious Pelagians, and Celestians, Celestine, Pelagius, Julian, Persidius, Florus, Marcellinus, Orentius, and those of the same mind with them, having been read in the Holy Council, we likewise judged that the decree passed against them by your Piety should be ratified and confirmed. And we all are of one mind with you, holding them for deposed."

Mansi 4. 1337. B.

In another place St. Augustine contemplates the possibility of Pope Zosimus, the successor of St. Innocent, having supported the heretic Pelagius, instead of condemning him. In fact the Pelagians falsely asserted that Zosimus had

supported him. "But if, which God forbid, such a judgment had then been pronounced in the Roman Church concerning Celestius or Pelagius, that those their opinions, which Pope Innocent had condemned in them and with them, should have been declared to be sound tenets, it would have followed from this rather that the brand of surrendering the truth was to be impressed on the Roman Clergy." Again, speaking of the virulent calumnies of a Donatist :

"What need, then, is there, that I should answer the accusations he has brought against Bishops of the Roman Church, whom he has pursued with incredible calumnies? Marcellinus, and his Presbyters, Melchiades, Marcellus, and Silvester," (all Popes,) "are accused by him of surrendering the divine writings, and of offering incense."—Then further on, "Truly it is no slight consolation nor one little glorious to any one of us, if we are accused by the Church's foes together with the Church herself. Her defence, however, does not consist in the defence of those individuals whom they by name assault with their false accusations. Assuredly of whatever character were Marcellinus, Marcellus, Silvester, Melchiades," (Bishops of Rome,) "Mensurius, Cæcilianus," (Bishops of Carthage,) "and others against whom they object what they please in behalf of their dissension, no hurt arises to the Catholic Church spread throughout the whole world. If they be innocent, we in no degree share their crown: if they be guilty, we in no degree share their guilt. If they were good, in the threshing of the Catholic floor as grain they have been winnowed: if they were bad, in the threshing of the Catholic floor as straw they have been crushed."

Here, as Launoy observes, there is no division of Roman Pontiffs into private Doctors who may err, and public who may not, or into those who teach the whole Church, and those who do not, or into those who pronounce *ex cathedra*, and those who do not, but it is said absolutely, the Church's defence does not consist in the defence of Marcellinus, Marcellus, Silvester, and Melchiades, Bishops of Rome, any more than in that of Mensurius and Cæcilianus, Bishops of Carthage. Had Augustine considered the decision of the Roman Pontiff to be the voice of the Church Catholic, and that Pontiff the Vicar of Christ in a sense in which no other

SECT.  
IV.

Tom. 10.  
434, E. referred to by  
Launoy.

Tom. 9. 541,  
C. 542, F.  
quoted by  
Launoy.

Hypothetical Heresy of Popes fatal to themselves not to the Church.

Force of this language.

CHAP.  
II.

Bishop was, would it have been respectful, would it have been compatible with common sense, to speak thus? But if he looked upon that Bishop as the occupant indeed of the single Apostolical See of the West, and the first of all his brethren and colleagues both in the East and West, but still only an individual Bishop, he might blamelessly, he would naturally, so speak. What Roman Catholic would so speak now of the Pope? This is the difference between Primacy and Supremacy; between being guardian and defender of the Church's Canons, and her Head; between Peter and Christ.

Contrast of  
his lan-  
guage re-  
specting a  
General  
Council.

But if an erroneous decision of a Roman Pontiff in a matter of Faith would only result in his personal condemnation, as St. Augustine declared in the case of Zosimus, did he use similar language in respect to a plenary Council? On the contrary, to this he attributes the supreme and final authority which he never supposes to reside in the See of Rome. I have pointed out this above in the case of rebaptizing heretics. In another place after setting forth certain difficult questions respecting Baptism he continues, "But our safe course is, not to touch with any rash judgment on points the consideration of which has been entered upon by no Catholic Provincial Council, and terminated by no Plenary Council: but with the confidence of security to assert that which has been confirmed by the consent of the universal Church under the government of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ."

Tom. 9. 202,  
B. quoted  
by Launoy.

We cannot better arrive at St. Augustine's opinion than by contrasting his language respecting the occupants of the See of Rome with that concerning an Ecumenical Council. But the words of the Church's greatest Doctor are more than borne out by the legislative acts of that vast Communion, containing six Provinces, and four hundred and sixty Bishops, which his spirit directed and animated.

#### SECT. V.

IN the latter years of St. Augustine's life, between 418 and 426, the important question, as to whether appeals from

the African Clergy and Bishops to the Roman See should be allowed, was settled. It will be necessary to state the case fully on account of the strong light it throws on the then existing government of the Church, its testimony to the Nicene Canons as a real and living system a hundred years after they were passed, and the maxims and principles which the African Church, of which St. Augustine was then the soul, avowed in its relations with the Apostolical See of the West, which latter indeed are such as of themselves almost to decide the question of Schism between the Eastern and English Church on the one side, and the Roman on the other.

SECT.  
V.  
Appeals  
from Africa  
to the  
Roman  
Pontiff.

“It was,” says Tillemont, “in this year (418) that the affair of Apiarius, Priest of Sicca in the Proconsular Province, began: whose ordination, deposition, and appeal, caused great troubles, not only to Sicca, but even to all Africa. Nothing is known of his ordination: but it is plain, that, having committed diverse faults, he was deposed and excommunicated by Urbanus, Bishop of Sicca, a pupil of St. Augustine. So far as one can judge, Urbanus himself committed some informality in this excommunication.

Tillemont,  
T. 13. art.  
292.

“Apiarius appealed from him to the Pope, although that was forbidden by several Councils of Africa, and by that even of this year; although no Ecclesiastical constitution authorized these sorts of appeals; and although the Council of Nicea had ordered, that the affairs of Ecclesiastics should be terminated in their own Province, not granting them any other appeal. Nevertheless Baronius with much probability believes, that Zosimus not only received the appeal, but even restored Apiarius to Communion and the Priesthood: and that it was partly for this that he sent Faustinus into Africa, to justify himself there, says an author of this day, because the Africans complained that in receiving Apiarius he violated the rules of Ecclesiastical discipline, which do not allow a Bishop to admit to Communion those who have been separated from it by their own Bishop. There are some who believe that he claimed the right to take cognisance of the affair of Apiarius, as a neighbouring Bishop, according to a Canon of the Council of Sardica, though assuredly there is

See above  
the case of  
Marcion.

CHAP.  
II.

no colour for maintaining that this Canon gave him that right. It is certain that he sent into Africa this Faustinus, Bishop of Potenza in the March of Ancona." . . . "Philip and Asellius, Roman Priests, were also sent into Africa by Zosimus with Faustinus: they also had the rank of this Pope's Legates.

"These three Legates were sent to carry to the Bishops of Africa the letters of Zosimus, and to treat with them of divers matters according to the orders that the Pope had given them, partly in writing, partly by word of mouth. They had instructions addressed to them, of which we have only a part, by which Zosimus charged them with four matters, of which they had to treat with the Bishops of Africa, viz., that Bishops might appeal to the Bishop of Rome: that they should not go so often to the Court: that Priests and Deacons inconsiderately excommunicated by their Bishops should be tried afresh by the neighbouring Bishops: and that the Bishop Urbanus should be separated from Communion, or even summoned to Rome, if he did not amend what he had done amiss; a demand which Zosimus made on the strength of the accusations brought by Apiarius against this Prelate. The first and the third articles he grounded on the Canons of the Council of Sardica, which he quoted under the name of the Council of Nicea.

"These Legates having arrived in Africa, as it seems, about the end of the year, a Council was doubtless assembled, of which nevertheless there is no record extant: but it is sufficiently marked in that of the 25th May, 419. St. Alypius speaks of it, and witnesses clearly enough that he was present himself. Novatus of Stefa was doubtless there also. The same must be said of Aurelius of Carthage, and what passed there is evidence enough of it. What we know of it is, that there were great contentions which lasted long, and filled very long notes, without however inflicting a wound on charity. These, perhaps, are the preceding Acts, and facts shortly previous, of which the Council in the following year speaks. The Bishops judicially demanded of the Legates, according to usual rule, what they were charged to treat of with them. These set forth their commission at first by word of mouth, and when they were pressed to shew it

written, they produced the instructions of which we have spoken, which were read and inserted in the journals of the Council. The Bishops were doubtless surprised to see ascribed to the Council of Nicea Canons which they did not find in any Greek copy, any more than in the Latin, though many were consulted, and of which it seems they had no knowledge: for we have already remarked that the Council of Sardica was not known at this time in Africa. It cannot be doubted that this was one subject of the contentions which arose. At length, however, the Bishops of Africa notified this year to Pope Zosimus by the letter of their Council that they consented to observe the Canons in question, supposing them to be of the Council of Nicea: and that, until a more exact search into the genuine Canons of this Council should have been made: that is to say, that they consented that Bishops might appeal to the Pope, and Ecclesiastics to the neighbouring Bishops of their Province: For the Canon of Sardica does not mean that they might appeal out of their Province."

In the mean time Pope Zosimus dies, and is succeeded by Boniface. Tillemont continues: "As to the affair of Apiarius and the rest, on account of which Zosimus had sent Faustinus, Aurelius perhaps would not terminate them in 418, in order to be able to assemble the whole Council of Africa. This Council was in fact held on the 25th May, 419, at Carthage in the sacristy of the Basilica of Faustus. Aurelius attended it with Valentinus of Baia, Primate of Numidia, Faustinus the Pope's Legate, the deputies of the different Provinces of Africa, that is to say, the two Numidias, Byzacena, Mauritania of Stefa, Cesariensis, Tripolitana, and further the Bishops of the Proconsularis, which made in all 217 Bishops."

"Aurelius then caused to be read by the notary the instructions of Pope Zosimus to his Legates: and after the first Canon had been read, which he produced to shew that all Bishops can appeal to Rome," "Alypius, Bishop of Tagaste, Legate of the Province of Numidia, said, About this we have already written back in the former letter also of our Council, and we declare that we will maintain what has been ordered in the Nicene Council. As yet however I am struck by

CHAP.  
II.

this, that when we inspect the Greek copies of this Nicene Council, we by no means find, I know not how, these expressions there. Wherefore we beseech your Reverence, holy Pope Aurelius, that as an authentic copy of this Nicene Council is said to be in the city of Constantinople, you would have the goodness to send some persons with the writings of his Holiness: and not only to our holy Brother the Bishop of Constantinople, but also to the venerable Priests of Alexandria and Antioch, that they may send us this Council with the subscription of their letter, for all doubt for the future to be removed: because we by no means find it as our Brother Faustinus quotes. We declare, however, that we will keep these regulations for a short time, as I said before, until the complete copies come. We must also write and request Boniface, the venerable Bishop of the Roman Church, that he also would be good enough to send persons to the above-mentioned Churches, that they may produce the same copies of the aforesaid Nicene Council according as he has quoted. But for the present let us insert in our Acts such copies of the above Nicene Council as we possess."

Tillemont,  
13, art. 293.

Tillemont continues, abstracting the Council: "Faustinus expressed that he took this proposal as an injury done to the Roman Church, to doubt of the Canons she quoted: and that they should content themselves at most with writing about it to the Pope, to pray him to examine himself the genuineness of these Canons, and to observe what he should judge proper: that to act otherwise, was to wound charity, and put division between the Churches. As the Africans were very sincerely desirous of union and peace, Aurelius, not to embitter matters, would make no answer to this proposition, and contented himself with replying, that they would write about the whole to the Pope," whom he calls, "our holy Brother and fellow-Priest Boniface."

Considering what St. Alypius had said, and the doubts of the whole African Council as to the Canons quoted being those of Nicea, and that Faustinus was perfectly well aware all the time that the Canons really were those of Sardica, and could with a word have put an end to all discussion on the matter, it is no wonder he did not particularly desire to have reference made to the Eastern Patriarchs. As the

African Bishops afterwards express a vigorous opinion about his conduct, one is happily not called upon here to characterize it; yet I cannot forbear saying, that he seems like a shadow projected forwards of a Legate *a latere* in the 14th century. SECT.  
V.

“Next was read the second Canon produced by Zosi- Tillemont.  
mus, touching the appeals of Ecclesiastics to neighbouring Bishops.”

“When it was read, Augustine of the Church of Hippo Mansi, 4.  
Regiensis, Legate of the Province of Numidia, said, ‘This 406.  
too we declare that we will keep, reserving to ourselves a more diligent inquiry into the Nicene Council.’ The Bishop Aurelius said, ‘If this also is agreed upon generally by your charity, confirm it by an answer.’ The whole Council said, ‘All is ordered in the Nicene Council: we all agree.’ Jocundus, Bishop of the Church of Suffetula, Legate of the Byzacene Province, said, ‘What is ordered in the Nicene Council can in no respect be broken by any body.’”

“Faustinus shewed less approval of this remark of J- Tillemont,  
ocundus, and of that of St. Alypius, who had at first used the as before.  
same expression, than of that of St. Augustine, and again demanded that the matter should be referred to the Pope. The whole Council, without stopping for that, ordered the Creed and Canons of Nicea to be read and inserted in the Acts, as Cæcilianus had brought them, and the other regulations which had been made since: that Aurelius should write to the Bishops of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople, for the genuine Canons of Nicea: that if those which Faustinus alleged were found there, they should be kept absolutely, and that if they should not be found there, a Council should be assembled to deliberate what was to be done.”

After this the affair of Apiarius “was terminated by Tillemont,  
common agreement. His Bishop, Urbanus, was the first 13. art. 295.  
to correct, without opposition, what there might have been defective in his procedure against this Priest. And presently Apiarius, having asked pardon for all his faults, was restored to Communion, and to the Priesthood, at the request of Faustinus. However, as it was necessary to provide for the peace and security of the Church for the future, as well as

CHAP.  
II.

for the present, and as it was to be feared that disorders might still be seen equal to or even greater than those which had been seen, it was thought proper to remove Apiarius from the Church of Sicca, which he had scandalised by his irregularities, by giving him a letter of Communion to exercise the Priesthood where he would and could be received, and Apiarius having requested that letter, it was given him immediately. Such was the mean which it was thought might be observed between the sentence which condemned Apiarius, and that of Zosimus who had received him to Communion.

Letter to  
Pope Boni-  
face.

“Matters then being so terminated, the Council in a body, that is to say, Aurelius, Valentinus, and the other 217 Bishops wrote to Boniface to give him an account of the whole.” I think any thing short of an exact translation of parts of this letter would be doing injustice to the importance of the case, for the very fairest summary fails to render the precise tone of the original. It runs thus:—

Mansi, 4.  
511. Co-  
dex Ecclē-  
siæ Africa-  
næ, 134.

“To the most blessed Lord and honourable Brother Boniface, Aurelius, Valentinus, Primate of the Province of Numidia, and the rest who were present to the number of 217 from the whole Council of Africa.”

After a summary of the events already mentioned they proceed to say, that in the Pope's instructions to his Legates four things were contained: “The first concerning the appeals of Bishops to the Priest of the Roman Church: the second, that Bishops should not be too ready to attend the Court: the third, of the trying the causes of Presbyters and Deacons before the neighbouring Bishops, if they have been wrongly excommunicated by their own: the fourth, about the excommunication of the Bishop Urban, or even the summoning him to Rome, if he did not correct what seemed to require it. Of all which things about the first and third, viz. that Bishops be allowed to appeal to Rome, and that the causes of Clergy be terminated by the Bishops of their own Provinces, we took care to intimate last year by our letter also to the same Zosimus, Bishop of venerable memory, *that we would for a short time permit these rules to be observed without any injury to him, until we had searched the statutes of the Nicene Council. And now we request of*

your Holiness to cause these rules to be kept by us, as they were passed or appointed at Nicea by the Fathers: and to cause the rules which they brought in their instructions to be carried out in your own Provinces, to wit:” here follow the 7th and 17th Sardican Canons. They proceed: “*These we have at all events inserted in the Acts until the arrival of the most authentic copies of the Nicene Council: and should they be there contained, (as the brethren sent to us from the Apostolical See have alleged in their instructions,) and be even kept according to that rule by you in Italy, we could by no means be compelled either to endure such treatment as we are unwilling to mention, or could suffer what is unbearable.* But we trust, by the mercy of our Lord God, while your Holiness presides over the Roman Church, that we shall not have to suffer that pride: and that a course of proceeding will be maintained towards us, which, even without our speaking, ought to be kept with fraternal charity: a course of proceeding which, according to the wisdom and justice which the Most High has given you, you yourself see ought to be maintained, if perchance the Canons of the Nicene Council run otherwise. For though we have read very many copies, yet we never find in the Latin copies of the Nicene Council the quotations made in the above-mentioned instructions: nevertheless as we could not find them here in any Greek copy, we the more desire they should be brought us from the Oriental Churches, where it is said authentic copies of the same decrees may be found. Wherefore we also beseech your Reverence to be good enough yourself to write to the Priests of those parts, that is, of the Church of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople, and to others also, if your Holiness please: that these same Canons appointed by our Fathers in the city of Nicea may reach us, you specially by the help of the Lord conferring this benefit on all the Western Churches. For who can doubt that the copies, brought from so many different places and noble Churches of Greece, which are compared, and agree, are the most authentic copies of the Nicene Council which met in Greece. Until this be done, the quotations made to us in the above-mentioned instruction, concerning the appeals of Bishops to the Priest of the

 SECT.  
V.

 Ibi apud  
vos.

CHAP.  
II.

Roman Church, and concerning the terminating the causes of Clergy by the Bishops of their own Provinces, we declare that we will maintain, till the copies are tested: and we trust your Blessedness will by the will of God help us in this. The rest which was done or confirmed in our Council, as our above-mentioned Brethren, our fellow-Bishop Faustinus, and fellow-Priests Philip and Asellius carry with them, they will, if you please, notify to your Holiness:" and by another hand: "may our Lord preserve thee to us many years, most blessed Brother. Subscribed also by Alypius, Augustine, Possidius, Marinus, and the other 217 Bishops."

The Roman Church has often had reason to thank the diplomatic skill of its Legates: on this occasion Faustinus, by maintaining that the Sardican Canons were those of Nicea, caused the important innovations in question to be admitted during an interim which lasted seven years. But, be it observed, no sort of right inherent in the See of Rome to hear Episcopal appeals is alleged by its Legate: and the express and repeated reference made by the African Bishops to the Nicene decrees, as the sole authority on which such a privilege was even asserted, specially excludes such a notion. On the return of their messenger from Constantinople and Alexandria, it is discovered that the Canons to which the Pope appealed in favour of his claim were not to be found among those of Nicea, but were in fact those of Sardica. The affair was a long time pending. Pope Boniface died, and Celestine succeeded him. "It was apparently in 426 that the Council of Africa wrote to Pope Celestine on the question of appeals." . . . "Apiarius, who had been the occasion of the commencement of this celebrated dispute, was so likewise of its termination. He had been restored to the Priesthood in 419 by the instrumentality of Faustinus Bishop of Potenza, Legate of Pope Zosimus, on condition of quitting the Church of Sicca, and retiring to another. It seems that he went to Tabraca, a celebrated city of the Proconsularis, where he conducted himself in such a way that the inhabitants were obliged to accuse him of enormous crimes, and he was deprived of Communion. Instead of acquitting himself he went off to Rome pretending to have appealed to the Pope, which he could not prove when he wished it. Nevertheless

Celestine believed it, and thereupon restored him to Communion. This Pope writing presently to Africa by the Priest Leo stated that he had been rejoiced at the arrival of Apiarius, whom, it seems, he had not yet examined. But not content with that, after having heard him, without hearing his accusers, and after having restored him, he wrote afresh to express the joy which he had in finding him innocent, and sent him back to Africa with the same Faustinus, to have him admitted there to Communion. At the arrival of Faustinus the Bishops assembled from all Africa to Carthage, and there held an universal Council." What they did their own language will best state.

SECT.  
V.

The Bishops wrote a synodical letter to Pope Celestine, of which not merely the substance, but the exact words and tone, are so important, that I think it necessary to render it literally, as exhibiting the very attitude and demeanour of the great African Church, with its 460 Bishops, towards the Roman Pontiff.

"To the beloved Lord and honourable Brother Celestine, Aurelius, Palatinus, Antonius, Totus, Servus-Dei, Terentius, Fortunatus, Martinus, Januarius, Optatus, Celtitius, Donatus, Theasius, Vincentius, Fortunatianus, and the rest, who were present at the universal African Council of Carthage.

Codex Ecclesiae Africanæ, No. 138. Mausi, 4. 515.

"We could wish that, like as your Holiness intimated to us, in your letter sent by our fellow-Priest Leo, your pleasure at the arrival of Apiarius, so we also could send to you these writings with pleasure respecting his clearing of himself. Then in truth both our own satisfaction, and yours of late would be more reasonable; nor would that lately expressed by you concerning the hearing of him then to come, as well as that already past, seem hasty and inconsiderate. Upon the arrival, then, of our holy Brother and fellow-Bishop Faustinus, we assembled a Council, and believed that he was sent with that man, in order that, as he (Apiarius) had before been restored to the Presbyterate by his assistance, so now he might with his exertions be cleared of the very great crimes charged against him by the inhabitants of Tabraca. But the due course of examination in our Council discovered in him such great and monstrous crimes as to overbear even Faustinus, who acted rather as an advo-

CHAP. cate than as a judge, and to prevail against what was more  
 II. the zeal of a defender, than the justice of an inquirer. For  
 first he vehemently opposed the whole assembly, inflicting on  
 us many injuries, under pretence of asserting the privi-  
 leges of the Roman Church, and demanding that Apiarius  
 should be received into Communion by us, on the ground  
 that your Holiness, believing him to have appealed, though  
 unable to prove it, had restored him to Communion. But  
 this we by no means allowed, as you will also better see by  
 reading the Acts. After however a most laborious inquiry  
 carried on for three days, during which in the greatest  
 affliction we took cognizance of various charges against him,  
 God the just Judge, strong and long-suffering, cut short  
 by a sudden stroke both the shuffling of our fellow-  
 Bishop Faustinus, and the evasions of Apiarius himself, by  
 which he was endeavouring to veil his foul enormities. For  
 his strong and shameless obstinacy was overcome, by which  
 he endeavoured to cover, through an impudent denial, the  
 mire of his lusts, and God so wrought upon his conscience,  
 and published, even to the eyes of men, the secret crimes  
 which He was already condemning in that man's heart, a  
 very sty of wickedness, that, after his false denial, he sud-  
 denly burst forth into a confession of all the crimes he was  
 charged with, and at length convicted himself of his own  
 accord of all infamies beyond belief, and changed to groans  
 even the hope we had entertained, believing and desiring  
 that he might be cleared from such shameful blots, except  
 indeed that it was so far a relief to our sorrow, that  
 he had delivered us from the labour of a longer inquiry,  
 and by confession had applied some sort of remedy to his  
 own wounds, though, Sir and Brother, it was unwilling,  
 and done with a struggling conscience. Premising, therefore,  
 our due regards to you, we earnestly conjure you, that for  
 the future you do not readily admit to a hearing persons  
 coming hence, nor choose to receive to your Communion  
 those who have been excommunicated by us, because your  
 Reverence will readily perceive that this has been prescribed  
 even by the Nicene decree. *For though this seems to be there  
 forbidden in respect of the inferior Clergy, or the Laity, how  
 much more did it will this to be observed in the case of Bishops,*

Moras.

lest those who had been suspended from Communion in their own Province might seem to be restored to Communion hastily or unfitly by your Holiness. Let your Holiness reject, as is worthy of you, that unprincipled taking shelter with you of Presbyters likewise, and the inferior Clergy, *both because by no ordinance of the Fathers hath the Church of Africa been deprived of this authority, and the Nicene decrees have most plainly committed not only the Clergy of inferior rank, but the Bishops themselves, to their own Metropolitans. For they have ordained with great wisdom and justice, that all matters should be terminated in the places where they arise; and did not think that the grace of the Holy Spirit would be wanting to any Province, for the Priests of Christ (i. e. Bishops) wisely to discern, and firmly to maintain, the right: especially since whosoever thinks himself wronged by any judgment may appeal to the Council of his Province, or even to a general Council*" (of Africa): "unless it be imagined that God can inspire a single individual with justice, and refuse it to an innumerable multitude of Priests (Bishops) assembled in Council. And how shall we be able to rely on a sentence passed beyond the sea, since it will not be possible to send thither the necessary witnesses, whether from the weakness of sex, or advanced age, or any other impediment? For that your Holiness should send any on your part we can find ordained by no Council of Fathers.

Because with regard to what you have sent us by the same our brother-Bishop Faustinus, as being contained in the Nicene Council, we can find nothing of the kind in the more authentic copies of that Council, which we have received from the holy Cyril our brother, Bishop of the Alexandrine Church, and from the venerable Atticus the Prelate of Constantinople, and which we formerly sent by Innocent the Presbyter, and Marcellus the Sub-deacon, through whom we received them, to Boniface the Bishop your predecessor of venerable memory. Moreover whoever desires you to delegate any of your Clergy to execute your orders, do not comply, lest it seem that we are introducing the pride of secular dominion into the Church of Christ, which exhibiteth to all that desire to see God the light of simplicity and the splendour of humility. For, now that

SECT.  
V.

Improbable  
refugia.

A tuæ sanc-  
tatis la-  
tere.

CHAP.  
II.

the miserable Apiarius has been removed out of the Church of Christ for his horrible crimes, we feel confident respecting our brother Faustinus, that, through the uprightness and moderation of your Holiness, Africa, without violating brotherly charity, will by no means have to endure him any longer. Sir and Brother, may our Lord long preserve your Holiness to pray for us."

Inference  
from the  
above his-  
tory.

Here some most important points are at once apparent, viz., that the Pope grounded the right of hearing appeals whether from Presbyters or Bishops, not on the inherent privilege of his See, but on the Sardican Canons, which he quoted as if they were the Nicene. Roman writers justify this by asserting that the Nicene and Sardican Canons were bound up together: but Archbishop de Marca says that the Nicene Canons were always numbered in the heading as 20, which alone would prevent the 21 Sardican Canons being counted with them. "Perhaps then we shall be nearer the truth if we say that Zosimus was in some measure compelled to praise the Sardican Canons under the name of the Nicene Council, because Innocent the First had plainly said that the Church used no other Canons except the Nicene, in judgments of Ecclesiastical causes, as also because the Africans knew of no Sardican Council save that held by the Arians, as Augustine in his 163rd (44th) letter testifies. Therefore it was necessary for Zosimus to ascribe these Canons to the Nicene Council, to meet the opposition of the Africans." Whether this trenches upon the veracity of Zosimus, I leave for others to say, but at all events he grounds the innovation he was introducing on the gift of a Council: now what Councils give they may take away. Secondly, that the African Bishops, while they would have yielded obedience to the Nicene Canons, absolutely refuse it to the Pope's demand, unsupported by them, nay, whatever colour of right it might gather from the Sardican Canons. Thirdly, the African Bishops here positively assert that the Nicene Canons, which Pope Leo tells us are to last till the end of the world, subject the Bishops themselves to their respective Metropolitans. "From this account, which is drawn from the Acts, we collect that the Canons of Sardica were unknown to Africa and the other Provinces, except Italy, up to the time

De Concor.,  
lib. 7. c. 16.  
§ 1.

De Marca,  
De Concor.,  
lib. 7. c. 15.  
§ 4.

of Pope Zosimus: besides, that appeals of Bishops to the Apostolic See had not been practised, and that they were contrary to the Canons of the Nicene Council." And fourthly, the African Bishops, so far from imagining a privilege to be lodged in the Roman See of directing Legates *a latere* to different Churches, distinctly state that they can find no Council in which that has been ordered, (the only authority, therefore, which could order it,) and that they will not permit it.

SECT.  
V.

These four points amount to nothing less than cutting away the whole ground of antiquity, and, much more, of divine right, from under those distinctive Papal claims which followed the reception of the false Decretals, and the time of Pope Nicholas the First (A.D. 858—867.)

Compare for instance with the foregoing history, with the deposition of Paul of Samosata, or with the whole practice of the Church for many centuries, the dictum of St. Innocent the Third. "For not by human but rather by divine power is the spiritual marriage dissolved, when by the authority of the Roman Pontiff, who is admitted to be the Vicar of Jesus Christ, a Bishop is removed from his Church by translation, deposition, or cession. And therefore these three things afore-stated are reserved to the Roman Pontiff alone not so much by appointment of the Canons, as by divine institution." An assertion which, De Marca states, has caused Roman Canonists to consider the deposition of Bishops a closed subject, on which they could not enter.

Contrast of  
medieval  
claims.

Quoted by  
De Marca,  
de Concor.,  
lib. 7. c. 26.  
§ 8.

De Concor.,  
lib. 7. c. 1.  
§ 1.

Bossuet's judgment on this passage of history is well worth transcribing. "Why did holy and consummately learned men esteem even the claims of the holy Pontiffs Zosimus and Celestine to be novelties? Why did they appeal to the Nicene Canons? Why did 'some sooner, some later, some in one, some in another point, as occasion offered,' (he is here censuring an Ultramontane opponent's imprudent admission,) "recognise the Pope's authority? Had it ever been a principle in their minds that his will, by Christ's institution, was to be their law, without exception, why then did they think it necessary for Roman Pontiffs to allege the Canons, which at their pleasure might be annulled? *The truth is, they knew nothing of these divine commands and rules.*"

Bossuet,  
Def. Præv.  
Diss. No.  
81.

CHAP.  
II.

Importance  
of this case  
to the cause  
of the Eng-  
lish Church.

But as to the whole case of Apianus I confess it was not without astonishment that I first read this passage of history; so exactly had the African Bishops, in 426, when the greatest Father of the Church was one of them, anticipated and pleaded the cause of the English Church, in 1534. It is precisely the same claim made in both instances, viz. that these two laws should be observed, on which the stability of the government of the whole Church Catholic rests; as Thomassin remarks:—first, that the action of the Bishop in his own Diocese, in matters proper to that Diocese, should not be interfered with; secondly, that the action of the Metropolitan with his Suffragans in matters belonging to his Province should be left equally free. Who ever accused the African Bishops, and St. Augustine, of schism, for maintaining a right which had come down to them from all antiquity, was possessed and acted on all over the Church, was specifically enacted at the greatest Ecumenical Council, and recognised in every Provincial Council held up to that time? This was all that the Church of England claimed; she based her claim on the unvarying practice of the whole Church during, at least, the first six centuries. I repeat, it is not a case of doubt, of conflicting testimony, in words elsewhere quoted, “of Popes against Popes, Councils against Councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a consent of Fathers of one age against a consent of Fathers of another age, the Church of one age against the Church of another age.” It is the Church of the Martyrs, the Church of the Fathers, of Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, and Chrysostome, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great, bearing one unbiassed indisputable witness, attested in a hundred Councils, denied in none, for the Patriarchal system, and against a power assumed by one Bishop, though the greatest, most venerable, and most illustrious in his own See, to interfere, dispense with, suspend, or abrogate, the authority of the Bishop in his Diocese, and of the Metropolitan in his Council; to exercise singly, by himself, powers which belong only to an Ecumenical Council, and to annul the enactments of at least the first four Ecumenical Councils. Had an advocate been instructed to draw out the abstract

Chillingworth,  
quoted by  
Mr. Newman, De-  
velop-  
ment, p. 4.

case of the English Church, he could not have described it more exactly than the African Bishops in stating their own. True, indeed, it is, that the African Bishops were maintaining a right which not only had never been interrupted, but was universal; while the English Bishops resumed a power which had been surrendered, not only by them, but by all the West of Europe, for many hundred years. Accordingly, the African Bishops did not suffer even a temporary suspension of Communion with Rome, for having both condemned afresh Apiarius, whom the Pope had restored, and explicitly refused permission to the Pope to interfere in the ordinary government of their Dioceses; while the English Church has ever since been accused of schism by the rest of the Latin Communion. I do not think it makes at all in favour of the Papal Supremacy that the liberties which the African Church under St. Aurelius and St. Augustine so nobly maintained, grounding them at once on the inherent rights of Bishops, and on the authority of the Nicene decrees, were in process of time wrested from them by the Popes, probably when they were enfeebled by the irruption of the Vandals, and were in greater need of transmarine assistance. I cannot imagine how a divine right can be constructed out of a series of successful encroachments.

SECT.  
V.

SECT. VI.

IN the year 402, St. Augustine wrote a letter to the Catholics, commonly called his treatise "on the Unity of the Church." The bearing of this book on the controversy respecting schism between ourselves and the Roman Catholics is very remarkable. The Saint refers triumphantly to most express passages from the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, our Lord's own teaching, and that of His Apostles, bearing witness to the catholicity of the Church, an "*Ecclesia toto terrarum orbe diffusa.*" He challenges his adversaries, the Donatists, to produce a single passage, which either restricted the Church to the confines of Africa, or declared that it would perish from the rest of the world, and be restored out of Africa. His test seems decisive against the Donatists,

St. Augustine 'on the Unity of the Church.'

CHAP.  
II

and against all those who in after times have restricted the Church to one Province, or have declared the Roman Church to be so corrupt that it is not a part of the true Church. For if it be not, then the promises of Christ have failed, inasmuch as, the Eastern Church being liable, in the minds of such persons, to the same charges of corruption as the Latin, it would follow that there is actually no Catholic Church upon earth. But while it annihilates the position of the Donatists, and of the Puritan or Evangelical faction in these present times, it leaves unassailed that of Andrewes and Ken. St. Augustine every where appeals to the Church spread throughout the whole world, as being, by virtue of that fact, the one Communion in which alone there was salvation, and this upon the testimony of the Holy Scriptures only. "To salvation itself, and eternal life, no one arrives, save he who has Christ for his head. But no one can have Christ for his head, except he be in His Body, which is the Church, which like the Head itself we ought to recognise in the Holy Canonical Scriptures, nor to seek after it in the various reports, opinions, doings, sayings, and sights of men." But in the whole book there is not one word about the Roman See, or the necessity of Communion with it, save as it forms part of the one universal Church. It is not named by itself any more than Alexandria, or Antioch. Any one will see the force of this fact who has but looked into the writings of late Roman Catholic authors. He will see how unwearied they are in setting forth the necessity of the action of the Roman See; how they consider it, and rightly, the centre of their system; how they are ever crying, like De Maistre, "Without the sovereign Pontiff there is no true Christianity." The contrast in St. Augustine is the more remarkable. Compare with this the authority, which, in another book, he gives for receiving the holy Scriptures. "In the Canonical Scriptures let him follow the authority of the *majority* of Catholic Churches, amongst which are certainly those which were thought worthy to receive Apostolical Sees and letters. He will therefore pursue this method in the Canonical Scriptures; he will prefer those which are received by all Catholic Churches to those which some do not receive. In the case of those which are not received by all, he will

Tom. 9. 372.  
F.

Tom. 3.  
pars 1. 28.  
C. pointed  
out in Oxf.  
Tertullian.

prefer those which the more numerous and more important receive to those which the fewer and less authoritative Churches hold. But should he find some held by the greater number, others by the more important, although this will scarcely happen, still I consider that such are to be held of equal authority." And elsewhere he speaks of "the Christian Society, which through the Sees of the Apostles and the successions of Bishops is diffused through the world with a certain propagation." And the test to which he would bring his Donatist opponent is, that "letters should be sent to those Churches, which we equally admitted had been already at that time founded on the authority of Apostles," not to the See of Rome only. Now the Creed of the Council of Trent says, "I acknowledge one holy, catholic, and Apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all Churches: and I promise and vow true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, successor of the blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ." This is distinct and unambiguous: just as much so is St. Augustine's "orbis terrarum." "For this the whole world says to them (the Donatists,) an argument most briefly stated, but most powerful by its truth. The case is, the African Bishops had a contest between themselves; if they could not arrange between themselves the dissension which had arisen, so that the wrong side should either be reduced to concord, or deprived, and they who had the good cause remain in the Communion of the whole world through the bond of unity, there was certainly this resource left, that the Bishops beyond the sea, where the largest part of the Catholic Church is spread, should judge concerning the dissensions of their African colleagues," &c. No doubt the Bishop of Rome was one, and the most eminent, of these Bishops beyond the sea; but St. Augustine refers the decision of the Donatist controversy not to him specially, but to the Bishops generally. This is the very principle, for which the Eastern Church for a thousand years, and the English Church for three hundred, have contended against the Church of Rome. I know not whether what St. Augustine says or what he does not say is strongest against the present Roman claim; but I think his *silence* in his book "De Unitate Ecclesiæ" absolutely convincing to

Tom. 2, 843.  
E. quoted  
by Bingham.

Tom. 2.  
102. B.

Tom. 9.  
340. A.

CHAP.  
II.

any candid mind. Let us hold for an infallible truth his dogma, "Securus judicat orbis terrarum;" but the Latin Communion is not the "orbis terrarum." In truth, the Papal Supremacy at once cut the Church in half; the West, where the Pope's was the only Apostolical See, unanimously held with him; the East, with its four Patriarchs, as unanimously refused his claim, as a new thing which they had never received. Even De Maistre observes, "It is very essential to observe that never was there a question about dogmas between us at the beginning of the great and fatal division."

Du Pape,  
liv. 4. ch.  
4.

Sermons on  
the day of  
SS. Peter  
and Paul.

Again, St. Augustine has five sermons on the day of the Apostles Peter and Paul; he enlarges, as we might expect, on their labours and martyrdom; on the wonderful change of life which grace produced in them, the one thrice denying, and then thrice loving; the other, a blasphemer and persecutor, and then in labours more abundant than all. He speaks of their being joined in their death, the first Apostle and the last, in the service and witness of Him, who is the First and the Last; of their bodies, with those of other martyrs, lying at Rome. But not one allusion is there in all these to the Roman Pontiff; not a word as to his being the heir of a power not committed to the other Apostles. On the contrary, on the very occasion of St. Peter's festival, he does say, "What was commended to Peter,—what was enjoined to Peter, not Peter alone, but also the other Apostles heard, held, preserved, and most of all the partner of his death and of his day, the Apostle Paul. They heard that, and transmitted it for our hearing: we feed you, we are fed together with you." "Therefore hath the Lord commended His sheep to us, because He commended them to Peter." Thus Peter's commission is viewed not as excluding, but including, that of all the rest; not as distinguished from, but typical of, theirs. Yet at this very time Roman Catholics would have us believe that the successor of Peter communicated to all Bishops their power to feed the Lord's flock; and that such a wonderful power and commission is passed *sub silentio* by the Fathers.

Tom. 5.  
1199. D.  
1202. F.

Witness of  
St. Vincent  
of Lerins.

The very same principles which the Great Voice of the Western Church proclaims in Africa, St. Vincent of Lerins

repeats from Gaul. Take the summary of his famous Com-munitorium by Alban Butler. "He layeth down this rule, or fundamental principle, in which he found, by a diligent inquiry, all Catholic Pastors and the ancient Fathers to agree, that such doctrine is truly Catholic as hath been believed in all places, at all times, and by all the faithful. By this test of universality, antiquity, and consent, he saith all controverted points in belief must be tried. He sheweth, that whilst Novatian, Photinus, Sabellius, Donatus, Arius, Eunomius, Jovinian, Pelagius, Cœlestius, and Nestorius expound the divine oracles different ways, to avoid the perplexity of errors we must interpret the Holy Scriptures by the tradition of the Catholic Church, as the clue to conduct us in the truth. For this tradition, derived from the Apostles, manifesteth the true meaning of the Holy Scripture, and all novelty in faith is a certain mark of heresy; and in religion nothing is more to be dreaded than itching ears after new teachers. He saith, 'They who have made bold with one article of faith will proceed on to others; and what will be the consequence of this reforming of religion, but only that these refiners will never have done, till they have reformed it quite away?' He elegantly expatiates on the divine charge given to the Church, to maintain inviolable the sacred depositum of faith. He takes notice that heretics quote the Sacred Writings at every word, and that in the works of Paulus Samosatenus, Priscillian, Eunomius, Jovinian, and other like pests of Christendom, almost every page is painted and laid on thick with Scripture texts, which Tertullian also remarks. But in this, saith St. Vincent, heretics are like those poisoners or quacks, who put off their destructive potions under inscriptions of good drugs, and under the title of infallible cures. They imitate the father of lies, who quoted Scripture against the Son of God, when he tempted Him. The Saint adds, that if a doubt arise in interpreting the meaning of the Scriptures in any point of faith, we must summon in the holy Fathers, who have lived and died in the Faith and Communion of the Catholic Church, and by this test we shall prove the false doctrine to be novel. For that only must we look upon as indubitably certain and unalterable, which all, or the major

CHAP.  
II.

part of these Fathers have delivered, like the harmonious consent of a General Council. But if any one among them, be he ever so holy, ever so learned, holds any thing besides, or in opposition to the rest, that is to be placed in the rank of singular and private opinions, and never to be looked upon as the public, general, authoritative doctrine of the Church. After a point has been decided in a General Council, the definition is irrefragable. These general principles, by which all heresies are easily confounded, St. Vincent explains with equal elegance and perspicuity." "The same rules are laid down by Tertullian in his book of Precriptions, by St. Irenæus, and other Fathers."

Lives of the  
Saints, May  
24.

But not a word is there here of the authority of the See of Rome deciding of itself what is, and what is not, error; or of its Communion of itself being a touchstone of what is, and what is not, the Catholic Church. These are necessary parts of the Papal Supremacy; instead of which St. Vincent holds universal consent.

From the East St. Basil re-echoes the same test. To the Pontic Bishops, who had been set against him, he says: "The fair thing would be to judge of me not from one or two who do not walk uprightly in the truth, but from the multitude of Bishops throughout the world, connected with me through the grace of the Lord. Make inquiry of Pisdians, Lycaonians, Isaurians, Phrygians of both Provinces, Armenians your neighbours, Macedonians, Achæans, Illyrians, Gauls, Spaniards, the whole of Italy, Sicilians, Africans, the healthy part of Egypt, whatever is left of Syria; all of whom send letters to me, and in turn receive them from me. From the letters they send hither, and from those sent back to them, you may learn that we are of one spirit, of one mind. Whoso, then, shuns Communion with me, it cannot escape your accuracy, cuts himself off from the whole Church."

Agreement  
of S. Basil.  
Ep. 204.  
Mr. New-  
man's trans-  
lation save  
one sen-  
tence.

Bossuet on  
St. Vin-  
cent's rule.  
Def. Cleri  
Gall., lib. 7.  
c. 5.

Now let us hear Bossuet speaking of St. Vincent's rule. "These things then are understood not by this or by that Doctor, but by all Catholics with one voice, that the authority of the Church Catholic agreeing is most certain, irrefragable, and perspicuous. Christians must rest on that agreement, as a most firm and divine foundation; from

whom nothing else is required but that in the Apostles' Creed, that believing in the Holy Spirit they also believe the holy Catholic Church; and claim for her the most certain authority and judgment of the Holy Spirit, by which they are led captive to obedience. Which entirely proves that this indefectible power both lies and is believed to lie in consent itself; and this clear and manifest voice dwells altogether in the agreement of the Churches; in which we see clearly, on the testimony of the same Vincent of Lerins, that not a part of the Church, but universality itself, is heard: 'For we follow,' saith he, 'the whole in this way, if we confess that to be the one true faith which the whole Church throughout the world confesses.' And a little after, 'What doth the Catholic Christian, if any part hath cut itself off from the Communion of the universal faith? What surely, but prefer the soundness of the whole body to that pestilent and corrupted member?'

"Thence floweth unto General Councils that certain and invincible authority which we recognise in them. For it is on no other principle that Unity and Consent have force in Councils, or in the assembled Church, than because they have equal force in the Church spread through the whole world. For the Council itself hath force, because it represents the whole Church; nor is the Church assembled in order that Unity and Consent may have force, but it is therefore assembled, that the Unity which in itself has force in the Church, every where spread abroad, may be more clearly demonstrated in the same Church assembled, by Bishops, the Doctors of the Churches, as being the proper witnesses thereunto.

"Hence, therefore, is perceived a double method of recognising Catholic truth; the first, from the consent of the Church every where spread abroad; the second, from the consent of the Church united in Ecumenical or General Councils; both which methods I must set forth in detail, to shew more clearly that this infallible and irresistible authority resides in the whole body of the Church."

He then proceeds to shew that the type or form of all Ecumenical Councils was taken from the first Council held at Jerusalem by the Apostles. He notes these particulars:

CHAP.  
II.

Bossuet on  
the Council  
of Jerusa-  
lem.

First, there was a great dissension, the cause of it: then, that the chief Church, in which Peter sat, was then at Jerusalem; whence it became a maxim, that Councils should not be regularly held without Peter and his Successors and the First Church in which he sits. Thirdly, it was as universal as could be. Fourthly, all were assembled together. Fifthly, the question was stated, next deliberated on, lastly decided by common sentence; which all became rules for future Councils. Sixthly, the discussion is thus stated in the Acts, "when there had been much disputing." Seventhly, the deliberation is opened by Peter, whence it became a custom that the President of the Council should first give sentence. Eighthly, Paul and Barnabas gave their testimony, in confirmation of Peter's sentence; and James expressly begins with Peter's words—"Simon hath declared," whence the custom that the rest gave their voice at the instance of the President. Ninthly, "They do not, however, so proceed as if they were altogether bound by the authority of the first sentence, but themselves give judgment; and James says, 'I give sentence.' Then he proposes what additions seemed good to the principal question, and gives sentence also concerning them." Tenthly, "The decree was then drawn up in the common name, and adding the authority of the Holy Spirit, 'It seemed good unto us being assembled with one accord,' and 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us;' there then lies the force, 'to the Holy Ghost and to us:' not, what seemed good to Peter precisely, but, to us; and led by the Spirit, not Peter alone, but the unity itself of the holy Council. Whence, too, Christ said that concerning the Spirit whom He was about to send: 'But when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He shall teach you all truth:' you, saith He, the Pastors of the Churches, and the Masters of the rest. Hence the Spirit is always added to the Church and the holy congregation. 'I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church:' and with reason therefore, and carefully, was the maxim which we have mentioned laid down of old by our Doctors: 'The strength of Councils resides not in the Roman Pontiff alone, but chiefly in the Holy Spirit and in the Catholic Church.'

"Eleventhly: when the matter had been judged by com-

mon sentence, nothing was afterwards reconsidered, nor any new dissension left to any one; but the decree was carried to the Churches, and the people are taught to keep the decrees which were decreed, in the Greek 'judged,' by the Apostles and Elders which were at Jerusalem. SECT.  
VI.

"This we Catholics urge with common consent against heretics who decline the commands and authority of Councils: which would indeed have no force, unless together with the authority we also prove the form, and place the force itself of the decree, not in Peter alone, but in Unity, and in the consent of the Apostles and the Pastors of the Church."

I need only observe on this passage of Bossuet, that the leadership, which in this Council he assigns to St. Peter, is certainly not discernible in the original, where the authority of St. James is at least as conspicuous as that of St. Peter.

In another place he says, "In Ecclesiastical Acts we do indeed find that the Catholic Church is affirmed by Chief Pontiffs and Councils to be represented by Ecumenical Synods, which contain all its virtue and power, which we are wont to mean by the word 'represent.' But this we do not read of the Roman Pontiff, as either affirmed by the Pontiffs themselves, or by Ecumenical Councils, or any where in Ecclesiastical Acts." Ib., lib. 8.  
c. 19.

### CHAP. III.

#### SECT. I.

BUT it will certainly be doing injustice to the case, if we do not look more specially at the sentiments of the Greek Fathers, as to the light in which they regarded the Roman See. In taking the testimony of the West, I have selected that most favourable to Roman authority. But it must not be forgotten, that if the West spoke much more strongly in favour of Rome than it does speak, this would be of no force to prove a divine tradition, and so to bind the conscience, The witness  
of the Greek  
Fathers.

CHAP.  
III.1. Witness  
of St. Basil.

unless the East assented. Now I know not how we can enter into the inner mind of the East in the fourth century, with more certainty of not being deceived, than by taking the letters of that great Saint who seems to have caught the mantle of Athanasius as he left the earth, and to have completed in his short Episcopate of eight years that defence of the Eastern Church from Arianism, which her former champion had conducted for nearly half a century. From his departure to the present day the name of St. Basil, respected through the whole world, has been embalmed in the love and veneration of the East. He, with one or two others, is their especial Doctor, their living Guide. Now his correspondence represents his principles and convictions in the most unsuspecting form. And the circumstances in which he lived lead him to expressions bearing very strongly, though quite casually, on the question of the Roman Supremacy. Had he lived in times of peace and quiet, there would probably have been merely complete silence on such a subject, leaving just room for that adventurous theory of later Roman writers, that the whole East, though governed by its own Bishops, Primates, and Patriarchs, yet having its first two Patriarchal Sees instituted by St. Peter, acknowledged *sub silentio* the grant of its jurisdiction from Rome: and that this most important fact lies underneath, and unnoticed by, all the Canons of Councils, and the acts of Bishops and Fathers, which are quite opposed to it. Now there is something that no mere quotations, which must at the utmost be very short, can convey, viz., the tone, feeling, or atmosphere in which a writer lives. He who reads St. Basil's letters for himself will rise from their perusal quite satisfied, that the bold theory just mentioned is a pure imagination, invented to turn aside the inexorable records of antiquity. I will proceed to point out some grounds for this assertion, besides those quotations already made from St. Basil. The Arian heresy was, in his Episcopate, making its last desperate effort, by the imperial favour, to subjugate the Church. A most profligate political party were everywhere using the strong arm of power to cast out the orthodox Bishops, and intrude Arianizers in their stead. Twice did Basil brave martyrdom, and through his dauntless bearing alone failed to receive its crown. He met

and foiled the miserable Valens with, if possible, yet greater energy than Ambrose overcame the great Theodosius. For years of his life, as Bishop, he was in continual expectation of being hurried into exile, at any hour, and with the most unseemly violence. Such was the treatment which he saw his most illustrious friends and fellow-Bishops receive. This was the state of things in the East. But a tone of mind less tempted to subtle disquisition, and a more favourable disposition of the imperial power, suffered the West to enjoy a state of comparative calm. To the West, accordingly, and the authority of its Bishops, St. Basil looked, humanly speaking, for an alleviation of that frightful state of things which he saw around him. Thus to the great Athanasius he writes in the year 371. "For myself, I have been long of opinion, according to my imperfect understanding of ecclesiastical matters, that there was but one way of succouring our Churches, viz., the co-operation of the Bishops of the West. If they would but shew, as regards our part of Christendom, the zeal which they manifested in the case of one or two heretics among themselves, there would be some chance of benefit to our common interests; *the civil power would be persuaded by the argument derived from their number, and the laity in each place would follow their lead without hesitation.*"

To the same Athanasius he writes a little afterwards. "Time, as it advances, is ever strengthening that opinion which I have long had about your Excellency. Individual events only tend to increase it. For most other men have enough to do to look after what is under their own charge: whereas this is not sufficient for you: *who have as great solicitude for all the Churches*, as for that, the burden of which in particular has been laid upon you by our common Lord. This may be said, since you are incessant in conversing, admonishing, writing letters, sending persons in all directions with the best suggestions.—And wishing to contribute something to this matter myself, I thought it would be a most suitable beginning to recur to your perfection, *as to the supreme Head*, and to take you for counsellor and leader.—And to me it seemed fitting to write to the Bishop of Rome, requesting him to visit by letter these parts, and give his opinion. *For inasmuch as it is difficult for any deputies to come thence with*

SECT.  
I.

Letter to  
St. Athana-  
sius.  
S. Basil,  
Ep. 66.  
Mr. New-  
man's  
transla-  
tion:  
Church of  
the Fa-  
thers.

Ep. 69.  
To the  
same.

CHAP.  
III.

*the joint authority of a Synod, he might act of his own authority in the matter,* and choose out men able to bear the fatigues of the journey, and likewise by gentleness and firmness to admonish the perverted among us. But for this end they must speak to the point, and with discretion, bringing, moreover, with them all that has been done after the Synod of Ariminum, to annul the violent acts which then took place. And this must be done secretly, so that they should come quietly by sea, and take by surprise the enemies of peace.”

Letter to  
Pope Da-  
masus.  
Ep. 70.

Another letter, though without inscription, bears internal evidence of being written to Damasus, Bishop of Rome. It runs thus: “To renew the laws of ancient love, and restore again to vigour the peace enjoyed by our fathers, the heavenly and saving gift of Christ, which through lapse of time has withered away, for us is necessary and serviceable, as I am sure it will be delightful to your Christ-loving disposition. For what could be more pleasing than to see those who are dissevered by so great a space of country joined by the union of love into the harmony of members in the Body of Christ? Almost the whole East, most excellent Father, (I mean by East the region from Illyria to Egypt,) is shaken by a violent storm and surge, from that heresy, the seeds of which were long ago sown by Arius the enemy of the truth, but which has now burst forth into full luxuriance of growth, and like a bitter root gives forth the fruit of death. But it has been long prevailing, because the orthodox Bishops in the several Dioceses have been expelled by false accusations and violence, whilst power is put into the hands of those who lead captive the souls of the simpler sort. The only deliverance I expect from this is a visitation by letter from your tender compassion. Your exceeding affection in past time has soothed us with hope, and our spirits revived for a short time at a more cheerful report, that we should be in some way visited by you. But deceived in this hope, and enduring no longer, I betake myself to solicit you by letter to rise up to our defence, and to send persons like-minded, who shall reunite the disagreed, or bring the Churches of God to friendship with each other, or at least point out to you more evidently

the authors of the confusion. And thus you too may see for the future with whom you ought to have Communion. *Assuredly I ask nothing new, but what has been customary both to other blessed men of old, beloved of God, and especially to you*" (i. e. the Bishops of Rome.) "*For I know from traditional records, as I learn from questioning our Fathers from the letters still preserved by us, that the most blessed Bishop Dionysius, conspicuous among you for his orthodoxy, and other virtues, visited by letter our Church of Cesarea, and by letter encouraged our fathers, and sent persons who ransomed brethren from captivity.* But things now are in a more difficult and cheerless state, and so require greater attention. For it is not the destruction of earthly buildings, but the ruin of Churches, that we lament. Nor is it bodily slavery, but the captivity of souls, which we behold in daily operation by the champions of heresy. So that if ye rise not up presently to our help, in a short time ye will find none to whom to hold out the hand, for all will be reduced under the power of the heresy." Here St. Basil, using the strongest arguments which come to his mind to induce the Pope of the day to assist him with his authority and that of the Western Bishops, reminds him that the friendly visitation he was urging was an usual thing with holy men, specially those who occupied the See of Rome, and that about a hundred and ten years before one of his predecessors had visited St. Basil's own Church by letter. This, of course, was the latest instance he could find. But, according to the Papal theory, St. Basil was all the while deriving from that very Pope Damasus the whole right of jurisdiction which he possessed over the Diocese of Cesarea. Yet he says not a word of the Pope's duty as the common Father of Christendom: not a word about his personal decision, as distinct from the Bishops whom he headed, being of the utmost importance, and claiming obedience as a right in the name of St. Peter. Nay, in another letter, he says to his friend Eusebius of Samosata, "the Presbyter Evagrius, who went to the West with the blessed Eusebius, has now returned from Rome, asking of me a letter conceived in the exact terms which they have written, (for he brought back my writing which had not satisfied the more particular persons there,)

CHAP.  
III.

*and for us to send at once a deputation, of men of credit, that they may have a fair pretext for visiting us."* What! the Pope require a fair pretext for visiting the Church of Cesarea, or the East, a prey to the most frightful heresy: a fair pretext for visiting Bishops who were his own deputies, as we are now told, and answerable to him for the exercise of their powers! The sovereign, as De Maistre so often puts it, himself requests that a specious opportunity may be afforded him of inquiring how his own viceroys conduct themselves. On the contrary, the visitation which St. Basil asks for was a token of Christian love and solicitude which Bishops were wont to shew to each other, and the Bishop of Rome, as the most distinguished, more than all. And if there be any difference in the tone in which he addresses his brethren of Rome and Alexandria, it is that he addresses the latter with the greater respect. Let those, who wish to feel in its full force the difference between the Patriarchal and the Papal systems, compare the tone of St. Basil to Pope Damasus with that of St. Bernard to Pope Eugenius. In the next year, 372, we find a letter composed in the name of the chief Bishops of the East. It is addressed thus: "To our most religious and holy Brethren and Fellow-ministers the concordant Bishops of Italy and Gaul, Meletius, Eusebius, Basil, Bassus," &c. After giving a deplorable picture of the Church's condition in the East it goes on, "Permit not half of the world to be swallowed up by error. Allow not the Faith to be quenched among those where it first shone forth. Assuredly you have no need to learn from us, but the Holy Spirit will Himself suggest to you, how you may assist us, and shew your sympathy with the afflicted. But all speed must be used to save the remnant: *and many brethren must come, so that the comers may make up with us a numerous Council, that they may have sufficient credit to work a reformation, not only from the dignity of those who depute them, but from their own number.* Now these must set forth again the faith written by our Fathers at Nicea," &c. Had the Bishop of Rome's authority by itself tended to settle the question, this observation had been quite unnecessary: but in truth among "the concordant Bishops of Italy and Gaul, our Fellow-ministers," the Pope is in no respect dis-

Ep. 92.  
To the Bishops of  
Italy and  
Gaul.

tinguished. It is plain that the government of the Church, when this letter was written, was really episcopal, not monarchical. Another letter of four years later date gives just the same impression, and points out exactly what sort of help the East asked from the West. It was not the decision of a superior authority, which was never so much as imagined. The letter is addressed simply "to the Westerns." It says, "Brought to the extremity of misery, we do not give up hope in God: but cast about us on every side for help. Whence, too, we now look to you, most excellent Brethren, whom in the time of afflictions we have often expected to appear to our succour, but deceived in our hope, said to ourselves, 'I looked for some to have pity on me, but there was no man, neither found I any to comfort me.' How then is it that no consolatory letter, no visitation of brethren, nothing else of what is due to us by the law of charity, has taken place? We beseech you, now at length, to stretch forth your hand to the Churches through the East which are already stricken to the earth, and to send those who shall remind us of the rewards that are laid up for the endurance of sufferings for Christ's sake. *For it is natural that the word of those to whom men are accustomed has not so much effect as a strange voice to console*, especially when it comes from men, who, through the grace of God, are every where most honourably known, such as report declares you to all men to be, with whom the Faith has continued unwounded, inasmuch as you have preserved the Apostolical deposit inviolable. It is not so with us," &c. In another letter, likewise "to the Westerns," in the year 377, St. Basil says much the same thing. Those who openly profess the Arian heresy do not so much hurt us, he observes, as concealed enemies: "whom we call upon your diligence to publish to all the Churches of the East, in order that, either, walking uprightly they may be with us sincerely, or, remaining in their perversity, keep the hurt among themselves, and so not be able, through freedom of communication, to spread their own disease among their neighbours. Now these persons must be mentioned by name, that you, too, may know those who work confusion among us, and make them known to our Churches." Here was exactly a point for the Apo-

SECT.  
I.

Ep. 242.  
To the  
Westerns.

Ep. 263.  
To the  
Westerns.

CHAP.  
III.

stolical power of St. Peter's successors to intervene, but besides that he is not mentioned in the whole letter, any more than in the one last quoted, St. Basil goes on: "For our language is suspected by the many, as if we acted to them in a mean and narrow spirit through certain private grudges. But you, inasmuch as you are far removed from them in space, have so much the more credit with the people, besides that the grace of God co-operates with you, to succour those who are quite overborne. *But if, further, a great number of you with one voice pass the same decrees, it is plain that the number of those who join in the decree will cause its reception to be undisputed by all.*" He ends thus: "These are the things we wish you to attend to. This might be done, if you would write to all the Churches throughout the East, that such as thus pervert sound doctrine may be received to Communion if they correct themselves. But if they choose contentiously to persist in their innovations, they must be cut off from the Church. *And we know very well that we ought to sit together in Synod with your prudence, and to take common counsel in these points;* but since the time does not allow this, and delay is hurtful, inasmuch as their mischief has taken root, we could not do otherwise than send these brethren, to inform you of any points passed over in the letter, and to move your Piety to provide the wished-for assistance to the Churches of God."

Was not St. Basil in his day a witness, whose testimony coming to us indirectly cannot be turned aside, to the episcopal constitution of the Church, and against the monarchical? And are those who contend for that constitution now, as one which cannot be infringed because it is of divine appointment, impugners of visible unity? If there is one thing more than another which St. Basil inculcates, it is visible unity; which he recognises as existing in the system under which he lived. Thus in another long letter wherein he appeals to the West to succour the East, and in which there is not one word of the Bishop of Rome individually, he writes, "to the truly-religious and most dear Brethren and Fellow-ministers of one mind, the Bishops throughout Gaul and Italy, Basil, Bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia. Our Lord Jesus Christ having deigned to name the whole

Ep. 243.  
To the Bishops of  
Gaul and  
Italy.

Church of God His own Body, and made us severally members of each other, hath granted us all likewise to be nearly connected with all, according to the harmony of the members. Wherefore, however far apart we are in our dwellings, yet, as conjoined in the Body, we are near each other. But since the head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you, surely neither will you have the heart to put us away, but will sympathize as warmly with the afflictions, to which we have been given up for our sins, as we rejoice with you in the glory of that peace, which the Lord has granted you. Now on other occasions we have called upon your love to assist and sympathize with us: but assuredly, because our punishment was not filled up, you were not allowed to rise up to our help. What we most desire is, that the Emperor himself of your world should be informed, through your Piety, of our confusion. If this be difficult, at least send some to visit and console the afflicted, that they may put before your eyes the sufferings of the East, which it is impossible for your ears to receive, because no words can be found vividly expressing to you our state.”

SECT.  
I.

“The disorders of Christendom,” says Mr. Newman, “and especially of the East, and still more of Asia Minor, were so great in Basil’s day, that a spectator might have foretold the total overthrow of the Church. So violent a convulsion never has been experienced in Christendom since; it would almost seem as if the powers of evil, foreseeing what the kingdom of the Saints would be, when once heathen persecutions ceased, were making a final effort to destroy it. In Asia Minor the Church was almost ‘without form and void:’ religious interests were reduced, as it were, to a state of chaos, and Basil seems to have been the principle of truth and order, divinely formed, divinely raised up, for harmonizing the discordant elements, and bringing them to unity of faith and love.” Such being the case, it is remarkable that Basil did not apply to the Bishop of Rome, as able personally by a doctrinal decision to declare what the truth was, and to abate this disorder, as being one whose voice all were bound to hear. We have a great authority for declaring that Christendom has never since experienced such a convulsion, and yet the Exarch of Pontus, who was dashed to and fro

Church of  
the Fathers,  
p. 90.

CHAP.  
III.

Quoted  
above, p.  
29.

Ep. 214.  
To the  
Count  
Terentius.

by its surge, and looked every where for help, saw not in the See of Rome the "ultimate form of unity," nor in its occupant the single Vicegerent of Christ: but he addressed him simply as a great Bishop; the highest title he ever gives him is "leader of the Westerns" in a passage where he talks of writing to him privately not to take "pride for dignity." In truth he addressed him with just the same deference, and no more, as he addressed the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch: and when Rome decided that Paulinus was the true Bishop of Antioch, he kept firm to Meletius. Thus in a letter to the Count Terentius, whom the party of Paulinus were endeavouring to gain, he says: "Again, another report reached us that you were staying at Antioch, and joining in the administration of government with the supreme powers. Beside this we also heard, that the brethren of the party of Paulinus are setting on foot negotiations with you respecting union with us: by us I mean the party of the man of God, Meletius the Bishop. I hear, moreover, that they are now carrying about letters from the Western Bishops committing the Bishopric of Antioch to them, and passing by Meletius, that most admirable Bishop of the true Church of God. And I do not wonder at this. For they (the Westerns) are entirely ignorant of matters here: and those who seem to know about them," (the friends of Paulinus,) "give them an account more in the spirit of party than with strict regard to truth. Not but what they may reasonably either not know the truth, or conceal from themselves the cause why the most blessed Bishop Athanasius came to write to Paulinus. But as your Excellency has there those who can narrate to you accurately what passed between the two Bishops, in the reign of Jovianus, we beg you to be fully instructed by them. But as we accuse no one, but desire to have love towards all, and especially to them who are of the household of faith, we congratulate those who have received the letters from Rome. And if they contain any honourable and weighty testimony to them, we pray this may be true, and confirmed by the facts themselves. I cannot, however, on this account ever persuade myself either not to know Meletius, or to forget the Church which is under him, or to think the questions of small importance, about which the division originally took

place, and of little weight in their bearing upon sound faith. *For my part I shall never submit to withdraw my opinion, because some one has received a letter from men, and makes much of himself upon it: no, not even though it came from heaven itself, if the person did not agree with the sound word of faith, can I receive him to the Communion of holy things.*"

He concludes thus: "I wish that your Excellency should be persuaded of this, that both you, and every one, who, like you, has a regard for the truth, and does not slight those who are fighting for the holy cause, ought to wait for those who are set over the Churches, whom I call the pillars and support of the truth and of the Church, to take the first steps in this reunion and peace. And I reverence them the more, the farther they are banished, since their exile is put upon them for a punishment." Presently he gives an account of this same matter to Meletius himself. "After I returned, having contracted great weakness from the violent rains and my dispirits, I received immediately letters from the East, stating that Paulinus' friends had had certain letters from the West, *conceived as if they were the credentials of a sovereign power*, and that his partisans were very proud of it, and exulted in the letters, moreover, were putting forth their faith, and on these terms were ready to join with the Church that stands by us. Besides this I was told, that they had seduced to their side that most excellent man Terentius, to whom I wrote at once, repressing that his inclination, as far as was in my power, and informing him of their deceit." Such is the way in which St. Basil receives what seems something like an attempt on the part of Pope Damasus to decide by authority the question between Meletius and Paulinus. And the Eastern Bishops were generally of St. Basil's mind, for Meletius having died while President of the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, they, as we have seen, would not take Paulinus in his place, but elected Flavian. I have not fallen upon passages more favourable to Rome in St. Basil's writings: otherwise I should consider it a matter of good faith to insert them. But indeed, when a particular view is so clearly developed in a considerable number of letters, it is very unlikely that a contradictory one is to be found in other writings of his.

Ep. 216.

To the  
Patriarch  
Meletius.ὡσπερ τινὸς  
ἀρχῆς συν-  
θήματα.

CHAP.  
II.

Summary  
of St. Ba-  
sil's con-  
duct to-  
wards  
Rome.

From these it is clear I think that St. Basil regarded the Bishop of Rome as a great and influential Bishop, "the leader of the Westerns,"—that he paid him such deference as he shewed to the Bishop of Alexandria or Antioch: but there is not any reason to conclude from his writings or his actions, rather there is great reason to disbelieve, that he thought the Roman Bishop possessed of any *peculiar* control whether over the Church generally, or the East specially, either in matters of faith or of discipline. He looked to the West for aid because the West had been comparatively free from the violence of Arian misrule: but that aid he considered would come *from the number of its Bishops assembled in Council*, and he says expressly that the East and West ought to sit together for this purpose. In the matter of Meletius and Paulinus he is not the least swayed by the whole authority of Rome and the West, as well as Alexandria, being against Meletius. The strong expressions about "Western pride" shew how little St. Basil imagined a monarch in St. Peter's chair. But the notion of any jurisdiction from Rome emanating to himself or his brother Prelates of the East is so very foreign to St. Basil's mind, that it seems, when one has been somewhat imbued with his spirit, almost absurd.

From St. Basil let us turn to his best-loved friend.

SECT. II.

2. St. Gre-  
gory of  
Nazianzum.

IN St. Gregory of Nazianzum I do not think any thing can be found which in any way implies that he thought an authority was lodged in the Bishop of Rome at all distinct in kind from that of other Bishops. Certainly his own conduct in accepting the See of Constantinople from the hand of St. Meletius, and his other actions at that period, do not intimate such a belief. Almost the only passage I can find sufficiently bearing on the subject to quote is that in his poem on his life. He is comparing Rome and Constantinople.

“ Nature which has not given two Suns, has given two Romes, to be luminaries of the whole world, the old and the new power, so far differing from each other inasmuch as the one shines over the East, the other over the West, but they present a beauty equally matched. But as to the faith of these, the one for a long time and still at present runs to the mark, binding together all the West in the word of salvation, worshipping the whole harmony of God,” (i. e. the Trinity,) “ as becomes her who presides over the whole<sup>s</sup>. But the other formerly stood upright, but now no longer, her I mean who was mine, and then not mine, but she lay in the depths of perdition.” No Roman writer would compare the metropolis of Christendom, as such, with any other city. His words in fact represent exactly the same sense as that third Canon of the Council over which he presided, giving the Bishop of Constantinople the second rank after the Bishop of Rome. Of course it would be ridiculous to compare the Pope with any Bishop of his Communion at present. The difference between them is immeasurable. In another place he says to the Novatians, “ Receive you not (to penitence) even the great Peter, because at the passion of the Saviour he experienced a weakness to which man is liable? But Jesus received him, and by the triple question and confession healed the triple denial.” It would have been much to the point to have added, that they excluded by their heresy from repentance him to whom Christ gave the sole commission to feed His sheep.

SECT.  
II.S. Greg.  
Nazianz. 2.  
704.Parallel between  
Rome and Constanti-  
nople.S. Greg.  
Naz., 1. 689.  
quoted by  
Mouravieff.

But St. Gregory does not seem to have attributed to St. Peter himself in the Apostolic choir any thing like that superiority which is now claimed for his successor over Bishops. In one of his orations, after many praises of humility and unity, he says, “ Would you have me offer you another example of good order, worthy of praise, and of present mention, as well as conveying admonition? See you, out of Christ’s disciples, though all were exalted, and

His view of  
the Aposto-  
lic College.Ib., 1. 591.  
Orat. 32.  
18.

<sup>s</sup> This passage is thus quoted by Bellarmine in proof that the Roman Church cannot err: “ S. Greg. Nazianzen says, ‘ Old Rome from ancient times holdeth the right faith, and always keeps it, as it becomes the city,

which presides over the whole world, always to maintain incorrupt faith in God.’ ” De Rom. Pont., lib. 4. cap. 4. That parallel between Rome and Constantinople, which affects the whole argument at issue, is studiously left out.

CHAP.  
III.

worthy of especial choice, yet one is called the rock, and is entrusted with the foundation of the Church, while another is the most loved, and reclines on the bosom of Jesus, and the rest bear this preference. And when He was to ascend into the mountain, to assume His shining Body, and exhibit His Godhead, and lay open Him that was concealed in the flesh, who ascend with Him? for not all are witnesses of the marvel. Peter and James, and John, who both are before the rest, and are so accounted. And who were present with Him in His agony, when He retired for a while before His passion and prayed? The same again. This preference was shewn by Christ. Yet how great was otherwise their good order and arrangement! Peter asks one question, and Philip another, Jude a third, Thomas a fourth, some one else a fifth, and neither all the same, nor each one all, but every man by turn, and one by one. What each needed, you may say. But how think you of this? Philip wishes to ask something, and is not bold enough alone, but takes with him Andrew also. Peter desires to ask something, and beckons to John to ask for him. Where here is ill-temper, or love of rule? How could they better shew themselves disciples of Christ, the meek and lowly of heart, the servant for the sake of us His own servants; Who ascribed all the glory to His Father in all things, that He might give us an example of good order and moderation." Now Peter could only transmit what he inherited: if the first among brethren was to found a line of monarchs, St. Gregory's example was not only thrown away, but quite mis-placed. In truth, however, such an idea was unknown in his day.

SECT. III.

S. S. Athanasius.

FROM the great Athanasius, who, if any other man, was under obligations to the See of Rome, I gather that while he did indeed consider the Bishop of Rome as possessor of an Apostolic See, he did not attribute to him any power different in kind from that of other Bishops. Thus in his letter to the Bishops of Africa he observes, "It suffices what

has been written by our beloved fellow-minister Damasus Bishop of Great Rome, and so many other Bishops assembled with him, and not the less what has been written by the other Councils holden in Gaul and in Italy concerning the sound faith, which Christ gave to us, and the Apostles proclaimed, and the Fathers, who assembled in Nicea from all our world, handed down." Here we may note the title given to Damasus, "our beloved fellow-minister," and the equal authority given to other Synods, with that of Rome, and the appeal, so constant in the fourth and fifth centuries, to the Nicene Council as the supreme rule of faith and discipline. Elsewhere, giving a catalogue of orthodox Bishops whose subscriptions might be a test against heresy, he names them thus, "Such as the great Confessor Hosius, and Maximinus of Gaul (Treves), or his successor, or Philogonius and Eustathius from the East (Antioch), or Julius and Liberius, Bishops of Rome, or Cyriacus of Mysia, or Pistus and Aristæus, Bishops from Greece, or Silvester and Protogenes from Dacia, or Leontius and Euppsychius, Bishops of Cappadocia, or Cæcilianus of Africa, or Eustorgius of Italy, or Capito of Sicily, or Macarius of Jerusalem, or Alexander of Constantinople, or Pæderos of Heraclea, or the great Meletius, and Basil and Longianus," &c. I presume that had Athanasius considered the Bishop of Rome to be what we are now told he is, he would not have merely named him thus. Again, describing the commencement of that attack on Liberius, Bishop of Rome, which ended in his lapse after two years' banishment, he says, "Neither did they from the beginning spare Liberius, Bishop of Rome, but extended their madness even to his people, nor revered it because it is an Apostolical throne, nor regarded Rome because it is the metropolis of Romania, nor remembered that in their letters before they had named them (the Bishops of Rome) Apostolical men." Presently he says that the eunuch, the Emperor's instrument in this, "forgot that he was before a Bishop, and with great threats went away with his presents." It would have had tenfold force to say, 'nor revered him as head of the universal Church, as common Father of Christendom.' But any such pretension was quite unknown to Athanasius. On the contrary in another place he says, "The Fathers of

SECT.  
III.

S. Athanas.  
tom. 1. 821.  
A. quoted  
by Mouravieff.

Tom. 1.  
278. C.  
Mouravieff.

Tom. 1.  
364. E.

Tom. 1.  
365. F.

Tom. 1.  
378. E.  
Mouravieff.

CHAP.  
III.

the people, and the teachers of the faith, are taken away, and the impious are intruded into the Churches. Who, when he saw that Liberius, Bishop of Rome, was banished, and the great Hosius, the Father of Bishops, was so suffering, or so many Bishops from Spain and other parts banished," &c. Thus he names the Bishop of Corduba, even in connection with Liberius, Father of Bishops. So again he calls Hosius Father of the Western Bishops who came to the Council of Sardica; elsewhere he introduces the Arians saying to the Emperor Constantius, "We have done every thing, we have banished the Bishop of the Romans, and before him a very great number of other Bishops, and have filled every place with alarm. But these strong measures of yours are as nothing to us, nor is our success at all more secure, so long as Hosius remains. While he is in his own place, the rest also continue in their Churches, for he is able by his arguments and his faith to persuade all men against us. He is the president of Councils, and his letters are every where attended to. He it was who put forth the Nicene Confession, and proclaimed every where that the Arians were heretics." In accordance with this we find the signatures of the Bishops at the Council of Sardica, in the works of St. Athanasius, headed by Hosius thus: "Hosius from Spain, Julius of Rome by the Presbyters Archidamus and Philoxenus, Protogenes of Sardica," and the rest: he, and not the Pope's Legates, presiding there. Again, he speaks of him thus: "Of the great Hosius, who answers to his name, that Confessor of an happy old age, it is superfluous for me to speak, for I suppose it is known unto all men that they caused him also to be banished; for he is not an obscure person, but of all men the most illustrious, and more than this, When was there a Council held, in which he did not take the lead, and convince every one by his orthodoxy? Where is there a Church that does not possess some glorious monuments of his patronage?" It need not surprise us then that he presided not only at the great Council of Sardica, but at the Nicene Council itself, as St. Athanasius states above: and that his name is put there before those of the Legates of St. Silvester, Bishop of Rome. Nor is there any authority for saying that he acted as Legate of St. Silvester

Tom. 1.  
352. C.

Tom. 1.  
369. A. Oxf.  
Tr., quoted  
by Moura-  
vieff.

Tom. 1.  
168. A.

Tom. 1.  
322. D.  
Oxf. Tr.,  
quoted by  
Mouravieff.

himself, save that of an author of small repute who lived one hundred and seventy years later, while the mode in which St. Athanasius mentions him seems to exclude this notion: for if it was merely as Legate of the Pope that he presided at Nicea or Sardica, he could hardly be said "to put forth the Nicene Confession," and the words "When was there a Council held in which he did not take the lead," would convey a false impression, for a Legate is only of importance as representing the person for whom he sits. The truth, I suppose, is, that according to the Roman theory the Pope must preside at every Ecumenical Council, and as it is beyond question that the Emperor Constantine convoked the Council of Nicea, and that the name of Hosius of Corduba, who sent the Emperor's letters of convocation to the Bishops, is at the head of all the subscriptions, there was no help for it but maintaining that Hosius presided as the Roman Bishop's Legate.

SECT.  
III.

Vid. Euseb.  
Hist. 10. 6.

But, supposing that Hosius presided at the Council of Sardica in the quality of first Papal Legate, and not as the most distinguished Bishop in the Church, the personal friend of Constantine, and his family, we have a result more than ever disproving the present doctrine of the Papal Supremacy. It is that Hosius proposed to the Fathers there assembled in respect to causes of Bishops: "Let us honour, if you think it good, the memory of the Apostle St. Peter; let those who have examined the cause write to Julius, Bishop of Rome; if he thinks proper to order a fresh trial, let him name judges; if he does not think there is reason to renew the matter, let what he orders be kept to." Now I think it has been fairly said, "If our Saviour had made the See of Rome the seat of the spiritual monarchy, put the government of the universal Church into the hands of that Bishop, and made him the supreme judge of all controversy, it had been a weak, not to say a disrespectful, motion in Hosius, to desire the Council, that out of regard to St. Peter's memory, they would allow an appeal to the Pope in the case of a single Bishop. Such a request as this destroys the supposition of a divine right, and is utterly inconsistent with the pretences of the universal pastorship. And if Hosius should have overshot himself to this degree, which is most

Dilemma  
if Hosius  
was Papal  
Legate at  
Sardica.

Collier, Ecc.  
Hist., bk. 1.  
p. 73.

CHAP. III. unlikely, we may imagine the Council would have been more modest, and more just too, than to have pretended an authority of granting the Pope any part of that right which was so incontestably his own before; as being a branch of that sovereignty which was handed down to him from St. Peter. But this right of receiving appeals, in some cases, as slender a privilege as it is in comparison of a divine Supremacy, yet the Popes were well satisfied with the favour, as appears by the sixth Council of Carthage, where Zosimus, to justify his receiving appeals from transmarine Churches, insists upon this concession in the case of Apiarius, and endeavours to pass it upon the African Fathers for a Canon of the Council of Nice."

He adds that Pope Julius, instead of disowning what Hosius had done, valued himself, as did his successors, upon the concession above mentioned.

Letter of  
Pope Julius  
to the  
Eusebian  
Bishops.

The letter of the same Pope Julius to the Eusebian Bishops, in the works of St. Athanasius, supplies us with a Papal testimony to the belief in the Patriarchate of Antioch at the middle of the fourth century concerning the rights of Bishops.

S. Athan.  
Apology  
against  
Arians, Oxf.  
Tr., p. 45.

"Now if you really believe," says he, "that all Bishops have the same and equal authority, and you do not, as you assert, account of them according to the magnitude of their cities, he that is entrusted with a small city ought to abide in the place committed to him."

Now these Bishops of the East had written to Pope Julius, according to Sozomen, that "the Church of the Romans is indeed honourable among all, as having been the school of the Apostles, and the metropolis of piety from the beginning: not but that the original teachers of the Faith came to it from the East. *Not however for this were they content to take the second place, being as they were eminent for virtue and firmness of mind, inasmuch as they did not grasp at more than their due by means of the greatness and populousness of their Church.* And they bring accusations against Julius for having communicated with Athanasius and the rest, and complained that their Synod (of Tyre) was insulted, and its decision annulled: and censured what had been done as unjust and contrary to Ecclesiastical rule. Having made these censures, and declared that they had been greatly

wronged, *they offered peace and Communion to Julius*, if he would receive the deposition of those whom they had expelled, and the establishment of those whom they had elected in their stead: but if he resisted their decree, they threatened a contrary course. For they maintained that the Priests throughout the East, their predecessors, had made no resistance, when Novatian was expelled from the Roman Church." (This was a mistake: for great resistance had been made: "his condemnation by a celebrated Council of Rome had only been received in the East with much difficulty, and after several Councils held in each Province:" but it only strengthens the argument for Eastern independence.) "But as to their conduct in reference to the decrees of the Council of Nicea, they did not even make him any answer, stating that they had many necessary reasons wherewith to defend what had been done, but that it was superfluous at that time to clear themselves on these points, as they were suspected of general injustice throughout."

SECT.  
III.

Tillemont,  
7. 277 and  
8. 462-4.

Sozomen,  
Ecc. Hist.  
3. 8.

Doubtless these Bishops were part of that cruel Arian faction which was tyrannising throughout the East, but I do not see that this lessens the force of their testimony to the existing constitution of the Church. But let such as wish further to see what this was, read the whole of that most moderate and dignified letter of Pope Julius, from which I have above quoted. In it he justifies to these Bishops his conduct towards the eminent Saint, Athanasius, whom they persecuted. They were indignant because, after they had most illegally deposed him, in a Synod of their own at Tyre, Julius had heard his cause, and given him his Communion. It was obvious for Julius to reply that he had done so as Head of the Church, in virtue of his Supremacy: that the Bishop of Alexandria was responsible to him for the due conduct of his See, as were all other Bishops: that, if wrong, by him he was to be punished; if right, by him to be upheld. Their strenuous declaration of independence, their refusal even to take the second place, would surely provoke him to this, had such a power been acknowledged to reside in his See, or been exercised by his predecessors. On the contrary, throughout a long letter there is no assumption of the kind. *The Canon of the Church is*

The letter  
of Pope  
Julius most  
adverse to  
the present  
Papal  
claim.

CHAP.  
III.

Sect. 22.

*again and again appealed to as the supreme authority.* To meet the charge of reversing a decree of the Council of Tyre not any peculiar authority of the Bishop of Rome is alleged, but the agreement "of the Bishops of the great Council of Nicea, not without the will of God, that the decisions of one Council should be examined in another." This was just before the Council of Sardica, which allowed to Julius a certain limited right of hearing appeals: and it is the more remarkable, that being the case, that he claims no such right in virtue of his Primacy. The utmost privilege he does claim is in respect "to the Church of the Alexandrians in particular," and has been already explained by me above: and that, after he had said that Bishops should be proceeded against according to the Canon of the Church, word being written to all their brethren, and a just sentence proceeding from *all*. Thus, in the middle of the fourth century, Julius of Rome, and Athanasius of Alexandria, and the Bishops of the Antiochene Patriarchate, are really agreed in the main about the constitution of the Church.

See above,  
p. 31.

Constitution of the Church in 362 as instanced in St. Athanasius.

The conduct of Athanasius, at a particular juncture, in the year 362, exhibits the then constitution of the Church in full action. "The accession of Julian was followed by a general restoration of the banished Bishops; and all eyes throughout Christendom were at once turned towards Alexandria, as the Church, which, by its sufferings and its indomitable spirit, had claim to be the arbiter of doctrine, and the guarantee of peace to the Catholic world. Athanasius, as the story goes, was, on the death of his persecutor, suddenly found on his Episcopal throne in one of the Churches of Alexandria; a legend happily expressive of the unwearied activity and almost ubiquity of that extraordinary man, who, while a price was set on his head, mingled unperceived in the proceedings at Seleucia and Ariminum, and directed the movements of his fellow-labourers by his writings, when he was debarred the exercise of his dexterity in debate and his persuasive energy in private conversation. He was soon joined by his fellow-exile, Eusebius of Vercellæ; Lucifer, who had journeyed with the latter from the upper Thebaid, on his return for the West, having left him for Antioch on business, which will presently be explained. Meanwhile, no time

was lost in holding a Council at Alexandria (A.D. 362), on the general state of the Church." The question how to treat the Arianising Bishops, was one "of great difficulty:" it is almost needless to observe that it could only be settled by the supreme authority in the Church. And it was settled, as Mr. Newman informs us, at this Council of Alexandria. By this influence of Athanasius, "a decree was passed, that such Bishops, as had communicated with the Arians through weakness or surprise, should be recognised in their respective Sees, on their signing the Nicene formularies; but that those, who had publicly defended the heresy, should only be admitted to lay Communion." And "their magnanimous decision was forthwith adopted by Councils held at Rome, in Spain, Gaul, and Achaia." Now the whole volume, from which I quote this, is an indirect indeed, but therefore unsuspecting, testimony against the present Roman Supremacy, inasmuch as it exhibits the Church Catholic, not in one instance, but during a struggle of fifty years, the most terrible she has ever undergone, acting throughout according to her Episcopal and Patriarchal constitution; in which the Bishop of Rome has indeed great influence, but neither that extent nor that kind of influence which he now claims, while the other Prelates of great Sees are seen also in the possession of a precisely similar influence to his, and, more especially, acting as co-ordinate, and assessors with him. The decree of the Alexandrine Council, then, is only one instance of this among a multitude. But I have a letter of Athanasius concerning it to quote for this reason. Mr. Newman alleges in behalf of the Supremacy, that St. Damasus writes to the Eastern Bishops, calling them "most honoured Sons." The letter is supposed to have been written in 373, and I cannot but observe that the Bishops composing the second Ecumenical Council in 381 seem by their synodical letter, which I have quoted already in full, to have a very small sense of the parental authority lodged in Pope Damasus, telling him plainly that the government of the Eastern Churches from Apostolic tradition belongs to them, and not to him: and, moreover, acting very decidedly upon their words. But how little this appellation of Sons, addressed by a Patriarchal throne to Bishops, proves what Mr. Newman wants it for,

SECT.  
III.

Newman's  
History of  
the Arians,  
p. 376, 382,  
383.

On Deve-  
lopment,  
p. 173.

CHAP.  
III.

Athan.  
tom. 1. 963.  
Calls a  
Bishop his  
Son.

may be seen by the following letter of Athanasius to the Bishop Rufinianus. "To the Lord, my Son, and most dear fellow-minister, Rufinianus, Athanasius sendeth greeting in the Lord. You indeed write what is becoming a well-beloved Son to his Father. At least as you drew near me by your letter, I grasped you in my arms, O Rufinianus, most dear to me of all. And I, though I could write to you at the beginning and middle and end of my letter as a Son, yet checked myself, that it might not seem a public commendation and testimony. For you are my letter, as it is written, known and read in my heart.—Thus therefore believe, and be thus affected, yes, believe: I beg and entreat you to write: for thus you give me not a little but a great delight. But since excellently, and according to Ecclesiastical order,—for this again is as becomes your piety,—you have consulted me concerning the case of those who have been drawn away by violence, yet not corrupted by heretical belief, and wish me to write to you what was decreed concerning them in the Councils, and every where: know, my most dear Lord, that immediately, on the cessation of violence, there was a Council held of the Bishops present from foreign parts: there was also one held by our fellow-ministers in Greece: and no less by those in Spain and Gaul: and that was agreed upon which was agreed upon here and every where, that those who had fallen and been leaders in the impiety, should be received to repentance, but not allowed their place in the Clergy: while those who did not encourage the impiety, but were drawn aside by constraint and violence, should be treated compassionately, and even retain their rank in the Clergy: especially because they have given a reasonable excuse, and it seemed good that a dispensation should be exercised in their case." "This," says the Seventh Ecumenical Council, at which this letter was read, "is not the voice of the holy Athanasius alone, but also of Councils, because the same Father says, that both the Romans, and the Bishops of Greece, received it." And presently, "the most holy Patriarch Tarasius said, the decision of our Father Athanasius instructs us, that the most reverend Bishops are to be received, if there be no other cause against them."

Mansi, tom.  
12. 1030. D,  
and 1034.  
A.

Thus, in this difficult case, how the Arianising Bishops

were to be treated, was settled by the Synods of the several Provinces to which they belonged. Pope Liberius in his 13th letter speaks of the Alexandrine and Greek decision as influencing him, "who have to weigh all circumstances with moderation." The decision of Athanasius is quoted four hundred years later at an Ecumenical Council as authoritative. Thus the supreme power of dispensing in the case of Bishops is exercised by Athanasius, as afterwards by St. Cyril, in virtue of his See, and without any reference to Rome. And St. Basil tells the Neocæsareans, if he ever received any that were secretly Arians upon their profession of orthodoxy, he did it, "not suffering myself to form a judgment entirely on my own responsibility concerning them, but following the decrees passed concerning them by our Fathers. For I received a letter from the blessed Father Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, which I have in my hands, and shew to those who ask it, in which he plainly declared, that if any one were minded to come over from the Arian heresy, and confess the faith of Nicea, such an one should be received without hesitation: and he cited to me as joining in this decree all the Bishops both of Macedonia and Achaia: and I conceived it necessary to follow so great a man, on account of the authority of those who passed the law," &c. "This Council" (of Alexandria) "may pass," says Tillemont, "for one of the most important which has ever been held."

S E C T.  
III.

Constant,  
Epist. Pon-  
tiff. Rom.,  
p. 448.

S. Basil.  
Ep. 204.  
tom. 3. 306.  
D.

Tillemont.  
tom. 8. 206.

But there is a very striking passage in the history of Pope Liberius, which seems to belong properly to the testimony of Athanasius, I mean his interrogatory before the Emperor Constantius, when he refused to betray the cause of that persecuted Saint. If Pope Liberius afterwards sullied, at least for a time, the glory of his confession, yet is it difficult to find a nobler passage of Ecclesiastical history than his contempt of the Emperor's threats and seductions. I shall give much of it, in the words of Theodoret, because it so happens that the defender of the Church's Catholic constitution in the nineteenth century can hardly desire a more favourable statement of his cause than that supplied by Pope Liberius in the fourth. If ever the light of that century shines clearly, it is here. "I desire," says the Bishop of

Passage in  
the life of  
Pope Libe-  
rius.

CHAP. III.  
 Theodoret,  
 Eccl. Hist.  
 2. 15—17.  
 referred to  
 by Launoy.

Cyrus, "to insert in my history the bold conduct of the illustrious Liberius in behalf of the truth, and the admirable language which he held with Constantius. For it has been committed to writing by pious men of that day, as being fit to encourage and inspire with zeal the lovers of divine things. It was he who directed the Church of the Romans after Julius, the successor of Silvester.

"The Emperor Constantius said, We have thought you fitting, as being a Christian, and Bishop of our city, to be sent for, and we charge you to reject Communion with the flagitious folly of the impious Athanasius. For the whole world hath approved of this course, and hath judged him to be severed from Ecclesiastical Communion by the decrees of a Council. The Bishop Liberius answered, Ecclesiastical judgments, O Emperor, ought to be conducted with great equity. If therefore it seems good to your piety, order a court of judgment to be assembled. And if Athanasius be found worthy of condemnation, then, according to the course marked out by Ecclesiastical practice, sentence will be passed against him. For we cannot condemn a man whom we have not judged. Constantius the Emperor said, The whole world has given sentence concerning his impiety, and how from the beginning he lays hold of any circumstances to elude detection. The Bishop Liberius answered, Those who subscribed were not eye-witnesses of the facts, but did it through desire of distinction, or through fear of being dishonoured by you. The Emperor, What mean you by this desire of distinction, or fear of dishonour? Liberius, Those who love not the glory of God, having more regard to your presents, condemned, without judging him, a person whom they had not seen, which is foreign to the practice of Christians. The Emperor, But he was in person judged in the Synod held at Tyre, and in this Synod all the Bishops of the world condemned him. Liberius, He has never been judged in person, &c. The Bishop Epictetus said, O Emperor, it is not in behalf of the faith, nor of Ecclesiastical judgments, that Liberius is now speaking, but that he may make his boast to the Senators of Rome that he has out argued the Emperor. The Emperor said to Liberius, *What portion of the world are you,* that you alone make cause with an impious

man, and break up the peace of the empire and the whole world? Liberius, The cause of the faith is not diminished because I am alone, for in old times three alone were found to resist the command. The Eunuch Eusebius replied; You make our Emperor a Nebuchadnezzar. Liberius said, No: but you condemn without reason a man whom we have not judged. *But for my part I request that an universal subscription first take place, to confirm the faith set forth at Nicea: in order that, when our brethren have been called back from their banishment, and restored to their own places, should those who now create disturbances in the Churches be seen agreeing with the Apostolic faith, we may then all meet at Alexandria, where are both the accused and the accusers, and their supporter, and having taken inquiry about these matters may pass a concordant sentence on them.* The Bishop Epictetus observed: The public posts would not be sufficient for the passage of the Bishops. Liberius, Ecclesiastical affairs do not need the public posts. The Churches can afford to convey their own Bishops as far as the sea. The Emperor, What has already taken form cannot be undone. For the sentence of the greater number of Bishops ought to prevail. You are the only one who claims the friendship of that impious man. Liberius said, O Emperor, we have never heard of a judge alleging impiety against an accused person in his absence, as if he were carrying on a private quarrel with a man. The Emperor, He has injured all together: but no one like me: &c.—Liberius, O Emperor, make not Bishops instruments to avenge your wrath. For the hands of Ecclesiastics ought to have leisure from all but blessing. Wherefore, if you think good, order the Bishops to be recalled to their several posts. And if they be seen to accord with him who now defends the orthodox faith set forth at Nicea, then let them assemble together, and consider for the peace of the world, that it may not be proved that one who has committed no fault has been censured. The Emperor, One thing is wanted. My pleasure is to send you back to Rome when you have embraced Communion with the Churches. Consent therefore to peace, and subscribe and return to Rome. Liberius, I have already bidden farewell to my Brethren at Rome. For the laws of the Church are of

CHAP.  
III.

more importance than dwelling in Rome. The Emperor, You have then a delay of three days for consideration, whether you will subscribe and return to Rome, or make up your mind where you wish to be transported. Liberius, The space of three days or months does not change one's mind. Send me therefore where you will. And the Emperor, having two days after called Liberius, when he would not change his mind, sentenced him to be banished to Berœa in Thrace. When Liberius was gone out, the Emperor sent him 500 pieces of money for his expenses. Liberius said to the bearer, Return, give them to the Emperor. For he wants them to give to his soldiers. So too the Empress sent him the same. Liberius said, Take them back to the Emperor, for he needs them for the pay of his armies. But if the Emperor does not want them, let him give them to Auxentius and Epictetus: for this is what they want. And when he would not take it from them, the Eunuch Eusebius offers him others. But Liberius said to him, You have desolated the Churches of the world, and then offer me an alms as a condemned criminal. Go, and first become a Christian. And after three days he was banished refusing to take anything.

“So the glorious champion of the truth went to Thrace as he was enjoined. But after two years Constantius came to Rome. Now the wives of persons in office and high rank besought their husbands to supplicate Constantius to restore the shepherd to his flock, declaring that otherwise they would leave their husbands, and fly to that great pastor. These answered, that they feared the Emperor's wrath. For to us that are men he will not perhaps make any allowance; but if you request him, he will surely have consideration, and either yield your request, or, if not, send you away without hurt. Those admirable women, accepting this advice, approached the Emperor in their accustomed magnificence, in order that, seeing them by their dress to be of great distinction, he might receive them with respect and lenity. And so approaching him they besought him *to pity so great a city deprived of its shepherd*, and exposed to the inroads of wolves. The Emperor replied that the city did not need any other shepherd, but had one that was able to take care

of it. For after the great Liberius one of his deacons had been elected, named Felix, who kept indeed himself the whole faith set forth at Nicea, but freely communicated with those who were corrupting it. But no Roman would go into the house of prayer when he was in it. And these ladies told the Emperor this. Induced by which he ordered, that that most excellent man should return, and that both in common should direct the Church. When this letter was read in the Circus, the people shouted out, that the Emperor's sentence was just, for that the spectators were divided into two parties, taking their names from their colours, and one might govern the one, and the other the other. Thus they turned to ridicule the Emperor's letter, and uttered with one voice, one God, one Christ, one Bishop. For I have thought it fitting to set down their very words. After these cries, replete with piety and justice, of that Christ-loving people, the admirable Liberius returned, but Felix retired and dwelt in another city."

Now to the distinct and decisive testimony of this narrative I know not what can be added. The Emperor, not wishing to offend Liberius, but to bend him to his purpose, treats him as a single Bishop, though that of the chief city. Liberius does not demur to this. When the Emperor says, *how large a portion of the world are you*, that you alone take up the cause of this impious man, Liberius does not reply, as it would have been natural for him to reply, had he known it, I am the Head of the universal Church, the one Vicar of Christ, without whom other Bishops can do nothing. On the contrary he accepts the Emperor's word, and answers, The cause of the faith is not diminished by my loneliness, for of old time three alone were found to resist the king's command. Again, the ladies of Rome request the Emperor to take pity on so great a city deprived of its shepherd, not to take pity on the whole Church deprived of the superintendence of its Head. Both the reply of Liberius, and the request of the ladies, would have had tenfold force, had it been such as I have supposed. But in truth the Emperor's taunt would have been absurd, "How large a portion of the world are you," &c. Moreover, all that Pope Liberius requests is, that a Council of Bishops should assemble and settle the

Inference  
from this  
narrative.

CHAP.  
III.

whole matter of Athanasius, and that, not at Rome but at Alexandria. It would be hard to state in more decisive terms than this Pope does, that the supreme power in the Church resides in her assembled Bishops: and besides, the way in which he defends Athanasius proves, in accordance, as I have noted, with the letter of St. Julius, that the Bishop of Rome, not however alone, but at the head of the Western Bishops, received the appeal of Athanasius because all Ecclesiastical rule had in his case been grossly violated, not because the See of Rome at that time claimed a power of rehearing causes once validly settled by an Episcopal judgment in Council.

Summary  
of St. Athanasius.

Thus the writings and conduct of that great Saint, who was persecuted in the East, but supported by the courage of successive Bishops of Rome, and righted first by their Provincial Council, and then by the great Western Council of Sardica, are no more in favour of the present Roman Supremacy, or what Mr. Newman calls the monarchical principle in the Church, than those of St. Basil, the Saint whom Rome slighted and discouraged. St. Athanasius, occupying that Eastern throne which was closest connected with Rome, himself beholden to her in no ordinary degree, calls her the metropolis of Romania, esteems her Bishop, like himself, possessor of an Apostolical throne, numbers him among other orthodox Bishops, placing some before and some after him, a small thing in itself, but utterly irreconcilable with such a position as Roman Catholics now assign to him, and, finally, acts himself on the most important occasions as a co-ordinate and independent authority.

#### SECT. IV.

4. St. Chrysostome.

Now as I mentioned at length St. Augustine's interpretation of those passages in Holy Writ, which are now put forward as warranting the special claims of the Roman See, I think it desirable to compare with his the interpretation given by the great Fathers St. Chrysostome and St. Cyril of these same passages. Not only is this highly valuable in itself, but it will throw collaterally great light on the consti-

tution of the Church, and enable us the better to estimate their actions, inasmuch as they were not only Doctors but possessors of Patriarchal thrones. Their doctrinal and didactic teaching and their official acts corroborate each other. A single phrase may be perverted, or estimated at too much or too little; but a connected and consistent view of doctrine, and a series of acts, form a whole of which it is difficult to resist the weight, or colour the testimony.

St. Chrysostome in a great many places refers to St. Peter's personal Primacy. Thus in the election of Matthias, "And in those days Peter rose up in the midst of the disciples and said.' As one eager, and as entrusted by Christ with the flock, and as the first of the choir, he ever first begins to speak. 'And the number of names together was,' he says, 'about a hundred and twenty. Men and brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost spake before.' Why then did he not singly ask of Christ to give him some one in the place of Judas? And why do they not make the election of themselves? Peter had now improved. We may thus answer this. Why they did not simply but by revelation ask for one to fill up their band, for this we will assign two reasons: the first, that they were engaged about other things: the second, that this was the greatest proof of Christ's presence with them. For being absent He made the election as He would have done if present. And this was no small matter of consolation. But observe Peter doing this with common consent: nothing of authority; nothing with dominion. And he did not say simply thus: Instead of Judas we elect this man: but, consoling them about what had past, see how he manages his discourse. For what had happened, had caused no small distress. And do not wonder at this. For if many at present twist about this fact, what may we expect that they said? Men and brethren, he says: if the Lord called them brethren, how much more he. This is why he declares this in the presence of all. Behold a Church's dignity and angelical order. No one was there torn from the Body: there was neither male nor female. Such would I have the Churches be now. . . . 'Wherefore,' saith he, 'of these men that have companied with us all the time.' . . .

SECT.  
IV.

Tom. 9. 23.  
B. E. 24. E.  
25. B. 26.  
B. C. D.  
Primacy of  
St. Peter.  
Election of  
Matthias.

CHAP.  
III.

Why does he communicate this to them? That the matter may not be contested, nor they fall into strife. For if this had happened to them, (the Apostles contending who should be first,) much more would it to the others. And this he always avoids. Therefore he said at the beginning, Men and brethren, we must choose one of us. He commits the judgment to the multitude, both to invest with respect those who were chosen, and to escape himself odium from the rest. . . . 'To be a witness with us of His resurrection.' Why? that the choir might not be lopped of its number. What then. Might not Peter himself have elected? Certainly. But he does not so, that he might not seem partial. Moreover he had not as yet received the Spirit. 'And they appointed,' he saith, 'two, Joseph that is called Barsabas, and Matthias.' He did not appoint them, but all. But he introduced the matter, shewing that it was not even his own, but from above according to prophecy. So that he was an interpreter, not a master." On which words Bossuet says of an opponent: "He dreams that it was Chrysostome's meaning that Peter could have done the whole matter of his own right, even without consulting his brethren, which is far from the mind of Chrysostome, and from those times. Chrysostome's meaning was, that Peter, the chief of the sacred band, might, as he had first spoken about the election, at the same time have selected and marked out some one, in whom the rest would then have readily agreed, which is indeed to be the first, not the only one, selecting. But Peter did not do this. He said indefinitely, one of them must be ordained to be a witness with us of Christ's resurrection. Chrysostome therefore marks the moderation of Peter in being unwilling to pre-occupy the judgments of others. But if they mean what never entered into Chrysostome's thoughts, that Peter even singly might have arranged the whole matter authoritatively, what then will follow? Surely that Peter's successor, separately from the Church even when assembled, may do something, designate for instance a certain Bishop, but not therefore be able to decree these points of supreme importance, which concern the faith, and schism, and universal reformation, on which the question turns."

Bossuet's  
interpretation  
of this.  
Def., lib. 8.  
c. 17.

Further on the Saint proceeds. "Observe the modera-

tion of James. He received the Bishopric of Jerusalem, and yet he says nothing then. Observe too the great humility of the other disciples, how they yield him place, and no longer dispute with each other."—"He (Peter) first acted the teacher. He said not, We are sufficient: so free was he from all vain-glory. And he looked to one thing only: although indeed he had not an authority equal to that of all. But these things passed thus with reason on account of the virtue of the man: and because the task of government was then not a matter of honour but of solicitude for the governed. . . . They were a hundred and twenty, and he asks one out of the whole number. Justly. He first acts with authority in the matter, as being himself put in charge of all. For to him Christ said, And thou, when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."

SECT.  
IV.

κατοι οὐδὲ  
ισότυπον  
ἅπασιν  
εἶχε τὴν  
κατάστα-  
σιν.

Elsewhere he says, "After so great an evil (of denying Christ) He restored him to his former honour, and put into his hands the presidency of the universal Church." Preaching before his Bishop Flavian at Antioch he says, "He too received this name Peter not from wonders and signs, but from zeal and earnest affection. For it was not because he raised the dead, nor because he made the lame man upright, that he was so called; but, because he shewed forth a true faith together with his confession, he inherited this name, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church. Why? not because he did miracles, but because he said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. Thou seest that his very being called Peter took its beginning not from working miracles, but from ardent zeal. But, since I have mentioned Peter, another Peter occurs to me, our common Father and Teacher, who being his successor in virtue has also inherited his seat." (Singular enough it is that, at the moment the Saint said this, Flavian was not the Bishop of Antioch who enjoyed the Communion of Rome, but was supported by the East against Paulinus.) "For this, too, is one of the privileges of our city, that it received at the beginning for its teacher the first of the Apostles. For fitting it was that the city, which, before the whole world, encircled her brows with the name of Christian, should receive as Pastor the first of the Apostles. But, though we received him for

Tom. 2. 309.  
D.

Tom. 3. 70.  
B.

The Rock  
Peter's con-  
fession.

The Bishop  
of Antioch,  
being out  
of Commu-  
nion with  
Rome, call-  
ed Peter, as  
inheriting  
his seat.

CHAP.  
III.

our teacher, we did not keep him to the end, but yielded him to imperial Rome: or rather we kept him to the end. For we have not indeed the body of Peter, but we keep the faith of Peter as himself: and having the faith of Peter, we have Peter himself."

If the Saint at this time knew and believed the doctrine that the first of the Apostles had not only left his body to Rome, but the Monarchy of the universal Church, this is at least a remarkable mode of speaking.

Further, I cannot find that he considered the person of Peter to be the Rock, (which Bellarmine says is the opinion of Catholics generally, of the whole Church and of the Greek and Latin Fathers,) but his confession of the Godhead and Manhood. Thus, "Having said to Peter, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonas, and having promised to lay the foundations of the Church upon his confession, not long after He says, Get thee behind Me, Satan."

Again, in a passage to be noted for another reason, "Christ, wishing to repress this, (Peter's confidence,) permitted his denial. For when he would not listen either to Him or to the Prophet,—for for this very purpose He had cited the Prophet, that he might not contradict—but when he would not bear the treatment of words, He teaches him by deeds. For to shew that He therefore permitted it, that He might correct this in him, hear what He says, 'But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not.' For this he spake severely touching him, and shewing that his fall was worse than that of the rest, and needing more help. For there were two charges, that he contradicted, and that he put himself before the rest, or rather a third, that he ascribed all to himself. To cure this, then, He permitted the fall, and therefore, leaving the rest, He turns to him. For He saith, 'Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to sift you as wheat,' that is, to confound, to disturb, to tempt: 'but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not.' And wherefore, if he desired all, said He not for all, I prayed? Is it not plain that it is for the reason I mentioned above? To touch him, and shew him that his fall was worse than that of the rest, He addresses him. And wherefore said He not, I have not permitted, but, I prayed? Being about to suffer, He speaks

De Rom.  
Pont., lib.  
1. c. 10.

The Rock  
Peter's con-  
fession.  
Tom. 10.  
657. C.

Tom. 7.  
785. C.

humbly, to shew the humanity. For He *who built the Church upon his confession*, and so fortified it that unnumbered dangers and deaths should not gain the victory over it: He, who gave to him the keys of the heavens, and made him Lord of such power, and needed not prayer for this,—for He did not then say, I prayed, but, with authority, I will build My Church, and I will give to thee the keys of heaven—how needed He prayer to fix the agitated mind of one man? Wherefore, then, spake He thus? for the cause that I have mentioned, and on account of their weakness, for they had not yet the fitting opinion about Him. How then denied he? He said not, that thou mayest not deny, but that thy faith fail not, that it perish not utterly.”

Again, when, in one of his most elaborate works, the commentary on St. Matthew, he comes to the passage itself, and speaks of it in detail, not only does he make the Rock to be St. Peter's confession, but his argument leads him to dwell in an especial manner on the fact that it was St. Peter's expressed faith in the Godhead and Manhood, our Lord's true and incommunicable Sonship and Consubstantiality with the Father, which drew down so peculiar a blessing. “What then saith Peter, the mouth-piece of the Apostles? He that is ever ardent, the leader of the band of the Apostles, when all are asked, answers himself.” . . . “If he had not confessed Him genuine Son and born of the Father Himself, this had not been matter of revelation: since before him they who were in the vessel after the storm which they saw had said, ‘Truly He is Son of God,’ and were not blessed, although they had spoken the truth. For they did not confess such a Sonship as Peter, but thought Him to be really a Son, one out of many, distinguished indeed beyond the many, but not of His Very Substance. And Nathanael too said, ‘Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel,’ yet not only is he not blessed, but, as having spoken something much beneath the truth, is censured by Him. At least, He added, ‘Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig-tree, believest thou? thou shalt see greater things than these.’ Why then is Peter blessed? Because he confessed Him to be genuine Son.” . . . “What then saith Christ? ‘Thou art Simon, Son of Jonas; thou shalt be called

SECT.  
IV.

Interpreta-  
tion of Matt.  
16. 16.

Tom. 7.  
546. E. 547.  
D. 548. B.

CHAP. III. Cephas.' For since thou hast proclaimed My Father, saith He, I too name him that begat thee: all but saying, that as thou art Son of Jonas, so am I of My Father: since it was superfluous to say, thou art Son of Jonas. But since he had called Him Son of God, to shew that He is Son of God in the sense in which the other is son of Jonas, of the same substance with his father, therefore He added this, 'And I say unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church,' that is, *upon the faith of his confession*. Hence He shews that many were about to believe, and raises his spirit, and makes him a shepherd." . . . "For what belongs to God alone, to loose sins, and to render the Church immoveable in such an assault of waves, and to make a fisherman more solid than any rock, when the whole world was at war with him, these are what He promises to give him: as the Father addressing Jeremiah said, 'I have made thee—an iron pillar and brasen walls,' but him to one nation, whereas the other to the whole world. Willingly would I ask those who wish to diminish the dignity of the Son, which are the greatest gifts, those which the Father gave to Peter, or those which the Son? For He bestowed on Peter the revelation of the Son, but the Son disseminated that of the Father and of Himself through the whole world, and put into the hands of a mortal man power over all things in heaven, when He gave him the keys: Who extended the Church through the whole world, and shewed it to be firmer than the heaven."

Again, assigning as above a reason why the Lord said to Peter, I have prayed for *thee*, "I, He says, restrained him, knowing that ye cannot bear the temptation. For the expression, 'that thy faith fail not,' shews that had He permitted it, his faith would have failed. But if Peter, the fervent lover of Christ, who exposed his life for Him times numberless, even starting forth before the company of Apostles, and blessed by his Master, and therefore called Peter, because he had a firm unchangeable faith, if he would have been carried away, and given up his confession, had Christ permitted the devil to tempt him as much as he wished, what other shall be able to stand without His assistance?"

It is certainly time to quote these interpretations of the

Tom. 3.  
35. D.  
Interpreta-  
tion of Luke  
22. 32.

great Fathers, when we are told that the words "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not," mean an express covenant from our Lord to the Bishop of Rome, as occupant of the See of Peter, that, though all the rest of the Church should fail, his faith should yet stand. And in like manner that the passage in Matthew is the charter by which supreme power to rule the Church is put into the Roman Pontiff's hands, and that in John, Feed My sheep, is in such sense a commission to feed the whole Church that all other shepherds receive their commission through him: so that, even their orders being valid, they cannot have legitimate jurisdiction, save from that one Pontiff's hands. Since the time of Bellarmine this interpretation has been more and more received in the Roman Communion, though opposed from time to time by men of great learning and ability, who could not but feel that the golden Canon of St. Vincent, Antiquity, Universality and Consent, was directly against it. Assuredly had such been the anciently and universally received meaning, I could have accepted it, just as I would most readily accept the doctrine it is meant to assert, were it not that antiquity knows nothing of that doctrine. Those who feel that St. Vincent's Canon tells with an almost annihilating force against certain doctrines which they wish to hold, may give it up: I, for one, where it can be applied, think it convincing: and this matter of the Roman Supremacy is just one to which that induction can be applied to an unusual extent.

Now let the language of St. Chrysostome on these various passages be fairly weighed. No thought, assuredly, had he, continually alluding, as he does, to St. Peter's Primacy, dwelling upon it, and speaking of it largely and generously, that, while this was to last for ever, and be wondrously developed into a great centralising power in the heart of the Church, on the other hand the Apostolic powers of his brethren were not to continue, (as Bellarmine asserts, and as the Roman theory and practice exhibit,) but be absorbed in the authority of their chief. Does he say, for instance, that Peter has the whole world committed to him? This is true, but then it is not exclusively of his brethren, but in conjunction with them. Bellarmine will quote him for the

SECT.  
IV.

Contrast  
between  
St. Chrysos-  
tome's in-  
terpretation  
and the late  
Roman one.

CHAP.  
III.

Tom. 8.  
525. D.  
527. B.  
528. A.  
Interpreta-  
tion of John  
21. 15.

first point, but omit the second. For instance, the following is the comment of St. Chrysostome on the third of the passages in question. "Jesus saith unto Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My sheep. And why then, passing by the rest, does He converse with him on these things? He was the chosen of the Apostles, and the mouth-piece of the disciples, and the head of the band. Therefore also Paul once went up to see him rather than the rest. It was besides to shew him that for the future he must be bold, as the denial was done away with, that He puts into his hands the presidency over the brethren. And He does not mention the denial, nor reproach him with what had past: but He says, if thou lovest Me, rule the brethren, and shew now that warm affection which on all occasions thou hast shewn, and in which thou didst exult, and that life which thou didst offer to lay down for Me, now spend for My sheep." And a little further on. "But if any one asks, how then did James receive the throne of Jerusalem, I would reply that He elected Peter not to be teacher of this throne, but of the whole world." But presently the same is said of John, with Peter: "but since *they* were about to receive the charge of the whole world, they were not for the future to be joined together: for this would have been a great loss to the world." Thus then St. Peter's being *the chosen Apostle, the mouth-piece and head of the band, having the presidency over the brethren put into his hands, and being made teacher of the whole world*, does not exclude the other Apostles likewise from receiving *the charge of the whole world*. In exact accordance with this St. Cyril of Alexandria calls all the Apostles *doctors of the whole world*. For speaking of the confession made by St. Thomas, My Lord and my God, he says, "To him who so believed and was thus disposed at the end of the Gospel He says, go and make disciples all nations. But if He bids one who thought thus to make disciples all nations, and appoints him *Ecumenical Doctor*, He willeth that we should have no other faith."

Agreement  
of S. Cyril,  
tom. 4.  
1109. D.

Surely Holy Scripture impresses on us the same view: for while in Matt. xvi. 19 the power to bind and to loose is

*promised* to St. Peter: I will give: whatsoever thou shalt bind, whatsoever thou shalt loose &c., in Matt. xviii. 18 this promise is repeated to all the Apostles. Still both these are promises. But in John xx. 21 and 23, this power is *actually conveyed* not to Peter by himself, but to all together. "As My Father sent Me, even so send I you." "Whose sins ye remit they *are* remitted: whose ye retain, they *are* retained." And this after He had said, breathing on them, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." As it was in conjunction with his brethren that St. Peter was made a Priest to offer the pure and unbloody sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, when the Lord said, "This do in remembrance of Me:" so in conjunction with his brethren did he receive the power of binding and loosing sins, which belongs to that most awful Priesthood. Thus St. Chrysostome commenting on the passage of John xx. 21 and 23, takes it as a grant to the whole Priesthood of the Church.

"For great is the dignity of Priests: 'Whose sins,' saith He, 'ye remit, they are remitted.' Wherefore also Paul said, 'Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, and hold them very highly in honour.' For thou carest for thine own matters, and if thou disposest these well, wilt have no account to give of the rest. But the Priest, though he order well his own life, yet, if he take not careful charge of thine, or of all about him, will depart into hell with the wicked. And oftentimes, not having been betrayed by his own actions, he is ruined by yours, if he has not well performed all which belongs to himself. Knowing therefore the greatness of the danger shew for them great good-will. Which Paul intimated in his words, 'for they watch over your souls,' and that not simply, but as 'those that must give an account.' . . . Think what Christ says concerning the Jews: 'the Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore that they say unto you to do, do ye.' But now we may not say 'The Priests sit in Moses' seat, but in that of Christ.' For His office of teaching have they inherited. Wherefore also Paul saith, 'We are ambassadors for Christ, as if God besought you through us.' . . . But why say I Priests? Neither Angel nor Archangel can do anything in what is given of God: but the Father and the Son

SECT.  
IV.

Tom. 8.  
517. C. 518.  
E.  
John 20. 21,  
a grant to  
the whole  
Priesthood.

CHAP. and the Holy Spirit dispenseth all: the Priest lendeth his  
 III. tongue and stretcheth forth his hand.”

In another passage he says to the same effect,

Tom. 1.  
 382. B. 383.  
 B.

“For the Priesthood is performed indeed upon the earth, but holdeth the rank of things done in heaven. And with great reason. For neither man, nor Angel, nor Archangel, nor any other created power, but the Paraclete Himself, hath arranged this service: and taught those who are yet in the flesh to represent the ministry of Angels. . . For when thou seest the Lord sacrificed, and lying, and the Priest standing over the sacrifice and praying, and all men empurpled with that precious Blood, dost thou think thyself to be still among men, and to stand upon the earth? . . . For if any one would consider, how great a thing it is for one being a man, still encompassed with flesh and blood, to be able to draw nigh That Blessed and Pure Nature, then would he plainly see how great an honour the grace of the Spirit hath conferred upon Priests. For by their instrumentality both these things are done, and other things not at all inferior to these, both in respect of their dignity and our salvation. For those who dwell on the earth and sojourn there have been entrusted with the administration of things in heaven, and have received a power which neither to Angels nor Archangels hath God given. For not unto them is said: ‘Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.’ For they who rule on earth have indeed the power of binding, but the body alone. While this chain reacheth to the soul itself, and extendeth through the heavens. And what acts Priests do below, these God ratifies above: and the Lord confirmeth the sentence of His servants. For what else hath He given them, but all power in heaven. For, saith He, ‘whose sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whose ye retain, they are retained.’ For what power can there be greater than this? The Father hath given all judgment unto the Son: but I behold them invested with all this by the Son. For unto this government they have been advanced, as if they were already translated into the heavens, and had surpassed the nature of man, and had been set free from our affections. Again, were a king to

The Real  
 Presence as  
 stated by  
 St. Chry-  
 sostome.

The Christian  
 Priest-  
 hood.

communicate to any of his officers this honour, that he might imprison whom he would and release them, such an one would be admired and looked up to by all. While he that hath received from God an authority so much greater than this, as heaven is more precious than earth, and souls than bodies, seems to some men to have received so small an honour, that it can be imagined that one so entrusted should even despise the gift. Away with such madness. For it is manifest madness to despise so great a power, without which we can obtain neither salvation nor the promised blessings. For if no one can enter into the kingdom of heaven except he be born again of water and of the Spirit, and he that eateth not the Flesh of the Lord and drinketh His Blood is cast out of eternal life, and if all these are done by nothing else but only by those holy hands—those of the Priest I mean—how can any one without these be able either to escape hell-fire, or gain the rewards which are laid up? For it is these, I say, these, who are entrusted with spiritual travails, and have committed to them the birth through Baptism. Through these we put on Christ, and are buried together with the Son of God, become members of that blessed Head. So that with justice may they be to us not only more terrible than governors or kings, but also more honourable than fathers. For these beget us from blood and the will of the flesh, but the others are causes to us of the birth from God, of that blessed regeneration, of the true liberty, and of the adoption by grace. The priest of the Jews had authority to deliver from bodily leprosy, or rather, by no means to deliver, but to approve those who had been delivered, and you know how the office of Priest was then sought after; but these have received authority concerning, not the leprosy of the body, but the uncleanness of the soul, and not to approve it when removed, but utterly to remove it. So that such as despise them, are involved in greater crime, and worthy of greater punishment, than Dathan and his company. For if these claimed a power which did not belong to them, yet at least they had a wonderful conception of it; and shewed this by seeking it earnestly. Whereas the others, when this office hath been more highly honoured, and hath received so great an increase, have dared to do contrarywise

SECT.  
IV.

Superiority  
of spiritual  
to temporal  
power.

Superiority  
of Christian  
to Jewish  
Priesthood.

CHAP.  
III.

Authority  
of the Priest-  
hood above  
that of  
natural  
parents.

indeed to them, but much worse than them. For it is not so great an act of contempt to desire an honour which does not belong to one, as to despise blessings so great: but this latter is as much greater than the other, as the difference between contempt and admiration. What soul then can be so miserable as to despise blessings so great I cannot say, unless it be one smitten with a goad from the demon. But to return whence I had digressed. Not in punishing only, but also in doing good, God hath given a greater power to Priests than to natural parents; and the difference between the two is so great, as is that of the present and the future life: for these beget us unto this, but those unto that. And these cannot keep off even bodily death from their children, nor repel the assault of disease: but those have often saved the soul, both in sickness, and at the point to perish, procuring to some a milder punishment, and not permitting others to fall into it at all: not only by teaching and warning, but also by the help of their prayers. For they have power to pardon sins not only when they regenerate us, but such also as are committed after this: for, saith he, 'is any one sick among you, let him call the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he have committed sins, they shall be remitted to him.' Moreover, natural parents, if their children have offended persons great and powerful in the world, can give them no help: whereas Priests have reconciled not governors or kings, but God Himself, who had been often enraged against them. Will any one then still after this venture to condemn us of folly? For I conceive that the minds of hearers should be affected by so much reverence through what has been said, that they would impute folly and audacity no longer to those who shrink from, but to those who of themselves approach and endeavour to gain, this honour. For if men who are entrusted with the command of cities, should they be not very prudent and watchful, have ruined those cities, and moreover destroyed themselves; how much power, both of his own and of that from above, seemeth it to you that he needeth, who hath received the bride of Christ to adorn, in order that he may not sin?"

Here it is certainly hard not to observe what mercy St. Chrysostome would have shewn to those miserable heresies, denying the Christian Priesthood, and regeneration in Baptism, and the Lord's sacrifice in the Eucharist, and the forgiveness of sins after Baptism laid up in the Church, which Luther, Calvin, and the rest of their fellows have bequeathed to the distracted sect-ridden West. It is plain what opinion all those who accept the teaching of the Fathers must have concerning the teaching of those just mentioned. Something more, however, is tolerably plain. Here is the whole Church described as exercising her most awful powers, regenerating souls by Baptism, feeding them with the Body and Blood of Christ, reconciling them to God by prayer, and remitting their sins; things which require not only Orders, but Jurisdiction. And the whole of this great authority is declared to be vested in the Priesthood of the Church by virtue of the promise in Matt. xviii. 18, and the fulfilment of the promise in John xx. 21—23. Whatever power was then committed to the Apostles, is viewed as transmitted from them to their successors. What would have been St. Chrysostome's reply supposing one had said to him, Yes, it is true indeed that these powers are given to Priests through the sacrament of Orders, and are so given by Bishops; yet can neither Bishops bestow them, nor Priests receive them, so as to convey the blessings attached to them, unless they receive their Mission and Jurisdiction from the Bishop of Rome? The Bishop Meletius who ordained you Reader, and Deacon, the Bishop Flavian who ordained you Priest, did both those acts in virtue of their Mission from the Roman Pontiff. Perhaps St. Chrysostome would have been satisfied with the mere question of fact, and stated, that both Meletius and Flavian, when they ordained him, were out of Communion with Rome, and instead of deriving Jurisdiction from Rome, actually exercised their episcopal powers in spite of all the opposition which Rome could give, and finally handed down their succession to the Church after them. Certain, however, it is, that no vestige can be found in St. Chrysostome's writings of the notion that the Bishop who inherited St. Peter's See was the sole fountain of that grace which St. Peter himself just *received* in conjunction with the other Apostles. And

SECT.  
IV.

Contrast  
with the  
modern  
Roman  
claim of  
exclusive  
Jurisdiction.

Reader in  
368, Deacon  
in 378,  
Priest in  
383 or 5.

CHAP.  
III.

this being the case, such passages as the above turn the whole authority of this great Saint against this modern notion about Jurisdiction.

In another place he makes the following application of John xxi. 15. " 'Peter, if thou lovest Me,' saith He, 'feed My sheep;' and by asking him thrice, He asserts that this is the proof of love. *But this is said not only to Priests*, but also to each of us, who are entrusted with even a little flock. Do not despise it because it is little, for My Father, saith He, is well-pleased in them. Each one of us hath a sheep," (i. e. his own soul,) "this let him lead to the fitting pastures."

Tom. 7.  
749. B.  
John 21.  
15. said to  
Priests.

In another passage of great power and eloquence, which but for its length I should quote in full, he illustrates the words "Upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," by a vivid detail of the superhuman triumphs which the Church up to his time had wrought: that is, he views the promise specially made to Peter as made to him in the person of the Church, not as distinct from his brethren. This idea is so spread over the whole passage, that it is difficult to convey it adequately save by the whole. How did Christ effect His promise? "By the means of eleven men, without letters, uninstructed, inelegant, of no note, poor, without a country, without store of wealth, without bodily strength, or brilliant reputation, or ancestral splendour, or power of words, or skill in persuasion, or pre-eminence in knowledge, but fishermen, tent-makers, foreigners. For they did not even speak the language of those whom they convinced, but a strange tongue different from all others, the Hebrew: and by means of them He built this Church which extends from one end of the earth to the other." "This they were able to do, naked and unshod, and with a single coat making the circuit of the whole world, for they had, to fight with and succour them, the invincible power of Him who said, 'Upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'"

Matt. 16.  
16. applied  
to all the  
Apostles.

Tom. 1.  
575. E.  
578. B. The  
whole pas-  
sage, 574.  
E. to 579.  
C.

Agreement  
of St. Chry-  
sostome and  
St. Augus-  
tine: silence  
as to the  
See of  
Rome.

The comment, then, of St. Chrysostome on these three passages of Scripture agrees in the main with that of St. Augustine, the East with the West. The former makes the Rock to be the confession of Christ's Godhead and manhood, as the latter says that Peter receives the keys as represent-

ing the Church. But the remarkable thing is that both are entirely silent as to any reference to the See of Rome in particular. Deep meanings indeed they see in these texts, but not the Roman Supremacy. They speak with the clear unhesitating voice of antiquity that the keys, the power to bind and to loose, and the commission to feed the sheep, were all lodged in the Church's Episcopate, not in one of her rulers, but in her whole Apostolic hierarchy.

But indeed, having most carefully sought, I have been unable to find any testimony of St. Chrysostome to the transmission of St. Peter's Primacy over the whole Church to the Bishop of Rome; unless the passage above respecting Antioch and Rome may be considered such. Yet there is a conjuncture in that great Saint's life, in which, had he acknowledged any powers to be lodged in the Bishop of Rome beyond those of a Patriarch, the first Bishop of the West, he would surely have expressed it. I mean his letter to Pope St. Innocent, detailing the unjust persecution which he had suffered. In this, which was written just after his first and before his second expulsion, he complains of violated Canons, describing how Theophilus of Alexandria, being summoned by the Emperor to Constantinople, had come not alone but with a band of partizans ready to commit all sorts of violence. The Saint, when requested by the Emperor to come to him, and hear the accusations made against Theophilus, says, "We, both knowing the laws of our fathers, and out of respect and honour to the man, having moreover letters from him, *which pointed out that causes should not be drawn beyond the countries to which they belonged, but that the affairs of each Province should be transacted therein*, would not accept the office of judge, but with much earnestness begged to be excused." Here we have the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, in the "clear light of the fifth century," exactly agreeing with St. Aurelius, St. Augustine, and the whole Council of Africa, in their statement of the Church's constitution. Again, "It is not fitting that one in Egypt should judge those in Thrace, and he, a person under accusation, an enemy and foe. But nevertheless, without any respect to this, and eager to accomplish what was on his mind, *though we declared that we were ready to answer his*

His letter  
to Pope St.  
Innocent.

See 5th and  
6th Canon  
of Nicea,  
and 2nd of  
Constanti-  
nople.

CHAP.  
III.Appeals to  
a Council  
and the  
Canon of  
the Church.Tom. 3.  
516, 517.  
520.Duplicates  
of his letter  
sent to the  
Bishops of  
Milan and  
Aquilaia.

*charges before a hundred or a thousand Bishops*, and to shew that we were innocent, as we are, he would not agree: but while we were absent, and *appealed to a Council*, and sought for judgment, and declined not a hearing but open enmity, he both received accusers, and absolved those whom I had deprived of Communion, and received complaints from those very persons who were not yet cleared themselves, and caused depositions to be made, all which things *were contrary to law, and the order of the Canons . . .* Dragged through the middle of the city by the officer, and hurried away by violence, I was taken and cast into a ship, and sailed by night, *having appealed to a Synod for a just hearing.*" Again, "For if this custom is to grow into use, and those, who will, be allowed to burst into the Dioceses of others at such distances, and to cast men out at their pleasure, to take upon their own authority what measures they choose, be assured that all will be ruined, and implacable war overrun the whole world, all men being engaged in hostilities. That then so great a confusion may not seize on the whole world, be so good as to write that proceedings so lawless, in our absence, one side only heard, though we did not decline pleading, have no force, as they have none by their own nature. And that they who have thus transgressed, when convicted, be subjected to the punishment of the Ecclesiastical laws. And let us, who have neither been condemned nor proved guilty, nor set on our trial, enjoy continually the advantage of your letters and your affection, and that of all the rest," (i. e. other Western Bishops,) "which we used to enjoy." He sends duplicates of this letter to Venerius, Bishop of Milan, and Chromatius of Aquileia. The Bishop of Rome, then, is begged to disapprove of these proceedings, but so likewise, and in the same words, are the other two great Primates of Italy: and reference is made throughout to a supreme Ecclesiastical authority, which is, the Canon of the Church: and the second Bishop of the world, thus treated, appeals not to the See of Rome simply as a superior tribunal, but to a Council.

Bellar-  
mine's quo-  
tation of  
this letter.

Now what is Bellarmine's account of the document I have just quoted? It appears as his seventh proof out of the Greek Fathers that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter in

the monarchy of the Church. "St. John Chrysostome in his first letter to Pope Innocent says, 'I beseech you to write that proceedings so lawless may not have force: but that they who have acted lawlessly may be subject to the punishment of the Church's laws,' &c. Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, in a Council of many Bishops, had deposed Chrysostome from the Bishopric of Constantinople. Chrysostome writes to the Roman Pontiff that he by his own authority should decree that the sentence of Theophilus was null, and should punish Theophilus himself. Therefore Chrysostome recognises Pope Innocent as supreme judge even of the Greeks." That is, he proves the Roman Pontiff's monarchy by the expressions of a letter, duplicates of which he omits to say were sent to the Bishops of Milan and Aquileia.

SECT.  
IV.  
De Rom.  
Pont., lib.  
2. c. 15,  
noted by  
Launoy.

Another letter written by the Saint in the third year of his exile is just of the same tone as the former. He thanks St. Innocent for having done all that he could, though it had not availed to check outrage. Nor does Pope Innocent's own language to the Saint suggest any relation but that of one Bishop to another. The greeting runs, "To his beloved brother John—Innocent." "You," says he, "the teacher and pastor of so many nations, need not to be reminded that the most excellent are ever tried in many ways as to whether they will continue firm and patient, and yield to no labour or trouble."

Tom. 3.  
521.

Tom. 3.  
522.  
St. Innocent's replies.

But in a letter "to the Presbyters and Deacons and all the Clergy of the Church of Constantinople, who are under the Bishop John," Innocent says, after reviewing the unlawful proceedings against him, "As to the observance of Canons we declare that those should be followed, *which were set forth at Nicea, which alone the Catholic Church ought to execute and acknowledge.*" "For it were better even that right proceedings should be condemned, than that things done against the Canons, most honoured brethren, should have force. But what can we do against such things at the present time? *The revision of a Council is necessary, which we said long ago ought to be assembled. For this alone can lay the commotions of such hurricanes:* which that we may obtain it is well in the mean time to remit the cure to the

Tom. 3.  
524.

CHAP.  
III.

will of the great God, and of His Christ our Lord. . . . We too have much in our thoughts how an Ecumenical Council may be assembled: that by the will of God these tumultuary movements may be arrested."

S. Chrys.,  
tom. 13.  
9—10, re-  
ferred to by  
Launoy.  
Testimony  
of Palladius.

Palladius the Bishop, disciple of St. Chrysostome, in his life of him, tells us that "the blessed Pope Innocent sent in answer letters of Communion to both (Chrysostome and Theophilus,) annulling the judgment which seemed to have been passed by Theophilus, and declaring that another unexceptionable Council of Westerns and Easterns ought to be assembled, from which first the friends and then the enemies of the parties should retire." And to Theophilus himself the Pope writes, "Brother Theophilus, we acknowledge both thee and brother John to be in our Communion, as in our first letters we made known our mind: and now, not altering our first purpose, we write to thee again the same, and so often as thou sendest. For except a fitting judgment follow upon such acts of mockery, it is impossible that we should without reason decline John's Communion. So that if thou art confident in the judgment, meet the Council assembling according to Christ, and there set forth thy accusations according to the Canons of Nicea, *for other Canon the Church of the Romans receiveth not*: and so thou wilt have undeniable security." Here we may observe that the Pope appeals to the Canons of Nicea, declaring them to be of universal and permanent authority, on the very same point on which we appeal to them, i. e. the rights of Metropolitans and Bishops. The holy Pope, it appears, took all possible means to obtain this Council from the Emperors Arcadius and Honorius: but, before he could succeed, St. Chrysostome died; and so the Council intended to have been held at Thessalonica never took place.

Pope Inno-  
cent's letter  
to the Patri-  
arch Theo-  
philus.

Conclusion  
from this  
history.

In this whole affair what is done and said on both sides illustrates both the previously quoted writings of St. Chrysostome, and the existing constitution of the Church, and proves that it was Episcopal, and that it was not Papal. The Bishop of the second See is intruded on and outraged by the Bishop of the third, in violation of the Canons: he appeals to a Council: at the same time he requests the three Primates of Italy, in the same words, to shew their disapproval

of proceedings intrinsically null. The Bishops of Rome, Milan, and Aquileia, do disapprove of the act of Theophilus: nevertheless the former writes to the Clergy of Constantinople that a Council is necessary: he expressly disowns the power of being able to settle such disorders. To Theophilus he writes in the same terms, and he sets himself to obtain this Council. Can a more complete picture of that Church government, which we demand, be set forth? The Popes of the fourth and fifth centuries, it seems, never imagined that the Canons of the Nicene Council were to be changed into a totally different discipline.

St. Chrysostome has further a passage about Rome which is worth transcribing; for sometimes, as we have just seen, as much is proved by what is *not* said, as by what *is* said. Speaking then of St. Paul, he writes:—

“Rather if we listen to him here, we shall surely see him there; if not standing near him, yet we shall see him surely shining near to the King’s throne, where the Cherubim ascribe glory, where the Seraphim spread their wings. There with Peter shall we behold Paul—him that is the leader and director of the choir of the saints,—and shall enjoy his true love. For if, being here, he so loved men, that having the choice ‘to depart and be with Christ,’ he chose to be here, much more there will he shew warmer affection. Rome likewise for this do I love, although having reason otherwise to praise her, both for her size, and her antiquity, and her beauty, and her multitude, and her power, and her wealth, and her victories in war. But passing by all these things, for this I count her blessed; because, when alive, he (Paul) wrote to them, and loved them so much, and went and conversed with them, and there finished his life. Wherefore the city is on that account *more remarkable than for all other things together*, and like a great and strong body, it has two shining eyes, the bodies of these saints. Not so bright is the heaven when the sun sends forth his beams, as is the city of the Romans sending forth everywhere over the world these two lights. Thence shall Paul, thence shall Peter, be caught up. Think, and tremble, what a sight shall Rome behold, when Paul suddenly riseth from that resting place with Peter, and is

SECT.  
IV.

Passage of  
St. Chry-  
sostome  
about  
Rome.

S. Chrys.,  
tom. 9. 757.  
A.

Eminence  
of Rome as  
the burial-  
place of the  
Apostles  
Paul and  
Peter.

CHAP.  
III.

carried up to meet the Lord. What a rose doth Rome offer to Christ! with what two garlands is that city crowned! with what golden fetters is she girdled; what fountains does she possess! Therefore do I admire that city; not for the multitude of its gold, nor for its columns, nor for its other splendours, but for these the pillars of the Church." Had St. Chrysostome felt like a Roman Catholic could he have stopped there? Loving Rome for possessing the blessed and priceless bodies of the two Apostles, could he have failed to mention the sovereignty of the universal Church, which together with his body Peter had left enshrined at Rome? Would it not have seemed to him by far the greatest marvel at Rome, as it has to a late eloquent partisan, that Providence has placed "in the middle of the world, to be there the chief of a religion without its like, and of a society spread everywhere, a man without defence, an old man who will be the more threatened, the more the increase of the Church in the world shall augment the jealousy of princes, and the hatred of his enemies." "This vicar of God, this supreme Pontiff of the Catholic Church, this Father of kings and of nations, this successor of the fisherman Peter, he lives, he raises among men his brow, charged with a triple crown, and the sacred weight of eighteen centuries: the ambassadors of nations are at his court: he sends forth his ministers to every creature, and even to places which have not yet a name. When from the windows of his palace he gazes abroad, his sight discovers the most illustrious horizon in the world, the earth trodden by the Romans, the city they had built with the spoils of the universe, the centre of things under their two principal forms, matter and spirit: where all nations have passed: all glories have come: all cultivated imaginations have at least made a pilgrimage from far: Rome, the tomb of Martyrs and Apostles, the home of all recollections. And when the Pontiff stretches forth his arms to bless it, together with the world which is inseparable from it, he can bear a witness to himself which no sovereign shall ever bear, that he has neither built, nor conquered, nor received his city, but that he is its inmost and enduring life, that he is in it like the blood in the heart of man, and that right can go no further than this, a continuous generation

Lacordaire,  
Sur le  
Saint Siège.

which would make the parricide a suicide." Such feelings as these are what any Churchman must habitually entertain, who looks on the Roman Pontiff as at once the governing power and the life of the Church. Could, then, St. Chrysostome have beheld in Rome the Church's heart, whence her life-blood courses over the whole body, and have seen no reason to love her for that? or have stated that she was more remarkable for possessing even the bodies of the blessed Apostles than for all other things together? What Roman Catholic would so speak now? The power of the Roman Pontiff in the Latin Communion is actually such, that Laccordaire's words respecting the city of Rome apply to that whole Church; to destroy that power would be to destroy the Church herself; the parricide would be a suicide. But how can this dogma be imposed upon us as necessary to salvation, if St. Augustine, St. Chrysostome, and the Church of their day knew it not? or let it be shewn us, how any men who did know it, could either have written as they write, or have been silent as they are silent.

SECT.  
IV.

## SECT. V.

LET us now take the commentary of another great luminary of the Eastern Church in the fifth century on the passages of Scripture which are made to support the peculiar privileges of the Bishop of Rome. St. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria from 412 to 444, says, "For this reason the divine word tells us that Peter, the chosen among the holy Apostles, was blessed. For when the Saviour, being in the parts of Cesarea Philippi, inquired, whom do men say that the Son of man is, and what report concerning Him hath gone through the land of the Jews, or the cities bordering on Judea, discarding the puerile and unseemly opinions of the vulgar, with great wisdom and understanding he cried out, saying, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, and speedily received the recompense of his true conception concerning Him, Christ saying, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jonas, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto

5. Witness of St. Cyril.

S. Cyril. de Trin. 4. tom. 5. 507. D. referred to by Mouravieff.

Matt. 16. 16, the rock the faith of Peter.

CHAP.  
III.

thee, but My Father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. *Calling, I imagine, nothing else the rock, in allusion to his name, but the immoveable and most stable faith of the disciple, on which the Church of Christ is founded and fixed without danger of falling, and remains for ever inexpugnable to the very gates of hell.*"

S. Cyril, in  
Esai., lib. 4.  
Orat. 2.  
tom. 2. 593.  
C. quoted  
by Moura-  
vieff.  
The Apo-  
stles foun-  
dations of  
the earth.

Again, "But why say we that they are named foundations of the earth? For the foundation and immoveable support of all is Christ, who upholds all, and binds together all that is built on Him solidly. For on Him are we all built, a spiritual house, jointed together through the Spirit unto a holy temple, His dwelling-place. For He dwelleth in our hearts through faith. But Apostles and Evangelists, who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, and have become a confirmation of faith, may be considered the next adjoining foundations and nearer to Him than we. For, when we have resolved that it is our duty to follow their traditions, we shall maintain our faith in Christ straight and unperverted. For, in a certain place, when the divine Peter wisely and unblamably confessing his faith in Him said, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, it was said by Him, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, calling, I imagine, the unshaken faith of the disciple the rock. And it is said too in a certain place by the voice of the Psalmist, Her foundations are upon the holy hills. Well may we liken to the holy hills the holy Apostles and Evangelists, whose knowledge is firmly fixed like a foundation to those coming after them, not permitting those who have been inclosed in their net to fall away to a reprobate faith."

Christ the  
Rock.  
S. Cyril. in  
Esai., lib. 3.  
tom. 3;  
tom. 2. 460.  
A. quoted  
in Oxf.  
Tertullian.

Again on the words of Isaiah, 'His place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks,' xxxiii. 16. He says, "It is surely probable that in these words our Lord Jesus Christ is likewise named to us as the Rock. In whom the Church, as it were a cave or fold of sheep, is understood as possessing a firm and immoveable mansion in well-being. For thou art Peter, saith the Saviour, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against

it. To him then, saith he, that dwelleth in this rock, bread shall be given, and the water of faith supplied; for to them that dwell in the Church Christ the Bread of life is given, from God the Father, and the faithful water of holy Baptism, making, that is, faithful and stable those that are thought worthy of it. For the grace of holy Baptism is given to those that are cleansed through holy Baptism.”

Yet more remarkable is the comment of the great Doctor of the Incarnation on the twenty-first chapter of St. John, that rich treasure-house of divine mysteries. On the words “Feed My sheep,” &c., he says, “Peter came to Him before the rest, as it seems, not caring for the passage in the boat, through his incomparably fervent and admirable love towards Christ. So he is the first to start forth and draw the net. For he was one ever ready, stimulated by an ardent zeal both in acting and speaking. Thus he was the first to confess the faith, when the Saviour in the parts of Cesarea Philippi inquired of them, Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am? For when the rest said, Some say Elias, some Jeremias, or one of the Prophets: as Christ asked them again, and said, But whom say ye that I am? He, that is the leader and set before the rest, again stands forward in advance of the others, and says, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. Likewise when the band of soldiers came together with the servants of the Jews to carry Jesus to the rulers, all the rest left Him and fled, as it is written, but Peter with his sword struck off the ear of Malchus. For he thought it his duty in every manner to defend his own Master, even though he made the attempt in a manner altogether displeasing to Him. When he comes, therefore, Christ asks him more severely than the rest, if he loves more than them, and this three times. Peter assents, and confesses that he loves Him, calling Himself to witness of his inward disposition. At each of his confessions separately he is told to take care of the rational sheep. Now, inasmuch as I affirm that we ought to search out the secret meaning of these things, I conceive that they were not written without purpose, but the word is again in the throes of child-birth, and there is surely some secret mystery in the sense of what is before us. For may not some one say with reason, why asked

SECT.  
V.

John 21.  
a great  
mystery.  
The renew-  
al of Peter's  
Apostolate.  
S. Cyril.,  
tom. 4.  
1118-20.

CHAP.  
III.

He the question of Simon alone, though the other disciples were standing by? And what is the meaning of 'feed My sheep,' and the like? We say then that St. Peter had been already elected to the divine Apostolate together with the other disciples: for our Lord Jesus Christ Himself named them Apostles, as it is written. But the plot of the Jews having taken place, and he in the mean time committed a certain fault, for St. Peter overwhelmed with terror thrice denied the Lord, Christ. makes good what had happened, and demands in various terms the triple confession, setting this as it were against that, and providing a correction equivalent to the faults. For one may grant that the sinning in word, and the force of a crime lying in the tongue alone, might in the same mode be wiped away. But He bids him say if he loves Him even more than the rest. For in truth, as one who had met with greater forbearance, and received the remission of his offence from a more bountiful hand, might he not with reason gather up in himself a greater love than that of the rest, and answer his benefactor with a supreme affection? For all the holy disciples shared in the crime of being put to flight, when the cruelty of the Jews inspired them with intolerable fear, and the savage soldiers, who came to seize Jesus, threatened them with a horrible death: but the offence of Peter in the triple denial was over and above this peculiarly his own. Therefore, as having received a fuller remission than the rest, he is required to say if he loves Him more. It is according to the Saviour's word, to whom much is forgiven, he loveth much. Again, the Churches are hence instructed thrice to demand confession in Christ from those who, approaching holy Baptism, make their choice to love Him. Whilst the study of this passage would instruct teachers, that by no other means can they please the Chief Shepherd of all, that is, Christ, save by making the health of the reasonable sheep, and their continuance in well being, the subject of their care. Such an one was divine Paul, being weak with the weak, and naming as the boast of his Apostolate, his joy and crown, those who through him had believed, and had made their choice to be of good report by the splendour of their deeds. For well he knew that this was the plain fruit of perfect love in Christ.

This may be seen by plain and clear reasoning. For if He died for us, how should He but esteem the safety and life of us all worthy of the utmost care? And if they, who sin against the brethren, and hurt their weak conscience, really sin against Christ, how is it not true to say, that such as train the minds of those already believing, and of those who expect to be called, unto this, and who by all manner of assistance are zealous to preserve their firmness in the faith, shew piety to the person of the Lord Himself? Therefore by the triple confession of blessed Peter, the offence of triple denial was done away. *But by the Lord's saying, Feed My sheep, a renewal, as it were, of the Apostolate already conferred upon him is understood to take place, wiping away the intervening reproach of his falls, and effacing the littleness of human infirmity.*

Add to this his account of the giving of the Apostolic Commission in these words, "As My Father sent Me, even so send I you." "In these words our Lord Jesus Christ elected the guides and teachers of the world, and the stewards of His divine mysteries, whom He bids forthwith to shine like lights, and to illumine not merely the land of the Jews according to the measure of the legal command stretching from Dan to Beersheba, as it is written, but rather all that is beneath the sun, and those that are in all countries scattered, and there dwelling. Truly therefore doth Paul say, that no one taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God. For our Lord Jesus Christ called unto the most glorious Apostolate before all others His own disciples, and fixed the earth that was all but shaken and entirely falling, revealing, as God, her foundations, and those that were able to bear her up. Wherefore He said by the voice of the Psalmist concerning the earth and the Apostles, 'I bear up the pillars of it.' For the blessed disciples became as it were the pillars and foundation of the truth: whom indeed He also says that He sends, as His Father sent Him, at once shewing the dignity of the Apostolate, and the incomparable glory of the power given to them: and at the same time, as it seems, pointing out to them the principle of the Apostolic institute. For if He thought that He should so send His own disciples, as the Father sent Him, how must

SECT.  
V.S. Cyril,  
tom. 4.  
1093. E.The com-  
mission to  
the Apostles  
to be Ecu-  
menical  
Doctors.

CHAP.  
III.

not those, who were to be their imitators, see for what purpose the Father sent the Son?" i. e. he proceeds, to call sinners everywhere to repentance.

Now it follows from this that, as truly as the Bishops of Rome descended from St. Peter, so truly the other Bishops descended from the other Apostles: and that, as, notwithstanding St. Peter's personal Primacy, they were all constituted Doctors and Teachers of the whole world, and the fulness of Christ's power deposited in them all together, so, notwithstanding St. Peter's Primacy inherited by his own See, the fulness of Christ's power continued still in the bosom of the whole Episcopate: as St. Chrysostome says, "What meaneth, 'Peter standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice and said unto them?' *They uttered one voice and he was the mouth-piece of all.*" Such is the one view found in the whole ancient Church concerning her constitution and government. Her Doctors as little imagined the absorption of all power in one See, as the Apostolate confined to the single person of St. Peter. What claims the Roman Church now? simply this, that those most awful words, "As My Father sent Me, even so send I you," were said to St. Peter and to his heirs alone. I make bold to say that the glorious Apostle would as little have accepted such an isolation, as the eleven have allowed it.

S. Chrys.,  
tom. 9. 36.  
E. quoted  
by Moura-  
vieff.

Bishops  
stand in the  
place of the  
Apostles.

Now St. Cyril in a great many places sets forth the Apostles as Doctors of the whole world, and the Rulers of the Church Catholic: and no less does he consider these functions as continued in the Bishops their successors generally, and not restricted to one Bishop the successor of one the chief Apostle. The Patriarch Dan, he says, signifying a Judge, "may set forth in his own person the glorious and renowned choir of the holy Apostles, who are set for the government of believers, and have been by Christ Himself appointed to judge. For divine Paul saith, 'Know ye not that we shall judge Angels, how much more things that pertain to this life.' Now according to the Scriptures there is one Judge and Legislator Christ. But if the Apostles are ambassadors for Christ, and the word of reconciliation is placed in them, it is nothing strange, if they be considered Judges according to their likeness unto Christ. In a certain

S. Cyril,  
Glaphyror.  
in Gen., lib.  
7. tom. 1.  
pars 2.  
p. 228.

place the great Isaias hath cried out to us, setting forth S E C T.  
 clearly both the godlike kingdom of Christ Himself, and this V.  
 same preaching of the holy Apostles: 'Behold a King shall Isa. 32. 1.  
 reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment.'  
 For in old time they that came out of the tribe of Judah  
 reigned at Jerusalem, but they that attended on the holy  
 tabernacle, and were appointed to the priesthood, were set to  
 judge. 'For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and Judgment,  
 they should seek the law at his mouth.' But when the LXX.  
 shadow of the law was as it were contracted, and the spiritual  
 and true worship introduced by Christ, the world needed  
 more illustrious judges, and the divine disciples were called  
 in to this, and took the place of the teachers according to  
 the law. Therefore unto the mother of the Jews, Jerusalem  
 I mean, was it said of God by the mouth of the Psalmist,  
 'Instead of thy fathers thou shalt have children:' that is,  
 thy children exercising judgment have taken the place of  
 the fathers: but unto our Lord Jesus Christ, 'Thou shalt  
 make them rulers over all the earth.' Which any one may  
 see accomplished. For we have had for governors, and re-  
 ceived for Ecumenical Judges, the holy disciples, by whose  
 teaching the very mystery of Christ is spoken, since these  
 are both dispensers of the saving word, and directors of  
 practice." Again,

"The divine disciples have become dispensers of our Savi- Glaphyr.  
 our's mysteries, and took not to themselves this honour: for in Lev., lib.  
 they came not to this of their own vocation, but were rather 1. tom. 1.  
 appointed to the Apostolate, and were set to offer as priests pars 2. p.  
 the message of salvation, that is, the Gospel of Christ, to 349.  
 those that are in all the world. For He distinguishes those Ἱερουργεῖν.  
 who should initiate into His mysteries in these words, Go  
 and make disciples all nations. So then yielding with great  
 willingness to the orders of their Lord, they illuminate  
 the world, having themselves for instructor their God and  
 Father in heaven, and making others partakers of the  
 grace." Again,

"He appointed the holy Apostles as it were builders and Tom. 1.  
 spiritual artizans of the Church of the Gentiles, saying, Go 330. C. De  
 and make disciples," &c. This indeed is beyond all doubt, Adoratione,  
 but then he does not restrict this office to the twelve Apo- &c.

CHAP. stles, viewing it as continued only in the single successor of  
 III. St. Peter, but considers all Bishops as invested with the

Tom. 1.  
141.

like charge. Thus, "In Christ they (the Apostles) have become Fathers of many nations, and of a countless seed, as Abraham in Isaac. But we shall make this application not merely to the holy Apostles of old, but also to those who have succeeded them in the office of the Priesthood, and in the government of Churches, or indeed to every holy and good man." Again, on St. John, x. 1, "He teaches that the preservation of their dignity shall be given to those only who are called by Him to the ruling of the people. Therefore He calls Himself the door, as introducing of His own proper will the man of understanding and piety to the leading of the reasonable flocks. But thief and robber He calls him that gets up by some other way, that by force and tyranny thinks that he can take the honour not given unto him, such as were some concerning whom He speaks by one of the Prophets, 'They have set up kings, but not by Me; they have governed, but not by My Spirit.' By these words He signifies, that if they have a pleasure in ruling the people, they must, believing and receiving the divine message, run to this through Him, that they may have an untroubled and firmly fixed government, as was the case both with the holy Apostles, and with the teachers of the holy Churches after them, by whom the door-keeper opens, that is, either the Angel that is appointed to preside over the Churches, and to co-operate with them that exercise the Priest's office unto the good of the people, or, again, the Saviour Himself who is at once the door, and the Lord of the door." And further on he says,

In Joan.,  
lib. 6. tom.  
4. 637. D.  
643. A.

"They who receive the government by the gift of God, and through Christ come unto this, with great authority and grace shall rule over the most sacred fold."

Tom. 2.  
463. B.

Again, commenting on Is. xxxiii. 21, "Look upon Sion, the city of our solemnities," he says, "For we have the Church of Christ as it were a city the type of that above, and there shall be in it rivers and broad and spacious streams. By these he signifies the holy Evangelists, the Apostles, those who from age to age govern the Churches, who like the stream of a river water the minds of believers,

bedewing them with the words of God, and infusing into them abundant consolation, that is, by the Holy Spirit. But all these rivers and streams receive one that is above all, that is, Christ, of whom it is written, The rivers of the flood thereof make glad the city of God." SECT.  
V.

Again, on the words, "There shall be upon every high mountain and upon every high hill rivers and streams of waters in the day of the great slaughter, when the towers fall," Is. xxx. 25, he says, "This, too, you must understand spiritually, for hills and mountains he calls the holy Evangelists and Apostles, and all the rest who after them have been put in charge of the holy Churches, and have been priestly ministers of the divine mysteries, who mind no earthly thing, but are as it were lifted up on high. For it is written that 'the mighty ones of God have been raised greatly above the earth:' and they pour forth the divine and heavenly word out of their mind as from a fountain, being first enriched themselves with grace from above. And this water is abundant, for many are the mountains, and as many the hills, and the stream from them is sweet, and on all sides exuberant." Tom. 2.  
431. A.  
Ps. 46. 9.  
LXX.

Now St. Bernard said expressly to a Pope, concerning St. Peter, "He could not give to thee that which he had not. What he had, that he gave, the care, as I have said, over the Churches." And Pope St. Sixtus, A.D. 433, "The blessed Apostle Peter handed down to his successors that which he received." The same, but no more. Most important, therefore, are these passages to shew how St. Cyril conceived the holy Apostles as put in common charge of the whole world: St. Peter is not their head, but Christ: and St. Peter's successor cannot be more, of divine right, in the Episcopal college, than the author and origin of his Primacy in the Apostolic. Now St. Cyril, writing, at the head of his patriarchal Council, a letter of excommunication to Nestorius, says, "Equality of honour maketh not unity of natures. Peter, at least, and John, were of equal rank with each other in that they were Apostles and holy disciples: but the two are not one person." And it is remarkable that, in his mention of the college of Apostles, their essential parity is much more insisted on than Peter's Primacy: S. Bernard.  
de Con.,  
lib. 2. c. 6.  
tom. 1. p.  
425. D.  
Epist. S.  
Xysti ad  
Joannem  
Antioche-  
num. Cou-  
stant, 1260.  
Tom. 6.  
pars 2. 71.  
A.

CHAP.  
III.

but that this latter made him anything more than a brother to them, or gave him a jurisdiction and power which they had not, is nowhere imagined. In truth that honour and power, which are now claimed for the Bishop of Rome, are everywhere given to Christ, and to Him alone, in accordance with the doctrine of the Greek Church to this present hour. Thus on Isaiah liv. 11, Behold I prepare unto thee a carbuncle for a stone, (LXX,) he says, "He speaks concerning a city which is all but seen, the magnificent and most beautiful Church of the Gentiles: and this, he says, shall appear adorned with the most precious stones. I will make, He saith, thy stone a carbuncle. By these words he seemeth to wish to signify Jesus, whom the holy Scripture declareth to be placed for the foundations of Sion, on whom if any man believe he shall not be ashamed. Here he names Him a carbuncle." . . . "So then the carbuncle is set for a stone, and for an immoveable foundation of the holy city. But on it the stones of sapphire, denoting perhaps the troop of the holy Apostles. For these are nearer unto Christ, and are become as it were foundations after Him of the universal Church. Thus saith David in the seventeenth Psalm, 'The springs of waters were seen, and the foundations of the round world were discovered at Thy chiding, O Lord, at the blasting of the breath of Thy displeasure.' For when those of Israel were rebuked, and overborne by the breath of the divine wrath, because they had been mad against Christ, the springs of the waters were seen, that is, purification by holy Baptism, and the foundations of the round world were discovered, this is again, the divine disciples, the Apostles and Evangelists." . . . "And so much concerning the commanders of the city, which the discourse portrays to us: but about the inhabitants of it what does he say? 'and all thy children shall be taught of God.'"

Tom. 2.  
766. D. 767.  
A. 768. C.

The Apo-  
stles in  
their Priest-  
hood take  
the place of  
the Leviti-  
cal Hier-  
archy.

Again, St. Cyril agrees with the Fathers generally in considering the Apostles as in their Priesthood taking the place of the Levitical hierarchy. Who then is the antitype of Aaron? Here what he says and what he does not say is equally remarkable. On a passage of Numbers in which Aaron and his sons were set over the sanctuary, he says, "You see the mystery of Christ as yet in shadows, and shin-

Tom. 1.  
452. C.

ing beforehand in types. . . . Now at that time the type was observed in Melchisedec, but in the times of Moses it is observed again in Aaron, who signifies by his own person Christ, the Priest of Priests, who directeth and is set over the holy tabernacle, that is, the Church, the holy of holies, and the God of gods, to Whom every oblation is due from us: for it is written, ‘All that are round about Him shall bring presents.’”

SECT.  
V.

Ps. 76. 11.

And, further on upon the passage, “Bring the tribe of Levi near, and present them before Aaron the Priest, that they may minister unto him. And they shall keep his charge, and the charge of the whole congregation, before the tabernacle of the congregation, to do the service of the tabernacle. And they shall keep all the instruments of the tabernacle of the congregation, and the charge of the children of Israel to do the service of the tabernacle. And thou shalt give the Levites unto Aaron and to his sons: they are wholly given unto him out of the children of Israel. And thou shalt appoint Aaron and his sons, and they shall wait on their priests’ office; and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.” St. Cyril says, “So then the Levites are assigned as in a certain way fellow-workers and assistants to the priests. For they shall keep his charge, that is, Aaron’s, and all the vessels of the tabernacle of witness, and the charges of the sons of Israel. And this is the limit of their co-operation. But over the tabernacle He setteth Aaron and his sons with him. For they shall wait, he saith, on their priests’ office, and on all the things of the altar, and those within the veil, that is, the more secret and mystical, and all which they are wont to do who attend upon the divine altar. Now the type points manifestly to Christ, Whom the Father hath set over His own house, whose house are we. And they who are joined in the priesthood with Aaron may signify with propriety the sacred and admirable choir of the holy Apostles, fellow-workers as it were, and fellow-ministers with Christ. For they became fellow-workers with God, dispensers and stewards of the mysteries of God, and also ministers, through whom we have believed. But if any one chooses to look closely into the order of the Church, he would justly admire its fore-shadowing in the

Numb. 3. 6.  
Tom. 1.  
453. C.

βαυδν.

θυσιασθη-  
ριω.  
Aaron the  
type of  
Christ:  
Priests of  
the Apo-  
stles.

CHAP.  
III.

Aaron the  
type of the  
Bishop:  
Priests of  
Presbyters.

Tom. 1.  
128. B.

Cyril, Let-  
ter to the  
Monks,  
tom. 6.  
pars 2 p.  
183. D.

law. For unto the Bishops, as those whose office it is to govern, and indeed to those who hold the lesser rank, that is, Presbyters, the altar is entrusted, and the things within the veil, to whom it might well be said, they shall wait on their priesthood: but to the Deacons this, they shall keep the charges of the tabernacle, and all its vessels, and the charges of the people." In another place he says, "Eleazar prefigures to us the one and only true High-Priest, that is, Christ." Again, what is further remarkable, he says, "The God of all appointed a long robe to be made for Aaron, wrought out in divers colours: a dress this befitting the High Priesthood alone, and assigned to it. Now on the breast of the High-Priest were hanging certain stones in number twelve, in the midst of which were placed again two other stones, Manifestation and Truth. Now by these the choir of the holy Apostles was darkly shewn, which girdles around Emmanuel, who is Manifestation and Truth: for He hath manifested to us the truth, removing the worship which was in shadows and types." According to St. Cyril, therefore, Aaron and his sons are a type of Christ and the Apostles, and again, of the Bishop and his Presbyters: but of that analogy so often drawn out in later times by the defenders of Ecclesiastical monarchy between the Jewish High-Priest, and the Pope, St. Cyril is profoundly silent, as are all the Fathers of his age. That the Christian Church is a continuation of the Jewish, carrying on the old forms, but turning them into substance, "not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life," which from the High-Priest streams over to all His members, this we firmly believe: this St. Cyril has carried out in detail in one of his works, but this leads not to the Papal, but to the Episcopal, constitution of the Church.

St. Cyril's  
actions cor-  
roborate his  
teaching.

Further, the actions of St. Cyril come in fully to corroborate his doctrine. When in the year 412 he succeeded his uncle Theophilus as Patriarch of Alexandria, that whole Patriarchate, as well as those of Antioch and Constantinople, had been for nearly eight years out of Communion with Rome, in consequence of the persecution of St. John Chrysostome. Pope St. Innocent had nobly defended his cause, but he was unable to prevent the whole East taking a contrary course,

and he accordingly removed them from his Communion. But did they in consequence yield? Did they acknowledge such an authority in the Bishop of Rome, even at the head of his Council, or of the whole West, that what he ruled to be right was right: and that, if they disobeyed him, and in consequence were excluded from his Communion, they endangered their salvation? If we may judge from their actions no such notion ever occurred to their minds. Rather than replace the name of St. John Chrysostome in the Diptychs they suffered the East and West to be divided for years. Alexander of Antioch was the first who in the year 414 placed St. Chrysostome's name in the roll of Bishops, and restored Communion with Rome. After some little time Atticus of Constantinople did the same, and we have a letter of his to St. Cyril, excusing himself for this course, as done unwillingly, and to gain many persons at Constantinople, as well as to restore peace throughout the world. It is plain from the writer's tone that he had no notion of any superior authority in Rome: he speaks of the *Canon*, as what both he and St. Cyril alike respected. Still more remarkable is St. Cyril's answer from its bold uncompromising tone. By the act of Atticus he was left alone with his Patriarchate in opposition to Rome. Yet he speaks even contemptuously of the little gain Atticus would derive from his conduct. "Carefully viewing and considering with myself if they who have done this," (i. e. replaced St. Chrysostome's name in the Diptychs,) "are following the decisions of the Fathers of Nicea, and directing the mind's eye a little towards that great Council, I behold the whole assembly of those holy Fathers as if by their looks refusing, and with all their power preventing me from agreeing with this." Here was the Canon of the Church, and the Council of Nicea, as St. Cyril thought, on one side, and the authority of Rome and the West on the other. We see to which he considered himself bound. Further on he says, "Whom then to save, or to bring back to your assemblies, do you place out of the Church's boundaries all Egypt, Augustalis, Thebais, Libya, and Pentapolis, and grieve so many Churches? To gain nobody: for the grace of the Saviour hath already gained all. And I ascribe the labour in this to the instructions of your Piety. Do not then impute to yourself those

SECT.  
V.

S. Cyril,  
tom. 6.  
201-3.

His letter  
to Atticus.

S. Cyril,  
tom. 6. 204.  
A. 205. C.  
206. B. D.

CHAP.  
III.

who are divided out of a contentious disposition, and who do not receive the just judgment passed on him. For does your Piety think that we are so remiss as not zealously to endeavour to make ourselves acquainted both with your good reputation, and how the flocks of the Saviour are directed? For one is the solicitude of Priests, though we be divided in position." (These remarkable words may be considered an expression of St. Cyprian's famous sentence, "The Episcopate is one, of which each enjoys full possession.") "But not to seem tedious on this matter, or opposed to the wishes of your Piety, grant that there are some very few seditious, who still hold out in behalf of his wickedness. As many Churches are there on my side, who maintain that the decision in his case should hold good." Thus trying to persuade Atticus to continue his resistance to Rome he says, "Grant that a few are displeased at this: permit me to say openly, we desire indeed the salvation of all, but if any one out of his own ignorance separates, and resists the laws of the Church, what is that man's loss?" "We may say with Paul to those that resist, We beseech you in Christ's behalf, be ye reconciled with God. But the disobedient let us leave to the power of God, saying, We have healed Babylon, and she was not cured. We left her because her judgment has drawn nigh to heaven. It is not seemly, then, that because of the contradiction of some men, if some there be, the laws of the Church should be as it were shaken from their foundations, when a layman is ranked with those who have had the priestly dignity, and put in equal honour. For let not some men call this an *ecumenical peace*, but rather a *concession*." Unwillingly, and when his two other colleagues had for some time given way, did St. Cyril replace St. Chrysostome's name in the Diptychs, and so re-enter into Communion with the West. This is believed to have been in the year 418, six years after his accession. In the mean time, according to modern Roman maxims, he put his own salvation, and that of all those committed to his charge, into peril. Now that St. Cyril may have been wrong on a question of fact, as St. John Chrysostome's condemnation, I can well imagine, as St. Cyprian was wrong on the question of Baptism. But that a Patriarch of Alexandria, Saint and

Inference  
from St.  
Cyril's con-  
duct.

Doctor, was ignorant of the Church's constitution, or acted in defiance of it for years, and expressed no contrition when he retraced his course, this I cannot believe. The simple truth is, which is as plain as the day in the whole matter, that St. Cyril felt himself as completely and independently the head of the Alexandrine Patriarchate, as St. Innocent was of the Roman; and that he had no superior but the Canon of the Church, and an Ecumenical Council. And the conduct of the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch, and of the Emperors who supported all three, proves the same.

It is curious to put beside this narrative Mr. Newman's approving quotation from Bellarmine. "All Catholics agree . . . that the Pope, when determining anything in a doubtful matter, whether by himself, or with his own particular Council, *whether it is possible for him to err or not, is to be obeyed* by all the faithful."

Mr. Newman on Development, p. 125.

If any one chooses to take the final yielding of Alexander of Antioch, Atticus of Constantinople, and St. Cyril of Alexandria, in a question of fact, for an "actual exemplification of the monarchical principle in the fourth" (here the fifth) "century," of which Mr. Newman speaks, I think he must be very hard driven by a theory, besides having the most unlimited confidence in his power of arranging the facts of history.

On Development, p. 170.

Twelve years later St. Cyril shewed by his conduct towards an heretical successor of Atticus, that his care was not confined to the limits of his own Patriarchate, ample as was its extent, or almost sovereign his authority therein: but that in truth "the solicitude of Priests is one, though they be divided in space." After in vain endeavouring by private remonstrances to check the heresy of Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, he wrote to St. Celestine of Rome, informing him both of what he had done, and of the sayings and proceedings of Nestorius. In this letter he observes: "I confess I was minded to shew him, by a letter from my Council, that, if he says such things, and is so minded, we cannot communicate with him: this indeed I have not done, but considering that it is our duty to lend a hand to those that slip, and to raise them up as brothers that have fallen, I exhorted him by letters to abstain from such evil words: but I

Conduct of St. Cyril in the case of Nestorius.

S. Cyril, tom. 6. Epistolæ, p. 37. B. Letter to Pope Celestine.

S E C T.  
V.

CHAP.  
III.

did no good." Thus St. Cyril says it was open for him to have cut off Nestorius from his Communion, though a Patriarch like himself, without first writing to Rome: however, considering the extreme danger of the crisis, from the position of Nestorius, and the great importance of united action when the criminal was so powerful, he thought it best to inform

P. 36 C. D. Celestine of everything. He had already said, "But since God demands from us watchfulness in these matters, *and the ancient customs of the Churches persuade us to communicate them to your Holiness*, I cannot but write, signifying this, that Satan is throwing all into confusion," &c. "And I have written nothing concerning him that is now at Constantinople, ruling the Church there, *either to your Holiness, or to any other of our fellow-ministers*, believing that rashness in such things is not without censure." He concludes: "We therefore that are entrusted with the dispensation of the word, and the security of the faith, what shall we answer in the day of judgment if we keep silence in such a case? Yet we do not confidently shut ourselves out from his Communion before making known these matters to your Piety. Wherefore have the goodness to set forth your sentence, whether we should communicate with him, or boldly reject him on the ground that with one so minded and so teaching no one communicates. But the view of your Piety in this case should be made known by letter to the most pious and religious Bishops of Macedonia, and to all those in the East. For we shall give them an opportunity which they desire, that we may all stand with one soul and one mind, and contend for the right Faith which is assaulted."

St. Cyril's letter indicates that he was writing to a person of the like rank with himself, but who from his position at the head of the whole West was of even greater influence, and whose consent in such a proceeding was proportionably necessary; i. e. the idea of his letter is the Patriarchal, and is not the Papal.

On receiving St. Cyril's account, besides the homilies of Nestorius himself, Pope Celestine held a Council, the result of which he writes to St. Cyril, warmly approving the course he had taken, and he concludes his letter thus:

"Wherefore *joining the authority of our See to your own,*

and using with authority our stead and place, execute this sentence with strict severity : namely, that unless within ten days, to be numbered from the receipt of this our admonition, he anathematises in express words his wicked doctrine, and promises that he will hold for the future that faith concerning the generation of Christ our God, which both the Roman Church, and that of your Holiness, and the universal Christian religion preaches, your Holiness shall immediately provide for that Church : and he shall understand that he is entirely severed from our body, as one who has rejected all treatment of his physicians, and madly spreading like a pestilent disease through the whole body of the Church, has endeavoured to overwhelm in utter destruction as well himself as all that are intrusted to him. We have written in the same terms likewise to our holy brethren and fellow-Bishops, John" (of Antioch), "Rufus" (of Thessalonica), "Juvenal" (of Jerusalem), "and Flavian" (of Philippi) : "in order that our sentence, or rather the divine sentence of Christ our Lord, concerning him, may be made known to more."

SECT.  
V.

The sentence thus solemnly promulgated by the Pope, the First Patriarch, at the head of his Council, accepted by the third Patriarch, at the head of his Council, committed to him for execution, and duly delivered to the criminal, became afterwards a dead letter, simply through the convocation of the third Ecumenical Council, by the Emperor Theodosius the younger. The cause of Nestorius, as I shall afterwards shew, was heard there *de novo*, as if no papal sentence had been issued against him : St. Cyril in person, and St. Celestine by his legates, Arcadius and Projectus, Bishops, and Philip, Presbyter, taking a main part in the whole proceeding. No man can doubt where the sovereign power of the Church lay in 431.

Suspension  
of the sen-  
tence.

How little St. Cyril imagined that Pope Celestine's authority absorbed or originated his own, we may see by a letter in which he notifies the above sentence to the monks at Constantinople. It is addressed thus : "To the most pious and religious fathers of monasteries in Constantinople, Cyril and the holy Synod assembled at Alexandria send greeting in the Lord." Then after expressing a wish that Nestorius "had chosen the faith handed down of old to the Churches from the holy Apostles and Evangelists, who became the

S. Cyril,  
tom. 6.  
Epist.,  
p. 80. D.  
Letter to  
Monks of  
Constanti-  
nople.

CHAP. III. lawful stewards of the mysteries of Christ, and were appointed to minister as Priests His Gospel to those that are in the whole earth," he proceeds, "Since he has continued in the same sentiments, or even worse, adding even blasphemy to blasphemy, and introducing altogether strange and foreign dogmas, which the holy Catholic Church hath not at all known, we have thought fit to admonish him with a third letter, namely this, *which is sent forth from us, and from our most holy and religious brother and fellow-minister Celestine, Bishop of Great Rome<sup>h</sup>,*" &c.

Letter to  
John of  
Antioch.

His letter to John, Patriarch of Antioch, sets forth the reason he had for applying to Rome, and exhibits incidentally the relation of the Patriarchs to each other, for which reason I give it entire.

S. Cyril,  
tom. 6.  
Epist.,  
P. 42-4.

"Your Piety has surely learnt from many sources the present state of the holy Church of Constantinople, in what confusion it has been thrown, and how many even of the very good and upright have been debarred from Communion, enduring no slight disturbance in the matter of the Faith itself, in consequence of words spoken in the very Church by the most reverend Bishop Nestorius, whom I have by letter advised to abstain from such unhappy and perverted inquiries, and to follow the Faith of our fathers. But he took me for an enemy in writing this, and was so far from listening to one who wrote thus to him in affection, as to think that with such a mind and such words he could pre-occupy even the ears of the Romans. For certain strange things has he written, arranged in a long letter, to my Lord the most reverend the Bishop of the Church of the Romans, Celestine. Moreover he has inserted in his own writings against those who are

<sup>h</sup> An expression is quoted by Roman Catholics in favour of the Papal Supremacy which occurs in a homily ascribed to St. Cyril. The homily is found in one manuscript only, and bears a remarkable similitude to another which is contained in the acts of the Council of Ephesus, and was undoubtedly delivered by the Saint. The sentence as it stands is strikingly ungrammatical, and runs thus: "In proof that these things are really so, let us produce a witness worthy of credit, the most holy, and Archbishop of the whole world, the both Father

and Patriarch Celestinus, *him* of the great city of Rome."—Tom. 6. 384. E. It is evident from the ungrammatical state of the sentence that no reliance can be placed on the exact collocation of the words. In the homily of which I suspect this to be another copy, at the parallel place, the appeal runs, "Receive as witness the honourable and holy Archbishop of Great Rome, Celestine."—Tom. 6. 358. B. Whether St. Cyril considered the Pope 'Archbishop of the whole world' may be judged by his letter to Atticus above quoted.

opposed in belief to himself, that they do not shudder to call the holy Virgin Mother of God. He has besides sent quaternions of his own commentaries, which the most reverend Bishops who were then in the great city of Rome read, and after holding many Councils, cried out against him, plainly declaring that he had invented a most dangerous heresy, which had been invented by none in former times.

“Since then I was constrained upon his writing these things thither, to set forth all that had happened, and also to send copies of the letters I had written to him, the beloved deacon Poseidonius, a clerk of the Alexandrine Church, was obliged to travel thither. Whereupon, after his commentaries had been read in the Council, especially his letters, in which there is no opportunity of misrepresentation, inasmuch as they bear his own subscription, the holy Council of the Romans has given a plain decision, and has also written to your Piety *in terms which all must comply with who hold to Communion with all the West*. For they have also written copies to Rufus, the most reverend Bishop of Thessalonica, and to some others of the reverend Bishops of Macedonia, *who always agree with their decisions*. They have no less written to Juvenal, most reverend Bishop of the Church of *Æliæ*, (Jerusalem.) It is the duty therefore of your Piety to consider what is expedient. For we shall follow the judgment given by it (the Council), *fearing to lose the Communion of so many*, and they not indignant at any light matter, nor thus moved or passing judgment on small things, but in behalf of the Faith itself, and the Churches that are everywhere in disturbance, and for the edification of the people. Salute the brotherhood with you: that with me salutes you in the Lord.”

Value of  
the Pope's  
Communion.

To Juvenal of Jerusalem St. Cyril writes in like terms, adding: “Since then the above-mentioned most pious and reverend Bishop of the Church of the Romans, Celestine, has written openly concerning him, and has sent to me the letters, I thought that I should forward these, and invite by letter to a holy zeal your Piety that is of itself alive and vigorous: in order that with one spirit and accordant earnestness we may gird ourselves for the defence of the love of Christ, and save the flocks that are in danger, and raise up so illustrious

S. Cyril,  
tom. 6.  
Epist.,  
p. 66. E.  
Letter to  
Juvenal of  
Jerusalem.

CHAP. III. a Church: being, that is, all of one mind with each other, and writing both to him and to the flocks according to the form set forth."

Lastly, in his celebrated letter of excommunication to Nestorius, St. Cyril thus delivers his sentence. It is addressed,

S. Cyril,  
tom. 6.  
Epist.,  
p. 68.

"To the most pious and reverend our fellow-minister Nestorius, Cyril and the Council assembled at Alexandria out of the Egyptian Diocese (Patriarchate), greeting in the Lord."

Sentence of  
Nestorius.

"Therefore, together with the holy Council assembled in great Rome under the presidency of our most holy and reverend brother and fellow-minister the Bishop Celestine, we notify to you by this third letter, charging you to abstain from such stupid and perverted dogmas as you hold and teach, and to choose the right Faith which has been delivered down to the Churches from the beginning, through the holy Apostles and Evangelists, who have been eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. And if your Piety does not so, according to the time set forth in the letter of the above-mentioned our most holy and reverend brother and fellow-minister, Celestine, Bishop of the Church of the Romans, know that you will have no portion or place with us, or rank among God's Priests and Bishops. For we may not overlook Churches thrown into such confusion, and populations scandalized, and the right Faith set aside, and flocks scattered by you who were bound to save them, had you been with us a lover of the right doctrine, following on the steps of the holy Fathers' piety. But with all, both laymen and clerks, who have been separated by your Reverence on account of the Faith, or deposed, we all are in Communion. For it is not just that those who are of a right mind should be injured by your decision, in that, doing well, they have contradicted you. For this very thing you mentioned in your letter written to the most holy Celestine of great Rome, our fellow-Bishop. But it will not be sufficient for your Reverence merely to agree to the symbol of the Faith which was once set forth through the Holy Spirit, by the great and holy Council which formerly assembled at Nicea. For though professing to agree with the words, you have put not a correct but a distorted meaning and interpretation upon them. But you

must in express words solemnly declare that you anathematise these your foul and profane opinions, and will hold and teach as we all do, *the Bishops and Doctors, and Heads of the people in the West and the East.* And both the holy Council at Rome hath agreed, and we all, with the letters written to your Reverence by the Church of the Alexandrians, as being correct and blameless. And we have subjoined to these our letters what you must hold and teach, and from what abstain. For this is the Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, with which all orthodox Bishops both of the West and East agree." &c.

SECT.  
V.

This sentence, however, was, as I have said, entirely suspended by the convocation of an Ecumenical Council. That Council was held, and Nestorius therein legitimately condemned. Yet John of Antioch, with his Bishops, through jealousy as it would seem of St. Cyril, though present at Ephesus part of the time, separated himself from the Council, and held in fact another Council against it. In consequence he and his Patriarchate became separated from Rome, Alexandria, and Constantinople for about two years. The following letter expresses their reconciliation.

"To our most holy and reverend brethren and fellow-ministers Sixtus" (of Rome), "Cyril" (of Alexandria), "and Maximianus" (of Constantinople), "John and all the rest who are with me, greeting in the Lord.

S. Cyril,  
tom. 6.  
Epist., p. 99.  
John of  
Antioch's  
letter to the  
other Pa-  
triarchs.

"To excel in the right Faith, and so to teach the people placed under their hand, should be the study and aim of all who have received the Priesthood, and been entrusted with the divine ministry of the Episcopate by Christ the Saviour of us all. This being so, in the past year by a decree of the most pious and Christian Emperors a holy Council of most religious Bishops was convened to the metropolis of the Ephesians, on the matter of Nestorius. They having sat together with the Legates sent by Celestine of blessed memory, who was Bishop of the holy Church of the Romans, deposed the above-mentioned Nestorius, as teaching a profane doctrine, and having given offence to many, and not walking straight in the Faith. We also, who attended thither, and then found this done, were grieved at it. For this cause a difference having arisen between us and the

CHAP.  
III.

holy Council, and much having been done and said in the meantime, we returned to our own Churches and cities, not then agreeing with the holy Synod in subscription to the vote of deposition passed against Nestorius, but the Churches being set at variance. Since, then, all should have most care for their being united, by the removal of all variance between them, and as the most pious and Christian Emperors have decreed that this should be, and have therefore sent the most excellent tribune and notary Aristolaus, it has been agreed for the removal of all contention, and that peace may be given to the Churches of God, that we too should agree to this sentence of the holy Council, passed against Nestorius, and should hold him for deposed, and should anathematise his blasphemous doctrines, inasmuch as the Churches with us have ever held the right and pure faith, as hath your Holiness, and ever guard this and hand it down to the people. We also agree to the ordination of the most holy and reverend Bishop of the holy Church of Constantinople, Maximianus, and we are in Communion with all the most reverend Bishops throughout the world, as many as hold and keep the orthodox and blameless Faith."

Thus jealously did John of Antioch, at the head of the Bishops of his Patriarchate, maintain his independence, even in the face of the other three great divisions of the Church.

Interference  
of St. Cyril  
in the Pa-  
triarchate  
of Antioch.

I must now give two instances in which St. Cyril interfered in the ordinary government of his brother Patriarchs, inasmuch as it is upon certain cases, precisely similar, of the Roman Pontiff's interference with the East, that the proof of his universal Supremacy is built. Thus a complaint against St. Dionysius of Alexandria, made to St. Dionysius of Rome, is mentioned by Mr. Newman. The importance of the fact will depend entirely on whether the Roman Pontiff claimed and exercised such an interference as his single privilege. The truth is that all the Patriarchs did as much.

It seems this same John of Antioch, whose reconciliation to the great body of the Church we have just seen, gave offence to Maximus, a Deacon of Antioch, because he continued his Communion to certain favourers of Nestorius, without requiring of them an express abjuration of his heresy. This was done by John out of regard to the peace

of the Church, and he informed St. Cyril of his motive by his Deacons Cassius and Ammonius. Thereupon Maximus conceived that he ought to withdraw from Communion with his Patriarch. St. Cyril writes to him thus: "I learnt from the beloved monk Paul, that your Piety shuns up to this present time Communion with the most reverend John, because certain persons in the Church of Antioch either still hold the views of Nestorius, or have held them, but have now perhaps given them up. Consider, then, in your equity whether they, who are said to assemble, hold Nestorius's sentiments openly and shamelessly, and communicate them to others, or, though they had once a hardened conscience, now meet to repent of the errors by which they were carried away, yet are perhaps ashamed to confess their fault. Such is often the case with those who have been deceived. But if you know that they now agree with the right Faith, forget the past. For we would rather see them denying, than with shameless mind defending, the wickedness of Nestorius. But that we may not seem to love strife, let us embrace the most reverend John's Communion, making allowance for him, and as a matter of indulgence not pressing matters to the utmost against those who repent. For the matter requires, as I said, great indulgence."

SECT.  
V.

S. Cyril.,  
tom. 6.  
p. 192.

This indulgence is no other than the supreme power of dispensation exercised by St. Cyril. *οικονομία.*

The other case is more important, involving as it did the establishment of a fifth Patriarchate. Archbishop de Marca tells it thus: "The Bishop of Æliæ, that is, Jerusalem, had obtained the fourth rank by the seventh Canon of the Nicene Council: but the metropolitanical rights over Palestine had been preserved to the Bishop of Cæsarea. Juvenal Bishop of Jerusalem endeavoured to gain for his See by a decision of the Council of Ephesus Patriarchal authority over the three Palestines, which he would have severed from the Church of Antioch: but he was defeated. However by a rescript of Theodosius the administration of the Palestines, Phœnicia, and Arabia, was entrusted to him, as is clear from the Council of Chalcedon, by whose decree concord was established between the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople, and Cyril of

Establishment of a fifth Patriarchate. De Concord., &c., lib. 3. c. 13. § 9.

CHAP.  
III.

Alexandria, had given their consent to the rescript of Theodosius, and received the Bishop of Jerusalem into their Communion under the title of Archbishop, and administrator of the Palestines. Gennadius a Priest and Archimandrite was deeply offended at this, for the violation of the seventh Nicene Canon, and so abstained from the Communion of Proclus." On this occasion St. Cyril wrote to him as follows :

S. Cyril,  
tom. 6. 191.  
Interference  
with the  
Patriarch-  
ate of  
Constanti-  
nople.

"I do not now learn, but have long known, the earnest piety of your Reverence, who is minded to live with such close observance, and greatly do I praise it. But an indulgent allowance sometimes forces men a little out of the strict path of right, for a greater gain. Just as a crew, under pressure of a storm, when the ship is in danger, in their distress throw part of the freight overboard to save the rest. So we, in practical matters, when it is not in our power to preserve the abstract right, pass over some things, not to suffer the loss of all. This I write upon learning that your Piety has taken offence against our most holy and reverend brother and fellow-minister the Bishop Proclus, for having received into his Communion the Bishop of *Æliæ*; whom the laws of the Church do not recognise as set over Palestine: but his own empty vain-glory, which will have a sad result, spurs on to the unbounded desire of this matter. Let not then your Piety avoid Communion with the most holy and reverend Bishop Proclus: for I have acted jointly with his Holiness in the matter, and it is a point of dispensation, which no wise man has ever rejected."

St. Proclus  
and St. Cy-  
ril act as  
supreme  
authorities.

St. Proclus and St. Cyril act completely as supreme authorities in this matter, which both altered a Nicene Canon, and established a fifth Patriarchal Chair. They do not first ask the consent of the Roman Patriarch. It is the more remarkable because St. Cyril had formerly written to St. Leo, when Archdeacon of Rome, reprehending the ambition of Juvenal in this very matter. And, two years after the Council of Chalcedon had finally ratified the new Patriarchate, St. Leo wrote to Maximus of Antioch: "Let it be sufficient to pronounce as a general rule, that if any thing has either been attempted, or seems for a time to be extorted, by any one, in any Council, against the statutes of the Nicene Canons, it can inflict no prejudice on those inviolable

S. Leo, Ep.  
119. cap. 4.

decrees: and it will be easier that the compacts made by any agreements be annulled, than that the rules of the aforementioned Canons be in any respect corrupted." In this case, however, as in the case of the second rank of the Patriarch of Constantinople, his resistance was vain: the Bishop of Jerusalem exercised the power of a Patriarch, from that time forward.

SECT.  
V.

Again, when some persons were trying to force John of Antioch publicly to censure the name of Theodore of Mopsuestia, St. Cyril writes to St. Proclus on the subject, and recommends that by a common letter they should state, as a matter of dispensation, and for the peace of the Church, that the name itself of Theodore should not be mentioned.

Another instance of general superintendence in the Patriarchs.

Instances, therefore, of this kind, which prove the general superintendence over the Church exercised by the Patriarchs, do not, when brought forward in the case of the Bishop of Rome, in the least prove his Supremacy as now claimed.

On the whole I may ask whether it is possible to set forth more distinctly than do these several documents that very constitution of the Church Catholic, for which the Church of England, amid all her isolation, is a witness.

SECT. VI.

To resume, then, both the testimony of St. Cyril, and of the other great Fathers of the East and West.

The Papal claim has in late ages been grounded on certain palmary passages of Holy Writ, viz., Matt. xvi. 15—19; Luke xxii. 31-2; and John xxi. 15—17. "We are met," says Mr. Newman, "by certain announcements in Scripture, more or less obscure, and needing a comment, and claimed by the Papal See as having their fulfilment in itself." These are "not precepts merely, but prophecies and promises, promises to be accomplished by Him who made them, prophecies to be interpreted by the event,—by the history that is of the fourth and fifth centuries, though they had a partial fulfilment even in the preceding period, and a still more noble development in the middle ages." With regard to the develop-

Scriptures claimed for the Roman See.

On Development, p. 171-2.

CHAP.  
III.

What the prerogatives of Rome are which the fourth and fifth centuries allow.

On Development,  
p. 178.

Ib., p. 23.

1. As to these passages of Scripture.

ment in the middle ages of this doctrine there can be no doubt, that is, *as to the West*, though *never* in the East, which alone vitiates Mr. Newman's inference: but as to the fourth and fifth centuries, having through fourteen pages collected instances of the high esteem which was felt for the Apostolical See of Rome, from the Council of Nicea downwards, which instances, being chiefly the words of Popes in support of their own See, yet exactly fit into and agree with the Patriarchal and Episcopal system, *and do not at all bear out or exemplify the Papal*, Mr. Newman is bold enough to say at the end, "*More ample testimony for the Papal Supremacy* is scarcely necessary than what is contained in these passages: the simple question is, whether the clear light of the fourth and fifth centuries may be fairly taken to illuminate the dim notices of the preceding." He had already said, "The writers of the fourth and fifth centuries fearlessly assert, or frankly allow, that *the prerogatives of Rome* were derived from Apostolic times, and that because it was the See of St. Peter." The *prerogatives of Rome* which his argument requires are the pure Ecclesiastical monarchy of the present day: those which the writers of the fourth and fifth centuries fearlessly assert or frankly allow, differ not merely in degree but in kind. For my part "the clear light of the fourth and fifth centuries" is that which I wish to follow. I am ready to take St. Augustine and St. Chrysostome, and the Church of their day, as my rule not in one thing but in all things, not with an easy volatile eclecticism, which chooses what flatters the taste of the individual, and discards the rest, but with loyal affection and implicit confidence, as the undoubted manifestation of the Holy Spirit. And so I interrogate the fourth and fifth centuries, and first as to the meaning of the aforesaid remarkable passages of Scripture. They do not give a doubtful sound. I find the chief Doctors of the East and West seeing in them mysteries, and enlarging on those mysteries: speaking as men who knew that there were in Scripture unfathomable depths. No affinity have those Doctors of the world with the shallowness of modern schools, crying, with a profane application, 'he that runneth may read:' their lives no less than their words, their stern self-discipline, their watchings and fastings, shewed, how they

felt they had to deal with a length and depth and breadth and height, which transcended their intelligence, and stretched into eternity. I ask St. Augustine, St. Chrysostome, and St. Cyril, that is, I ask the East and the West, Antioch and Constantinople, Egypt and Africa, what these passages mean. They reply with one voice, that they see in them great gifts bestowed on the Church and its rulers, but they are silent as to the See of Rome. It never comes into their thoughts to observe that they do, or do not, relate to the Roman Bishop in particular, except, indeed, that they give incidentally such an interpretation of them as pointedly excludes that notion. Let us see what the Fathers ought to say, what the Councils ought to prove, what the whole Church of the East and West ought to allow, in order to establish Mr. Newman's thesis. St. Bernard has said it in unmistakeable language: it was the doctrine of his time in the West. He says to Pope Eugenius, who had been his own monk, "Come let us inquire yet more diligently who you are, that is, what person you for a time sustain in the Church of God. Who are you? A great Priest, the supreme Pontiff. You are chief of the Bishops, heir of the Apostles, in primacy Abel, in government Noah, in patriarchate Abraham, in order Melchisedec, in dignity Aaron, in authority Moses, in judgment Samuel, in power Peter, in unction Christ. You are he to whom the keys are delivered, to whom the sheep are entrusted. Others indeed there are who keep the door of heaven, and are shepherds of flocks, but you have inherited both names above the rest, as in a more glorious, so in a different way. They have each their several flocks assigned to them, while to you singly all are entrusted as one flock. And not only of the sheep, but of all the shepherds, you are the only shepherd. Ask you whence I prove this? By the word of the Lord. For to whom I say, not of Bishops but even of Apostles, were all the sheep entrusted so absolutely and without distinction? Peter, if thou lovest Me, feed My sheep. Which sheep? The people of this or that city, or region, or specified empire? My sheep, He saith. To whom is it not plain that He did not designate some, but assign all? Nothing is excepted where nothing is distinguished. And perhaps the rest of his fellow-disciples were present, when, by committing

SECT.  
VI.

They intimate great gifts to the Church's rulers. Silence as to the See of Rome.

Contrast of St. Bernard's language, De Cons., lib. 2. c. 8. He says just what is wanted for the Papal claim, and what the Fathers do not say.

CHAP. them to one, He commended unity to all in one flock and  
 III. one shepherd, according to that, My dove, my beautiful, my  
 Cant. 6. 9. perfect, is but one. Where is unity there is perfection. The  
 other numbers have not perfection but division, in receding  
 from unity. Hence it is that others received each their own  
 people, knowing the sacrament. Finally James, who seemed  
 to be a pillar of the Church, was contented with Jerusalem  
 alone, yielding to Peter the whole. But well was he there  
 placed to raise up seed to his dead Brother, where that  
 Brother was slain. For he was called the brother of the  
 Lord. Moreover, when the brother of the Lord gives way,  
 what other would intrude himself on the prerogative of  
 Peter?

“Therefore, according to your Canons, others have been  
 called to a part of your solitudine, but you to the fulness of  
 power. The power of others is confined within certain limits ;  
 yours is extended even over those who have received power  
 over others. Can you not, if fitting cause exist, shut heaven  
 to a Bishop, depose him from the Episcopate, even deliver  
 him to Satan? Therefore does your privilege stand to you  
 unshaken as well in the keys which are given you, as in the  
 sheep which are entrusted to you. Hear another thing which  
 no less confirms to you your prerogative. The disciples were  
 in the ship, and the Lord appeared on the shore, and, what  
 was cause of greater delight, in His risen Body. Peter,  
 knowing that it is the Lord, casts himself into the sea, and  
 thus came to Him, whilst the rest arrived in the ship. What  
 meaneth that? It is a sign of the one only Priesthood of  
 Peter, by which he received not one ship only, as the rest  
 each their own, but the world itself for his government.  
 For the sea is the world, the ships Churches. Thence it  
 is, that, on another occasion, walking, like the Lord, on the  
 waters, he marked himself out as the single Vicar of Christ,  
 who should rule over not one people, but all. Since the  
 Rev. 17. 15. ‘many waters’ are ‘many peoples.’ Thus while every one of  
 the rest has his own ship, to thee the one most great ship is  
 entrusted, the Universal Church herself, made out of all  
 Churches, diffused through the whole world.”

I have given this passage entire on account of the admir-  
 able manner in which it condenses and sets forth the genuine

Papal Idea: and, because it does so, it stands in the most marked contrast with the testimony of the centuries I have been considering. Had such been the divinely constituted government of the Church, the first six centuries would have borne witness to it. I assert that they have borne the most complete, manifold, and clearly expressed witness against it. We have seen it in the case of the passages of Scripture under discussion. But when I turn, besides, to other writings and the lives and actions both of these saints and others, such as St. Basil, St. Augustine, St. Cyril, and, moreover, that "keen visioned seer" tossed to and fro through the earth from Alexandria to Treves in his fifty years' confessorship for Christ, but whose glory now it is that the Athanasian faith is the faith of all Christians, I find them using expressions concerning the Bishop of Rome and the See of Rome, such as neither good reasoners, nor holy men, nor mere observers and narrators of events, could possibly have used, had the Bishop of Rome been in their eyes possessed of a power different in kind from that of all other Bishops, much less, if he had committed to him the fulness of power wherewith to rule the universal Church of Christ. And this observation is no less true of St. Athanasius, who was most deeply beholden to the See of Rome, than of St. Basil, who, during his conflict with Arianism "met from Rome with nothing but disappointment, or rather slight and want of sympathy:" no less true of St. Augustine in Africa, whose doctrine the Church of Rome especially claims to follow, than of St. Chrysostome, who was ordained by a Bishop not in Communion with Rome, and brought up in a school most opposed to her, and possessed of a See, which was, as his predecessor St. Gregory observed, the light of the East, as Rome was that of the West.

Nor can it be said that the same power was then visible in germ, which afterwards so splendidly and marvellously developed into an august and consistent whole. The power of the Roman Pontiff in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries stood on a different basis from his power in the middle ages. The difference perhaps may be summed up by saying that in the former he was Vicarius Petri, in the latter Vicarius Christi: in the former he had a more or less defined

SECT.  
VI.

Had this claim existed, it must have been set forth in the documents of the first six centuries.

2. As to the writings and actions of the Fathers.

Church of the Fathers, p. 91-2.

Difference between Vicarius Petri and Vicarius Christi; former the symbol of early, latter of mediæval times.

CHAP.  
III.

Primacy; he was the first among brethren: in the latter he laid claim to a complete Supremacy; he was exalted as a Monarch above his Councillors. A Primate is one Idea: a Monarch is another. It seems to be the great *tour de force* of Roman writers to prove the second by the first. Now granting that Mr. Newman's examples set forth the Primacy, which I admit, do not the counter examples annihilate the Supremacy which he vaunts? Is not the light of the fourth and fifth centuries, aye, and of the sixth, very clear indeed? Let his proofs of the *Supremacy* antecedent to the times of Pope St. Gregory be produced. I repeat, let a single sentence, not however torn from its context, but candidly and fairly considered by the light of that context, by other writings and actions of the time, be produced from the writings of St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nazianzum or of Nyssa, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostome, St. Augustine, St. Cyril of Alexandria, yes, or even from the 'homine Romano' St. Jerome himself, which acknowledges the present Papal Idea: that is, that the Bishop of Rome is the common Father of Christendom: that, in virtue of his succession from St. Peter, he has a power distinct and different in kind from that of his "brother-bishops and fellow-ministers," specially the great Bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and the See of Jerusalem: that his decisions in doctrine or discipline are final, and bind the whole Church; that the government of the Church lies in him, and not in the whole Episcopate, or, as Bellarmine expresses it, that "the Pope has, full and entire, that power which Christ left on earth for the good of the Church." I do not believe that one such sentence can be produced: while on the other side all the actions and the writings of these great Fathers bear witness to their belief that the Bishops throughout the Church have inherited, equally with the Roman Bishop, the power of the Apostles.

General  
view of the  
Fathers.

S. Aug.,  
tom. 10. 412.  
B. quoted  
in Fleury,  
Oxf. Tr. 3.  
98.

We may, therefore, sum up the view entertained by the great Doctors of the fourth and fifth centuries as to the relation of the Roman Pontiff to his brother Bishops in St. Augustine's beautiful words to Pope Boniface:—"To sit on our watch-towers and guard the flock belongs in common to all of us who have Episcopal functions, although the hill on

which you stand is more conspicuous than the rest." My object in these remarks throughout has been to shew, that a denial of either of these truths is a violation of the Church's divine constitution. The Papacy has greatly obscured the essential equality of Bishops; its opponents have avenged themselves by explaining away the unquestionable Primacy of St. Peter, and its important action on the whole Church.

SECT.  
VI.

## CHAPTER IV.

### SECT. I.

WHAT this Primacy was, and how it was exercised at a most important crisis of the Church, I will now endeavour to shew. Five years, A.D. 431, after the decision of the African Bishops about appeals, the third Ecumenical Council assembled at Ephesus, in the church of great St. Mary, "the holy Gospel being placed on the throne in the middle, and representing to us Christ Himself Who was present." This was the rule observed in other Ecumenical Councils, and they who with the eyes of faith discerned their risen Lord in the midst of them, were little tempted to assign *His* place to one of their own number. As to the bearing of this Council's Acts upon the present question, I prefer that here as in other cases another should speak, and he the most illustrious Prelate of France in modern times. "In the third general Council of Ephesus, and in those which follow, our whole argument will appear in clearer light, its Acts being in our hands; and there existing very many judgments of Roman Pontiffs *on matters of faith*, set forth with the whole authority of their See, which were afterwards re-considered in general Councils, and only approved after examination, than which nothing can be more opposed to the opinion of infallibility. And as to the Council of Ephesus, the thing is clear. The innovation of Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, is known;

Roman Primacy at the Third Council.

Mansi 4. 1237. C.

Bossuet's account. Def. Cler. Gall., lib. 7. c. 9 —13.

Judgments of Roman Pontiffs de Fide re-considered.

CHAP.  
IV.

how he divided into two the person of Christ. Pope St. Celestine, watchful, according to his office, over the affairs of the Church, had charged the blessed Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, to send him a certain report of the doctrine of Nestorius, already in bad repute. Cyril declares this in his letter to Nestorius; and so he writes to Celestine a complete account, and sets forth the doctrines of Nestorius and his own: he sends him two letters from himself to Nestorius, who [likewise, by his own letters and explanations, endeavoured to draw Celestine to his side. Thus the holy Pontiff, having been most fully informed by letters from both sides, is thus inquired of by Cyril. 'We have not confidently abstained from Communion with him (Nestorius) before informing you of this; condescend, therefore, to unfold your judgment, that we may clearly know whether we ought to communicate with him who cherishes such erroneous doctrine.' And he adds, that his judgment should be written to the other Bishops also, 'that all with one mind may hold firm in one sentence.' Here is the Apostolic See manifestly consulted by so great a man, presiding over the second, or at least the third, Patriarchal See, and its judgment awaited; and nothing remained but that Celestine, being duly consulted, should perform his Apostolic office. But how he did this, the Acts elsewhere adduced have shewn.

"In those Acts he not only approves the letters and doctrine of Cyril, but disapproves too the perverse dogma of Nestorius, and that distinctly, because he was unwilling to call the blessed Virgin Mother of God: and he decrees that he should be deprived of the Episcopate and Communion, unless, within ten days from the date of the announcing of the sentence, he openly rejects this faithless innovation, which endeavours to separate what Scripture joineth together, that is, the Person of Christ. Here is the doctrine of Nestorius expressly disapproved, and a sentence of the Roman Pontiff on a matter of Faith most clearly pronounced under threat of deposition and excommunication: then, that nothing be wanting, the holy Pope commits his authority to Cyril to carry into execution that sentence, 'associating,' he saith to Cyril, 'the authority of

our See, and using our person, and place, with power.' So to Cyril; so to Nestorius himself; so to the Clergy of Constantinople; so to John of Antioch, then the Bishop of the third or fourth Patriarchal See; so to Juvenal, Bishop of the Holy City, whom the Council of Nice had ordered to be especially honoured: so he writes to the other Bishops also, that the sentence given may be duly and in order made known to all. Cyril proceeds to execute his office, and performs all that he had been commanded. He promulgates and executes the decrees of Celestine; declares to Nestorius, that after the ten days prescribed and set forth by Celestine, he would have no portion, intercourse, or place with the Priesthood. Nothing evidently is wanting to the Apostolical authority being most fully exercised; but whether the sentence put forward with such authority, after a great dissension had arisen and mention been made of an Ecumenical Council, was held to be final, the succeeding Acts will demonstrate.

SECT.  
I.

“We have often said—we shall often say—that it is the constitution of the Church only in extraordinary cases and dissensions to recur, of necessity, to an Ecumenical Council. But in the usual order even the most important questions on the faith, when they arise, are terminated by the consent of the Church being added to the decree of the Roman Pontiff. This is clearly manifest from the cause of Nestorius. We confess plainly that the sentence of Celestine would have been sufficient, as Cyril hoped, to repress the new heresy, had not great commotions arisen, and the matter seemed of such a nature as to be referred to an Ecumenical Council. But Nestorius, Bishop of the royal city, possessed such influence, had deceived men’s minds with such an appearance of piety, had gained so many Bishops, and enjoyed such favour with the younger Theodosius and the great men, that he could easily throw everything into commotion; and thus there was need of an Ecumenical Council, the question being most important, and the person of the highest dignity; because many Bishops, amongst these almost all of the East, that is, of the Patriarchate of Antioch, and the Patriarch John himself, were ill disposed to Cyril, and seemed to favour Nestorius; because men’s feelings were divided,

CHAP. and the whole empire of the East seemed to fluctuate be-  
 IV. between Cyril and Nestorius. Such was the need of an  
 Ecumenical Council.

“To this must be added the prayers of the pious and orthodox; here were most pious monks, who had suffered much from Nestorius for the orthodox faith, and the expression, ‘Mother of God,’ supplicating the Emperor ‘for a sacred and Ecumenical Council to assemble, by the presence of which Christ should unite the most holy Church, bring back the people to one, and restore to their place the Priests who preached the pure faith, before that impious doctrine (of Nestorius) crept wider.’ And again, ‘We have asked you to call together an Ecumenical Council, which can most fully consolidate and restore what is tottering or even overthrown.’ Here, after the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, a firm and complete settling of the tottering state of things is sought for by the pious in an Ecumenical Council.

“The Emperor, moved by these and other reasons, wrote to Cyril,—‘It is our will that the holy doctrine be discussed and examined in a sacred Synod, and that be ratified which appeareth agreeable to the right faith, whether the wrong party be pardoned by the Fathers or no.’

“Here we see three things: first, after the judgment of St. Celestine, another is still required, that of the Council; secondly, that these two things would rest with the Fathers, to judge of doctrine and of persons; thirdly, that the judgment of the Council would be decisive and final.

“He adds, ‘those who everywhere preside over the Priesthood, and through whom we ourselves are and shall be professing the truth, must be judges of this matter.’ See on whose faith we rest. See in whose judgment is the final and irreversible authority.

Sentence of  
 St. Celestine and St.  
 Cyril sus-  
 pended.

“Both the Emperor affirmed, and the Bishops confessed, that this was done according to the Ecclesiastical Canons. And so all, and Celestine himself, prepared themselves for the Council. Cyril does no more, though named by Celestine to execute the pontifical decree. Nestorius remained in his original rank; the sentence of the universal Council is awaited; and the Emperor had expressly decreed, ‘that before the assembling and common sentence of the most

holy Council, no change should be made in any matter at all, on any private authority.' Rightly, and in order; for this was demanded by the majesty of an universal Council. Wherefore, both Cyril obeyed and the Bishops rested. And it was established, that although the sentence of the Roman Pontiff on matters of Faith, and on persons judged for violation of the Faith, had been passed and promulged, all was suspended, while the authority of the universal Council was awaited. This we have seen acted on by the Emperor, acquiesced in by the Bishops and the Pope himself. The succeeding Acts will declare that it was approved in the Ecumenical Council itself.

SECT.  
I.

“ Having gone over what preceded the Council, we re-view the acts of the Council itself, and begin with the first course of proceeding. After, therefore, the Bishops and Nestorius himself were come to Ephesus, the universal Council began, Cyril being president, and representing Celestine, as being appointed by the Pontiff himself to execute his sentence. In the first course of proceeding this was done. First, the above-mentioned letter of the Emperor was read, that an Ecumenical Council should be held, and all proceedings in the mean time be suspended: this letter, I say, was read, and placed on the Acts, and it was approved by the Fathers, that all the decrees of Celestine in the matter of Nestorius had been suspended until the holy Council should give its sentence. You will ask if it was the will of the Council merely that the Emperor should be allowed to prohibit, in the interim, effect being given to the sentence of the Apostolic See. Not so, according to the Acts; but rather, by the intervention of a General Council's authority, (the convocation of which, according to the discipline of those times, was left to the Emperor,) the Council itself understood that all proceedings were of course suspended, and depended on the sentence of the Council. Wherefore, though the decree of the Pontiff had been promulged and notified, and the ten days had long been past, Nestorius was held by the Council itself to be a Bishop, and called by the name of most religious Bishop, and by that name, too, thrice cited and summoned to take his seat with the other Bishops in the holy Council; for this expression,

Course of proceeding as to the Faith.

Nestorius summoned as a Bishop.

CHAP.  
IV.

‘to take his seat,’ is distinctly written; and it is added, ‘in order to answer to what was charged against him.’ For it was their full purpose that he should recognise, in whatever way, the Ecumenical Council, as he would then afterwards be, beyond doubt, answerable to it; but he refused to come, and chose to have his doors besieged with an armed force, that no one might approach him.

Letters  
both of  
Cyril and  
of Nestorius  
examined.

“Thereupon, as the Emperor commanded, and the Canons required, the rule of Faith was set forth, and the Nicene Creed read, as the standard to which all should be referred, and then the letters of Cyril and Nestorius were examined in order. The letter of Cyril was first brought before the judgment of the Council. That letter, I mean, concerning the Faith, to Nestorius, so expressly approved by Pope Celestine, of which he had declared to Cyril, ‘We see that you hold and maintain all that we hold and maintain;’ which, by the decree against Nestorius, published to all Churches, he had approved, and wished to be considered as a canonical monition against Nestorius: that letter, I repeat, was examined, at the proposition of Cyril himself, in these words: ‘I am persuaded that I have in nothing departed from the orthodox Faith, or the Nicene Creed; wherefore I beseech your Holiness to set forth openly whether I have written this correctly, blamelessly, and in accordance with that holy Council.’

“And are there those who say that questions concerning the Faith, once judged by the Roman Pontiff on his Apostolical authority, are examined in general Councils, in order to understand their contents, but not to decide on their substance, as being still a matter of question? Let them hear Cyril, the President of the Council; let them attend to what he proposes for the inquiry of the Council: and though he were conscious of no error in himself, yet, not to trust himself, he asked for the sentence of the Council in these words: ‘whether I have written correctly and blamelessly, or not.’ This Cyril, the chief of the Council, proposes for their consideration. Who ever even heard it whispered, that, after a final and irreversible judgment of the Church on a matter of Faith, any such inquiry or question was made? It was never so done, for that would be to doubt about the Faith

itself, when declared and discussed. But this was done after the judgment of Pope Celestine: neither Cyril, nor any one else, thought of any other course: that, therefore, was not a final and irreversible judgment. SECT.  
I.

“In answer to this question, the Fathers in order give their judgment,—‘that the Nicene Creed, and the letter of Cyril, in all things agree and harmonise.’ Here is inquiry and examination, and then judgment. The Acts speak for themselves: we say not here a word.

“Next that letter of Nestorius was produced, which Celestine had pronounced blasphemous and impious. It is read: then at the instance of Cyril it is examined, ‘whether this, too, be agreeable to the Faith set forth by the holy Council of the Nicene Fathers, or not.’ It is precisely the same form according to which Cyril’s letter was examined. The Fathers, in order, give judgment that it disagreed from the Nicene Creed, and was, therefore, censurable. The letter of Nestorius is disapproved in the same manner, by the same rule, by which that of Cyril was approved. Here, twice in the same proceeding of the Council of Ephesus, a judgment of the Roman Pontiff concerning the Catholic Faith, uttered and published, is re-considered. What he had approved, and what he had disapproved, is equally examined, and, only after examination, confirmed.

“Now these were the proceedings on Faith in the first sitting of the Council of Ephesus. We proceed to review what concerns the person of Nestorius, in the same sitting. First, the letter of Celestine to Cyril is read and placed on the Acts; that, I mean, in which he gave sentence concerning Nestorius: on which sentence, as the Fathers were shortly, after full consideration, to pass their judgment, for the present it was only to be placed among the Acts. In the letter of Celestine there was no special doctrine: it only contained an approval of Cyril’s doctrine and letter, and a disapproval of those of Nestorius; concerning which letters of Cyril and Nestorius the judgment of the holy Council was already past, so that it would be superfluous to add anything to them. Course of  
proceeding  
as to the  
person of  
Nestorius.

“But for the same reason, the other letter of Cyril being read,—that, I mean, which executed the sentence of Celes-

CHAP. IV. tine,—nothing special was done concerning that letter, but it was only ordered to be placed on the Acts.

“After these preliminaries judgment was to be pronounced on the person of Nestorius. Inquiry was made, whether what Celestine had written to Nestorius, and what Cyril had done in execution, had been notified to Nestorius; it was certified that it had been notified, and that he had remained still in his opinion: and that the days had elapsed, both which were first fixed by St. Celestine, and afterwards by the Emperor, convoking the Council. Next, for accumulation of proof, testimonies of the Fathers are compared with the explanations of Nestorius: the huge discrepancy shews Nestorius to be an innovator, and therefore a heretic. A decree is made in these words. The holy Council declares,—‘Since the most impious Nestorius has neither been willing to obey our citation, nor to admit the Bishops deputed by us, we have necessarily proceeded to the examination of what he has impiously taught: finding, therefore, partly from his own letters, partly from his discourses, that he holds and preaches impiety,—compelled by the holy Canons, and by the letters of our most holy Father, and fellow-minister, Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church,—we have come to this sentence: “Our Lord Jesus Christ, by this most holy Council, declareth Nestorius to be deprived of his dignity of Bishop.”’ You see the Canons joined with the letters of Celestine. Terms, indeed, of high honour, which tend to set forth the majesty of the Apostolic See. You see the Council carry out what Celestine decreed, and thus compelled it comes to a painful judgment, but that a new one, and put forth in its own terms in the name of Christ; and after, by legitimate inquiry, it was evident that all had been done rightly and in order.

“Finally, the sentence pronounced by the Council is written to the most impious Nestorius: ‘The holy Council to Nestorius, another Judas: know thou hast been deposed by the holy Council.’ So he, who before the inquiry of the holy Council was called the most religious Bishop, after this inquiry is presently set forth as most impious, as another Judas, and as deposed by an irrevocable sentence from his Episcopal seat: and the sentence is promulged.

Mansi 4.  
1212. C, a  
few words  
omitted.  
Nestorius  
deposed by  
a fresh  
judgment  
of the  
Council.

“Thus a most weighty matter is completed by the most weighty agreement; that same which we have asserted gives validity to everything in the Church: and the order of the judgment is plain in itself. That is, sentence is put forth by Celestine: it is suspended by the convocation of a General Council: it is heard and examined: it is corroborated by a new and irrevocable judgment, united with the authority of the whole Church. This the Fathers declare in their report to the Emperor: ‘We have removed Nestorius from his See, and canonically deprived him: highly extolling Celestine, Bishop of Great Rome, who before our sentence had condemned the heretical doctrines of Nestorius, and had anticipated us in giving judgment against him.’ This is that unity, this that agreement, which gives invincible and irresistible force to Ecclesiastical judgments.

Mansi 4.  
1240. C.

“So everything is in harmony, and our judgment is supported. For in that the holy Council approves and executes the judgment of the Apostolical See, on a matter of Faith and on a person, it does, indeed, recognise the legitimate power and Primacy of the said See. In that it does not approve of its judgment, until after legitimate hearing and renewed inquiry, it instructs us that the Roman Pontiff is, indeed, superior to all Bishops, but is inferior only to a General Council, even in matters of Faith. Which was to be proved.

“In the mean time, the Bishops Arcadius and Projectus, and the Presbyter Philip, had been chosen by Celestine to be present at the Council of Ephesus, with a special commission from the Apostolic See, and the whole Council of the West. So they come from Rome to Ephesus, and appear at the holy Council, and here the second procedure commences.

Arrival of  
the Papal  
Legates.

“Wolf, of Louvain, amongst other records of antiquity, has put forth the charge of Celestine to his Legates, and his instructions, as Celestine himself calls them. In these he charged them, to defend the dignity of the Apostolic See; ‘not to mix themselves with the dissensions of the Bishops, whose judges they should be,’ in conjunction, that is, with the Council: ‘to confer on proceedings with Cyril, as being faithful.’ We shall now review what they did, in compliance

CHAP. with these orders : and by this we shall easily shew that our  
IV. cause is confirmed.

“First they bring forward the letter of St. Celestine to the Council, in which the charge committed to his Legates is thus expressed :—‘ We have directed our holy brethren and fellow-priests to be present at the proceedings, and to execute what we have ordained.’ Hence it is evident that the Council of Ephesus was employed in executing the Apostolical judgment. But of what sort this execution is, whether it be, as they will have it, mere obedience, or by a legitimate hearing of the Council itself, and then by a certain and infallible judgment, the ensuing proceedings will shew.

Mansi 4.  
1288. D.

εις πέρας  
κελεύσθη  
πληρέστα-  
τον ἄγεσ-  
θαι.

“After reading the letter of Celestine, the Legates, in pursuance, say to the Bishops ;—‘ Let your Holiness consider the form of the letters of the holy and venerable Pope Celestine the Bishop, who hath exhorted your Holiness, not as instructing those who are ignorant, but as reminding those who are aware : in order that you may command to be completely and finally settled according to the Canon of our common Faith, and the utility of the Catholic Church, what he has before determined, and has now the goodness to remind you of.’ This is the advantage of a Council ; after whose sentence there is no new discussion, or new judgment, but merely execution. And this the Legates request to be commanded by the Council, in which they recognise that supreme authority.

“Firmus, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, answers for the Council ;—‘ The Apostolical and holy See of the Bishop Celestine hath prescribed the sentence and rule for the present matter.’ The Greek words are, ‘ hath first set forth the sentence and rule, or type,’ which expression is afterwards rendered, ‘ form.’ We will not quarrel about words ; let us hear the same Firmus accurately explaining what the thing is :—‘ We,’ says he, ‘ have charged to be executed this form respecting Nestorius, passing against him a Canonical and Apostolic judgment ;’ that is, in the first procedure, in which, after examination and deliberation, we have seen the decree of Celestine confirmed. Thus a General Council executes the sentence of the First See, by

legitimate hearing and inquiry, and not as a simple functionary, but after giving a canonical and apostolical judgment. Let the Pope's decree, as is due to the authority of so great a See, be the form, the rule; which same, after convocation of a Council, only receives full authority from the common judgment.

“It behoved, also, that the Legates, sent to the Council on a special mission, should understand whether the proceedings against Nestorius had been pursued according to the requisition of the Canons, and due respect to the Apostolic See. This we have already often said. Wherefore, with reason, they require the Acts to be communicated, ‘that we too,’ say they, ‘may confirm them.’ The proceedings themselves will declare what that confirmation means.

“After that, at the request of the Legates, the Acts against Nestorius were given them, they thus report about them at the third procedure:—‘We have found all things judged canonically, and according to the Church's discipline.’ Therefore judgments of the Apostolic See are canonically, and, according to the Church's discipline, re-considered, after deliberation, in a General Council, and judgment passed upon them.

“After the Legates had approved the Acts against Nestorius communicated to them, they request that all which had been read and done at Ephesus from the beginning, should be read afresh in public Session, ‘in order,’ they say, ‘that obeying the form of the most holy Pope Celestine, who hath committed this care to us, we may be enabled to confirm the judgment also of your Holiness.’ After these all had been read afresh, and the Legates agreed to them, Cyril proposes to the holy Council, ‘That the Legates, by their signature, as was customary, should make plain and manifest their canonical agreement with the Council.’ To this question of Cyril the Council thus answers, and decrees that the Legates, by their subscription, confirm the Acts; by which place this confirmation, spoken of by the Council, is clearly nothing else but to make their assent plain and manifest, as Cyril proposed. This true and genuine sense of confirmation we have often brought forward, and shall

What confirmation means.

CHAP. often again; and now congratulate ourselves that it is so  
IV. clearly set before us by the holy Council of Ephesus.

Not St.  
Cyril, but  
Arcadius,  
Projectus,  
and Philip,  
Legates  
from Rome  
to the  
Council.

“But of what importance it was that the decrees of Ephesus should be confirmed by the authority of the Legates of the Apostolic See, as says Projectus, one of the Legates, is seen from hence; because, although Cyril, having been named the executor of the Pope’s sentence, had executed it in the Council, yet he had not been expressly delegated to the Council, of which Celestine had yet no thought, when he entrusted Cyril to represent him. But Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip, being expressly sent by Celestine to the Council, confirmed the Acts of the Council, in virtue of their special commission, and put forth in clear view by all manner and testimony the consent of all Churches with the chief Church, that of Rome.

They repre-  
sented the  
whole West.

“Add to this, that the Legates, sent by special commission to the Council of Ephesus, bore the sentence, not only of the Apostolic See, but also of the whole West, whence the Presbyter Philip, one of the Legates, after all had been read afresh, and approved by common consent, thus sums up; ‘Therefore the sentence against Nestorius is established according to the decree of all Churches: for the Priests of the Eastern and Western Church are present in this sacerdotal assembly either in person or by their Legates.’

Mansi 4.  
1296. E.

“Hence it is clear how the decrees of the Churches themselves mutually confirm each other; for all those things have force of confirmation, which declare the consent and unity of all Churches, inasmuch as the strength of Ecclesiastical decrees itself consists in unity and mutual agreement. So that, in putting forth an exposition of the Faith, the East and the West, and the Apostolic See and Synodical assemblies, mutually confirm each other; whence, too, we read that acclamation to Celestine, in the Council of Ephesus:—‘This is a just judgment. To Celestine another Paul, to Cyril another Paul, to Celestine guardian of the Faith, to Celestine of one mind with the Council, to Celestine all the Council renders thanks. One Celestine, one Cyril: one Faith of the Council, one Faith of the whole world.’

Mansi 4.  
1288. C.

“These acclamations, then, of Catholic unity being heard, Philip, the Legate, thus answers:—‘We return thanks to

your holy and venerable Council, because, by your holy voices, as holy members, you have joined yourselves to a holy head; for your Blessedness is not ignorant that the blessed Peter is the head of the whole Faith, or even of the Apostles.' This, therefore, is the supreme authority—the supreme power—that the members be joined with each other, and to the Roman Pontiff, as their head. Because the force of an Ecclesiastical judgment is made invincible by consent.

“Finally, Celestine himself, after the conclusion of the whole matter, sends a letter to the holy Council of Ephesus, which he thus begins; ‘At length we must rejoice at the conclusion of evils.’ The learned reader understands where he recognises the *conclusion*; that is, after the condemnation of Nestorius by the infallible authority of an Ecumenical Council, viz., of the whole Catholic Church. He proceeds: ‘We see, that you, with us, have executed this matter so faithfully transacted.’ All decree, and all execute, that is, by giving a common judgment. Whence Celestine adds, ‘We have been informed of a just deposition, and a still juster exaltation:’ the deposition of Nestorius, begun, indeed, by the Roman See, but brought to a conclusion by the sentence of the Council; to a full and complete settlement, as we have seen above: the exaltation of Maximianus, who was substituted in place of Nestorius immediately after the Ephesine decrees: this is the conclusion of the question. Even Celestine himself recognises this conclusion to lie not in his own examination and judgment, but in that of an Ecumenical Council.

SECT.  
I.

Mansi 5.  
266.

“And this was done in that Council in which it is admitted that the authority of the Apostolic See was most clearly set forth, not only by words, but by deeds, of any since the birth of Christ. At least the Holy Council gives credence to Philip uttering these true and magnificent encomiums, concerning the dignity of the Apostolic See, and ‘Peter the head and pillar of the Faith, and foundation of the Catholic Church, and by Christ’s authority administering the keys, who to this very time lives ever, and exercises judgment, in his successors.’ This he says, after having seen all the Acts of the Council itself, which we have mentioned,

CHAP.  
IV.

so that we may indeed understand, that all these privileges of Peter and the Apostolic See entirely agree with the decrees of the Council, and the judgment entered into afresh, and deliberation upon matter of Faith held after the Apostolic See."

Pope Celestine's letter to the Council. Fleury, 25, 47. Oxf. Trans. See Mansi 4. 1283.

The letter of Pope Celestine, received with all honour as that of the first Bishop in the world, recognises likewise the authority of his brethren. It began thus: "The assembly of Priests is the visible display of the presence of the Holy Ghost. He who cannot lie has said, 'Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them:' much more will He be present in so large a crowd of holy men; for the Council is indeed holy in a peculiar sense,—it claims veneration as the representative of that most holy Synod of Apostles which we read of. Their Master, whom they were commanded to preach, never forsakes them. It was He who taught them, it was He who instructed them, what they should teach others; and He has assured the world that in the person of His Apostles they hear Him. This charge of teaching has descended equally upon all Bishops. We are all engaged in it by an hereditary right; all we, who, having come in their stead, preach the name of our Lord to all the countries of the world, according to what was said to them, 'Go ye and teach all nations.' You are to observe, my brethren, that the order we have received is a general order, and that He intended that we should all execute it, when He charged them with it as a duty devolving equally upon all. We ought all to enter into the labours of those whom we have all succeeded in dignity."

"Thus Pope Celestine acknowledged that it was Christ Himself who established Bishops in the persons of the Apostles, as the teachers of His Church: he places himself in their rank, and declares that they ought all to concur for the preservation of the sacred deposit of Apostolical doctrine."

The importance of this testimony will be felt by those who remember that Bellarmine specifically denies that the government of the Church resides in the whole body of the Episcopate; and that in this he is at least borne out by the last three centuries of Roman practice.

Bossuet proceeds to remark as follows:—"From this doctrine of St. Celestine we draw many conclusions: first, this, —that Bishops in the Apostles were appointed teachers by Christ Himself, not at all by Peter, or Peter's successors. Nor does a Pontiff, seated in so eminent a place, think it unworthy to mix himself with the rest of the Bishops. 'We all,' he says, 'in the stead of the Apostles preach the name of the Lord: we all have succeeded them in honour.' Whence it is the more evident that authority to teach was transmitted from Christ, as well to Celestine himself, as to the rest of the Bishops. Hence that the deposit of sacred doctrine is committed to all, the defence of which lies with all; and so the Faith is to be settled by common care and consent; nor will the protection of Christ, the true Master, be wanting to the masters of Churches. This Celestine lays down equally respecting himself and all Bishops, successors of the Apostles. Then what agrees with it: that as the Apostles, assembled on the question concerning legal rites, put forth their sentence as being at once that of the Holy Spirit and their own, so too shall it be in other most important controversies; and the Council of the Apostles will live again in the Councils of Bishops. Which indeed shews us, that authority and the settlement of the question lie not in the sentence of Peter alone, or of Peter's successors, but in the agreement of all.

"Nor, therefore, does Celestine infringe on his own Primacy in reckoning himself with the other successors of the Apostles; for as the other Bishops were made successors to the other Apostles, so he, being made by Christ successor to Peter their chief, everywhere takes precedence of all by authority of Peter, as we read set forth and acted on in the same Council.

"Thus in the third holy General Council, and in those first ages, we both prove against heretics, that the power of the Apostolical See everywhere takes precedence and leads all, and, what is of the most importance, in the name of Peter, and so as instituted by Christ. Not less do we shew to Catholics, that the final and infallible force of an Ecclesiastical judgment is seated there, where to the authority of Peter, that is, of the Pope, is added the authority and agree-

SECT.

I.

Ut sup. ch.  
14.

CHAP. IV. ment of Bishops also, who are throughout the whole world in the stead of Apostles; which alone the Church of France demands,"—and, we may add, the Church of England.

Again; compare the spirit of St. Celestine's words with the spirit that dictated the following to De Maistre, whom we might leave alone, if he were not the exponent of a theory now in the greatest vogue in the Roman Church;—a theory, indeed, which those must accept, who leave us, without any chance of modification; for it is not Bossuet's most Catholic doctrine, but Bellarmine's, which is acted on and taught now. "I do not affect to cast the least doubt upon the infallibility of a General Council. I merely say, that it only holds this high privilege from its head, to whom the promises have been made. We know well that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church. But why? On account of Peter, on whom she is founded. Take away this foundation, how would she be infallible, since she exists no longer? Unless I am deceived, in order to be something, one must first exist."

Du Pape,  
liv. 1. ch. 2.

Id., liv. 1.  
ch. 4.

Again: "We see that for two centuries and a half religion has done very well without them (General Councils), and I do not think that any one thinks of them, in spite of the extraordinary needs of the Church, for which the Pope will provide much better than a General Council, if only people knew how to avail themselves of his power."

Eighth  
Canon of  
the Council.

Hammond's  
Translation. Mansi  
4. 1469.

It must not be forgotten that this same Council of Ephesus, which allows none but heretics to refuse to the blessed Virgin the title and the honour of 'Mother of God,' confirms by its eighth Canon, or at least, its decision, the Episcopal and Patriarchal system, and bears the strongest testimony against the Roman. It runs thus: "The most beloved of God and our fellow-Bishop Rheginus, and Zeno and Evagrius, the most religious Bishops of the Province of Cyprus, have declared unto us an innovation which has been introduced contrary to the laws of the Church, and the Canons of the holy Fathers, and which affects the liberty of all. Wherefore since evils which affect the community require more attention, inasmuch as they cause greater hurt; and especially since the Bishop of Antioch has not so much as followed an ancient custom in performing ordinations in Cyprus, as those most

religious persons who have come to the holy Synod have informed us, by writing and by word of mouth; we declare that they, who preside over the holy Churches which are in Cyprus, shall preserve, without gainsaying or opposition, their right of performing by themselves the ordinations of the most religious Bishops, according to the Canons of the holy Fathers and the ancient custom. The same rule shall be observed in all the other Dioceses, and in the Provinces everywhere, so that none of the most religious Bishops shall invade any other Province, which has not heretofore from the beginning been under the hands of himself or his predecessors. But if any one has so invaded a Province, and brought it by force under himself, he shall restore it, that the Canons of the Fathers may not be transgressed, nor the pride of secular dominion be privily introduced under the appearance of a sacred office, nor we lose by little the freedom which our Lord Jesus Christ, the deliverer of all men, has given us by His own blood. The holy and Ecumenical Synod has therefore decreed, that the rights which have heretofore, and from the beginning, belonged to each Province, shall be preserved to it pure and without restraint, according to the custom which has prevailed of old, each Metropolitan having permission to take a copy of the things now transacted for his own security. But if any one shall introduce any regulation contrary to what has been now defined, the whole Holy and Ecumenical Synod has decreed that it shall be of no effect.”

It must be allowed that De Maistre has very good reasons for disliking General Councils.

As to the application of this Canon Archbishop De Marca says: “It is clear that the regulation was made not only against the Patriarch of Antioch, but also against the other Patriarchs, that they should not presume to take more power in their Dioceses, than is allowed them by the Canon and by ancient custom. The word Diocese signifies, as I have said, the Countries and Provinces put under Patriarchs. In which sense it is plainly to be received here, because the Canon puts Provinces under Dioceses. ‘But let this,’ it says, ‘be observed in the other Dioceses, and in all the Provinces.’ For which reason Theodoret in his collection of Canons,

SECT.  
I.

Application  
of this  
Canon by  
De Marca,  
De Concor.  
Sacer.  
3. c. 1. § 6.  
& lib. 1. c. 3.  
§ 7.

CHAP.  
IV.

And by  
Theodoret.

under the first head, has marked that Canon of the Council of Ephesus to prove that Patriarchs are not allowed to invade the Provinces." De Marca elsewhere quotes Theodoret's words. "Concerning the rank assigned to the Patriarchs by the Canons. And that no one of them is allowed to steal away a Province belonging to another as to ordination and administration. But that also those already stolen away should be restored to the parties wronged. See the 6th and 7th Canons of the Council of Nicea. The 3rd and 4th of the Council of Constantinople. The 7th of the Council of Ephesus."

Thus a great Father of the fifth century makes the very same application of these Canons of Ecumenical Councils which I have made, and quotes them without hesitation as the supreme law of the Church, which the Roman Patriarch had no more licence to transgress than his Eastern Colleagues.

## SECT. II.

Important  
Pontificate  
of St. Leo.

NINE years after this Council St. Leo the Great became Pope, whose long and able Pontificate will afford us the best means of judging what the legitimate power of the Roman See was, and how it tended to the preservation and unity of the whole Church. He lived at an important crisis, when the barbarous tribes of the North were about to burst over the Empire and the Church; the system of which, had it not been consolidated by himself, his immediate predecessors, and successors, might have been dissolved and broken up into fragments.

I will first shew, by a few quotations, that St. Leo had no slight sense of his own duty and dignity among his brother Bishops. We will then see how his actions, and the way in which they were received by others, supported his words.

In a sermon on the anniversary of his consecration, after noticing with pleasure the number of Bishops present, he continues, "Nor, as I trust, is the most blessed Apostle Peter, in his kind condescendence and faithful love, absent from this assembly, nor does he disregard your devotion,

S. Leo, tom.  
I. 9. Bal-  
lerini.

reverence for whom has drawn you together. And so he at once rejoices at your affection, and welcomes the observance of the Lord's Institution in those who share his honour; approving that most orderly charity of the whole Church, which in Peter's See receives Peter, and slackens not in love to so great a shepherd, even in the person of so unworthy an heir." On a like occasion,—“Although, then, beloved, our partaking in that gift be a great subject for common joy, yet it were a better and more excellent course of rejoicing, if ye rest not in the consideration of our humility: more profitable and more worthy by far it is to raise the mind's eye unto the contemplation of the most blessed Apostle Peter's glory, and to celebrate this day chiefly in the honour of him, who was watered with streams so copious from the very Fountain of all graces, that while nothing has passed to others without his participation, yet he received many special privileges of his own. The Word made flesh already dwelt in us, and Christ had given up Himself whole to restore the race of man. Wisdom had left nothing un-ordered; power left nothing difficult. Elements were obeying, spirits ministering, angels serving; it was impossible that Mystery could fail of its effect, in which the Unity and the Trinity of the Godhead itself was at once working. *And yet out of the whole world Peter alone is chosen to preside over the calling of all the Gentiles, and over all the Apostles, and the collected Fathers of the Church: so that though there be among the people of God many priests and many shepherds, yet Peter rules all by personal commission, whom Christ also rules by sovereign power. Beloved, it is a great and wonderful participation of His own power which the divine condescendence gave to this man: and if He willed that other rulers should enjoy ought together with him, yet never did He give, save through him, what He denied not to others.* In fine, the Lord asks all the Apostles what men think of Him; and they answer in common so long as they set forth the doubtfulness of human ignorance. But when what the disciples think is required, he who is first in Apostolic dignity is first also in confession of the Lord. And when he had said, ‘Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,’ Jesus answered him, ‘Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood

SECT.  
II.

Tom. i. p.  
15—19.

Peculiar  
privileges  
of Peter in  
the Apostolic  
College.

Proprie.

CHAP.  
IV.

hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father, which is in heaven:’ that is, Thou art blessed, because My Father hath taught thee; nor opinion which is of the earth deceived thee, but heavenly inspiration instructed thee; and not flesh and blood hath shewn Me to thee, but He, whose only-begotten Son I am. And I, saith He, say unto thee, that is, as My Father hath manifested to thee My Godhead, so I, too, make known to thee thine own pre-eminence. For thou art Peter; that is, whilst I am the immutable Rock, I, the corner-stone, who make both one, I, the foundation beside which no one can lay another; *yet thou also art a rock, because by My virtue thou art established, so that whatever is Mine by sovereign power is to thee by participation common with Me.* And upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: on this strength, saith He, I will build an eternal temple, and My Church, which in its height shall reach the heaven, shall rise upon the firmness of this faith. This confession the gates of hell shall not restrain, nor the chains of death fetter; for that voice is the voice of life. And as it raises those who confess it unto heavenly places, so it plunges those who deny it into hell. Wherefore it is said to most blessed Peter, ‘I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.’ The privilege of this power did indeed pass to the other Apostles, and the order of this decree reached to all the rulers of the Church, but not without purpose what is intended for all is put into the hands of one. For therefore is this entrusted to Peter singly, because all the rulers of the Church are invested with the figure of Peter. The privilege, therefore, of Peter remaineth, wheresoever judgment is passed according to his equity. Nor can severity or indulgence be excessive, where nothing is bound, nothing loosed, save what blessed Peter either bindeth or looseth. But at the approach of His passion, which would disturb the firmness of His disciples, the Lord saith, ‘Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren, that

All the  
Church's  
rulers in-  
vested with  
the figure  
of Peter.

ye enter not into temptation.' The danger from the temptation of fear was common to all the Apostles, and they equally needed the help of divine protection, since the devil desired to dismay, to make a wreck of all: and yet the Lord takes care of Peter in particular, and asks specially for the faith of Peter, as if the state of the rest would be more certain, if the mind of their Chief were not overcome. *So then in Peter the strength of all is protected, and the help of divine grace is so ordered, that the stability, which through Christ is given to Peter, through Peter is conveyed to the Apostles.*

"Since, therefore, beloved, we see such a protection divinely granted to us, reasonably and justly do we rejoice in the merits and dignity of our Chief, rendering thanks to the Eternal King, our Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ, for having given so great a power to him whom He made chief of the whole Church, that if anything, even in our time, by us be rightly done and rightly ordered, it is to be ascribed to his working, to his guidance, unto whom it was said,— 'And thou, when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren:' and to whom the Lord, after His resurrection, in answer to the triple profession of eternal love, thrice said with mystical intent, 'Feed My sheep.' And this, beyond a doubt, the pious shepherd does even now, and fulfils the charge of his Lord; strengthening us with his exhortations, and not ceasing to pray for us, that we may be overcome by no temptation. But if, as we must believe, he everywhere discharges this affectionate guardianship to all the people of God, how much more will he condescend to grant his help unto us his children, among whom on the sacred couch of his blessed repose he resteth in the same flesh in which he ruled. To him, therefore, let us ascribe this anniversary day of us his servant, and this festival, by whose advocacy we have been thought worthy to share his seat itself, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ helping us in all things, Who liveth and reigneth with God the Father and the Holy Spirit for ever and ever." I have before me similar passages in abundance; but these are enough to shew how far the teaching of St. Leo, as to his own office, agreed with, how far went beyond, that of St. Augustine. The combination of the Patriarch's, and still more of the universal Primate's, power with that of the

Present government of the Church ascribed to him.

St. Leo's teaching to be compared with St. Augustine's.

CHAP.  
IV.

Bishop, is a nice point. If this be pushed too far, it issues in a monarchy; if the other alone be allowed, it converts the one kingdom of Jesus Christ into an unlimited number of petty republics. On the one hand there is danger pregnant to the high priesthood of the Church; on the other hand, to the sacrament of unity. The one-sided development of St. Leo's teaching has produced the Papacy, in which the Bishops, who represent the Apostles, are no longer the brethren, coordinate in authority, but the delegates, of St. Peter's successor: but the one-sided development of St. Cyprian's teaching would rend into pieces the seamless robe of Christ. Yet this need not be so: in the bright days of the Church of Christ it was not so. Surely the first eight centuries of her existence are not a dream; and that beautiful image of St. Augustine not an imagination, but what he saw before his eyes: "to sit on our watch-towers, and guard the flock, belongs in common to all of us who have episcopal functions, although the hill on which you stand is more conspicuous than the rest."

The position of St. Leo in the Church.

A Pontiff so deeply and religiously impressed with the prerogatives of St. Peter's successor was likely to be energetic in discharging his duties. In truth we behold St. Leo set on a watch-tower, and directing his gaze over the whole Church: over his own West more especially, but over the East too, if need be. He can judge Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, as well as Eugubium, and is as ready too. Wherever Canons are broken, ancient custom disregarded, encroachments attempted, where Bishops are neglectful, or Metropolitans tyrannical, where heresy is imputed to Patriarchs, in short, wherever a stone in the whole sacred building is being loosened, or threatens to fall, there is he at hand to repair and restore, to warn, to protect, or to punish. But still they are brethren, they are equals, they are fellow-Apostles, with whom he has to act, over whom he presides. If Peter was reproved by Paul, and yet the glorious Apostles laboured, witnessed, fought together, and together rest in Roman earth, then may the successors of the Twelve remonstrate with, nay, reprove and resist the successor of the Chief of the Twelve. If he is Vicar of Christ, so are they. We have already seen examples of this, we shall find others, without schism.

It had become the custom of the Roman Pontiffs, at least as early as St. Damasus, (366—384,) and St. Siricius, (384—398,) to charge some one Prelate, in each Province where their influence extended, to represent the Roman Church; to report any infractions of discipline, or innovations on the Faith; to announce the election and consecration of Bishops. Thus Anastasius of Thessalonica presided over the ten Metropolitans of Illyricum in Pope Leo's name. The Primate of Arles represented him in southern Gaul; and others in Spain; and so on. It is even said, though, I believe, without grounds, that all the Primacies of western Europe were in their origin derivations thus made from the Primacy of St. Peter. An authority, which was exercised on the whole for the good of all, seems to have been generally submitted to by the Bishops of the different Provinces: doubtless every Bishop felt his hands strengthened in his particular Diocese, and had an additional security against any infraction of his rights by his brethren, when he was able to throw himself back on the unbiassed and impartial authority of the Bishop of Rome. An authority, however, which in its commencement professed to be the especial guardian of the Canons, and to protect and maintain all in their proper place, was very liable to abuse, and had an inherent tendency to increase, and to absorb the power of the local Bishops and Metropolitans in the indefinite pretensions of the Patriarch. We have seen the resistance offered to the Pope in the case of the wretched Apiarius by the African Church, and now the Church of Gaul furnishes a defender of the rights of Metropolitans against Pope Leo in one of the holiest and most Apostolical of its ancient Bishops.

St. Hilary of Arles, of noble birth, of splendid ability, having in the world the highest prospects, was converted to God by the prayers of St. Honoratus. Thereupon he sold his large possessions, and betowed them on the poor, and retired to the desert of Lerins. His friend, St. Honoratus, was shortly after made Bishop of Arles, but he could not persuade St. Hilary to remain there with him. Within three years he died, and St. Hilary, who was attending him in his sickness, hastened, as soon as all was over, to return to his monastery. But it was in vain: he was pursued,

SECT.  
II.

System of  
appointing  
other  
Bishops  
Vicars of  
the Roman  
Bishop.

History of  
St. Hilary  
of Arles.

CHAP.  
IV.

brought back by force, and ordained, in spite of himself, Metropolitan of the first See in Gaul, at the age of twenty-nine years. At forty-eight he died, worn out with the severe labours and ascetic life he had imposed on himself. The nineteen years of his Episcopate were devoted to the most incessant exertions as Bishop and Metropolitan. Unwearied in energy, unbounded in charity, gifted with extraordinary eloquence, a severe defender of discipline, yet winning others to follow where he was ready to go before himself, he becomes the soul of the three or four Provinces over which the See of Arles then presided. He is connected in some degree with ourselves, as having probably held one of the chief places in that great Council of the Gauls in the year 429, which sent St. Germanus and St. Lupus into Britain to resist the Pelagians. He belonged to the same monastery as St. Vincent of Lerins, and at the same time. It is certain, also, that he was a great friend of St. Germanus, and often conferred with him. On one of these occasions great complaints were brought to the two Saints against Celidonius, Bishop of Besançon, for having formerly married a widow, and for having condemned persons to death. St. Hilary judged Celidonius in a Provincial Council, which declared that, having been husband of a widow, he could not keep his Bishopric, and that he ought voluntarily to quit a dignity which the rules of Scripture permitted him not to hold. He was accordingly deposed.

Case of Celidonius according to Tillemont, tom. 15. p. 72. St. Hilary goes to Rome: maintains that the Church of Gaul had the same rights as that of Africa: is overborne by the Pope: and leaves Rome secretly.

“Celidonius, finding himself deposed, had recourse to Rome, where he complained that he had been unjustly condemned. It seems that St. Leo, without further examination, at once admitted him to his Communion, in which he may have followed what Zosimus and Celestinus did in respect of the miserable Apiarius, Priest of Africa. But I know not what Canon or what rule of the Church justifies such a proceeding. St. Hilary learnt this at the severest time of winter. Nevertheless, all the discomforts and dangers of this season gave way to the ardour of his zeal and faith. He undertook to pass the Alps, and to go on foot to Rome; and this he accomplished, without having even a horse either to ride or to carry baggage. Being come to Rome, he first visited the relics of the Apostles and Martyrs.

Next he waited on St. Leo; and having paid him the greatest respect he besought him very humbly to please to order what respected the state of the Churches according to immemorial practice. Persons were seen attending at Rome on the holy altar who had been juridically and justly deposed in Gaul: he was obliged to address to him his complaints of this; and, if they were found correct, besought the Pope at least to stop by a secret order this violation of the Canons. If not, he would not trouble him further, not being come to Rome to bring an action, and make accusations, but to pay to him his respects, to declare to him the state of things, and to beseech him to maintain the rules of discipline. There is reason to believe that St. Hilary maintained that St. Leo had no right at all to take cognizance of this cause as judge, meaning, doubtless, that the Church of France was in the same condition as that of Africa, and had the same power to terminate causes which arose there, without an appeal elsewhere being allowed. St. Leo even sufficiently assures us that this was St. Hilary's view; and he takes occasion from it to accuse him of unwillingness to be subject to St. Peter, and to recognise the Primacy of the Roman Church: which would prove that all the holy Bishops of Africa did not recognise it, and give heretics a great advantage. St. Leo, on the other hand, maintained not only that the Churches of the Gauls had often consulted that of Rome in various difficulties—which had nothing to do with the matter in question—but, also, that they had often appealed to the Holy See, which had either altered or confirmed judgments pronounced by them. If we may be allowed to regard the depositions of St. Leo and St. Hilary as the claims of different parties, and to examine the matter to the bottom, according to the light which history sheds on it, we may say that we do not find that the Gallican Church had hitherto admitted, up to that time, any appeal to the Holy See; and that Zosimus, having wished to claim the right of judging Proculus, Bishop of Marseilles, Proculus always maintained himself, in spite of all the efforts of this Pope. Meanwhile, as St. Leo, sufficiently jealous of the greatness of his See, found himself opposed by St. Hilary on a point of this importance, it is not surprising that he

SECT.  
II.

Celidonius  
acquitted  
by St. Leo.

CHAP.  
IV.

was susceptible of the bad impression given him of the conduct of this great Saint, as we shall see hereafter. 'I dare not examine,' says the historian of St. Hilary, 'the judgment and the conduct of two men so great, especially now that God has called them to the possession of His glory. I confine myself to saying, that Hilary singly opposed this great number of adversaries; that he was not shaken by their menaces; that he laid the truth before those who would listen to it; that he prevailed over those who would dispute with him; that he yielded not to the powerful; in short, that he preferred running the risk of losing his life to admitting to his Communion him whom he had deposed together with so many great Bishops.'

"Had St. Leo only required to have the affair reheard in the Gauls, agreeable to the Canons of Sardica, the only ones which the Church had hitherto made in favour of appeals to the Pope, St. Hilary would, perhaps, have consented; that is, if he were better acquainted with this Council than they were in Africa. But it is not apparent that such a rehearing was mentioned. And, as to suffering the matter to be judged at Rome, St. Hilary, besides the other reasons which he might have, considered doubtless with St. Cyprian that the proofs of the facts on which judgment must be made cannot be transported thither. So the Gallican Church has always maintained itself in the right, that appeals made to Rome be referred back to the spot. Though St. Hilary had protested that he was not come to engage in any dispute, nevertheless he did not refuse to take part in a conference, in which St. Leo heard him, together with Celidonius. Several Bishops were there. Notes were made of all that was said. St. Leo says that St. Hilary had nothing reasonable to answer; his passion carried him away to say things that a layman would not have dared to utter, and that the Bishops could not listen to. He adds that this haughty pride touched him to the quick, and that, nevertheless, he had used no other remedy than patience, not wishing to sharpen and increase the wounds which this insolent language caused in the soul of him who held it: that moreover, having received him at first as his brother, he only thought of soothing rather than vexing and paining him; and that indeed he did this to

himself sufficiently by the confusion into which the weakness of his answers threw him. It is clear that St. Hilary would not answer on the main point of Celidonius's affair, because he maintained that St. Leo could not be judge of it. And we must not be surprised that the Romans found much insolence in the inflexible firmness with which he maintained it. Doubtless it was this pretended insolence which caused him even to be put under guard, which may surprise us in the case of a Bishop, and in an affair purely ecclesiastical. Among the insolent and rash expressions of which St. Leo in general complains, he remarks, in particular, that St. Hilary had often demanded to be condemned, if he had condemned Celidonius contrary to the rules of the Canons. He wished, then, that we should judge others by the rule which fully justifies St. Hilary. The Saint, seeing that his reasons were not listened to, would not wait St. Leo's sentence. He preferred withdrawing secretly, while this affair was still being examined. So he escaped from his guards, and, though it was still winter, left Rome, and returned to Arles, perhaps in February (445): so that when they sought for him to speak further on this matter, it was found that he was gone. St. Leo failed not to proceed, reversed the judgment delivered against Celidonius, declared him absolved and acquitted of the accusation of having married a widow, and restored him to his rank of Bishop, which he had already done at first, without having examined the affair."

There were other accusations made against St. Hilary, into which we need not enter. St. Leo wrote a very severe letter about him to the Bishops of Gaul: he accused him "of raising himself against St. Peter, and being unwilling to recognise his Primacy, as if all those who believe that a successor of St. Peter passes the bounds of the Canons were enemies of the Primacy of the Holy See. That would be to arm against the Popes in favour of heretics a great number of Fathers, of Saints, and of Councils." The result was, that he took away from St. Hilary his rights of Metropolitan, and conferred them on the Bishop of Vicene, who had claims upon them. But this measure was so disliked by the suffragans of Arles, that he restored the See of Arles to most of its privileges under Ravennius, the suc-

Tillemont,  
tom. 15.  
p. 81.

CHAP.  
IV.

Tillemont,  
tom. 15.  
p. 83.

cessor of St. Hilary. However, this matter had even more important consequences. We will let the Roman Catholic historian, as before, describe them. "St. Leo apparently feared that the Bishops of the Gauls would not be sufficiently submissive to what he had ordered. And though he had made it a charge against St. Hilary that he had employed an armed force in affairs of the Church, for all that he recurred himself to the imperial power against him. He represented him to the Emperor Valentinian the Third as one who rebelled both against the authority of the Apostolic See, and the majesty of the Empire, and obtained of this prince, who was then at Rome, a celebrated rescript, addressed to the Patrician Aetius, general of the armies of the Empire, by which, under pretext of maintaining the peace of the Church, he forbids undertaking anything whatever without the authority of the Apostolic See, or resisting its orders, which, says he, had always been observed inviolably up to Hilarius. He orders all Bishops to hold as law all that the authority of the Pope establishes, and all magistrates to compel by force to appear before the tribunal of the Bishop of Rome all persons cited thither, if they refused to go. It may be seen by what happened about this time to Atticus, Metropolitan of Nicopolis, in Epirus, how scandalous this employment of force was, and how opposed, according to St. Leo himself, to the gentleness of the Church. Valentinian adds, that the sentence given by St. Leo against St. Hilary had no need of any one to be executed in the Gauls, since the authority of so great a Pontiff has a right to give any order to the Churches. He goes so far as to make it a charge against St. Hilary, to have deposed and ordained Bishops without consulting the Pope. He even names him a criminal of State on the score of his being charged with having employed the force of arms to establish Bishops, and to place them on a throne where they had only to preach peace. This law is dated the 6th of June, 445, and it is this which fixes the time of all this history. It is undoubtedly very proper, as says Baronius, to shew that the Emperors have greatly contributed to establish the greatness and authority of the Popes. This is not the place to make other reflections upon it; but we cannot forbear saying that, in the mind of those who have any

love for the liberty of the Church, and any knowledge of its discipline, this law will always as little honour him whom it praises as it will injure him whom it condemns. Pope Hilary quotes this law, and avails himself of the authority it attributes to the decisions of Rome." It would be presumptuous to add a word to the judgment of one who has made the first centuries of the Church his especial study. St. Hilary, on his return to Arles, made many attempts to reconcile the Pope to him, but all were fruitless, as he would not give up the point in dispute. "It seems," says Tillemont, "that he continued resolved to do nothing in prejudice of the rights he believed to belong to his Church, but that, seeing the two great powers of Church and State united against him, he remained quiet and silent, occupied only in the work of his salvation, and that of his people." During the four years he survived, he redoubled his austerities and good works: he died in the odour of sanctity; and after his death, "St. Leo, though still persuaded that he was a presumptuous spirit, calls him 'of holy memory.' Yet we have neither proof nor probability that he had restored him to his Communion, from which he had cut him off." His name occurs in the Roman Martyrology.

SECT.  
II.

Tillemont,  
tom. 15.  
p. 89.

Thus an encroachment, which had failed in Africa, succeeded through a conjuncture of circumstances, especially the intervention of the civil power, in Gaul. Of course it was made the stepping-stone to further advances. This one specimen may give us a notion how the lawful power of the Patriarch and the recognised pre-eminence of the one Apostolic See of the West had a continual tendency to develop, and won, by degrees, unlimited control over the original and acknowledged rights of the Bishops and Metropolitans. Still, even in the hands of St. Leo, this was merely an extraordinary interference. Nor must it be considered without remembering the original liberty of election still enjoyed in Gaul as elsewhere. Ravennius, the successor of this very St. Hilary, was elected and consecrated by the Bishops of his Province, who then announced it to Pope Leo, and received a congratulatory answer. He says himself to the Bishops of the Province of Vienne, "It is not for ourselves that we defend the ordinations of your

Tendency  
of Patri-  
archal  
power to  
increase

S. Leo. Ep.  
40.

Ep. 10.

CHAP.  
IV.

Provinces, which perhaps Hilarius may, according to his wont, falsely state to you, to render disaffected the mind of your Holiness; but it is for you we claim them through our solicitude." And again: "Decreeing this, that if any one of our brethren in any Province die, he who is known to be the Metropolitan of that Province, should claim to himself the ordination of the Priest."

So long as the election and consecration of Bishops and Metropolitans were thus free and canonical, the greatness of the central See could never depress and extinguish the essential equality of the Episcopate. Let it be remembered that St. Leo, with all his power and influence, consecrated no other Bishops than those of Southern Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia, which were the bounds of his proper Patriarchate; there his authority was direct and immediate; but in Africa, the Gauls, Spain, Illyricum, and the West generally, it was only properly exercised in matters beyond the range of the Bishops and Metropolitans. I suppose it is impossible to define a power which was to correct and restore in emergencies. The Bishops of the Province of Arles afterwards besought Pope Leo to restore the Primacy to Arles, and render, A.D. 450, this undoubted testimony to the Primacy of the Roman Church, and to the connexion between the rights of the Metropolitan and the Patriarch:—

Primacy of Rome stated by Church of Arles. *Ib.*, Ep. 65.

"By the Priest of this Church (Arles) it is certain that our predecessors, as well as ourselves, have been consecrated to the High Priesthood by the gift of the Lord; in which, following antiquity, the predecessors of your Holiness confirmed by their published letters this which old custom had handed down concerning the privileges of the Church of Arles, (as the records of the Apostolic See doubtless prove;) believing it to be full of reason and justice, that, as through the most blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, the holy Roman Church holds Primacy over all the Churches of the whole world, so also within the Gauls the Church of Arles, which had been thought worthy to receive for its Priest St. Trophimus, sent by the Apostles, should claim the right of ordaining to the High Priesthood."

The view on which St. Leo acted in these proceedings against St. Hilary is very plainly set forth in certain of his

letters. Thus, "To our most beloved Brethren, all the Bishops throughout the Province of Vienne, Leo Bishop of Rome. . . . The Lord hath willed that the mystery of this gift (of announcing the Gospel) should belong to the office of all the Apostles, on the condition of its being chiefly seated in the most blessed Peter, first of all the Apostles: and from him, as it were from the head, it is His pleasure that His gifts should flow into the whole body, that whoever dares to recede from the rock of Peter may know that he has no part in the divine mystery. For him hath He assumed into the participation of His indivisible unity, and willed that he should be named what He Himself is, saying, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church:' that the rearing of the eternal temple by the wonderful gift of the grace of God might consist in the solidity of Peter, strengthening with this firmness His Church, that neither the rashness of man might attempt it, nor the gates of hell prevail against it." So to his vicar the Bishop of Thessalonica, whom he was erecting into an Exarch over the ten Metropolitans of Eastern Illyricum: "As my predecessors to your predecessors, so have I, following the example of those gone before, committed to your affection my charge of government; that you imitating our gentleness might relieve the care *which we in virtue of our headship, by divine institution, owe to all Churches*, and might, in some degree, discharge our personal visitation to Provinces far distant from us; since you can readily ascertain, by near and convenient inspection, what in every matter you might either by your own zeal arrange, or reserve to our judgment." "For we have entrusted your affection to represent us on this condition, that you are called to a part of our solicitude, but not to the fulness of our power. . . . . But if in a matter which you believe fit to be considered and decided on with your brethren," (the Bishops of the Province,) "their sentence differs from yours, let everything be referred to us on the authority of the Acts, that all doubtfulness may be removed, and we may decree what pleaseth God. For to this we direct all our solicitude and care, that the unity of mutual agreement and the maintenance of discipline be broken by no dissension, nor neglected by any slothfulness.

SECT.  
II.Ep. 10.  
St. Leo's  
view of his  
own power  
as stated to  
Bishops of  
his own  
Patriarch-  
ate.S. Leo, Ep.  
14. cap. 1.  
11.Principali-  
ter.

CHAP. . . . For the compactness of our unity cannot remain firm,  
 IV. unless the bond of charity bind us into an inseparable whole ;  
 because, 'as we have many members in one body, and all  
 members have not the same office, so we, being many, are  
 one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.'  
 For it is the joining together which makes one soundness,  
 and one beauty in the whole body: and this joining to-  
 gether, as it requires unanimity in the whole body, so espe-  
 cially demands concord among Priests. For though these  
 have a like dignity, yet they have not an equal jurisdiction ;  
 since even among the most blessed Apostles, as there was a  
 likeness of honour, so was there a certain distinction of  
 power ; and the election of all being equal, pre-eminence  
 over the rest was given to one. From which type the dis-  
 tinction between Bishops also has arisen, and it was provided  
 by an important arrangement that all should not claim to  
 themselves power over all, but that in every Province there  
 should be one, whose sentence should be considered the first  
 among his brethren ; and others again seated in the greater  
 cities should undertake a larger care, through whom the direc-  
 tion of the Universal Church should converge to the one See  
 of Peter, and nothing anywhere disagree from its head."

Quibus cum  
 dignitas  
 sit commu-  
 nis, non est  
 tamen ordo  
 generalis.

Forma.

St. Leo's  
 words the  
 germ of the  
 present  
 Roman  
 system, but  
 not sup-  
 ported by  
 other parts  
 of the  
 Church.

I think it fair to admit that the germ of something very  
 like the present Papal system, without, however, such a  
 wonderful concentration and absorption of all power, is dis-  
 cernible in these words. I shall give further on Bossuet's  
 interpretation of their most remarkable expression. But it is  
 also certain that such is not the view of the Church's govern-  
 ment set before us by St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, St. Vincent  
 of Lerins, and the Fathers generally, especially those of the  
 Greek Church, nor the one supported by the acts of the  
 ancient Church. There is a very distinct tone in the teaching  
 and acts of St. Leo, and the other Popes generally, from that  
 of the contemporary Bishops and Fathers who had not suc-  
 ceeded to St. Peter's own See. It consists in dwelling on  
 the Primacy so strongly, as quite to throw out of view the  
 apostolic powers of other Bishops ; whereas these latter dwell  
 upon the apostolic powers of the Episcopate generally ; and,  
 while they admit St. Peter's Primacy and that of the Roman  
 See, place the government of the Church in the harmonious

agreement of all. St. Leo's view, rigorously carried out, as it has been by the later Roman Church, substitutes St. Peter singly, for St. Peter and his brethren; and this usurpation, I repeat, we have to admit afresh, or else be accounted heretics and schismatics.

SECT.  
II.

Now, as to the government of which St. Leo had the ideal before him, I must first remark that it was *new*. He says himself to the Bishop of Thessalonica: "The government of Churches in Illyricum, which we commit in our stead to your affection, following the example of Siricius of blessed memory, who to your predecessor Anysius of holy memory *then first committed with a certain charge* the supporting of the Churches of that Province, which he desired to be maintained in discipline." That is, it was scarcely sixty years since Pope Siricius had selected the Bishop of the Metropolis to keep a watch over the maintenance of the Canons. And now Pope Leo was already requiring the Metropolitans to consecrate no Bishop without first consulting the Bishop of Thessalonica as his vicar.

This government  
new.

Ep. 6. cap. 2.

Secondly, this proceeding on the part of the Popes was not submitted to generally, even throughout the West. The "Codex Ecclesiæ Africanæ" is full of prohibitions against even appealing to "Bishops beyond the sea," *i. e.* the Pope. In St. Augustine's time, as we have seen, they positively forbade the Pope's interference with their internal government, and only submitted to it after they had been enfeebled by the irruption of the Vandals.

And not  
submitted  
to in Africa.

Thus the 28th Canon of the Codex (under the date of St. Aurelius, the friend of St. Augustine) runs,

"It was also determined that if Presbyters, Deacons, or the other inferior Clerks, complain in their causes of the judgments of their own Bishops, let the neighbouring Bishops, with the consent of their own Bishops, hear them, and the Bishops thus called in settle between them. But if they think proper to appeal from these also, let them not appeal to tribunals beyond the sea," (*i. e.* the Pope,) "but to the Primates of their own Provinces, or to an universal Council," (*i. e.* of Africa,) "as also in the case of Bishops has often been ordered. But let him who thinks proper to appeal to tribunals beyond the sea be received by no one within Africa

CHAP.  
IV.

to Communion." I cannot refrain from saying that this is the Anglican oath in the words of St. Augustine.

Imposed  
by aid of  
the civil  
power.

Thirdly, this power was set up very much indeed by help of the imperial authority. The process, in fact, of centralizing in the Church, ran completely parallel with that in the State. The law of Gratian and that of Valentinian, above mentioned, are a strong proof of this. Of course the object of the emperors was to control the action of the Church through one Bishop made the chief. But it is somewhat remarkable that that Church, which maintains a standing protest against the interference of the State with spiritual matters, (a protest for which she is worthy of all respect and admiration,) should owe to the support of the State, in different periods of her history, very much more of her power than any other Church. It may be that God rewards the fearless maintenance of spiritual rights by the grant of that very temporal power which threatens them with destruction.

Words of  
St. Jerome  
opposed  
to it.

S. Jerome,  
Ep. 146.  
Vallarsi.

Now as we have had St. Jerome in a noted place appealing to Rome, and acknowledging her Primacy, let us take another passage of his which, I think, implicitly denies St. Leo's view. Arguing then against the pride of the Roman Deacons, in which city, as they were only seven in number, the office was in higher estimation than even the Priesthood, which was numerous, he observes, "Nor is the Church of the Roman city to be considered one, and that of the whole world another. Both the Gauls, and the Britains, and Africa, and Persia, and the East, and India, and all barbarous nations, adore one Christ, observe one rule of truth. If you require authority, *the world is greater than the city*. Wherever a Bishop is, be it at Rome, or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, or Tanæ, he is of the same rank, the same Priesthood. The power of riches, and the humility of poverty, make a Bishop neither higher nor lower. But all are successors of the Apostles. But you say, how is it that at Rome a Priest is ordained upon the testimony of a Deacon? Why allege to me *the custom of a single city*? Why defend against the laws of the Church a fewness of number, which is the source of their pride?" The very force of St. Leo's view lies in the exact contradictory of St. Jerome's words: viz. *the city is greater than the world*,

and this alone justifies and bears out the present claim of the Roman See, and its attitude both to those within, and to those without, its pale. SECT.  
II.

St. Augustine, commenting on the 45th Psalm, uses language which remarkably agrees with that of St. Jerome. And of St.  
Augustine.

It is the more valuable, because he is not arguing controversially, but expounding. He speaks decisively, but unconsciously.

He says on the words, "All Thy garments smell of myrrh, aloes, and cassia, out of the ivory palaces wherein the daughters of kings have made Thee glad in doing Thee honour," (Vulgate,) "The Churches are the daughters of Apostles, the daughters of kings: for he is the King of kings, they the kings of whom it is written, 'Ye shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.' They preached the word of truth, and begat Churches, not for themselves, but for Him." . . . "The daughters of kings are the daughters of Thy Apostles, but 'in doing Thee honour,' because they raised up seed unto their Brother." . . . "Shew me at Rome the temple of Romulus so greatly honoured as I can shew you there the shrine of Peter. But who in Peter is honoured, save He who died for us? For we are Christians, not Petrians. And if we be children by the brother of the Dead, yet are we named by the name of the Dead. Children *through* the one, but *unto* the other. *Behold Rome, behold Carthage, behold other and yet other cities are daughters of kings, and they have made their King glad unto his honour, and out of them all one particular Queen is made.*" . . . "On thy right hand did stand the Queen in a vesture of gold, wrought about with divers colours. What is the vesture of this Queen? Both precious it is, and wrought with divers colours: these are the mysteries of doctrine in all the different languages. One the African, another the Syrian, a third the Greek, a fourth the Hebrew, and again others and others: those languages make the divers colours of this Queen's vesture. But as all the divers colours of the vesture agree in unity, so all tongues in one Faith: in the vesture there may be divers colours, but not a rent." . . . "What means, 'Instead of thy fathers thou shalt have children?' For fathers were sent the Apostles, for Apostles children are born to thee, Bishops are appointed." S. Aug. in  
Psalm 44.  
tom. 4. p.  
393. F. 394.  
B. D. F.  
398. A.

And of St. Augustine.

CHAP.  
IV.

For in this day whence are the Bishops throughout the whole world born? The Church herself entitles them Fathers: herself hath borne them, and herself hath fixed them in the seats of the fathers. Therefore think not thyself (the Church) deserted, because thou seest not Peter, because thou seest not Paul, because thou seest not those through whom thou art born: out of thine offspring hath thy fatherhood grown. 'Instead of thy fathers thou hast children, whom thou shalt make princes over all the earth.' Behold how wide spread is the temple of the King! in order that the virgins, who are not brought into the King's temple, may know that they have no portion in that bridal. 'Instead of thy fathers thou hast children, whom thou shalt make princes over all the earth?' This is the Catholic Church: her sons are made princes over all the earth: her sons are appointed for fathers. Let those who are cut off recognise her, come to unity, be brought into the King's temple. His temple God hath placed everywhere: the foundations of Prophets and Apostles hath He everywhere established. The Church hath borne sons, hath set them for her fathers as princes over all the earth."

Most truly did St. Augustine, to whom it was given to smite down the great Donatist schism, behold in the Church of God an indivisible kingdom, an inseparable unity—an unity, not Roman, but Catholic; a kingdom not ruled by one Bishop in the place of Christ, but by Christ in person, with the Bishops His assessors, on the thrones of His Apostles, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

This government not allowed, nor even attempted, in the East.

But fourthly, had this government, as imaged out by St. Leo, been submitted to not only in Gaul, Spain, Africa, and Illyricum, but throughout the West generally, all this would still be nothing for its catholicity, and therefore its binding effect, unless it had been allowed by the East. Now we have the strongest proof that it never was so allowed. This interference, and much more the centralization pointed at, as it never would have been tolerated, so neither was it attempted, in the Patriarchates of the East. There was far less danger of the patriarchal power becoming excessive, when it was possessed by five, who were a check to each other. St. Leo's influence and authority in the West were

balanced by the exercise of like influence and authority in the East, originally by the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch, and at this and later times still more by that of Constantinople. And though throughout the East the Bishop of Rome was reckoned the first of these in rank, yet the Easterns were governed entirely by their own Patriarchs. I do not know that a stronger, though quite incidental, proof of this can be shewn, than occurs in the life of Synesius, Metropolitan of Ptolemais in the Pentapolis. His Patriarch, Theophilus of Alexandria, ordered him to divide a certain Bishopric, which had before been united by his own authority. Synesius went to the spot, and exerted all his influence to carry out the wishes of Theophilus, but in vain, on account of the attachment of the people to their actual Bishop. They therefore prevail on him to put off the affair till they had sent a deputy to Theophilus. Synesius in describing all this to Theophilus, says, "Nevertheless that which you judge proper must without difficulty prevail. For if it was your own judgment which made them think a certain course right, in changing that judgment you must make justice change also; and thus all your pleasure must be for the people the rule of justice and of right. Obedience is life, and disobedience causes death." I suppose that words of such entire deference can hardly be found in the first eight centuries applied to the Bishop of Rome even by any Bishop of his proper Patriarchate<sup>1</sup>: and, assuredly, if such can be found, they would be alleged as proofs of his universal Supremacy. The very way in which this has been done has been to quote expressions of this nature when addressed to him, and to omit all mention of the like expressions addressed to the other Patriarchs. This instance is the more remarkable, Theophilus being at this time, and for many years before, as indeed he died, out of Communion with Rome.

SECT.  
II.

Obedience of Synesius to his Patriarch when out of Communion with Rome.

Tillemont, Ecc. Hist., 12. 543.

So far from there being any authority delegated by Rome

<sup>1</sup> However in the Decretals of Gregory IX., A. D. 1240, we find it written of the Pope: "In anything that he wishes his will is instead of reason, nor is there any who can say to him, why doest thou thus? For he is able to dispense beyond law, to make

injustice justice, by correcting and altering laws."—Decret. Greg. IX. bk. i. tit. 7. cap. 3. p. 203, quoted by Pereira, Tent. Theol. In the concordat with Napoleon, Pope Pius VII. certainly exercised a power as great as this.

CHAP.  
IV.

to the Eastern Patriarchs, there was no appeal from them to Rome, that is to say, in a matter belonging to their particular government; for as to the general Faith of the Church, in any peculiar emergency or violation of the usual order of procedure, or of her supreme Law, *the Canon*, there was an appeal, if not lawful, at least exercised, to any of the Patriarchs. Thus Theodoret of Cyrus, unjustly deposed by Dioscorus of Alexandria in the Latrocinium of Ephesus, flies "to the Apostolic throne" of St. Leo; "for in all things it is becoming that you should have the Primacy. For your throne is adorned with many advantages. It has the sepulchres of our common Fathers and Teachers of the truth, Peter and Paul. These have made your throne exceedingly illustrious. This is the height of your blessings." Though a supplicant, he addresses him only as first Bishop of the Church, not as monarch. It is a virtual denial of the present Papal authority, because a silence, where it would have been put forward, had it been known. On the other hand, about the year 443, Athanasius, Bishop of Perrha, in the Patriarchate of Antioch, having been judged by his Metropolitan, at the reference of his Patriarch, Domnus, resigns his Diocese: he returns however, and attempts to execute his functions: being resisted, instead of applying to his own Patriarch Domnus, he goes to Constantinople, and by false reports interests in his favour St. Proclus, Patriarch of that See, and St. Cyril of Alexandria. They write in his favour to Domnus, who in consequence has his cause heard again. Proclus makes a sort of excuse to Domnus for meddling with an affair of the East. He observes that neither he nor St. Cyril act save as mediators, and that they pray him to consider their letters only out of regard to the charity which unites them all together.

Another Bishop of the Patriarchate of Antioch named Peter, considering himself unjustly deprived of his Church, applies to St. Cyril, who writes a letter in his behalf to Domnus, which sets forth in a tone of reprehension the supremacy of the Canon. He says, "Let therefore your Piety, considering that which is approved by the divine Canons, and that which is seemly for the Church and for those that are appointed to the sacred service, *and moreover besides this*

Theodoret  
appeals to  
Pope Leo.

In Epist.  
S. Leonis,  
52.

Tillemont,  
tom. 14.  
647-9.

Athanasius  
of Perrha  
appeals to  
St. Proclus  
and St.  
Cyril.

Peter ap-  
peals from  
Domnus of  
Antioch to  
St. Cyril.

Tom. 6.  
Epist., p.  
209.

having regard for my letter, stop the tears of the old man," &c. Words which, had they been spoken by a Roman Bishop, would have been quoted as proving his Supremacy. In like manner the heretic Eutyches, before the Council of his own Patriarch, "When his deposition was read, appealed to the holy Synod of the most holy Bishop of Rome, and Alexandria, and Jerusalem, and Thessalonica." Now with what equity, I ask, is the appeal of Eutyches to the Roman Council taken to prove the present Roman Supremacy, and his appeal to the Council of Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Thessalonica, allowed to prove nothing? Or the appeal of Theodoret, in spite of his own language, alleged for the same purpose, and such facts as those of these Bishops, Athanasius and Peter, on the other side not considered? If these Bishops, whose cause was suspicious, could appeal to other Patriarchs, *not* the Roman, against their own, why could not St. Chrysostome and St. Flavian, both of Constantinople, when overborne by the most outrageous violence, appeal to the West, of which Rome stood at the head, especially as their cause in the East stood no chance of being judged according to the Canons? Is not the proving the Papal Supremacy upon a class of facts which exist equally with regard to the other Patriarchs, a most gross application of the "leaden rule" of which Mr. Newman complains?

Again, St. Isidore of Spain, in the sixth century, says: "The order of Bishops is fourfold: that is, Patriarchs, Archbishops, Metropolitans, and Bishops. In Greek a Patriarch is called the first of the Fathers, because he holds the first, this is, the Apostolic place, and therefore, because he holds the highest rank, he has such an appellation, as the Roman, the Antiochene, and the Alexandrine." Accordingly Gieseler says, "At the end of this period," (A.D. 451,) the four Patriarchs of the East "were held in their Patriarchates for ecclesiastical centres, to which the other Bishops had to attach themselves for maintenance of ecclesiastical unity; and in conjunction with their patriarchal Synod they formed the highest tribunal of appeal in all ecclesiastical matters of the Patriarchate: whilst, on the other hand, they were treated as the highest representatives of the Church, who, through mutual communication with each other, were to maintain the

S E C T.  
II.

Mansi 6.  
817. C.  
Eutyches  
appeals to  
Rome,  
Alexandria,  
Jerusalem,  
and Thessa-  
lonica.

Isidorus  
Hisp., Ety-  
mol. 7, 12,  
quoted by  
Gieselerut  
sup. p. 406.

Gieseler,  
tom. 1. pt.  
2. pp. 191,  
192.

The Patri-  
archs the  
highest  
tribunal of  
appeal.

CHAP. unity of the universal Church, and without whose concur-  
 IV. rence no decrees concerning the whole Church could be  
 made.”

Tom. 1.  
 part 2. p.  
 202.

Eastern In-  
 dependence  
 and the  
 Supremacy  
 of the  
 Canon.

The Bishop  
 of Rome's  
 office in  
 respect to  
 the Canon.

When Gieseler speaks of “the principle of the mutual independence of the Western and Eastern Church being firmly held in the East generally,” of course it must be understood that there can be no independence, strictly so called, in the Church and Body of Christ. Independence annihilates membership and coherence. That which bound the East and the West, the least Bishop and the greatest, into one harmonious whole, was *the Canon of the Church*. *This, and no other supreme authority*, I find universally appealed to by Bishops and Patriarchs, and most of all by the Popes, from the Council of Nicea to St. Gregory the Great. I say no other supreme authority, because General Councils were held for the very purpose of maintaining the Canon of the Church when in peril, or declaring her Faith, besides that they were an extraordinary, not an ordinary, authority. They passed legislative acts, defining, or expressing afresh, the Canon or the Faith of the Church, which then every Bishop was bound to maintain, the greatest not only as much as the least, but more so, in proportion to the eminence of his See. When this Canon, or this Faith, seemed to be violated, the Patriarchs remonstrated with each other, and proceeded in case of necessity to dissolve Communion with the offending party. Not only the Bishop of Rome did this, but the Eastern Patriarchs also, with quite as much energy and independence. Moreover, I am fully prepared to admit that the Primacy of the Roman See, even among the Patriarchs, was a real thing; not a mere title of honour: but then his very pre-eminence lay in his being called, as First Bishop of the world, to the especial maintenance of the Canon, and the Faith. For them he could do everything, against them nothing. To this very end he had the privilege of receiving references as to doubtful points of faith and discipline: a privilege which the great Eastern Sees exercised as well as his, and that of Constantinople over all the East, as, in certain very special circumstances, the See of Rome received references from the East as well as the West. And so the power of the

First See was really exerted in difficult conjunctures to keep the whole body together. In that he was first, and not second, or third, - I am quite aware that the Bishop of Rome could do what the Bishop of Alexandria, or of Antioch, or of Constantinople, or of Jerusalem, could not do. Even merely as standing at the head of the whole West he counter-balanced all the four. And certainly it is in this view, as representing the West, that the Greek Fathers most speak of him. Not as if authority lay in him singly, but in him and his Council conjointly: as when St. Cyril speaks to John of Antioch of his losing the Communion of *so many* Bishops, if he did not agree to Pope Celestine's sentence on Nestorius: an expression which is most thoroughly opposed to the Papal Idea. St. Basil's tone throughout is just the same. Socrates, indeed, and Sozomen, tell us something more. Now I certainly believe they had before them neither the Papal Empire of St. Gregory the Seventh, nor the maxims of the Reformation, and so far they are unbiassed witnesses. Sozomen then tells us, that when St. Athanasius, unjustly deposed, fled to Rome for justice, together with Paul of Constantinople, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Asclepas of Gaza, "the Bishop of the Romans, having inquired into the accusations against each, when he found them all agreeing with the doctrine of the Nicene Synod, admitted them to Communion, as agreeing with him. *And inasmuch as the care of all belonged to him on account of the rank of his See, he restored to each his Church.* And he wrote to the Bishops throughout the East, (*i. e.* of Antioch,) *censuring them for not having decided rightly about these persons, and for throwing the Churches into confusion by not abiding by the decrees of Nicea.* And he bade some few of them appear on a certain day to defend the justice of their decision; or else he threatened that he would not for the future bear it, if they did not stop *innovating.*" Thus it is as defender of the Canons that St. Julius appears: for they, being Bishops in the dependence of the third See, had excommunicated and deposed the Bishop of the second, under most unjust circumstances. Nevertheless they took very ill what St. Julius said and did, for they afterwards pronounced a sentence of deposition against him: so little did they acknowledge his right to interfere. Again,

SECT.  
II.

Soz., Hist.  
3. c. 8.

CHAP. IV. Pope Julius "wrote to them, accusing them of secretly undermining the doctrine of the Nicene Synod, and that, contrary to the laws of the Church, they had not called him to their Council. *For that it was an hierarchical law to declare null what was done against the sentence of the Bishop of the Romans.*" So Socrates says, in reference to the same matter, that Pope Julius asserted to the Bishops of the East that "they were breaking the Canons in not having called him to their Council, *the ecclesiastical Canon ordering that the Churches should not make Canons contrary to the sentence of the Bishop of Rome.*" Now this seems all very plain, but then it is grounded on the letter of Pope Julius, which still exists, one of the most admirable monuments of antiquity; and referring to that letter I find Pope Julius says no such thing: what he does say I have already in its place set forth above, and it is not at all in favour of the present Papal claim. Nor is this all, for the Canon supposed by Socrates and Sozomen, and which is nowhere to be found in antiquity, was not kept in a notable instance sixty-five years before this matter, and in an equally notable one forty-four years after it. In the year 272 the Bishops of the East deposed Paul of Samosata, and *then* notified his deposition in like terms to the Bishops of Rome and Alexandria: and in the year 381 the second Ecumenical Council was held at Constantinople, the whole proceedings of which, as I have above described them, may be said to have ignored this Canon. While neither Pope Dionysius in 272, nor Pope Damasus in 381, complained of this, or alleged any such Canon. At the same time it may certainly be said that in matters concerning the state of the whole Church no law could be passed without the consent of the Bishop of Rome at the head of the West. But even this fact is much more marked from the time of the Council of Chalcedon downwards, than before it. But beyond all doubt the Eastern Patriarchates exercised a complete self-government, in conformity with the Canon of the Church: and as the deposition of St. Chrysostome by Theophilus did not prove that Constantinople was subordinate to Alexandria, nor the condemnation of St. Athanasius at Tyre that Antioch was superior to Alexandria, so neither did St. Athanasius taking refuge in Italy, and justified first

IV.  
Soz. Hist. 3.  
c. 10.

Socrates,  
Hist. 2. c.  
17.

This Canon  
not kept in  
two notable  
instances.

by the Council of the Roman Bishop, and then by the great, though not Ecumenical, Council of Sardica, prove that the East was governed by the West. The Canon in all these cases had been attacked: the Canon was appealed to: and the Canon finally prevailed. It was the stedfastness of the Roman Bishops in maintaining the Canon that so greatly increased their influence between the Councils of Nicea and Chalcedon. And so, no doubt, when the Patriarchs of the East were at variance, all would look for support to him, who was both the first of their number, and stood alone with the whole West to back him.

And thus again in St. Leo's time a very extraordinary emergency arose, which still further raised the credit of the Roman Patriarch. Dioscorus of Alexandria, supporting the heretic Eutyches, had, by help of the Emperor, deposed and murdered St. Flavian of Constantinople: Juvenal of Jerusalem was greatly involved in this transaction. Dioscorus had then consecrated Anatolius to be the successor of St. Flavian, and Anatolius had consecrated Maximus to Antioch, instead of Domnus, who, too, had been irregularly deposed after St. Flavian. Now, had Dioscorus been otherwise blameless, his consecrating Anatolius, of his own authority, to Constantinople, and Anatolius then consecrating Maximus to Antioch, was, as St. Leo observes, an infringement of the Canon of the Church, and so a proceeding that imperilled the unity of the Body: for, though the self-government of the East had been so jealously maintained in 381 both by its own Bishops and by the Emperor Theodosius, yet the Patriarch of Alexandria had no right to eject the Patriarch of Constantinople, and then consecrate a successor, nor that successor to consecrate a Patriarch of Antioch. That *this* was the particular violation of the Canons of which St. Leo complained, we have his own testimony. Writing to Anatolius he says, "For when your predecessor of blessed memory, Flavian, had been ejected on account of his defence of the Catholic truth, not without reason was it believed that your ordainers seemed to have consecrated one like themselves, *contrary to the constitutions of the holy Canons.*" In which words he intimates that had Flavian been ejected for heresy, as was Paul of Samosata, the presumption would have been

SECT.  
II.

Ep. 106.  
Ad Anat.  
c. 2.

Ib., c. 1.

CHAP.  
IV.

Ep. 104.  
Ad Marcia-  
num, c. 5.

the reverse, and then had the successor been ordained according to the Canons, and not by an intruding Patriarch, his own interference would have been unnecessary. Thus writing to the Emperor he further says, "Let the aforesaid Bishop *obey the Fathers*, consult the interests of peace, and not think his act of presumption in ordaining a Bishop for the Church of Antioch, *without any precedent, against the precepts of the Canons*, to have been lawful:" and his own particular office of especial guardian of the Canons, as First Bishop, is then alluded to: "which proceeding we, through desire for the restoration of the Faith, and zeal for peace, have forborne to call in question. Let him therefore abstain from doing wrong to the rules of the Church, and avoid unlawful excesses, lest, while venturing on courses opposed to peace, he cast himself off from the universal Church." So then the Bishop of Rome might interfere with affairs of the East: but on what occasion? When the supreme law of the universal Church, the Canon, to which he himself owed obedience, was violated. No Pope, perhaps, is so express in setting forth the Canon as St. Leo: it is not his own authority in itself, but his authority in defence of the Canon, which he uniformly exhibits. As it was, the whole East had been thrown into confusion. A heretic had been absolved; one Patriarch murdered, another deposed; and of the other two, one was chief agent, and the other not clear, in these transactions. No wonder that, at the Council of Chalcedon, the Bishop of Rome appeared at the head of the West, both to vindicate the Canon and his own violated rights, for Dioscorus had even deposed him, and as the restorer of true doctrine, and the deliverer of the Church.

### SECT. III.

Bossuet's  
argument,  
and its  
bearing on  
the ques-  
tion in  
hand.

BUT I must now quote, at considerable length, the argument of Bossuet, and his statement as to where the sovereign power in the Church resides. We have already seen what he has said respecting the Council of Ephesus; and his observations on that of Chalcedon and the four succeeding

Councils are equally important. His argument, which was intended for the justification of the Gallican Church, really reaches to that of the Greek and English Church also; and it is of the very utmost value, as it rests upon authorities which are sacrosanct in the eyes of every Catholic—the proceedings and decrees of Ecumenical Councils. Let it only be remembered, that I quote no German rationalist, no one who denies either the doctrine or hierarchy of the Church; but a Catholic prelate, the most strenuous defender of the Faith, and one who, in the great assembly of his brethren, cried out, “If I forget thee, Church of Rome, may I forget myself; may my tongue dry, and remain motionless in my mouth, if thou art not always the first in my remembrance, if I place thee not at the beginning of all my songs of joy.”

SECT.  
III.

Bossuet,  
Sermon  
sur l'Unité  
de l'Eglise.

The question then at issue is, whether the Bishop of Rome be the first of the Patriarchs, and first Bishop of the whole world, the head of the Apostolic college, and holding among them the place which Peter held, all which I freely acknowledge, as the testimony of antiquity; or whether he be, further, not only this, but the source of all jurisdiction, uniting in his single person all those powers which belonged to Peter and the Apostles collectively: an idea which, however extravagant, is actually maintained at present in the Church of Rome, is moreover absolutely necessary to justify its acts, and to condemn the position of the Greek and English Church. Bossuet, who fought for the Gallican liberties, fought for the Anglican likewise.

The real  
question at  
issue.

“Let us now review the Acts of the General Council of Chalcedon. The previous facts were these. The two natures of Christ were confounded by Eutyches, an Archimandrite and Abbot of Constantinople, an old man no less obstinate than out of his senses. He then was condemned by his own Bishop, St. Flavian of Constantinople, and appealed to all the Patriarchs, but chiefly to the Roman Pontiff. Leo writes to Flavian, and ‘orders everything to be laid before him.’ Flavian answers and requests of Leo ‘that, making his own the common cause and the order of the holy Churches, he should by his own letters agree with the deposition which had been canonically passed, and should strengthen the faith of the Emperor. For the matter only

Bossuet,  
Def. Cleri  
Gall., lib. 7.  
c. 15—17.  
Edit. 1745.

S. Leo, Ep.  
26. tom. 1.  
p. 787.

συμφέρι-  
σασθαι.

CHAP.  
IV.

needs an impulse and assistance from you, which by your agreement will restore all things to peace and quiet.' This means, it is plain and clear, it has yet few followers, and those obscure, and of no great name. He ends, 'For so the heresy which has arisen will be most easily destroyed, by the cooperation of God, through your letters; and the Council, of which there are rumours, be given up, that the holy Churches be not disturbed.' This, too, is in accordance with discipline, for heresies to be immediately suppressed, first by the Bishop's care, then by that of the Apostolic See: nor is it forthwith necessary that an universal Council be assembled, and the peace of all Churches troubled."

The relative position of St. Flavian and St. Leo.

Bossuet's words seem to suggest that St. Flavian admitted a right in St. Leo to rehear the cause of Eutyches: this is by no means the case. In the letter above quoted, announcing to the Pope the judgment passed on Eutyches, and addressed "to the most holy and religious Father and fellow-minister, Leo," he says, "I have sent to your Holiness the Acts in his case, in which we have deprived him, as one convicted of such things, both of the Priesthood, and of the presidency over his monastery, and of our Communion: *that your Holiness likewise being acquainted with his case may make manifest his impiety to all the most religious Bishops who are under your Piety, (i. e. those of the West,) lest through ignorance of his opinions, of which he has been convicted, they should be found holding intercourse with him, as with one of the same views, either by letter or otherwise.*" The demeanour of St. Flavian towards St. Leo is that of one Patriarch, independent in his own sphere, towards another, not that of a Bishop amenable to a superior.

Tom. 1.  
751-8.

"After the proceedings had been sent to Leo, he writes to Flavian, most fully and clearly setting forth the mystery of the Lord's Incarnation, as he says himself, and as all Churches bear witness; at the same time he praises the acts and the faith of Flavian, and condemns Eutyches, yet with the grant of indulgence, should he make amends. This is that noble and divine letter which was afterwards so warmly celebrated through the whole Church, and which I wish to be understood so often as I name simply Leo's letter.

“And here the question might have been terminated, but for those incidents which induced the Emperor Theodosius the younger to call the Synod of Ephesus. He was the same who had appointed the first Council of Ephesus, under Celestine and Cyril.

SECT.  
III.

The Em-  
peror calls  
a Council,

“Of this Synod St. Leo writes to Theodosius, at first, ‘that the matter was so evident, that for reasonable causes the calling of a Synod should be abstained from.’ And Flavian likewise seemed to have been against this. But after the Emperor, with good intentions, had convoked the Synod, Leo gives his consent, and sends the letter to the Synod, in which he praises the Emperor for being willing to hold an assembly of Bishops, ‘that by a fuller judgment all error may be done away with.’ He mentions that he had sent Legates, who, says he, ‘in my stead shall be present at the sacred assembly of your Brotherhood, and determine, by a joint sentence with you, what shall please the Lord.’

which Leo  
does not  
decline.

“Here are three points: first, that in questions of Faith it is not always necessary for an Ecumenical Council to be assembled. Secondly, that Leo, great Pontiff as he was, did not decline a judgment, if the cause required it, after the matter had been judged by himself. Thirdly, that, if a Synod were held, it behoved that all error should be done away with by a fuller judgment, and the question be terminated by the Apostolic See, by a joint sentence with the Bishops, in which he acknowledges that full force of consent, so often mentioned by me.

“But after Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, the protector of Eutyches, had done everything with violence and crime, and not a Council, but an assembly of robbers downright, had been held at Ephesus, then, when the Episcopal order had been divided, and the whole Church thrown into confusion, under the name of the Second Ecumenical Council of Ephesus, Leo himself admits, that a new General Council must be held, ‘which should either remove or mitigate all offences, so that there should no longer be either any doubt as to faith, or division in charity.’ Therefore he perceived that schisms, and such a fluctuation of minds respecting the Faith itself, could not be sufficiently removed by his own

Requests of  
the Em-  
peror a fresh  
Council.

CHAP.  
IV.

judgment. And the Pontiff, no less wise and good than resolute, demanded a fuller, firmer, greater judgment, by the authority of a General Council, by which, that is, all doubt might be removed."

Letter to the Emperor, Ep. 44. c. 3.  
St. Leo grounds his right to hear an appeal on the Sardican Canons quoted as the Nicene.

It is remarkable likewise that he grounds this demand on the appeal made by St. Flavian in the Latrocinium: saying "that the decrees of the Nicene Canons, ordered by the Priests of the whole world, and which are annexed, make it necessary." The Canon annexed is the fourth of the Council of Sardica: so that Zosimus was not the only Pope who quoted that Council for the Nicene: but the ascription of such a right to the gift of a Council, and not to the inherent privilege of his See, is in the mouth of St. Leo full of significance. It is true the words of Hosius, in causing the permission of appeal to be granted, speak plainly enough to all but the wilfully blind. But it is felt that the grant by a Council in 347 of the very limited right of revision accorded to the Roman See at Sardica strikes at the very heart of the Monarchie or Papal Theory, though Pope Zosimus in 419 and Pope Leo in 449 alleged no other ground for it.

Theodosius refuses a new Council,

Bossuet goes on, "But the Emperor Theodosius would not hear of a new Council, so long as he thought that due order had been preserved at Ephesus. 'For the matter was settled at Ephesus by the deposition of those who deserved it; and a decision having been once passed, nothing else can be determined after it.' Here the difference between the judgments of Roman Pontiffs and of General Councils is very evident; the judgment of the Roman Pontiff being reconsidered in a Council, whereas after a Council, so long as it is held a lawful one, nothing can be reconsidered, nothing heard.

but Marcian grants it.

"But as Theodosius shortly afterwards died, the Emperor Marcian, upon understanding that the Ephesine assembly had used violence, and acted otherwise against the Canons, and was therefore refused the name and authority of an Ecumenical Council by most Bishops, but chiefly by the Roman Pontiff, could not deny the calling of a new Council to Leo's request. So the Council of Chalcedon took place, and all admitted that there were certain dissensions on matter of Faith so grave, that they can only be settled by the authority of an Ecumenical Council.

“All know that more than six hundred Bishops assembled at Chalcedon. The Bishops Paschasinus and Lucentius presided over the holy Council in Leo’s stead. Magistrates were assigned by the Emperor to direct the proceedings, and restrain disorder; but to leave the question of Faith and all ecclesiastical matters to the power and judgment of the Council.

“But in this Council two things make for us: first, the deposition of Dioscorus; secondly, the sentence of the Council respecting the approval of Leo’s letter.

“With Dioscorus they thus proceeded, when, upon being cited, he refused to present himself to judgment, and his crimes were notorious to all. Paschasinus, Legate of the Apostolic See, asks the Fathers,—‘We desire to know what your Holiness determines:’ the holy Synod replied, ‘What the Canons order.’ The Bishop Lucentius said, ‘Certain proceedings took place in the holy Council of Ephesus by our most blessed Father Cyril; look into their form, and assign what form you determine on.’ The Bishop Paschasinus said, ‘Does your Piety command us to use Ecclesiastical punishment? Do you consent?’ The holy Council said, ‘We all consent.’ . . . Julian, Bishop of Hypæpa, said, ‘Holy Fathers, listen. Then, in the city of Ephesus, Dioscorus had power to judge, and by an unjust sentence he deposed the most holy Flavian, and the most reverend Bishop Eusebius: and he was the first to give an unjust judgment, and all followed him through constraint. Now your Holiness has the authority of the most holy Archbishop Leo, and all the holy Council, which is assembled by the grace of God and the command of our most pious Emperors, (has the authority). And you have taken cognisance of all the unjust acts at Ephesus; all the details have been made apparent to your Holiness. And you have cited Dioscorus a first, a second, and a third time, and he has not been willing to obey. We therefore beg your Holiness, him who holds, or rather you who hold, the place of the most holy Archbishop Leo, to give sentence against him: and to pronounce the canonical punishment. For we all, and the whole Ecumenical Council, give our vote in accordance with your Holiness.’ The Bishop Paschasinus said, ‘Again I ask, what is the pleasure of your Blessed-

1. Depo-  
sition of  
Dioscorus.

Mansi 6.  
1044. C.

CHAP. IV. ness?' Maximus, Bishop of the great city of Antioch, said, 'We are conformable to whatever seems good to your Holiness.'

Mansi 6.  
1047, 1050.  
1061, 1065.

"Thus the initiative, and form, as it was called, was to be given by the Apostolic See. And so the Legates, after recounting the crimes of Dioscorus, thus pronounced: 'Wherefore Leo, most holy and blessed Archbishop of great and Elder Rome, by us and the present most holy Council, together with the thrice blessed and sacred Apostle Peter, who is the rock and ground of the Catholic Church, and the foundation of the orthodox Faith, hath stripped him of the dignity of Bishop, and severed him from all sacerdotal rank. Therefore this most holy and great Council voteth what is in accordance with the Canons upon the aforesaid Dioscorus.'

"Anatolius, Bishop of the royal Constantinople, New Rome, said: 'Being in all things of the same mind with the Apostolic See, I too give my vote for the deposition of Dioscorus, who was Bishop of the great city of Alexandria, who has shewn himself unworthy of all sacerdotal ministrations, because he has in all things disobeyed the Canons of the holy Fathers, and, being thrice canonically summoned, refused to obey.'

Bishops of Rome and Constantinople mentioned in parallel terms.

"Maximus, Bishop of the great city of Antioch, said: . . . 'I subject him to ecclesiastical sentence, as our most holy and blessed Archbishop and Father Leo of the royal city of Elder Rome, by his representatives . . . and the most holy and blessed Archbishop of royal New Rome, Anatolius, have spoken. I also agree with these.'

So, through a space of more than thirty pages, the several Bishops give their sentence judicially, saying, 'I agree,' 'I am of the same mind,' 'I declare,' 'I decree,' and the like: sometimes stating that they follow the two great Archbishops. Thus Theodorus, Metropolitan of Tarsus, 'Whence he has been justly condemned by the greatest Sees, as well of great Rome, as of New Rome, by Leo and Anatolius, Archbishops of the most holy Churches: with whom I also agree.'

So Eutropius, Bishop of Aradus, says, 'I agree to the condemnation passed by Leo and Anatolius, most holy and

blessed Archbishops of Old Rome and New, and by this holy and universal Council.' SECT.  
III.

So John of Alindus says, 'I too agree with the holy Fathers of Old and New Rome, and the other holy Fathers.'

Bossuet continues, "Thus from Peter, the head and source of Unity, the sentence began, and then became of full force by common agreement of the Bishops, just as that first Council of the Apostles is always represented.

"By this is understood the letter of the Emperor Valentinian to the Emperor Theodosius: 'We ought to defend with all devotion, and preserve in our times uninjured, the dignity of the veneration due to the blessed Apostle Peter: so that the most blessed Bishop of the Roman city, to whom antiquity hath assigned the first place of the Priesthood before all, may have power to judge concerning the Faith and Bishops.' Not, however, alone, but with the condition added by the Emperor, 'That the aforesaid Bishop,' at least in those causes which touch the Faith and the universal state of the Church, 'may give sentence after assembling the Priests from the whole world.' That is, by a common decree, as both Leo himself had demanded, and as we have seen done in the Council itself.

"With the same view, the Empress Pulcheria writes to Leo concerning assembling the Bishops, 'who,' she says, 'a Council being called, shall decree, at your instance, concerning the Catholic confession, and concerning Bishops.'

"The Emperors Valentinian and Marcian write the same to Leo: that, 'by the Council to be held,' everything should be done at his instance: first laying this down, that he 'possessed the first rank in the Episcopate.'

"Hence it is very plainly evident, that, in the usual order, both the Pope should have the initiative, and the Bishops sitting with him should be judges; and that the force of an irreversible decree lies in agreement: the very thing to which the Empress Pulcheria bears witness, in her letter to Strategus the Consular, who was ordered to protect the Council from all violence: 'that the holy Council, holding its sittings with all discipline, without any disturbance and contention, what has been revealed by the Lord Christ should be confirmed in common by all.'

Bossuet's remarks on the mode of this judgment.

CHAP.  
IV.

“Meanwhile, it is evident that proceedings are at the instance of the Pontiff, yet so that the force of the decree lies, not in the sole authority of the Pontiff, which no one then imagined, but in the consent itself and approval of the Council: and that the Fathers and the Council decree together, judge together, and the sentence of the Council is the sentence of the Pope; which, when the consent of the Churches is added, is then held to be irreversible and final, which is all I demand.”

This the first time the Bishop of Rome had presided at an Ecumenical Council.

It must not be denied, however, that Bossuet goes beyond the spirit as well as letter of the very documents he is quoting. For in stating so strongly that the Roman Bishop had the initiative, he does not remark that the Council of Chalcedon, being the fourth Ecumenical, was the first at which the Pope, either in person, or by his Legates, had presided. For Hosius had presided at Nicea, St. Meletius, St. Gregory, and Nectarius at Constantinople, St. Cyril at Ephesus, in his own right, though he also held the proxy of St. Celestine, and Dioscorus again at the Latrocinium, which was intended to have been, and would have been, an Ecumenical Council, but for its uncanonical proceedings. Indeed the *extent* to which the present Roman theory contradicts antiquity can only be felt by those who read the ancient Acts themselves.

In loco.

But further, “Among all the decrees of Roman Pontiffs on a matter of Faith,” say the brothers Ballerini, “the letter of St. Leo to Flavian is most celebrated, in which the whole controversy of the Incarnation is exactly discussed and defined.” Bossuet, then, proves from the Acts of the Council itself that this very letter was submitted to the judgment of the several Bishops there assembled: that is, that the most elaborate doctrinal decision of perhaps the most renowned Pope was received not as a writing beyond discussion on account of the authority of the composer, but because it was examined and found to agree with the decisions of the three preceding Ecumenical Councils. Providentially the Acts are so explicit that it is impossible to deny this.

2. Examination of Pope Leo's letter.

Bossuet continues: “Another important point treated in the Council of Chalcedon, that is, the establishing of the Faith, and the approval of Leo's letter, is as follows. Already almost the whole West, and most of the Easterns, with Ana-

tolius himself, Bishop of Constantinople, had gone so far as to confirm by subscription that letter, before the Council took place; and in the Council itself the Fathers had often cried out, 'We believe, as Leo: Peter hath spoken by Leo: we have all subscribed the letter: what has been set forth is sufficient for the Faith: no other exposition may be made.' Things went so far, that they would hardly permit a definition to be made by the Council. But neither subscriptions privately made before the Council, nor these vehement cries of the Fathers in the Council, were thought sufficient to tranquillize minds in so unsettled a state of the Church, for fear that a matter so important might seem determined rather by outcries than by fair and legitimate discussion. And the Clergy of Constantinople exclaimed, 'It is a few who cry out, not the whole Council which speaks.' So it was determined, that the letter of Leo should be lawfully examined by the Council, and a definition of faith be written by the Synod itself. So the acts of foregoing Councils being previously read, the magistrates proposed concerning Leo's letter, 'As

SECT.  
III.

we see the divine Gospels laid before your Piety, let each one of the assembled Bishops declare, whether the exposition of the 318 Fathers at Nicea, and of the 150 who afterwards assembled in the imperial city, agrees with the letter of the most reverend Archbishop Leo.'

Mansi 7. 9.  
B.

"After the question as to examining the letter of Leo was put in this form, it will be worth while to weigh the sentences, and, as they are called, the votes of the Fathers, in order to understand from the beginning why they approved of the letter; why they afterwards defended it with so much zeal; why, finally, it was ratified after so exact an examination of the Council. Anatolius first gives his sentence. 'The letter of the most holy and religious Archbishop Leo agrees with the creed of our 318 Fathers at Nicea, and of the 150 who afterwards assembled at Constantinople, and confirmed the same Faith, and with the proceedings at Ephesus under the most blessed Cyril, who is among the saints, by the Ecumenical and holy Council, when it condemned Nestorius. I therefore agree to it, and willingly subscribe to it.'"

Mansi 7. 9.  
C. 12. C.  
28. B.

Well may Bossuet say, "These are the words of one plainly

CHAP.  
IV.

deliberating, not blindly subscribing out of mere obedience.” Out of many pages of subscriptions of the like character I select one or two. “John, most reverend Bishop of Sebastia in the first Armenia, said, ‘According to my conception the meaning of the letter of the most holy Bishop of the Church of the Romans agrees with the faith of the 318, and of the 150 afterwards assembled at Constantinople, and with the exposition of Ephesus at the deposition of the impious Nestorius, at which the most blessed Cyril presided. And I subscribe this same letter.’

“Seleucus, most reverend Bishop of Amasea, said: ‘We have found the synodical letter of our most holy Father Cyril agreeing with the Faith set forth by the 318 holy Fathers. And in like manner we have found the letter of our most holy Archbishop Leo agreeing both with the 318, and with those who were with the most holy Cyril.’

“John, most reverend Bishop of Germanicia Augusta on the Euphrates, said, ‘In the Faith of the 318 who formerly assembled at Nicea, and of the 150 at Constantinople, we have both been baptized and baptize: and having found what was set forth and confirmed by the most blessed Cyril in the former Council of Ephesus, as likewise the letter of the most holy Archbishop Leo, to accord with this, we have subscribed it.’

“The rest,” says Bossuet, “say to the same effect: ‘It agrees, and I subscribe.’ Many plainly and expressly, ‘It agrees, and I therefore subscribe.’ Some add, ‘It agrees, and I subscribe, as it is correct.’ Others, ‘I am sure that it agrees.’ Others, ‘As it is concordant, and has the same aim, we embrace it, and subscribe.’ Others, ‘This is the Faith we have long held: this we hold: in this we were baptized: in this we baptize.’ Others, and a great part, ‘As I see, as I feel, as I have proved, as I find that it agrees, I subscribe.’ Others, ‘As I am persuaded, instructed, informed, that all agrees, I subscribe.’ Many set forth their difficulties, mostly arising from a foreign language; others from the subject matter, saying, that they had heard the letter, ‘and in very many points were assured it was right: some few words stood in their way, which seemed to point at a certain division in the person of Christ.’ They add, that

they had been informed by Paschasinus and the Legates 'that there is no division, but one Christ; therefore,' they say, 'we agree and subscribe.' Others, after mentioning what Paschasinus and Lucentius had said, thus conclude: 'By this we have been satisfied, and, considering that it agrees in all things with the holy Fathers, we agree and subscribe.' Where the Illyrian Bishops, and others who before that examination had expressed their acclamations to the letter, again cry out, 'We all say the same thing, and agree with this.' So that, indeed, it is evident that, in the Council itself, and before it, their agreement is based on this, that, after weighing the matter, they considered, they judged, they were persuaded, that all agreed with the Fathers, and perceived that the common Faith of all and each had been set forth by Leo.

SECT.  
III.

"This was done at Chalcedon: but likewise before that Council our Gallic Bishops, at a Synod held in Gaul, wrote thus to Leo himself, concerning receiving his letter: 'Many in that (the letter of Leo to Flavian) with joy and exultation have recognised what their faith was assured of, and are with reason delighted that, by tradition from their fathers, they have always held just what your Apostleship has set forth. Some, rendered more careful by receiving the admonition of your Blessedness, congratulate themselves every way on being instructed, and rejoice that an occasion is given them, in which they may speak out freely and confidently, and each one assert what he believes, supported by the authority of the Apostolic See.'

Gallic and Italian Bishops speak of this letter. S. Leo., Ep. 99.

"The Italian (Bishops) agree, at the instance of Eusebius, Bishop of Milan, 'for it was evident that that (letter of Leo to Flavian) shone with the full simplicity of the Faith; was illuminated likewise by statements from the Prophets, by authorities from the Gospels, and by testimonies of Apostolic teaching, and in every point agreed with what the holy Ambrose, moved by the Holy Spirit, put in his books concerning the mystery of the Lord's Incarnation. And inasmuch as all the statements agree with the Faith of our ancestors delivered down to us from antiquity, all determined that, whoever hold impious opinions concerning the mystery of the Lord's Incarnation, are to be visited with fitting con-

Ib., 96, some words omitted.

CHAP. demnation, as they themselves agree, according to the sen-  
 IV. tence of your authority.'

Bossuet's  
 deduction  
 from this

"See here an authoritative sentence in the Roman Pontiff; and also the agreement of the Bishops to the instance of the Roman Pontiff, and that granted after inquiry into the truth. On these terms they gave their approval, and their subscription, and decreed that a letter, agreeing with the apprehensions of their common Faith, and found and judged to be such by them, was of universal authority by the union of their sentences with the Apostolic See. Which wonderfully accords with what we have just read in the sentences of the Fathers of Chalcedon.

Bossuet,  
 Gallia Or-  
 thodoxa,  
 No. 60, 61.

"This is that examination of Leo's letter, synodically made at Chalcedon, and placed among the Acts;" "nor did Anatolius and the other Bishops receive it, until they had deliberated, and found that Leo's letter agreed with the preceding Councils.

Discre-  
 pancy of  
 Cardinals  
 Bellarmine  
 and Ba-  
 ronius.

"But here a singular discussion arises between the eminent Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius. The latter, and with him a large number of our theologians, recognise the letter of Leo as the *Type and Rule* of Faith, by which all Churches were bound: but Bellarmine, alarmed at the examination which he could not deny, answers thus: 'Leo had sent his letter to the Council, not as containing his final and definitive sentence, but as an instruction, assisted by which the Bishops might form a better judgment.' But, most eminent man, allow me to say that Leo, upon the appeal of Eutyches, and at the demand of Flavian, composed this letter for a summary of the Faith, and sent it to every Church in all parts, when as yet no one thought about a Council. Therefore it was not an instruction to the Council which he provided, but an Apostolic sentence which he put forth. The fact is that out of this strait there was no other escape: Baronius will not allow that a letter, confirmed by so great an authority of the Apostolic See, should be attributed to any other power but that which is supreme and indefectible: Bellarmine will not take that to emanate from the supreme and indefectible authority, which was subjected to synodical inquiry, and deliberation. What, then, is the issue of this conflict, unless that it is equally evident

that the letter was written with the whole authority of the Apostolic See, and yet subjected, as usual, to the examination of an Universal Council.

“And in this we follow no other authority than Leo himself, who speaks thus in his letter to Theodoret: ‘What God had before decreed by our ministry, He confirmed by the irreversible assent of the whole brotherhood, to shew that what was first put forth in form by the First See of all, and then received by the *judgment* of the whole Christian world, really proceeded from Himself.’ Here is a decree, as Baronius says, but not as Bellarmine says, an instruction: here is a *judgment* of the whole world upon a decree of the Apostolic See. He proceeds. ‘For in order that the consent of other Sees to that which the Lord of all appointed to preside over the rest might not appear flattery, nor any other adverse suspicion creep in, persons were at first found who doubted concerning our judgments.’ And not only heretics, but even the Fathers of the Council themselves, as the Acts bear witness. Here the First See shews a fear of flattery, if doubt about its judgments were forbidden. Moreover. ‘The truth itself likewise is both more clearly conspicuous, and more strongly maintained, when after examination confirms what previous faith had taught.’ Here in plain words he speaks of an *examination* by the Council, *De Fide*, not by himself, as they wretchedly object, but of that Faith which the decretal letter set forth. And at length that same letter is issued as the Rule, but *confirmed by the assent of the universal holy Council*, or as he had before said, after that *it is confirmed by the irreversible assent of the whole Brotherhood*. Out of this expression of that great Pontiff the Gallican Clergy drew theirs, that in questions of Faith the judgment is, what Tertullian calls, *not to be altered*, what Leo calls, *not to be reconsidered, only when the assent of the Church is added*.” Bossuet goes on above,

S. Leo.,  
Ep. 120.

“This certainly no one can be blamed for holding with him and with the Fathers of Chalcedon. The forma is set forth by the Apostolic See, yet it is to be received with a judgment, and that free, and each Bishop individually is inferior to the First, yet so that all together pass judgment even on his decree.

Supreme  
authority of  
a Council  
over the  
Pope.

CHAP.  
IV.

“They conceived no other way of removing all doubt; for, after the conclusion of the Synod, the Emperor thus proclaims: ‘Let then all profane contention cease, for he is indeed impious and sacrilegious, who, after the sentence of so many Priests, leaves anything for his own opinion to consider.’ He then prohibits all discussion concerning religion; for, says he, ‘he does an injury to the judgment of the most religious Council, who endeavours to open afresh, and publicly discuss, what has been once judged, and rightly ordered.’

“Here in the condemnation of Eutyches is the order of Ecclesiastical judgments in questions of Faith. He is judged by his proper Bishop Flavian: the cause is reheard, reconsidered by the Pope St. Leo;” (let it be remembered that Eutyches likewise appealed to Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Thessalonica; and that his appeal was taken up by Dioscorus of Alexandria, whose violent support of him against St. Flavian in the second Ephesine Council had nearly rent the Church in pieces;) “it is decided by a declaration of the Apostolic See: after that declaration follows the examination, inquiry, judgment of the Fathers or Bishops, in a General Council: after the declaration has been approved by the judgment of the Fathers no place is any longer left for doubt or discussion.

S. Leo.,  
Ep. 102.

“To the same effect Leo: ‘For no longer is any refuge or excuse allowable to any, on plea of ignorance, or difficulty of understanding, inasmuch as for this very purpose the Council of about six hundred of our brethren and fellow-Bishops met together hath permitted no skill in reasoning, no flow of eloquence, to breathe against the Faith built on a divine foundation. Since, through the endeavours of our brethren and representatives, by the help of God’s grace, (their devotion in every procedure being most entire,) it hath been fully and evidently made manifest, not only to the Priests of Christ, but to princes also, and Christian powers, and to all ranks of the Clergy and people, that this is the truly Apostolic and Catholic Faith, flowing from the fountain of Divine goodness, which as we have received we preach, and now with the agreement of the whole world defend pure and clean from all pollution of error.’

“Thus at length supreme and infallible force is given to an Apostolic decree, after that it is strengthened by universal inquiry, examination, discussion, and thereupon consent and testimony.”

SECT.  
III.

“We add a third point, important to our cause, respecting the restitution of Theodoret to his See. After, then, by order of the Bishops, he had openly anathematized Nestorius, the most illustrious magistrates said, ‘All doubt respecting Theodoret is now removed: for he hath both anathematized Nestorius before you, and has been received by Leo, most holy Archbishop of old Rome, and has willingly accepted the definition of Faith set forth by your Piety, and moreover hath subscribed the epistle of the aforesaid most holy Archbishop Leo. It remains, therefore, that sentence be pronounced by your Reverence, that he may recover his Church, as the most holy Archbishop Leo has judged.’ All the most reverend Bishops cried out, ‘Theodoret is worthy of his See. Leo hath judged after God.’ So then the judgment put forth by Leo concerning his restoration to his See would have profited Theodoret nothing, unless, after the matter had been brought before the Council, he had both approved his faith to the Council, and the judgment of Leo been confirmed by the same Council. This was done in the presence of the Legates of the Apostolic See, who afterwards pronounced that sentence on confirming Leo’s judgment, which the whole Synod approved.”

Ch. 18, *ibid.*  
Theodoret  
restored by  
the Council,  
after Pope  
Leo’s judg-  
ment.

Mansi 7.  
190. B.

An additional proof that St. Leo’s previous judgment would have profited Theodoret nothing had it not been confirmed by the Council, is to be found in the fact that, when Theodoret seemed to hesitate expressly to anathematize Nestorius, the Bishops cried out, “He is a heretic, he is a Nestorian, cast out the heretic.”

Let any one of candour consider these Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, and then say, which of these two views agrees with them, *viz.*, that St. Leo was first Bishop of the Church, looked up to with great reverence as the special successor of St. Peter, and representative of the whole West; or that he was beside this the only Vicar of Christ, the source and origin of the Episcopate, from whom his brethren received their jurisdiction, which is the Papal Idea of the middle

Inference  
from this  
history.

CHAP.  
IV.

ages. For on the truth of this latter view depends the charge, that the Church of England is in schism.

A fourth point, the passing of the 28th Canon.

What follows may perhaps assist our solution of the question. At this very Council of 630 Bishops, the largest ever held in ancient times, and where the credit of the Roman Pontiff was so great, a very celebrated Canon was enacted concerning the rank of the Bishop of Constantinople. The Pope's Legates attempted, by absenting themselves, to prevent its being enacted, but that only led to its being confirmed the next day, in spite of their opposition. The circumstances were as follows, and they seem to deserve our most steadfast consideration, from their bearing upon the great subject we are considering, the Papal Supremacy.

Fleury, liv. 28, 29. Oxf. Tr. See Mansi 7. 426. D.

“On the same day, being the last of October, the fifteenth session was held, at which neither the magistrates nor Legates were present: for after the formula of Faith had been agreed to, and the private business brought before the Council had been despatched, the Clergy of Constantinople asked the Legates to join them in discussing an affair concerning their Church. This they refused, saying, that they had received no instructions about it. They made the same proposal to the magistrates, and these referred the matter to the Council. When the magistrates and Legates therefore had retired, the rest of the Council made a Canon respecting the prerogatives of the Church of Constantinople.” To make the scope of this clear we must observe, that the See of Constantinople had been now for at least seventy years the chief See of the East: at the second Ecumenical Council, held in 381, at Constantinople, it is declared in the third Canon, that “the Bishop of Constantinople shall have the Primacy of honour after the Bishop of Rome, because that Constantinople is New Rome.” It seems that in the interval that Bishop had not only taken precedence of Alexandria and Antioch, and reduced under him the Exarchs of Pontus, Thrace, and Asia, but that his authority was very great throughout all the East. Theodoret says, that St. Chrysostom governed twenty-eight Provinces, i. e. eleven forming the Pontic, eleven the Ephesine, and six the Thracian, Dioceses. Accordingly, in its famous 28th Canon, the Council of Chalcedon only confirmed an authority to the Bishop of Constantinople, which

Theod., lib. 5. ch. 28. quoted by Tillemont.

he had long enjoyed and often exceeded. It ran thus: "We, following in all things the decisions of the holy Fathers, and acknowledging the Canon of the 150 most religious Bishops which has just been read, do also determine and decree the same things respecting the privileges of the most holy city of Constantinople, New Rome. *For the Fathers properly have allowed the privileges to the throne of the Elder Rome, because that was the imperial city. And the 150 most religious Bishops, being moved with the same intention, gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of New Rome, judging with reason, that the city which was honoured with the sovereignty and senate, and which enjoyed equal privileges with the Elder royal Rome, should also be magnified like her in Ecclesiastical matters, being the second after her.* And (we also decree) that the Metropolitans only of the Pontic, and Asian, and Thracian Dioceses, and, moreover, the Bishops of the aforesaid Dioceses who are amongst the Barbarians, shall be ordained by the above-mentioned most holy throne of the most holy Church of Constantinople; each Metropolitan of the aforesaid Dioceses ordaining the Bishops of the Province, as has been declared by the divine Canons; but the Metropolitans themselves of the said Dioceses shall, as has been said, be ordained by the Archbishop of Constantinople, concordant elections being made according to custom, and reported to him."

SECT.  
III.

ἀποδεδώ-  
κασι τὰ  
πρεσβεία.

"The Legates, being informed of what had passed, demanded that the Council should assemble again, and the magistrates be present. On the morrow, therefore, being Thursday, the 1st November, the twelfth sitting was held. The magistrates were there with the Legates, and the Bishops of Illyria, and all the rest. After they had taken their seats, Paschasinus spoke, having asked permission of the magistrates, and said that he was astonished that so many things had been done the day before in their absence, which were contrary to the Canons and the peace of the Church, for which the Emperor was labouring with so much application and zeal. He demanded the reading of what had passed the day before. And Aétius, (Archdeacon of Constantinople,) having said that it was the Legates themselves who had refused to be present at the deliberation, presented

Tillemont,  
tom. 15.  
p. 711.

The sittings  
are various-  
ly counted.

CHAP.  
IV.

the Canon which had been drawn up with the signatures of the Bishops . . . . After the signatures had been read, Lucentius said the Bishops had been surprised, and compelled to sign. This is what St. Leo repeated often in the letter which he wrote concerning this twenty-eighth Canon, accusing Anatolius of having extorted the signatures of the Bishops, or of having surprised them by his artifices. Nevertheless, upon the reproach of Lucentius, all the Bishops cried out that no one had been forced. They protested again afterwards, both all in common, and the principal by themselves, that they had signed it of their full consent. Anatolius also maintains to St. Leo, that the Bishops took this resolution of their own accord.

Mansi 7.  
445, 451.

“The Legates continued to oppose the Canon, and shewed that they had an express order of the Pope to do so.” “The magistrates said, ‘Let each side produce the Canons.’ Paschasinus thereupon read the sixth Nicene Canon, with the celebrated heading, ‘The Roman Church always held the Primacy,’ as being opposed to the claim of the See of Constantinople. On the other side Aetius read this same Canon as it is in the original Greek, and then the three Canons of the second Ecumenical Council. The magistrates then called on the Bishops of the Pontic and Asian Dioceses who had subscribed the new Canon, to declare whether their subscription was voluntary. They severally declare that it was. The Bishops who had not subscribed are then asked the same question.”

Fleury, liv.  
28. 80. Oxf.  
Tr., vide  
Mansi 7.  
451.

τὰ πρω-  
τεία, καὶ  
τὴν ἐξάρε-  
τον τιμῆν.  
τῶν ἀντῶν  
πρεσβείων  
τῆς τιμῆς.

Thereupon “the magistrates said,—‘It appears from the depositions, first of all that the Primacy and precedency of honour should be preserved according to the Canons for the Archbishop of Old Rome, but that the Archbishop of Constantinople ought to enjoy the same privileges, and that he has a right to ordain the Metropolitans of the Dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, in the manner following. In each metropolis, the clergy, the proprietors of lands, and the gentry, with all the Bishops of the Province, or the greater part of them, shall issue a decree for the election of one whom they shall deem worthy of being made a Bishop of the metropolis. They shall all make a report of it to the Archbishop of Constantinople, and it shall be at his option

either to enjoin the Bishop elect to come thither for ordination, or to allow him to be ordained in the Province. As to the Bishops of particular cities, they shall be ordained by all, or the greater part, of the com-provincial Bishops, under the authority of the Metropolitan, according to the Canons, the Archbishop of Constantinople taking no part in such ordination. These are our views, let the Council state theirs.' The Bishops shouted, 'This is a just proposal: we all say the same: we all assent to it, we pray you dismiss us:' with other similar acclamations. Lucentius, the Legate, said,—'The Apostolic See ought not to be degraded in our presence; we, therefore, desire that yesterday's proceedings, which violate the Canons, may be rescinded; otherwise let our opposition be inserted in the Acts, that we may know what we are to report to the Pope, (the Apostolic and chief Bishop of the whole Church,) and that he may declare his opinion of this contempt of his See, and subversion of the Canons.' The magistrates said,—'The whole Council approves of what we said.' Such was the last Session of the Council of Chalcedon."

The remarks of Tillemont on this Canon are significant and worth transcribing. "It seems," he says, "to recognise no particular authority in the Church of Rome, save what the Fathers had granted it, as the seat of the empire. And it attributes in plain words as much to Constantinople as to Rome, with the exception of the first place. *Nevertheless I do not observe that the Popes took up a thing so injurious to their dignity, and of so dangerous a consequence to the whole Church.* For what Lupus quotes of St. Leo's 78th (104th) letter, refers rather to Alexandria and to Antioch, than to Rome. St. Leo is contented to destroy the foundation on which they built the elevation of Constantinople, maintaining that a thing so entirely ecclesiastical as the Episcopate ought not to be regulated by the temporal dignity of cities, which, nevertheless, has been almost always followed in the establishment of the metropolis, according to the Council of Nicca."

Significant remarks of Tillemont, tom. 15. p. 707, on the mode in which the Canon was opposed at Rome.

"St. Leo also complains that the Council of Chalcedon broke the decrees of the Council of Nicea, the practice of antiquity, and the rights of Metropolitans. Certainly it was

CHAP.  
IV.

an odious innovation to see a Bishop made the chief, not of one department but of three; for which no example could be found save in the authority which the Popes took over Illyricum, where, however, they did not claim the power to ordain any Bishop."

St. Leo's own language quite opposed to the present Roman claims.

Now I suppose any Roman Catholic would observe that this Canon is entirely opposed to the present Papal Theory: he would say that St. Leo and the West for that very reason refused to receive it. The opposition, beyond all question, is such, that it is quite impossible to reconcile them. Let any one, then, read through the 104th letter of St. Leo to the Emperor Mauricius, the 105th to the Empress Pulcheria, and the 106th to Anatolius himself, and he will see that St. Leo bases his opposition to it throughout on its being a violation of the Nicene Canons: there is not a word in all the three letters about any violation of the rights of St. Peter. May we not quote, alas! St. Leo's words, in these letters, to St. Leo's successor. "He loses his own, who lusts after what is not his due. . . . For the privileges of the Churches, instituted by the Canons of the holy Fathers, and fixed by the decrees of the venerable Nicene Synod, cannot be plucked up by any wickedness, or changed by any innovation. In the faithful execution of which work, by the help of Christ, I am bound to shew persevering service; since the dispensation has been entrusted to me, and it tends to my guilt, if the rules of the Fathers' sanctions, which were made in the Nicene Council for the government of the whole Church, by the teaching of God's Spirit, be violated, which God forbid, by my connivance; and if the desire of one brother be of more weight with me than the common good of the whole house of the Lord." This to the Emperor. To the Empress thus:—"Since no one is allowed to attempt anything against the statutes of the Fathers' Canons, which many years ago were based on spiritual decrees in the city of Nicea; so that if any one desires to decree anything against them, he will rather lessen himself than injure them. *And if these are kept uninjured, as it behoves, by all Pontiffs, there will be tranquil peace and firm concord through all the Churches. There will be no dissensions concerning the degree of honours; no contests about ordinations;*

S. Leo.,  
Ep. 104.  
cap. 8.

Ep. 105.

*no doubts about privileges ; no conflicts about the usurpation of another's right ; but under the equal law of charity both men's minds and duties will be kept in the due order ;* and he will be truly great, who shall be alien from all ambition, according to the Lord's words, 'Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister,' &c. But to Anatolius, thus:—"Those holy and venerable Fathers, who in the Nicene city established laws of ecclesiastical Canons, *which are to last till the end of the world,* when the sacrilegious Arius with his impiety was condemned, live both with us and in the whole world by their constitutions ; and if anything anywhere is presumed upon contrary to what they appointed, it is without delay annulled," &c.

Ep. 106.  
cap. 4.

But *what* the violation was he likewise states : it is not any wrong done to his own See personally. He says to the Empress : "But what doth the Prelate of the Church of Constantinople desire more than he hath obtained ? Or what will satisfy him, if the magnificence and glory of so great a city satisfy him not ? It is too proud and immoderate to go beyond one's own limits, and, trampling on antiquity, to wish to seize on another's right. And, in order to increase the dignity of one, to impugn the Primacy of so many Metropolitans ; and to carry a new war of disturbance into quiet Provinces, settled long ago by the moderation of the holy Nicene Council," &c.

Ep. 105.  
cap. 2.

To Anatolius himself he says : "I grieve—that you attempt to infringe the most sacred constitutions of the Nicene Canons : as if this were a favourable opportunity presented to you, when the See of Alexandria may lose the privilege of the second rank, and the Church of Antioch its possession of the third dignity : so that when these places have been brought under your jurisdiction, all Metropolitan Bishops may be deprived of their proper honour." "I oppose you, that with wiser purpose you may refrain from throwing into confusion the whole Church. Let not the rights of provincial Primacies be torn away, nor Metropolitan Bishops be deprived of their privileges in force from old time. Let no part of that dignity perish to the See of Alexandria, which it was thought worthy to obtain through the holy Evangelist Mark, the disciple of blessed Peter ;

Ep. 106.  
cap. 2—5.

CHAP.  
IV.

nor, though Dioscorus falls through the obstinacy of his own impiety, let the splendour of so great a Church be obscured by another's disgrace. Let also the Church of Antioch, in which first, at the preaching of the blessed Apostle Peter, the name of Christian arose, remain in the order of its hereditary degree, and being placed in the third rank never sink below itself."

What the  
injury was,  
and to  
whom done.

Ep. 107.

So then it was not St. Peter's Primacy, nor his own proper authority in the Church, which St. Leo conceived to be attacked by this Canon; but he refused to be a party to "treading under foot the constitution of the Fathers"—to disturbing "the state of the universal Church, protected of old by a most wholesome and upright administration." So the Emperor Marcian, Anatolius, Julian of Cos, beseech Leo to grant this, without so much as imagining that they are injuring *his* rank by asking it. I see not how it is possible to avoid the conclusion, that the power of the First See, even as its most zealous occupant viewed it, was quite different from that power which was set up in the middle ages. This is only one of a vast number of proofs which distinguish the Primacy from the present Supremacy. And it is the more valuable, because St. Leo certainly carries his notion of his own rights as universal Primate further than any Father of his time. I shall have occasion to make a like remark presently in the matter of St. Gregory's protest.

Reason as-  
signed to  
the Em-  
press for  
rejecting  
the 28th  
Canon.  
Ep. 105.  
c. 3.

But, indeed, such a Canon as this being passed in the most numerous Ecumenical Synod, in spite of the opposition of the Pope's Legates, speaks for itself. I am well aware that St. Leo refused to receive it, but then the reason which he assigned for this refusal must be carefully weighed. His words to the Empress Pulcheria are: "That consent of the Bishops which is opposed to the rules of the sacred Canons established at Nicea, joining with ourselves your Piety's faith, we declare void, and by the authority of the blessed Apostle Peter annul it by a declaration which is absolutely general, viz., *that in all Ecclesiastical causes WE OBEY those laws which the Holy Spirit, by means of the three hundred and eighteen Prelates, appointed for the peaceable observance of all Priests, so that even should a far greater number decree any thing different to what they appointed, whatever is in opposi-*

tion to the appointment of the aforesaid is to be treated with SECT III.  
*no sort of regard.*" Thus St. Leo not only maintains every-  
 where the supreme authority of the Nicene Canons, to which  
 the English Church appeals, and by which she claims to be  
 governed, but he absolutely denies to the Church after him  
 the power of altering these Canons. A more pointed exclu-  
 sion, however unconscious, of the doctrine of development,  
 at least as to the Church's constitution, is not to be found.

According to his decision the 28th Canon was not received  
 in the West; but it nevertheless always prevailed in the  
 East, and the Popes ultimately conceded the point it en-  
 acted. And from the hour it was enacted to this it has  
 remained the law of the Eastern Church; and the Patri-  
 archal power, which in the Western Church has developed  
 into the Papal, has remained attached to the throne of Con-  
 stantinople in the other great division of Christ's kingdom.

The West  
 rejects:  
 the East  
 maintains  
 it.  
 Tillemont,  
 tom. 15.  
 p. 731.

The ninth Canon of Chalcedon also says:—"If a Clergy-  
 man has any matter against his own Bishop or another, let  
 him plead his cause before the Council of the Province. But  
 if either a Bishop or Clergyman have a controversy against  
 the Metropolitan of the same Province, let him have recourse  
 either to the Exarch of the Diocese, or to the throne of the  
 imperial city of Constantinople, and plead his cause before  
 it." I remark this, because it is a far greater power of hear-  
 ing appeals granted to the Bishop of Constantinople, than  
 was granted to the Bishop of Rome a hundred years before  
 at the Council of Sardica.

Greater  
 power of  
 hearing  
 appeals  
 granted to  
 Constanti-  
 nople, than  
 at Sardica  
 to Rome.

But there is another Canon of the Council of Chalcedon  
 which is of the greatest importance in the Papal controversy.  
 "After Chrysostome," says Archbishop de Marca, "before  
 the time of the Council of Chalcedon, the Canons of Nicea,  
 Ancyra, Neocæsarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, and Con-  
 stantinople, to the number of a hundred and sixty-five, were  
 collected into one body by the industry of some Bishop." . . .  
 . . . . . "But because the Canons comprehended in that col-  
 lection, although sufficiently recommended by their own  
 utility, had not yet been approved by all Churches, and  
 especially by the Western and the Egyptian, it was ordered  
 by the first Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, that they  
 should have force everywhere. These are the words of the

Code of the  
 ancient  
 Church re-  
 ceived and  
 confirmed  
 in the first  
 Canon of  
 Chalcedon.  
 De Concor.  
 lib. 3. c. 3.  
 § 4.

CHAP.  
IV.

Canon according to the version of Dionysius Exiguus. 'We decree that the Canons of the holy Fathers which have been enacted in the several Councils to the present day should hold good.' The Canons of the Council of Chalcedon were added to this collection, which, increased by these enactments, was in force with full authority not only through all the Churches of the East, but also in the West. To this collection of Canons Justinian referred, when in his novell (131) he assigns the force of law to those Canons, which had been issued, or likewise confirmed, by the four Ecumenical Councils, that is, which had been passed by particular Councils, but were confirmed by the first Canon of the Council of Chalcedon."

The Ecclesiastical Constitution which it sets forth.

These 165 Canons may be read over in a very short time: they elucidate and corroborate each other, and they contain a complete system of Church government. Any one then may satisfy himself of the truth of the assertion I make: that they not only do not recognise the Papal monarchy, not only are silent about it, but that they set forth in the clearest manner a system of government, the Episcopal and Patriarchal, which is essentially opposed to it, which by no ingenuity however great, no novel theory however specious, can possibly be reconciled with it. They are especially valuable as proving that no power of hearing Episcopal causes by appeal belonged, inherently at all, or by practice for three centuries, to the Roman See.

Relation of the Council to St. Leo.

Mansi 6.  
148—156.

Finally the Council of Chalcedon addresses the following relation of what it had done to St. Leo:

"The holy, great, and Ecumenical Council, assembled at Chalcedon, metropolis of the Province of Bithynia, by the grace of God, and the command of our most pious and Christ-loving Emperors, to Leo, most holy and blessed Archbishop of the Church of the Romans.

"Our mouth was filled with laughter and our tongue with joy: grace has fitted this prophecy to us, by whom the restoration of piety has been accomplished. For what can be higher matter of concern for joy than the Faith? or motive for brighter pleasure than the knowledge of the Lord, which the Saviour Himself delivered unto us from above for our salvation, when He said, Go ye and make disciples all nations, baptizing

them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. This knowledge, descending to us like a golden chain from the command of Him who established it, thou hast kept throughout, *being set forth to all men as the interpreter of the voice of the blessed Peter, and drawing upon all the blessing of his faith.* Whence we also, enjoying the advantage of thee as our leader unto good, have exhibited the inheritance of the truth to the children of the Church, not teaching each by himself in a corner, but making known the confession of the Faith with one Spirit, with one accord and agreement. And we were in delight together, feasting as at a royal banquet, on the spritual dainties which Christ bestowed on us His guests by thy letter, and we seemed to behold the heavenly bridegroom going in and out among us. For if, where two or three are gathered together in His name, there He said He would be in the midst of them, how intimately shewed He Himself to five hundred and twenty Priests, who preferred the declaration of their confession in Him before both their country and their toil? *Amongst whom thou as a head over the members didst preside,* in the persons of those who held thy place, shewing thy good-will. And our faithful Emperors, for the maintenance of order, as Zorobabel did to Joshua, governed the Church being as it were Jerusalem, and shewed their zeal for the re-edification of the Faith.

SECT.  
III.

The Pope  
successor of  
St. Peter,

and head  
over the  
members.

“Now the adversary would have been like a wild beast out of the fold roaring by himself, not able to catch any, had not he who of late presided over the Alexandrian Church thrown himself as a prey unto him. For, shocking as were his former misdeeds, he has cast them into the shade by his later. For, contrary to all the order of the Canons, he deposed that blessed and now sainted Flavian, chief shepherd of Constantinople, who maintained the Apostolic Faith, and the most religious Bishop Eusebius: while Eutyches, that was condemned for impiety, he absolved by his tyrannical decrees. And the rank which had been taken away by thy Holiness, as from one unworthy of that grace, he gave back: and, falling like a ranging wild beast on the vine, tore up the plant which he found the best, and brought in what was

CHAP.  
IV.

cast forth as fruitless: and those who were for the shepherd he cut off, but set over the sheep such as had been proved to be wolves: and beside all this, *turned his madness even against the very one entrusted by the Saviour with the guardianship of the vine, thy Holiness we mean*, and meditated excommunication against him who was zealous to unite the body of the Church. And when he should have repented for this, when he should with tears have besought mercy, he exulted in them as fine deeds, and, while he rejected the letter of thy Holiness, resisted all affirmation of the truth. Now needful it was to have left him in the portion which he had chosen for himself, but since we profess to be disciples of the Saviour, who willeth all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, we hastened to shew this kindness to him in deed: and we called him fraternally to trial, not as endeavouring to cut him off, but affording him opportunity of defence for his recovery. And we prayed that he might appear better than the varied charges of those who accused him, that we might dissolve our assembly with joy, and in nothing have an advantage gained against us by Satan. But this man, having the conviction of his conscience written in himself, by declining judgment assented to the accusations. And he refused the three legal citations made to him. Wherefore that sentence, which by his misdeeds he gave against himself, we with all possible moderation ratified, stripping the wolf of the shepherd's coat: to which he was long ago convicted of only pretending. Hitherto our task has been painful: but here the pleasure of good dawned upon us. We have been delighted to fill the whole world with good seed at the cost of rooting up one tare. And as those who have received authority to pluck up and to plant, we sighed over a single excision, while we carefully strengthened a harvest of blessings. For it was God that worked in us, and Euphemia triumphant in victory, who offered our assembly as a chaplet to her Bridegroom: and receiving the definition of the Faith from us as if it were her own confession, presented it to her Bridegroom through the most pious Emperor, and the Christ-loving Empress, stilling all the tumult of opponents, giving strength to the confession of the truth, as dear to her, and with hand and

Present  
power of  
the Saints  
attested by  
the Church  
Catholic.

tongue adding her sentence unto demonstration to the sentences of all. This is what we have done together with thee, who wast present in spirit, and resolved to agree with us as brethren, and wast all but seen in the wisdom of thy Legates.

“ We make known to you also that we have decreed certain other points with a view to good order and the stability of the Ecclesiastical laws, being persuaded that your Holiness likewise, when instructed, will receive and confirm them. For that long prevailing custom which the holy Church of God at Constantinople had of ordaining Metropolitans for the Asian, Pontic, and Thracian Dioceses, we have now ratified by synodical decree, not so much granting any favour to the See of Constantinople, as providing for the good order of the Metropolitan cities, because tumults often spring up in them upon the death of their Bishops, the clergy and laity being without a head, and throwing into confusion the ecclesiastical order. And this your Holiness is aware of, especially in the case of the Ephesians, for which you have been often troubled. We have likewise confirmed the Canon of the 150 holy Fathers who assembled at Constantinople in the time of the great Theodosius of pious memory, *which declares that, after your most holy Apostolic See, that of Constantinople should be privileged, holding the second rank: being persuaded that, as you shine yourself in the full light of Apostolic radiance, you have, with habitual regard, often extended this likewise to the Church of Constantinople, inasmuch as you can afford without grudging to impart your own blessings to your kindred.* What therefore we have decreed for the removal of all confusion, and the confirmation of ecclesiastical order, have the goodness, most holy and blessed Father, to embrace, as being your own, pleasing to you, and conducing to harmony. For the most holy Bishops Paschasinus and Lucentius, and the most religious Presbyter Boniface, who is with them, the Legates of your Holiness, have attempted vehemently to resist what has been so decreed, doubtless with the wish that you should have the initiative, and with this good forethought, that the successful issue not only of the Faith, but of good order, should be set to your account. For we, out of regard to the most pious and Christ-loving Emperors, who are gratified with this, and

CHAP.  
IV.

to the illustrious Senate, and in a word to the whole imperial city, have judged well-timed the confirmation of this honour to it by the Ecumenical Council, and have ratified it with confidence, as if it had been begun by thy Holiness, who art ever ready to cherish them: *being aware that every success of the children is reckoned to the parents who own them.* We therefore entreat that you would honour our decision with your suffrage likewise: *as we have introduced agreement with the head in good things, so let your Highness fulfil to your children what is fitting.* For thus both the pleasure of the pious Emperors will be cared for, who have confirmed the decision of thy Holiness as law, and the See of Constantinople will be requited, which has ever shewn all eagerness to you in the cause of piety, and zealously joined itself in harmony with you. But that you may know that we have done nothing out of favour or enmity, but as guided by the Divine will, *we have left the whole force of the Acts to you that you may approve of us, confirming, and assenting to, what we have done."*

Distinction  
between  
Primacy  
and Supre-  
macy in the  
Council's  
language.

The strength of the terms in which the Council here honours the Pope seems to correspond to the strength of the opposition which it had offered to his wishes in the matter of the See of Constantinople. Certain at least it is that, in spite of the deference shewn at the conclusion, St. Leo and his successors strained every nerve to annul the predominance thus given to Constantinople in the East, but without effect. However, the acts and the words of the Council, put together, seem to combine what some think only an inconsistency, the recognition of a true and real Primacy in the Church, with a true and real self-government of its several provinces. *Both* at this time existed. On the one hand, he who rejects the Primacy of the Pope, with this letter of the Council of Chalcedon before him, must be prepared to give up the witness of antiquity, and to reject the authority of the Catholic Church. On the other hand, it is much to be observed that the acts and the words of the Council give no countenance to the present Papal Theory, for they declare that *in whatever sense Rome is first, in that same sense Constantinople is second.* If the *Primus inter pares* becomes a monarch, it is not a development,

but an usurpation. To deny Peter his own place is schism : to refuse him that of Christ, is duty. S E C T.  
III.

Now let us be fair and even-handed. If the great influence and authority exercised at the Council of Chalcedon by St. Leo is to be acknowledged as witnessing the Roman Primacy, let us also, grant that, unless the Acts and the Canons of the first four Ecumenical Councils are to be swept away as waste paper before the omnipotence of Papal prerogative, then the ancient decrees of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, offer an insurmountable barrier to the present claims of Rome. But concerning the Canons of Nicea, St. Leo, at least, says :—"I hold all ecclesiastical rules to be dissolved, if any part of that sacrosanct constitution of the Fathers be violated." St. Gregory repeats :—"I receive the four Councils of the holy universal Church as the four books of the Holy Gospel." Mr. Newman says, "that the definition passed at Chalcedon is the Apostolic Truth once delivered to the Saints, is most firmly to be received from faith in that overruling Providence, which is by special promise extended over the acts of the Church." Does it not equally follow that the Church government recognised as immemorial, and enforced at Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, *and the doctrine which is involved therein*, are likewise to be maintained, and that none who appeal to them with truth, as practised by themselves, whatever else they may fall into, can be guilty of schism ?

Conclusion  
from the  
whole his-  
tory.

S. Leo, Ep.  
107.

S. Greg.  
Ep., lib. 3.  
10.

On Deve-  
lopment, p.  
307.

## CHAPTER V.

## SECT. I.

Period  
succeeding  
the Council  
of Chalce-  
don.

THE hundred and thirty years between the death of St. Leo and the accession of St. Gregory were years of trouble, confusion, and disaster: "the stars fell from heaven, and the powers of the heavens were shaken." The Western empire was overthrown; barbarians and heretics obtained the mastery in Italy, and generally in the West; there was but one fixed and central authority to which the eyes of Churchmen could turn with hope and confidence in the whole West, that of the Roman Pontiff.

Gieseler,  
tom. 1.  
§ 117.  
State of the  
Church in  
the East  
after the  
beginning  
of the Mo-  
nophysite  
conten-  
tions.

"In the East from the beginning of the Monophysite contentions the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch had become so powerless, that only the Patriarchs of Constantinople, supported by the privileges received from the Council of Chalcedon, could still match themselves with the Roman Hierarchs. But whilst the former were continually dependent on the imperial humour, and unceasingly pressed by the Greek controversial spirit, the latter enjoyed the fullest freedom in Ecclesiastical matters, and the advantage of standing at the head of the West, less susceptible of contentions on points of belief, and therefore united. After the extinction of the Western Roman Empire, (476,) which had never been burdensome, often advantageous, to them, the Roman Bishops became subjects of German princes, who permitted the hierarchy to act with perfect freedom in the internal affairs of the Church. So especially acted Theodorick, king of the Arian Ostrogoths, (493—526,) to whom the schism continuing between Rome and Constantinople gave sufficient security, that no connections dangerous to the state were to be feared from the Catholic hierarchy. When, after the death of the Bishop Anastasius, the new choice was divided between Symmachus and Laurentius, (498,) he caused himself

first to be invited by both parties to decide, and then quietly permitted that a Roman Council under Symmachus (502) should reject all interference of laymen in the affairs of the Roman Church. SECT.  
I

“Thus were the Roman Bishops hindered in nothing, rather would it be only advantageous to them with their new masters, that they firmly resisted the innovations in belief at Constantinople, until they won a new victory over them upon Grecian wavering, under the Emperor Justin. The natural consequence of this was, that while the Patriarchs of Constantinople sunk in Ecclesiastical esteem through their indecision in these contentions, the Bishops of Rome only confirmed their old renown, of being protectors of oppressed orthodoxy.

“Under these favourable circumstances the Ecclesiastical pretensions of the Roman Bishops, who now formed the only centre of Catholic Christendom in the West over against the Arian conquerors, could without hindrance increase. They maintained that not only the right of the highest Ecclesiastical tribunal in the West, but the superintendence of orthodoxy and the maintenance of the Church’s laws in the whole Church, belonged to them: and they based these pretensions still, it is true, at times on imperial edicts, and decrees of Councils, but oftener upon the privileges granted to Peter by the Lord. After the Synodus Palmaris, convoked by Theodorick to inquire into the accusations raised anew against Symmachus by the party of Laurentius, had, influenced by the circumstances, acquitted him without inquiry, Ennodius, defender of this Council, Bishop of Ticinum in 511, first gave utterance to the assertion that the Roman Bishop can be judged by no one. Soon afterwards it was endeavoured to give also an historical basis to this principle by forging acts of older Popes: as likewise other falsifications of older documents in favour of the Roman Chair even now come before us. Still the Roman Bishops, to whom already in Italy the name of Pope was given in distinction, challenged as yet no other sort of respect than the rest of the Apostolic Sees: they still confessed that they were subordinate to General Councils, and that Bishops were bound to hear them only in case of a fault incurred, but otherwise were their equals in rank.”

CHAP.  
V.

What I have selected, as bearing on our subject, will illustrate this summary of Gieseler.

Affair of  
Timothy  
the Cat  
settled by  
the general  
consent of  
the Metro-  
politans  
and their  
Councils.

In the year 457 sad excesses took place at Alexandria. The authority of the Council of Chalcedon was resisted in Egypt, especially after the death of the Emperor Marcian, its supporter. The Patriarch Proterius, who had succeeded on the deposition of Dioscorus, was martyred in the baptistery, and Timothy the Cat set up by a furious party in his stead. He was the instigator of this murder, and the declared enemy of the Council of Chalcedon: but he had got possession of the Church of Alexandria. The case therefore respected what Rome still considered to be the second See of the Church, as well as concerned the preservation of the true Faith. In this emergence the Catholic Bishops of Egypt applied to the Emperor Leo, and to Anatolius, Archbishop of Constantinople. They beseech the Emperor that he would "condescend to write to the most holy Archbishop of the Roman city, in order that these events might be made known to him; likewise to the Bishop of Antioch, and Jerusalem, and of the city of Thessalonica, and of Ephesus, and to such others as he should think good: for that they had already set their cause by petition before Anatolius, Archbishop of the royal city: in order that their Holiness, taking certain cognizance of the evils which have been caused to the Churches and Bishops of the orthodox through Timothy, may report to your Piety what, in such misdeeds, is decreed by the rules of the holy Fathers." Of Timothy they say that he "anathematizes the supreme Archbishops, that is, Leo of Rome, Anatolius of Constantinople, and Basil of Antioch." The same Bishops request Anatolius, whom they entitle "most religious Father," to "make known their sorrows by synodical letters to Leo, most holy Pontiff of the Roman Church, also to the Bishops of Antioch, Jerusalem, Thessalonica, and Ephesus, and such others as shall seem good, since this crime is a common injury, that all the Bishops of the whole world taking cognizance of the presumptuous acts of Timothy, and of his innovations against the holy rules and orthodox religion, may write back by synodical letters to the Emperor and to your Holiness, according to the venerable rules of the Fathers, and give without delay the proper order to be followed." The Em-

Mansi 7.  
528. D.

Mansi 7.  
529. C.

Mansi 7.  
532. B.  
534. D.

peror directs Anatolius to hold a Council on the matter, "in order that gaining from all their letters a complete knowledge on these things," he might restore tranquillity to the Egyptian Diocese. Anatolius informs the Emperor that he had made the matter known to the Pope and the several Metropolitans, and gives his sentence, "I determine that Timothy is not worthy of the Episcopate." The Emperor wrote besides to the Metropolitans throughout the world, beginning with the Pope, directing them to hold Provincial Councils on the matter. Thirty-six of their answers are extant, including that of St. Leo, who spoke for the whole West, and of Anatolius; the rest belong to the chief Metropolitans of the East, speaking in the name of their several Bishops, as well as in their own. All approved the Council of Chalcedon: all rejected the ordination of Timothy. Thus the matter was settled by common consent.

SECT.  
I.  
Ib., 522. C.  
Ib., 538. A.

Bossuet, after referring to this, says: "Let them now call Bishops Counsellors of the Roman Pontiff. But the Emperor did not ask for Councils from the Bishops, to send to Pope Leo, but decrees and judgments, to be immediately executed. . . . Thus in the most important dissensions and dangers the authority of the Catholic Church, diffused throughout the world, but actuated ever by one spirit, exercises itself even without a General Council."

Def., lib. 9.  
c. 13.

It may be added that a dispute concerning the succession to what had been from the earliest times the Second See, was not referred simply to the judgment of the First: nay, the oppressed Catholic Bishops of Egypt apply to the Patriarch of Constantinople immediately, but to the Pope only mediately, and through him. And Anatolius occupies that place, which his predecessors since 381 had held *de facto*, and which had been assigned to him *de jure* by the Council of Chalcedon in its 28th Canon. His Deacon, Asclepiades, it appears, carried his letters to the Pope and all the Bishops who had met at Chalcedon, asking their decision, as did the Emperor, both respecting Timothy, and the maintenance of the Council of Chalcedon.

Great authority of the Bishop of Constantinople.

CHAP.  
V.

SECT. II.

Schism between the East and West in the time of Acacius.

IN the year 482 incidents arose which led to a most calamitous schism, lasting for thirty-five years, between the whole East and the West. John Talaia was duly elected Patriarch of Alexandria, but in notifying his election to his brother Patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem, it so happened that his letter to Acacius of Constantinople was not duly delivered, and that Patriarch, hearing of his election first from other sources, imagined that a deliberate slight was intended to his own person, or to his See. It would appear that the Patriarchs of Constantinople even at this time aspired to the exercise of very nearly, if not quite, as great power in the East, as the Patriarch of Rome possessed in the West. Thus Acacius in his anger set himself against John Talaia, and caused the heretical Peter Mongus to be recognised by the Emperor and the East as Patriarch of Alexandria. Through the same influence Calendion, the legitimate Patriarch of Antioch, was expelled, and the heretical Peter the Fuller substituted. John Talaia fled to Rome for succour. In vain Pope Felix the Third remonstrated with Acacius, who, supported by the Emperor Zeno, persisted in the course he had begun. Thereupon, after repeated admonitions, Pope Felix, at the head of his Council of 77 Italian Bishops, pronounced sentence of absolute degradation and excommunication against Acacius in the following terms: "Have therefore thy portion with those whom thou willingly embracest, according to the present sentence, which we direct to thee through the defender of thy Church, being severed from sacerdotal rank, and Catholic Communion, and likewise from the number of the faithful. Learn that thou art deprived of the name and office of the sacerdotal ministry, being condemned by the judgment of the Holy Spirit, and the Apostolical authority, and never to be released from the bond of Anathema." At the same time Peter Mongus of Alexandria, and Peter the Fuller of Antioch, were condemned. So that we have the First See at

Pope Felix condemns Acacius,

Mansi 7. 1137-8.

the head of its Provincial Council deposing the legitimate occupant of the *de facto* Second See, and disallowing the occupants of the Third and Fourth See, whom the Second had established. The decree was carried secretly to Constantinople, for no one dared to deliver it publicly through fear of the Emperor, and attached by some bold monks to the robe of Acacius as he was entering Church to celebrate mass. This action cost the monks their lives. But Acacius treated the Pope's decree with summary contempt, in which he was borne out both by the Emperor and the whole East. The most lamentable consequence was, that Communion between the East and West was broken off from A.D. 484 to 519: that Acacius induced the Emperor Zeno to impose his Henoticon on all the Bishops of his Empire, by which the authority of the Council of Chalcedon was set at nought: and that heresy and disturbances everywhere prevailed.

SECT.  
II.

who resists,  
and the  
East and  
West are  
severed.

Now, inexcusable as the conduct of Acacius was, the whole East seems to have agreed that the act of Pope Felix was a stretch of authority to which they could not submit. Their defence was, that nothing but an Ecumenical Council could depose the Bishop of Constantinople, against whom not heresy in his own person, but communicating with heretics, was alleged. On the other hand Pope Gelasius, the successor of Felix, high as he pushes his Primacy in the documents which are extant of his writing on this point, does not absolutely say that he could depose of his own authority the Bishop of Constantinople without a Council, although, certainly, his language is much bolder than that of Pope St. Innocent in the case of St. Chrysostome ninety years before, but maintains rather that Acacius was already condemned by the Council of Chalcedon for communicating with Eutychian heretics; and that he was simply carrying out the provisions of that Council, which not only the Apostolic See might do, but any Pontiff; "weighing which things," he observes, "according to the tradition of the Fathers, we are confident that no true Christian is ignorant, that no other See is more bound beyond the rest to execute the appointment of every single Council, which the assent of the universal Church has approved, than the First See, which both confirms every Council by its own authority,

Mansi,  
tom. 8. 17.  
B. 50. B.

Mansi 8.  
51.  
Pope Gela-  
sius de-  
clares that  
he is carry-  
ing out the  
provisions  
of the  
Council of  
Chalcedon.

CHAP. and maintains it by its continued government, that is, in  
 V. right of its first rank, which the blessed Apostle Peter

De Conc.,  
 lib. 3. c. 7.  
 § 2.

received from the voice of the Lord, and with the no less agreement of the Church hath ever held and holds." On which passage De Marca says, "He claims for the First See the especial execution of the Canons, but of those Canons which have been already received, and which the consent of the universal Church hath approved." On the one hand, therefore, we have the Eastern Church, with a cause otherwise bad, (for I suppose nothing can be alleged in favour of Peter Mongus, or Peter the Fuller, or the Henoticon of Zeno, or the conduct of Acacius as concerns these,) yet jealously maintaining its own self-government, in which it seems quite borne out by the deposition of Paul of Samosata by the Bishops of the East alone in 272, by the Acts of the Second Ecumenical Council in 381, and by the 28th Canon of Chalcedon in 451. I find these historical facts, not to mention the whole undeniable early government of the Church, not, to say the least, quite falling in with that view of the Primacy which I am about to quote from Pope Gelasius, although that view itself differs *toto cælo* from the claim set up in the middle ages, which is now sought to be imposed on all Churches. The Emperor Theodosius had declared absolutely to St. Ambrose in the matter of Maximus, who claimed the See of Constantinople, that the West had nothing to do with the government of the East: i. e. that its Patriarchs were in their several spheres supreme, subject of course to the common laws and Canons of the Church Catholic: and, so far as I can judge, this seems to have been the Eastern view from the very beginning to the present day: but the West not only *gradually* submitted to the *Patriarchal* authority of the Roman Bishop, (for at first Africa undoubtedly, and probably Britain, not to mention France, and other countries, were exempt from this,) but likewise recognised in St. Peter's See a certain control over the whole Church, *as defender and conservator of its Canons*. It was alleged in behalf of Acacius, that he had not recognised Peter Mongus as Patriarch of Alexandria without first absolving him. Pope Gelasius replies: "Since *without me* you have not the right either of absolving or

Eastern  
 view of the  
 Church's  
 govern-  
 ment from  
 the begin-  
 ning.

Mansi,  
 tom. 8. 80.  
 A. B.

receiving properly a person in such a position, it is plain that he was not acquitted lawfully or regularly." . . . "For, so long as my sentence against him remains, you having no right without me to undo my sentence, by what power is he either asserted to have been judged, or by what authority received?" Although St. Chrysostome near a hundred years before had governed eight and twenty Provinces as Bishop of Constantinople, although the Second Ecumenical Council had given that Bishop the rank of Second Bishop in the Church, and the Fourth Ecumenical Council ratified it afresh, and although Anatolius, at the Council of Chalcedon, had acted unquestionably as Second Bishop, in the presence of the Papal Legates, nay, been acknowledged by them as such, yet Pope Gelasius insists upon calling the Bishop of Alexandria the Second Bishop, and even insults Acacius by terming him a suffragan of Heraclea. He thus states his own Primacy: and surely the official statement of a Pope at the end of the fifth century about his own rights ought to be considered as setting them high enough. It is therefore an additional confirmation, that those who reject a totally different claim are not guilty of schism. Pope Gelasius says,

Mansi,  
tom. 8.  
p. 54. D.  
Pope Gela-  
sius states  
his Pri-  
macy.

"No one either could, or ought to expel, or restore, the Prelate of the Second See, without the consent of the First See. Unless indeed the whole order of things is to be thrown into disturbance and confusion, and neither the First, nor the Second, nor the Third See, is to claim observance or reception according to the ancient statutes of our ancestors; and by the removal of the head, all the members, as we see, are to struggle in wild contest against each other, and that which was written concerning the people of Israel is to happen: 'In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes.' For with what reason or consistence are other Sees to meet with deference, *if the ancient and time-honoured reverence is not paid to the First See of the most blessed Peter, by which the dignity of all Priests has ever been strengthened and confirmed, and for which, by the all-prevailing and peculiar judgment of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers, its most ancient honour was maintained.*"

CHAP.  
V.

S. Leo., Op.  
Ed. Ball,  
tom. 3. 52.

S. Jerome  
against  
Jovinian,  
lib. 1. c. 14.

Doubtless Pope Gelasius read the decrees of the Nicene Council according to the copy followed by Dionysius Exiguus, wherein the 6th Canon begins. "The Roman Church always had the Primacy." But then it must not be forgotten, that the Council speaks of the three great Sees in precisely similar language, so that to make a Monarchy out of the Primacy is utterly to contradict and destroy the meaning of that Council. Pope Gelasius proceeds, "Inasmuch as they remembered the sentence of the Lord, 'Thou art Peter, &c.' And again to the same, 'Lo, I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, &c. ;' and again, 'If thou lovest Me, feed My sheep.' Why then is the Lord's discourse so often directed to Peter? Were not, then, the other holy and blessed Apostles endued with similar virtue? Who would venture to assert this? But 'that by the appointment of a head the occasion of schism might be removed,' and that the body of Christ might be shewn to be of one compactness, meeting in one head by the most glorious bond of affection, and that the Church, which should be faithfully believed, might be one, and one the house of the One Lord and One Redeemer, in which we should be nourished of One Bread and of One Cup. Wherefore, as I have said, our ancestors, those reverend masters of the Churches, and illustrious luminaries of the Christian people, whom the worth of their virtues raised even to the most glorious victories of confession, and to the bright crowns of martyrdom, being full of the charity of Christ, sent to that See, in which Peter the chief of the Apostles had sat, the commencements of their Priesthood, looking thence for the greatest confirmation of their own strength. In order that by this sight it may be evident to all, that the Church of Christ is really in all respects one and indissoluble, which, wrought together by the bond of concord, and the wondrous contexture of charity, is shewn to be that robe of Christ single and undivided throughout, which not even the very soldiers who crucified the Lord dared to part."

If the Pope means by the above expressions the notification of their accession which the Patriarchs and Primates made to Rome, it must be added, that he too made the like to them, and that they as little waited for his authority,

when duly elected, to be consecrated, or to commence their functions, as he for theirs. A little further on he says, SECT.  
II.

“Assuredly there were twelve Apostles of equal merits and equal dignity. And though all shone equally with spiritual light, yet Christ willed that one out of them should be the chief, and directed him by a marvellous dispensation unto Rome the mistress of the nations, that in the chief or first city He might place Peter the first and chief.”

But as the identity of language used by the Nicene Council about the three great Sees implies the sameness of their authority, so here the words *first* and *chief* imply *second* and *like*. The Archbishop of Canterbury is the first Peer of England, but the last created Baron is just as much a Peer as he. Or again, he is the Primate of England, and matters beyond the sphere of his suffragans need his ratification, but the inferior Bishops do not derive their authority from him: and they have a deliberative voice as well as he. So in the Apostolic College Peter was “*first member* of the universal Church,” as Pope St. Gregory observes, but the Head of all was Christ. That which we resist is not the Pope being *Petri Vicarius*, but his being, *singly* and *solely*, *Christi Vicarius*. The restriction of this latter term to him, (for all Bishops are so as to Order in that they are Bishops, and as to Jurisdiction within their own Diocese,) after the first thousand years of the Christian era, gave an entirely new meaning to it: and on this Idea the Ecclesiastical legislation of Gratian’s decretals, and the succeeding ones, is built. But the phraseology of the First, Second, Third, &c. Sees, here used by Pope Gelasius, and universal in the time of the seven Ecumenical Councils, is quite opposed to this Idea. Certainly the Papal authority, as stated by Pope Gelasius in 493, is much greater than that claimed by Pope Julius in his letter to the Eusebian Bishops in 340,—and this was the reward of that unshaken orthodoxy which the First See had maintained in those hundred and fifty years, save the temporary fall of Liberius,—but it is the same in kind. The Primacy, being itself of divine institution, might yet have greater or smaller privileges attached to it by the Canons of Councils, or tacit consent of Bishops, but Primacy and Monarchy are radically different Ideas: so are the Patriarchal and the Papal Systems. Remarks on this statement.  
  
Distinction of ancient from mediæval claims.

CHAP.  
V.

That in fact Popes Felix and Gelasius were asserting and exercising privileges which had not been originally admitted as belonging to their See is plain, not only from the resistance of the East, but from the extant words of Pope Gelasius. He says in his instructions to Faustus, the Legate of King Theodorick,

Mansi, tom.  
8. 17. D.  
Pope Gela-  
sius attri-  
butes his  
power of  
hearing  
appeals to  
the Canons.

“They set against us the Canons, not knowing what they say: against which they betray their opposition by this very thing, that they shrink from obeying the First See, when it advises them soundly and rightly. *It is the Canons themselves which have ordered that appeals from the whole Church should be deferred to the examination of this See.* But they have decreed that no appeal any where should in any case be made from it, and by this that it should judge of the whole Church, while it should come itself before no one’s judgments, nor have they ordered that judgment should ever be passed upon its judgment, but appointed that its sentence should not be annulled, but rather its decrees observed.”

His claim  
goes beyond  
that of  
Pope St.  
Innocent,  
rejected by  
the African  
Bishops.

Here it is most carefully to be remarked that Pope Gelasius, like Pope Leo I. and Pope Zosimus, attributes the power of hearing appeals, belonging to his See, to the Canons, those doubtless of Sardica, in other words, to the regulations made by his brother-Bishops in Councils. As to the claim itself we have already seen that St. Innocent said something much less than this about eighty years before to St. Aurelius, St. Augustine, and the Universal Council of Africa: whereupon they asked him for his authority: authentic copies of the Nicene Canons were brought from Alexandria and Constantinople, and no such thing was found in them: and when it appeared that the Pope referred to the very limited privilege of hearing appeals first given to his See by the Council of Sardica, St. Aurelius, St. Augustine, and the Universal Council of Africa, positively refused to admit his right: and what they refused may, I suppose, be refused with impunity to the end of the world. Further, no such Canons, as the Pope refers to, can be produced, though the ancient Canons of the Church, either in the East or West, have not perished: but the Canons of the great Council of Chalcedon can be shewn, which declare that the See of Constantinople is the ultimate tribunal of appeal at least in the

East. Moreover, as I have quoted above, St. Augustine expressly mentions the power of appealing from the judgment of Pope Melchiades to an Universal Council: in fact, appeal was made from him to a provincial Council at Arles, without protest on his part. In truth it by no means follows that, because the Primacy is of divine institution, therefore all the privileges which are claimed under cover of the Primacy are likewise of divine institution. It was not schism to make the distinction in St. Augustine's or St. Cyril's time, neither is it schism now.

SECT.  
II.

Peace and union were only restored to the Church at the accession of the Catholic Emperor Justin, in the year 519, when the terms of the Pope were complied with, and the name of Acacius, as well as of the Patriarchs who had succeeded to him since the schism, expunged from the diptychs.

Restoration  
of unity on  
the terms  
of Rome.

SECT. III.

IN the year 499 Pope Symmachus was accused by certain of his Clergy and Laity to the King Theodorick, who sent a Bishop as visitor to take charge of the Roman Church, till the matter should be examined by a Council. This Council the king caused to assemble out of the Provinces of Rome, Milan, and Aquileia. On their passage to the Council many of these Bishops saw the king at Ravenna, and asked him the cause of the Council. "The most pious king replied, that many horrible stories had been brought to him concerning the conduct of Pope Symmachus, and that it ought to appear, by judgment in a Council, whether the accusation of his enemies was true." The above-mentioned Pontiffs replied, "that the person who was attacked ought himself to have called the Council, *knowing that to his See in the first place the rank or chiefship of the Apostle Peter, and then the authority of venerable Councils following out the Lord's command, had committed a peculiar power in the Churches, nor would a precedent be easily found to shew, that* in a similar matter the Prelate of the afore-mentioned See had been subject to the judgment of his inferiors. But the most mighty king declared, that the Pope himself had signified by

Pope Sym-  
machus  
ordered by  
Theodorick  
to be tried  
by an  
Italian  
Council.

Singula-  
rem.

CHAP.  
V.

letter his consent to the convoking of the Council." So at length the Council was held, and Pope Symmachus attended, and expressed his thanks to the king for the calling of the Council. Thus all scruple as to the Council's authority being removed, the Pope then desired that "the visitor, who had been demanded by a part of the Clergy, or certain of the Laity, contrary to religion, the statutes of the ancients, or the rules of our ancestors, should at once give way at the order of the Bishops," that all his power should be returned to him, "and the Prelate of so high a rank be first regularly restored to his previous condition, and then, not before, would plead his cause, and, if it so seemed good, answer the propositions of his accusers." This the Council thought should be done, but ventured not to decree anything without the knowledge of the king. The king, when applied to, "ordered that Pope Symmachus before the recovery of his patrimony, or the Churches which he had lost, should meet his opponents: and the Pope even then *was unwilling to resume the privileges of his authority, and the concessions which, as we justly consider, he had made for the purpose of clearing his conscience.*" But the Pope on his way to the Council was attacked by his opponents, and ran the risk of his life: whereupon he declined attending any more, and replied that "*he had not insisted on the above-mentioned Canons, humiliating his dignity through the desire of clearing himself, nearly at the cost of his life through such perils: that the king his lord had the right to do what he chose, but that in the mean time, if he refused to plead, he could not be compelled by the Canons.*" The king's reply was, "That he left it to the Council to prescribe the course of proceeding in so important a matter: nor had he any concern with Ecclesiastical affairs, save to reverence them, and that he committed it to the power of the Pontiffs to take the course they thought most advantageous, whether they chose to hear the matter before them, or not, provided only that by the care of the venerable Council peace might be restored to all Christians in the city of Rome." Whereupon the Council says, "Following the commands of God *we have given her ruler to Italy.*" Then, alleging the difficult circumstances which had attended their convocation,

The Council  
acquits him  
without  
entering  
into the  
case.

the dignity of the Apostle Peter's See, the impropriety of the sheep taking on them to provide against the snares of the wolf, rather than the shepherd, and the consent of almost all the people to Symmachus, they determine "that Pope Symmachus, Prelate of the Apostolic See, attacked by the above charges, be, so far as regards men, discharged and free, because the whole matter has been left to the divine judgment on account of the hindrances opposed by the above-mentioned causes; and that, without any crime being objected to him, he deliver the divine mysteries to the Christian people *in all the Churches which belong to the right of his See*: because we declare that he cannot be bound by the accusation of his enemies on account of the above-mentioned causes."

SECT.  
III.

Synodus  
Romana  
tertia sub  
Symmacho  
Papa.  
Mansi 8.  
247. D. 249.  
A. 250.

It is clear, I think, that the Bishops of Italy declined to judge their head in a private matter, (he is said to have been accused of adultery,) whatever they might have done in a case of heresy. But this matter further drew forth the following remarkable letter from Avitus, Bishop of Vienne. It is addressed to the Roman Senators Faustus and Symmachus. After premising that he could have wished the calamities of the times had permitted them to come to Rome, or, at least, that reasons of state did not hinder them from holding a national Council, but that, as neither of these courses was possible, all his Gallican brothers had charged him to make a representation in their name, he proceeds: "While we were in a state of anxiety and alarm about the cause of the Roman Church, *inasmuch as we felt that our order was endangered by an attack upon its head*, as a single accusation would have smitten us all even without any ill feeling of the multitude (in each Church), had it struck down the rank of our chief; anxious, I say, as we thus were, copies of the form of the sacerdotal decree were brought us from Italy, which the Prelates of Italy, convened at the city, had issued concerning Pope Symmachus. And though the consent of a numerous and venerable Council gives importance to this decree, yet our judgment is, that, if holy Pope Symmachus were accused to the secular powers, he should rather have gathered about him the support of his fellow-Priests, than have undergone their judgment. Be-

Remark-  
able letter  
of St.  
Avitus.

Testimony  
to the  
Primacy.

Aviti Epist.  
ad Senat.  
Faustum et  
Symmachum. Man-  
si 8. 293.

Utpote nu-  
tare statu-  
tum in la-  
cessito ver-  
tices senti-  
entes.

CHAP.  
V.

Eminen-  
tior.

Principa-  
tum.

The Epi-  
scopate it-  
self injured  
in the per-  
son of the  
Pope.

cause, as the ruler of heaven orders us to be subject to earthly powers, foretelling us that we shall stand before kings and princes under whatever accusation it may be, so we cannot easily conceive by what reason or law the superior is to be judged by his inferiors. For since the Apostle in a well-known precept exclaims, that an accusation ought not to be received even against an Elder, *what licence for accusations against the chiefship of the universal Church ought to be allowed?* And the venerable Council, providing against this itself by a laudable decree, chose to reserve to the judgment of God a cause which, with reverence to it be it said, it had almost inconsiderately undertaken to examine: observing however as briefly as it could, that none of the crimes objected to the Pope had been proved either to itself, or to the most illustrious King Theodorick. Wherefore, as a Roman senator, and as a Christian Bishop, (so may the prosperity you desire be granted to your times by the gift of the God of heaven, so may the dignity, by which you are conspicuous, maintain to the whole world the honour of the Roman name amid the shaking of earthly things,) I conjure you that the state of the Church be not less precious to you than that of the commonwealth, and that the power which God has put in your hands be for our advantage too, and that you bear not less affection in your Church to the See of Peter, than in your state to the capital of the world. If you judge the matter with your profound consideration, not merely is that cause which was examined at Rome to be contemplated: but as, if in the case of other Priests (i. e. Bishops) any danger be incurred, it can be repaired; *so, if the Pope of the City be put in question, not a single Bishop, but the Episcopate itself, will appear to be in danger.* You are well aware among what storms of heresies, while their winds sweep around us, we guide the ship of Faith: if, with us, you dread such dangers, it were well to defend your pilot by sharing his toil. Otherwise what means of safety is there, if the crew rage against the master, and way be given to them at their own hazard in such a crisis? He who rules the Lord's fold will render an account how he administers the care of the lambs entrusted to him: but it belongs not to the flock to alarm their own shepherd, but

to the Judge. Wherefore restore to us, if it be not yet restored, concord in our chief." SECT.  
III.

Doubtless in weighing the expressions of the letter the occasion of it must be borne in mind, viz., the first Metropolitan of the world, and the occupant of St. Peter's See, had been accused by some of his own Clergy and Laity to the civil power, who had directed his own suffragan Bishops to sit in judgment on him. What therefore would have been a great violation of the Canon in the case of any Metropolitan, was attempted on the person of the first Bishop of the Church. This may account for the words of St. Avitus, "inasmuch as we feel that our order was endangered by an attack upon its head, as a single accusation would have smitten us all even without any ill feeling of the multitude (in each Church), had it struck down the rank of our chief." Granting this, I confess I have not found any testimony so plain and so unimpeachable as this, of the same date, A.D. 501, to the great eminence of the Bishop of Rome, and to his position in the Church; at least according to the view held of him in the West. I question whether an Eastern would have said near so much. Receiving therefore the words of St. Avitus in their full and natural sense, and as the voice of all the Bishops of Gaul in his day, nothing can be more satisfactory than to feel, that they bear witness to the Patriarchal, and not to the Papal, Idea of the Church's constitution. The Bishop of Rome is "eminentior" among his "Consacerdotes:" the First of the Bishops, so that whatever touches his person, concerns the whole Episcopate: if the Bishop of Rome had never demanded more, the unity of Christendom had not, on his account, been broken. Principalem concordiam.

The Council, which in language so cautious acquitted Pope Symmachus, found both impugnors and defenders. Among the latter Ennodius, then a Deacon of high repute, afterwards Bishop of Ticinum, maintained that though the Bishop of Rome could send Bishops, as visitors, into the Sees of accused persons, yet that no power on earth could do the like to him: "God perchance has willed to terminate the causes of other men by means of men: but the Prelate of that See He hath reserved without question to His own judgment. It is His will that the successors of the blessed Idea indicated in these words.  
Statement of Ennodius in favour of the Council.  
Ennodius, Apologeticum pro Symmacho. Mansi 8. 284. A.

CHAP. V. Apostle Peter should owe their innocence to Heaven alone, and should manifest a pure conscience to the inquisition of

Card. Orsi,  
Hist. Ecc.  
37. 18. See  
Mansi 8.  
275. A.

the most severe Judge." He maintained likewise that "St. Peter has transmitted to his successors as a sort of dowry the fulness of his own merits, and the heritage of innocence. What was granted him in reward for his glorious deeds belongs likewise to those whose conversation and life are not less brilliant. Who can doubt that he is holy, who finds himself exalted to so high a degree of dignity? If he wants the advantages acquired by virtue of his own merit, those of his predecessor are sufficient for him. Jesus Christ either raiseth thither illustrious persons, or makes illustrious those who are so raised. And He, who invisibly sustains this spiritual building, well knows who is fit to serve for visible foundation to the great fabric of His Church. In fine, Ennodius has maintained, that the dignity of the Holy See renders impeccable those who mount it, or rather that God does not permit to approach there save those whom He has predestined to be saints. The continued holiness of so many supreme Pontiffs, predecessors of Symmachus, had inspired him with such an idea of the supreme Pontificate."

I can well understand this language in the mouth of an earnest Italian Churchman at the beginning of the sixth century: and the necessity which was felt amid the continual flux and reflux of worldly powers to have a sacrosanct and immoveable authority in the centre of the Church. I cannot, indeed, say whether Ennodius would have spoken so confidently of the holiness of St. Peter being an heirloom of his See, had he lived at the beginning of the eleventh, or of the sixteenth century, instead of the sixth. The remembrance of John XII. or of Alexander VI. might have sullied that glorious dream of sanctity. However that may be, this defence of the Synod was read before Pope Symmachus and his Council, and so warmly approved by them as to be inserted in the Acts, and ratified with all the authority they could give to it. "The Pope ordered that it should be put into the number of the Apostolical decrees. The Bishops next demanded the condemnation of those, who had accused the Pope, and attacked the Council. But the Pope begged that his persecutors might be treated more gently, declaring

His defence  
ratified by  
the Pope in  
Council.

Fleury, 30.  
55.

that he pardoned them. Nevertheless, to provide against such evils, he demanded that *the ancient Canons should be observed, according to which the sheep ought not to accuse their pastor, if he does not err against the Faith, or if he has not done them any private wrong.* The first of these exceptions is remarkable, because the Pope there admits that every Bishop, and himself, can be accused of error against the Faith." But the seed thus cast into the fertile ground of the Apostolical decrees was destined to germinate strongly. Gradually the opinion of Ennodius "that the First See is judged by no man," grew into a dogma, which became an axiom in medieval times. How much the power of the Roman Pontiff had grown in the 120 years which had elapsed from the time of Pope Damasus, we may judge from the fact that a letter exists from a Roman Council in his day, A.D. 378, to the Emperors Gratian and Valentinian, which stands in direct and formal contradiction to the dogma of Ennodius. "Hear also," it says, "another thing which that holy man (Pope Damasus) wishes rather to attribute to your piety than to claim for himself, and not to take from any one, but assign to the Emperors. *Since he does not ask any new privilege, but follows the precedents of his ancestors, that the Roman Bishop, if his cause is not entrusted to a Council, defend himself before the Imperial Council.* For likewise Pope Sylvester, when accused by sacrilegious men, pleaded his own cause before your ancestor Constantine. And similar examples are at hand out of Scripture: for when the holy Apostle suffered violence from the prefect, unto Cæsar he appealed, and unto Cæsar he was sent." A little before the writer, supposed to be St. Ambrose, had begged for Pope Damasus, "that he should not be treated as inferior to those, whom, though equal in office, he excels in the prerogative of the Apostolical See:" he means the Bishops, who were exempt from being tried by civil tribunals.

SECT.  
III.

His opinion that "the first See is judged by no man" passes into a dogma.

Mansi, tom. 3. 627. A. 626. E.

Yet is contradicted by a Roman Council in the year 378.

And by the practice of Pope Sylvester.

Now, doubtless, in all this, in the additional power, which their own noble and fearless maintenance of the Faith in the fourth and fifth centuries caused to be attached to the Roman Pontiffs, and in the very necessity for this which arises out of the hostile bearing of the powers of the world towards the Bride of Christ, the continual attempt to make her a slave

Remarks on this incident.

CHAP.  
V.

Mr. Newman on Development, p. 171.

whom they should honour as a queen, "we see before our eyes the centralizing process by which the See of St. Peter became the head of Christendom:" but what I do not see is, how privileges, not from the beginning inherent in that See, but added to it in the long course of ages, here one, and there another, by the concurrence or tacit allowance of Bishops in the West, can come forth as a divine right, to which all men, upon pain of their salvation, must yield. What, not being an original divine gift, was, in process of time, merely allowed by Bishops, may be resumed by the same power which conceded it. Most assuredly that privilege, which was conferred by our Lord on St. Peter and his successors, differs *toto cælo* from that infinite and irresponsible power, which we, as things at present stand, have only the alternative to accept or reject *en masse*. In other words, the Church is not governed according to the Nicene decrees, and the effects which Popes SS. Leo and Gregory foretold have followed.

#### SECT. IV.

Pope Agapetus deposes Anthimus, Patriarch of Constantinople, for heresy and irregularity.

In the year 536 we have one of those rare instances in which the Primacy of Rome is seen acting on the Eastern Church, but in perfect accordance with the Canons and the Patriarchal system. The Pope Agapetus had been compelled by Theodatus, king of the Goths, to proceed to Constantinople, in order that he might, if possible, prevail upon Justinian not to attempt the recovery of Italy. Not having wherewith to pay the expenses of his journey, he had been compelled to borrow money on the sacred vessels of St. Peter's Church. On arriving at Constantinople he refused to see the new Patriarch Anthimus, or to receive him to his Communion, both because he was suspected of heresy, and had been translated from the See of Trebisond. Anthimus refused to appear in the Council that the Pope held at Constantinople to judge him; so he was deposed, and returned his pallium to the Emperor. Mennas was elected in his

stead by the Emperor, with the approbation of all the Clergy and the people, and the Pope consecrated him in the church of St. Mary. "Pope Agapetus wrote a synodal letter to Peter, Patriarch of Jerusalem, to acquaint him with what he had done in this Council. 'When we arrived,' said he, 'at the court of the Emperor, we found the See of Constantinople usurped, contrary to the Canons, by Anthimus Bishop of Trebisond. He even refused to quit the error of Eutyches. Therefore, after having waited for his repentance, we declare him unworthy of the name of Catholic and Bishop, until he fully receive the doctrine of the Fathers. You ought likewise to reject the rest whom the Holy See has condemned. We are astonished that you approved this injury done to the See of Constantinople, instead of informing us of it; and we have repaired it by the ordination of Mennas, who is the first of the Eastern Church ordained by the hands of our See.'" I find this Pope presently called by the Easterns, 'Father of Fathers,' 'Archbishop of ancient Rome,' 'Ecumenical Patriarch.' This latter title is also given to Mennas. I shall have more to say about it hereafter; but it is remarkable that it was first given, so far as we have any record, to Dioscorus, by a Bishop in some complaint made to him at the Latrocinium of Ephesus; Justinian gives it continually to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

SECT.  
IV.

Fleury, liv.  
32. 54.

Gieseler,  
vol. 1. part  
2, p. 192.

The Pope shortly after dies at Constantinople, and a Council is held, at which the Patriarch Mennas presides, the Bishops who had accompanied the defunct Pope taking rank after him. He writes to the Patriarch Peter of Jerusalem, and informs him of the acts of this Council. Peter assembles his Council at Jerusalem: the procedure which took place at Constantinople was there found canonical, and the deposition of Anthimus was confirmed. Here the same facts which prove the Pope's Primacy refute his Supremacy: and this is not an isolated incident, but one link in a vast and uninterrupted chain of evidence.

The Patriarch of Jerusalem confirms the deposition.

I find in the laws of the Emperor Justinian just at the same time, looking at them merely as facts, a full confirmation and recognition of the Episcopal and Patriarchal constitution of the Church. "We decree," says he, "that the

Laws of Justinian give the force of law to the code of Canons

CHAP. V. holy Canons of the Church, which have been issued or confirmed by the four holy Councils . . . . should have the force of law. For we receive the decrees of the aforesaid four Councils as the holy Scriptures, and observe their Canons as laws. And we therefore decree that, according to their regulations, the most holy Pope of Elder Rome is the first of all Priests: but that the most blessed Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, has the second place after the holy Apostolic See of Elder Rome: but let it rank before all other Sees." In the 123rd Novell, forbidding Simony, he says "we only allow the payments mentioned in the present law to be made according to custom by the Bishops at their consecration. We therefore charge the most blessed Archbishops and Patriarchs, that is, of elder Rome, and Constantinople, and Alexandria, and Theopolis, and Jerusalem, since such is the custom, to give to the Bishops and Clergy at their consecration twenty pounds of gold . . . . but the Metropolitans, who are consecrated by their own Synod, or by the most blessed Patriarchs, and all other Bishops, who are consecrated either by the Patriarchs, or Metropolitans, to give a hundred solidi for their enthronement," &c. If any Bishop has a matter of dispute with one of the same Province, the Metropolitan with other Bishops of his Council shall in the first instance judge the cause. If both parties consent not to his judgment, the Patriarch of the Diocese shall hear them, and determine according to the Canons and Laws of the Church, and neither party shall oppose his sentence . . . . If a Bishop has a cause against a Metropolitan, let the Patriarch of the Diocese in like manner decide it. In like manner elsewhere he decrees that no Clerk accused by another Clerk or Layman be judged in the first instance by the Patriarch, but before the Bishop of the city where the Clerk dwells. Then, if he is suspected, before the Metropolitan: and if the Metropolitan rejects the case, before the Council of the Province, in which the Metropolitan with three of the eldest Bishops shall judge the case before the whole Council: but if this judgment be not acquiesced in, an appeal lies to the Patriarch, whose decision is final: "for our ancestors appointed that there should be no appeal against the sentence of these Prelates." The same is to be done in the case of a

ratified at Chalcedon, and establish, 1. the Primacy of Rome, 2. the supreme and final judgment of the several Patriarchs within their own limits. Novell 131. c. 1, 2.

Novell 123. c. 3, 22.

Bishop accused: for we altogether prohibit that the accusation be taken before the Patriarch in the first instance, or that accused persons be sent to another Province. In Novell 6, at the end, he mentions the same series of Bishops, Metropolitans, Patriarchs of each Diocese. And again: "Therefore let the most holy Patriarchs of each Diocese propose these things to the most holy Churches under them, and make known to the Metropolitans, beloved of God, what we have ratified. Let these again set it forth in the most holy Metropolitan Church, and notify it to the Bishops under them. But let each of these propose it in his own Church, that no one in our Commonwealth be ignorant of it." Addressed to Epiphanius, Archbishop of Constantinople, and copies sent to the Archbishops of Alexandria, Theopolis, and Jerusalem, and to John and Dominicus, Prætorian Prefects. In the long edict respecting the writings of Origen addressed to the Patriarch Mennas, he says, "We have written the same not only to your Holiness, but also to the most holy and blessed Pope and Patriarch of Elder Rome, Vigilius, and to all the rest most holy Bishops and Patriarchs, that is, of Alexandria, Theopolis, and Jerusalem, that they may give attention to this matter, and commit these things to execution." The Roman Primacy is distinctly marked in the following: "Justinian to John, most holy Archbishop of the good city of Rome, and Patriarch. Rendering honour to the Apostolic See and your Holiness, and esteeming your Blessedness as a Father, we hasten to bring before the knowledge of your Holiness all things which pertain to the state of the Churches: since it was always our great desire to maintain the unity of your Apostolic See, and that state of the holy Churches of God which hitherto prevails, and continues unshaken without opposition. And therefore we have hastened both to *subject and to unite* to the See of your Holiness all the Priests of the whole region of the East. At present therefore we have thought it necessary to bring to the knowledge of your Holiness the points mooted, although they are clear and undoubted, and according to the doctrine of your Apostolic See have ever been firmly maintained and preached by all Priests. For we do not endure that any thing which is mooted, pertaining to the state of the

SECT.  
IV.Codex, lib.  
1. tit. 4. 29.Novell 6.  
Epilogus.Mansi 9.  
523. D.Codex, lib.  
1. tit. 1. 8.

CHAP. V.

Churches, however clear and indubitable it may be, should not also be made known to your Holiness, *which is the head of all the holy Churches*. For we hasten in all things to increase the honour and authority of your See." But it would be giving a wrong impression of this language to conceal that he addressed the like "to Epiphanius most holy and blessed Archbishop of this royal city, and Ecumenical Patriarch. Wishing that your Holiness should be acquainted with all those things which respect the Ecclesiastical state &c., that in no manner whatever have we changed, do we change, or transgress, that state of the Church which by the help of God has been maintained hitherto, but in all things preserving the unity of the holy Churches with the most holy Pope of Old Rome, to whom we have written in similar terms. For we do not endure that anything which concerns the Ecclesiastical state be not also referred to his Blessedness, *since he is the head of all the most holy Priests of God*: or especially for this, because, so often as heretics have sprouted up in those regions, they have been repressed by the sentence and right judgment of that venerable See."

Codex, lib.  
1. tit. 1. 7.

Codex, lib.  
1. tit. 2. 25.

"The Church of Constantinople is *the head of all the others*."

Gieseler,  
tom. 1. part  
2. p. 409.  
§ 117.

Now as to the motive of Justinian, I fear there is too much truth in what Gieseler says, that he "honoured, it is true, the Roman See, but distinguished that of Constantinople not less, and sought in the end to make both mere tools, in order through them to rule in the Church as he did in the State." But at any rate his words are a testimony to the law of the Church in his day: and as he is to be believed when he acknowledges the Roman Primacy, and the continued orthodoxy of that See, so likewise is he not to be distrusted when he declares, that each of the five Patriarchal Thrones enjoyed the right of deciding without appeal within their own limits, and when he gives the force of law to the whole code of the ancient Church, which is so utterly irreconcilable with the medieval theory of the Papacy. No argument can be drawn from his use of the word Head, as he gives it both to Rome, and to Constantinople.

## SECT. V.

WE now come to the dark and sad history of Pope Vigilius. And here I am glad that another can speak for me. Bossuet says: "The Acts of the Second Council of Constantinople, the fifth general, under Pope Vigilius and the Emperor Justinian, will prove that the decrees of the third and fourth Councils were understood in the same sense by the fifth as we have understood them. And this Council received the account of them near at hand, and transmitted it to us."

Bossuet,  
Def. Cleri  
Gall., lib. 7.  
cap. 19.

"The three chapters were the point in question; that is, respecting Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret's writings against Cyril, and the letter of Ibas of Edessa to Maris the Persian. They examined whether that letter had been approved in the Council of Chalcedon. So much was admitted that it had been read there, and that Ibas, after anathematizing Nestorius, had been received by the holy Council. Some contended that his person only was spared; others that his letter also was approved. Thus inquiry was made at the fifth Council how writings on the Faith were wont to be approved in former Councils. The Acts of the third and fourth Council, those which we have mentioned above respecting the letter of St. Cyril and of St. Leo, were set forth. Then the holy Council declared—'It is plain, from what has been recited, in what manner the holy Councils are wont to approve what is brought before them. For great as was the dignity of those holy men who wrote the letters recited, yet they did not approve their letters simply or without inquiry, nor without taking cognizance that they were in all things agreeable to the exposition and doctrine of the holy Fathers, with which they were compared.' But the Acts proved that this course was not pursued in the case of the letter of Ibas; they inferred, therefore, most justly, that that letter had not been approved. So, then, it is certain from the third and fourth Councils, the fifth so declaring and understanding it, that letters approved by the Apostolic See, such as was that of Cyril, or even proceeding from it, as that of Leo, were received by the holy Councils not simply, nor without inquiry."

Mansi 9.  
337. E.  
The Council states that the letter of Pope Leo was approved after examination: which is admitted by Pope Vigilius.

CHAP.

V.

Fleury, liv.  
88. 52.

Pope Vigilius afterwards, when consenting to this Council, "acknowledges that the letter of St. Leo was not approved at the Council of Chalcedon until it had been examined and found conformable to the Faith of the three preceding Councils; and this avowal is the more important in the mouth of a Pope."

Mansi 9.  
473. C.

The words of Pope Vigilius are: "no one can doubt that our fathers believed, that they should receive with veneration the letter of blessed Leo, if they declared it to agree with the doctrines of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Councils, as also with those of blessed Cyril set forth in the first of Ephesus. And if that letter of so great a Pontiff, shining with so bright a light of the orthodox Faith, requires to be approved by these comparisons, how can that letter to Maris the Persian, which specially rejects the First Council of Ephesus, and declares to be heretical the expressed doctrines of the blessed Cyril, be believed to be called orthodox by the same Fathers, condemning as it does those writings, by comparison with which, as we have said, the doctrine of so great a Pontiff deserved to be commended."

Bossuet, *ut*  
*sup.*

"Again, in the same fifth Council the Acts against the letter of Nestorius are read, in which the Fathers of Ephesus plainly pronounce, 'that the letter of Nestorius is in no respect agreeable to the Faith which was set forth at Nicea.' So this letter also was rejected, not simply, but, as was equitable, after examination; and Ibas condemned, who stated that Nestorius had been rejected by the Council of Ephesus without examination and inquiry.

Mansi 9.  
345. B.

"The holy Fathers proceed to do what the Bishops at Chalcedon would have done, had they undertaken the examination of Ibas' letter. They compare the letter with the Acts of Ephesus and Chalcedon. Which done, the holy Council declared—'The comparison made proves, beyond a doubt, that the letter which Ibas is said to have written is, in all respects, opposed to the definition of the right Faith, which the Council of Chalcedon set forth. All the Bishops cried out, 'We all say this; the letter is heretical.' Thus, therefore, is it proved by the fifth Council, that our holy Fathers in Ecumenical Councils pronounce the letters read, whether of Catholics or heretics, or even of Roman Pontiffs, and that on matter of Faith, to be orthodox or heretical, ac-

ording to the same procedure, after legitimate cognizance, the truth being inquired into, and then cleared up : and upon these premises judgment given. SECT.  
V.

“What! you will say, with no distinction, and with minds equally inclined to both parties? Indeed we have said, and shall often repeat, that there was a presumption in favour of the decrees of orthodox Pontiffs; but in Ecumenical Councils, where judgment is to be passed in matter of Faith, that they were bound no longer to act upon presumption, but on the truth clearly and thoroughly ascertained.

“Such were the Acts of the fifth Council. This it learnt from the third and fourth Councils, and approved; and in this argument we have brought at once in favour of our opinion the decrees of three Ecumenical Councils, of Ephesus, of Chalcedon, and the second Constantinopolitan.”

The point here taken up by Bossuet, and proved upon indisputable authority, is of the greatest importance, viz. that the decree of a Roman Pontiff, *de fide*, and he, perhaps, the greatest of the whole number, was judged by a General Council, and only admitted when it was found conformable to antiquity. It settles, in fact, the whole question, that the Bishop of Rome is indeed possessed of the First See, and Primate of all Christendom; but that he is not the sole depository of Christ's power in the Church, which is, in truth, the Papal Idea, laid down by St. Gregory the Seventh, and acted upon since. The difference between these two Ideas is the difference between the Church of the Fathers and the present Latin Communion in the matter of Church government, in which they are wide as the poles asunder.

The history of Pope Vigilius further confirms the truth of what we have said. Bossuet proceeds: “In the same fifth Council the following Acts support our cause. State of  
things at  
the Fifth  
General  
Council.

“The Emperor Justinian desired, that the question concerning the above-mentioned three Chapters should be considered in the Church. He therefore sent for Pope Vigilius to Constantinople. There he not long after assembled a Council. He and the Orientals thought it of great moment that these Chapters should be condemned, against the Nestorians, who were raising their heads to defend them;

CHAP.  
V.

Vigilius, with the Occidentals, feared lest thus occasion should be taken to destroy the authority of the Council of Chalcedon; because it was admitted that Theodoret and Ibas had been received in that Council, whilst Theodore, though named, was let go without any mark of censure. Though then both parties easily agreed as to the substance of the Faith, yet the question had entirely respect to the Faith, it being feared by the one party lest the Nestorian, by the other lest the Eutychean, enemies of the Council of Chalcedon should prevail.

“From this struggle many accusations have been brought against Vigilius, which have nothing to do with us. I am persuaded that every thing was done by Vigilius with the best intent, the Westerns not enduring the condemnation of the Chapters, and things tending to a schism.” The facts here alluded to, but for obvious reasons avoided by Bossuet, are as follows, very briefly. Vigilius on the 11th of April, 548, issues his ‘Judicatum’ against the three Chapters, saving the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. Thereupon the Bishops of Africa, Illyria, and Dalmatia, with two of his own confidential Deacons, withdraw from his Communion. In the year 550 the African Bishops, under Reparatus of Carthage, not only reject the Judicatum, but anathematize Vigilius himself, and sever him from Catholic Communion, reserving to him a place for repentance. At length the Pope publicly withdraws his ‘Judicatum.’ While the Council is sitting at Constantinople he publishes his ‘Constitutum,’ in which he condemns certain propositions of Theodore, but spares his person; the same respecting Theodoret; but with respect to Ibas, he declares that his letter was pronounced orthodox by the Council of Chalcedon. Bossuet goes on: “however this may be, so much is clear, that Vigilius, though invited, declined being present at the Council: that nevertheless the Council was held without him; that he published a ‘Constitutum,’ in which he disapproved of what Theodore, Theodoret, and Ibas were said to have written against the Faith; but decreed that their name should be spared, because they were considered to have been received by the fourth Council, or to have died in the Communion of the Church, and to be reserved to the

judgment of God. Concerning the letter of Ibas, he published the following, that, 'understood in the best and most pious sense,' it was blameless; and concerning the three Chapters generally, he ordered that after his present declaration Ecclesiastics should move no further question.

"Such was the decree of Vigilius, issued upon the authority with which he was invested. But the Council, after his constitution, both raised a question about the three Chapters, and decided that question was properly raised concerning the dead, and that the letter of Ibas was manifestly heretical and Nestorian, and contrary in all things to the Faith of Chalcedon, and that they were altogether accursed, who defended the impious Theodore of Mopsuestia, or the writings of Theodoret against Cyril, or the impious letter of Ibas defending the tenets of Nestorius: and who did not anathematize it, but said it was correct.

"In these latter words they seemed not even to spare Vigilius, although they did not mention his name. And it is certain their decree was confirmed by Pelagius the Second, Gregory the Great, and other Roman Pontiffs. . . . These things prove, that in a matter of the utmost importance, disturbing the whole Church, and seeming to belong to the Faith, the decrees of sacred Councils prevail over the decrees of Pontiffs, and that the letter of Ibas, though defended by a judgment of the Roman Pontiff, could nevertheless be proscribed as heretical."

Finally the fifth Ecumenical Council, sitting in spite of the Pope, delivers its judgment on matters which the Pope during its sitting had forbidden to be discussed any further, and which judgment is contrary to his. It commences by very strongly censuring the Pope for not joining them in their work of condemning heresy. If our Lord set forth for condemnation the man who hid one talent, and kept it undiminished, to how much sorer punishment shall he be exposed, who not only neglects himself, but causes scandal and disturbance to others? "We therefore, *to whom is committed the charge of ruling the Church of the Lord*, fearing the malediction which hangs over those who do the work of the Lord negligently, hasten to preserve the good seed of faith pure from the tares of impiety."

SECT.  
V.

The Council issues a decree contradicting that of the Pope.

Censure of the Pope by the Council. Mansi 9. 368—70. partly abstracted; partly quoted.

CHAP.  
V.

“The most pious Vigilius, being in this city, has taken part in all which has been agitated about the three Chapters, and has several times condemned them by word of mouth and writing. Afterwards he agreed in writing to come to the Council, and to examine them there with us, that a definition might be made by us all agreeable to the right Faith. The Emperor, according to our agreement, begged him as well as us to meet, *because Priests ought to settle in common questions of common concern*. So that we have been obliged to beseech him to fulfil his promise. To this end we reminded him of those great examples of the Apostles, and of the traditions of our Fathers. For although the grace of the Holy Spirit was abundant to each one of the Apostles, so that they needed not the advice of others to determine their course of action, yet would they not declare any thing about the point in question, whether the Gentiles should be circumcised, before that they should assemble together, and each severally by the testimony of Holy Writ confirm their own words. Wherefore they issued a sentence in common about it, writing to the Gentiles, ‘It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us,’ &c.

The Church's authority resides not in the Pope, but in the consent of the Episcopal College.

“But likewise the holy Fathers, who from time to time have assembled in the four holy Councils, following ancient examples, have decided in common about heresies and questions that arose, it being a settled principle, that, in discussions of common interest, the arguments of both sides being set forth, the light of truth puts to flight the shades of falsehood. Nor in general discussions about the Faith can the truth otherwise be manifested, when every man needs the help of his neighbour, as Solomon says in the Proverbs,—and again in Ecclesiastes, ‘Two are better than one, because they have a reward for their labour,’ (iv. 9.) But the Lord Himself says, ‘If two of you agree,’ &c. After then our having often invited him, and after the Emperor had sent to him the magistrates, he promised to give by himself his judgment on the three Chapters. Having heard this answer we considered what the Apostle said, that each man shall render account to God for himself: moreover we fear the judgment, with which those are threatened who scandalize one of the least, how much more so Christian an Emperor

and whole nations and Churches. They proceed to declare their belief in the Faith which 'the Lord Jesus Christ, the true God, handed down to his Holy Apostles, and through them to the holy Churches, and which the holy Fathers and Doctors of the Church after them delivered to the nations entrusted to them.'"

Let both the tone and the precise expressions here be considered, and they will be found in strong opposition to those exaggerated statements about the Primacy, which are to be found in the writings of the Popes from St. Leo downwards. But it is as impossible to reconcile the words of the fifth Council with the theory of an Ecclesiastical monarchy, as their conduct towards Vigilius with the practice of it.

The Canons following, which anathematize by implication the Pope, for declaring blameless a letter which they pronounce accursed, are signed by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch in person, by the three Bishops representing the Patriarch of Jerusalem, by the Archbishops of Thessalonica, Cesarea, Ephesus, Carthage, &c.

Compare with this history the following remark of De Maistre, "that Bishops separated from the Pope, and in contradiction with him, are superior to him, is a proposition to which one does all the honour possible in calling it only extravagance."

Du Pape,  
liv. 1. ch. 3.

After all this Fleury says: "At last the Pope Vigilius resigned himself to the advice of the Council, and six months afterwards wrote a letter to the Patriarch Eutychius, where-in he confesses that he has been wanting in charity in dividing from his brethren. He adds, that one ought not to be ashamed to retract, when one recognises the truth, and brings forward the example of St. Augustine. He says, that, after having better examined the matter of the three Chapters, he finds them worthy of condemnation. 'We recognise for our brethren and colleagues all those who have condemned them, and annul by this writing all that has been done by us or by others for the defence of the three chapters.'"

Fleury, liv.  
33. 52; vid.  
Mansi 9.  
413—8.  
The Pope  
acknow-  
ledges his  
error.

CHAP.  
V.

SECT. VI.

NOR can I think it a point of little moment that Bishops of Rome were at different times deposed or excommunicated by other Bishops. As in the second century the Eastern Bishops disregard St. Victor's excommunication respecting Easter; and in the third St. Firmilian in Asia, and St. Cyprian in Africa, disregard St. Stephen's excommunication in the matter of rebaptizing heretics; so when the Bishops of the Patriarchate of Antioch found that Pope Julius had received to Communion St. Athanasius, and others whom they had deposed, they proceeded to depose him, with Hosius and the rest. This was in the fourth century. In the fifth, Dioscorus, at the Latrocinium of Ephesus, attempts to excommunicate St. Leo. In the sixth, as we have just seen, the Bishops of Africa, Illyria, and Dalmatia, all of the West, separate Pope Vigilius from their Communion, and the former afterwards solemnly excommunicate him. It matters not that in all these cases the Bishops were wrong; I quote these acts merely to prove that they esteemed the Bishop of Rome the first of all Bishops indeed, yet subject to the Canons like themselves, and only of equal rank. For on the present Papal theory, such an act, as we have seen le Père Lacordaire affirm, would be merely suicidal,—pure insanity. It is in utter contradiction to the notion of an Ecclesiastical monarchy.

Sozomen,  
lib. 3. ch.  
11.

Suspensions  
of Com-  
munion  
with Rome.

In like manner we find portions of the Church, as that of Constantinople, again and again out of Communion with the Roman Pontiff, but they do not therefore cease to be parts of the true Church. So Gieseler states that, in consequence of jealousies about the condemning the three Chapters, the Archbishops of Aquileia, with their Bishops, were out of Communion with Rome from A.D. 568 to 698. A reconciliation takes place, and Communion is renewed. Much more important and dangerous was that division, by which the whole East was, as we have seen, separated from the West, on account of St. Chrysostome's condemnation. Pope Pelagius himself, when on his defence either to King Childebert, or to the Bishops of Etruria, who had separated from

Tom. 1.  
part 2. 410.

his Communion through suspicion arising out of the three Chapters, does not venture to maintain "that he and the Roman Pontiffs cannot err, and that such as suspect error in their decrees are schismatics, but modestly clears himself by issuing a clear profession of his Faith." He quotes to these Bishops the authority of St. Augustine, who "mindful of the Lord's judgment by which He set the foundation of the Church on the Apostolic Sees, declares that whosoever detaches himself from the authority or Communion of the Prelate of those Sees is in schism: and proves that there is no other Church save that which is solidly rooted on the Pontiffs of Apostolic Sees." To Valerian he says himself, "As often as any doubt ariseth to any concerning an Universal Council, in order to receive account of what they do not understand—let them recur to the Apostolical Sees.—Whosoever then is divided from the Apostolical Sees, there is no doubt that he is in schism." St. Augustine, arguing against his Donatist opponent, alleged the authority of the See of Rome, yet not differently from that of other Apostolical Sees. "What hath the See of the Roman Church done to thee, in which Peter sat, in which Anastasius sitteth now? or of the Church of Jerusalem, in which James sat, and where now John sitteth: with which we are joined in Catholic unity, and from which ye in impious fury have separated." In the great division of the East and West, Rome was the single Apostolic See on one side: on the other were Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Thessalonica, Corinth, Ancyra, Philippi.

It is well known what an unanswerable proof the ancient Oriental Liturgies afford of the true Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, viz., that the Eucharistic elements become upon consecration the True, Real, and Proper Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. Their unanimous consent on such a point, combined with the fact that the Nestorian and Monophysite heretics carried this doctrine with them out of the Church in the fifth century, and, existing ever since in direct antagonism to the Church, have preserved it to this day, is a proof of the truth of the doctrine little, it at all, less strong than our Saviour's own words of institution recorded in the Gospels and by St. Paul. Now re-

SECT.  
VI.

Bossuet,  
Def., lib. 9.  
24.

Mansi 9.  
716. C.  
Pope Pe-  
lagius I.  
and St. Au-  
gustine on  
Apostolical  
Sees.

Ib. 732, 3.

Tom 9.  
254. G.

Testimony  
of the  
ancient  
Oriental  
Liturgies,  
1. for the  
Real Pre-  
sence, 2.  
against the  
Papal  
Supremacy.  
Mansi 9.  
368—70.

CHAP.  
V.

markable enough it is in favour of the preceding argument of this book, that these ancient Liturgies of St. Mark, St. James, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostome, used, that is, from time immemorial in the Churches of the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, contain prayers for the Patriarch and the Bishop of the Diocese, and sometimes for the other Metropolitans, but never for the Bishop of Rome. The Roman Liturgy alone contains prayers for the Bishop of Rome, as well as for the Bishop of the diocese. Had the Pope of Rome been according to the Eastern mind the One Chief Ruler of the Church of God, whose jurisdiction extended over the whole, his name must have been mentioned first, and that of the Patriarch as subordinate to him, second, and then that of the Bishop of the diocese. This will be better seen by observing the order of the persons prayed for. Thus in the Alexandrine Liturgy of St. Basil, after a prayer for the "one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church which is from one end of the earth to the other," for the sovereign, army, and different classes of men, the Liturgy proceeds, under the heading, Prayer for the Pope: "And again let us call upon the Almighty and merciful God, the Father of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, through whom we beseech and supplicate Thee, O Lover of man, good Lord. Remember, O Lord, our most holy and blessed High-Priest, Abba N. Preserve, preserve him to us for many years, and peaceful times, discharging the holy High-Priesthood entrusted by Thee to him, according to Thy holy and blessed will; rightly dividing the word of truth, and feeding Thy people in holiness and justice: together with all orthodox Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, with all the fulness of Thy holy, only, Catholic and Apostolic Church." On which words Renaudot says: "the prayer is plainly for the Patriarch of Alexandria: as likewise in the Greek manuscript of the Liturgy of St. Mark: it would be futile for any one to conjecture that this prayer belonged to the Roman Pontiff. It was according to ancient discipline that commemoration of him should be made in the diptychs of the living, but not that his name should be recited in the daily masses; as that was only observed towards the Patriarchs in whose Dioceses the Churches were.

Renaudot,  
tom. 1. 59.  
Edit. 1847.

Prayer for  
the Pope  
of Alex-  
andria.

Tom. 1.  
315.

While the Churches were in union, and a new Roman Pontiff wrote publicly letters concerning his ordination, his name was recited in the diptychs of the living, as that of his predecessor in the commemorations of the departed; but as this did not take place constantly, that mention was not inscribed in the manuscripts of the Liturgies. That such was the rule we conjecture from what afterwards was in force among the Copts, and of which we have manifold proofs, in the Patriarchal history, respecting the commemoration of the name of the Antiochene Patriarchs of that same Jacobite sect, with which the Alexandrines had the closest Communion. On a vacation of the See of Antioch the person elected to it immediately sent Synodical letters to the Patriarch of Alexandria by two Bishops. These having been read in the assembly of Egyptian Bishops, the name of the new Patriarch was inscribed in the diptychs of the living, and recited in the Liturgy: nor was this done before these letters arrived. Until then the name of the departed was recited at the altar as of one living. Certain moreover as this custom is, and established by various instances, yet no manuscript, so far as I know, has been seen, which contains a constant mention of the Patriarch of Antioch in the diptychs, although I have seen many. And so, even had the Greek manuscript belonged to the orthodox Church, which cannot be said of this one, but which appears certain of that which contains the Liturgy of Mark, the name of the Roman Pontiff would not be extant in the diptych." That is, Renaudot argues that the Roman Pontiff would be named in the Liturgy exactly on the occasions on which other Patriarchs were named, and none other.

In what Renaudot declares to be the ancient orthodox Liturgy of St. Mark, a composition of wonderful grandeur and beauty, which was first published in the West in the year 1583, from a Calabrian Greek Monastery, inasmuch as the Liturgy of Constantinople had for centuries expelled it from the East, the following prayers occur. First, in the Ante-Communion office, after a prayer for the Church Catholic, and another for the Sovereign, follows the bidding of the Deacon, "Pray ye for the Pope, and Bishop"

SECT.  
VI.

The Pope of Rome mentioned on those occasions only on which other Patriarchs were mentioned.

Renaudot,  
tom. 1. 122.

CHAP.  
V.

The Priest says, "O Sovereign Lord God Almighty, Father of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, we beseech and supplicate Thee, O Lover of man, O Good, for our most holy and blessed High-Priest Pope N. and the most reverend Bishop N. Preserve, yea, preserve them to us for many years in peace, fulfilling the holy High-Priesthood entrusted to them by Thee, according to Thy holy and blessed will, rightly dividing the word of truth, with all orthodox Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Sub-deacons, Readers, Singers, and Laity, with all the fulness of the holy and only Catholic Church, granting them peace, and health, and salvation."

Tom. 1.  
136.

The Patriarch in the Eastern Liturgies occupies the same place as the Pope in the Roman.

Roman missal.

In the Anaphora, or Canon itself, after the prayers for the departed, the Priest says, "The most holy and blessed Pope N., whom Thou hast foreknown to govern Thy holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and our most reverend Bishop N., preserve, yea, preserve them for many years, for peaceful times, fulfilling Thy holy High-Priesthood entrusted to them by Thee, according to Thy holy and blessed will, rightly dividing the word of truth. Remember likewise, wheresoever they be, orthodox Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Sub-deacons, Readers, Singers, Monks, those vowed to be Virgins, Widows, Laity." Thus the Patriarch occupies in the Eastern Liturgies that very place of the fulness of honour which the Pope now holds in the Roman Canon. "Thee therefore, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, we suppliantly beg and beseech, that Thou wouldst accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy spotless sacrifices: first of all which we offer Thee for Thy holy Catholic Church, which be pleased to preserve in peace, to guard, to unite, and to rule throughout the whole world, together with Thy servant our Pope N., and our Prelate N., and all who are orthodox, and worshippers of the Catholic and Apostolic faith."

Renaudot,  
2. 33.

So in the Liturgy of St. James, so called, we read, "The Priest bowing says, 'Wherefore we offer unto Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice, for Thy holy places which Thou hast glorified by the manifestation of Christ Thy Son; but especially for holy Sion, the mother of all Churches, and for Thy holy Church diffused through the whole world.'

“The Deacon. ‘Bless, Sir. Let us pray and beseech our Lord God at this moment of time great, fearful, and holy, for our fathers and rulers who are now set over us, and in the present life feed and rule the holy Churches of God, the venerable and blessed, the Lord N. our Patriarch, and the Lord N. Metropolitan, and the rest of the Metropolitans, and venerable Bishops.’”

SECT.  
VI.

“The Priest. ‘Grant them, O Lord, the richest gifts of Thy Holy Spirit. Remember, O Lord, our holy Bishops who rightly dispense to us the word of truth, but especially the Father of Fathers, our Patriarch, the Lord N., and the Lord N. our Bishop, with all other orthodox Bishops,’” &c.

Now as these Liturgies are throughout penetrated with the instinctive reverence, and deep unspeakable rejoicing of those who felt that they were in the awful and tremendous Presence of our Lord by the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Eucharistic elements, so do they set forth the Patriarch as within his Patriarchate the Head and Representative of the Catholic Church. They make no mention at all of him, who, we are now told, is the monarch of the Church: in praying for the Catholic Church they most unaccountably do not pray for him “who is set over the whole Christian world, and possesses in its completeness and plenitude that power which Christ left on earth for the good of the Church:” but they pray instead for their own Pope, or Patriarch, the Bishop, and all the orders of the Church under them. Why is this? Because they looked upon the government of the Church Catholic as vested first in the co-ordinate Apostolic, and then in the equally co-ordinate Episcopal College, and not in one Apostle, or his successor, according to that beautiful prayer of St. Mark’s Liturgy, immediately succeeding the prayer for the Pope of Alexandria. “O Sovereign Lord our God, who didst choose out the twelve-branched light of the twelve Apostles, and didst send them forth to preach through the whole world, and to teach the Gospel of Thy kingdom, and to heal all disease and infirmity in the people, and who didst breathe upon their faces, and saidst to them, Receive the Holy Ghost, the Comforter: whose sins ye remit, they are remitted to them: whose ye retain, they are retained: so too

The Pope of Rome not mentioned because the Patriarchs were supreme in their sphere.

Bellanmine.

Renaudot,  
1. 123.

CHAP.  
V.

breathe on us Thy servants who stand round, at the beginning of our priestly service, Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Readers, Singers and Laymen, with all the fulness of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

Cumulative  
argument  
of the pre-  
ceding  
facts.

Now all these various facts, from the first Nicene Council, converge towards one view, for which, I think, there is as full evidence as for most facts of history,—that the Pope, to the time of St. Gregory the Great, and indeed long afterwards, was but the first of the Patriarchs, who, in their own Patriarchates, enjoyed a co-ordinate and equal authority with his in the West. I suppose De Maistre acknowledges as much in his own way, when he says, "The Pope is invested with five very distinct characters; for he is Bishop of Rome, Metropolitan of the Suburbican Churches, Primate of Italy, Patriarch of the West, and, lastly, Sovereign Pontiff. The Pope has never exercised over the other Patriarchates any powers save those resulting from this last; so that, except in some affair of high importance, some striking abuse, or some appeal in the greater causes, the Sovereign Pontiffs mixed little in the Ecclesiastical administration of the Eastern Churches. And this was a great misfortune, not only for them, but for the states where they were established. It may be said that the Greek Church, from its origin, carried in its bosom a germ of division, which only completely developed itself at the end of twelve centuries, but which always existed under forms less striking, less decisive, and so endurable." The confession of one who travesties antiquity so outrageously as De Maistre is curious at least:—but the truth is that not a single act of authority done by any Pope up to the time of St. Gregory is found in history, which is not fully accounted for by his position in the Patriarchal system, and by his being First Bishop of the Church, and as such especially charged with the maintenance of her Canons. None of them reach the Papal claim, as it was set forth by St. Gregory VII. Yet surely, if that full claim be divine, and if those who reject it do so at the peril of their salvation, it is not too much to claim that such an authority should run through, and be distinctly visible, in the times when the East and West were joined in one Communion, as it has run through and completely penetrated

Du Pape,  
liv. 3. ch. 7.

Testimony  
of De  
Maistre to  
the patri-  
archal go-  
vernment  
of the  
Eastern  
Church  
from the  
beginning.

with itself, the middle ages, at least in the West. Assuredly had the Papal Monarchy existed in the times of the Ecumenical Councils it could not have lain hid. It has not lain hidden in the centuries since it was put forth: the sun is not hidden in the solar system: nor are the historians of a state unable to discern where lies its sovereign power. And documents there were, such as the decretal letters of the early Popes, which did speak decisively, and imposed upon the middle ages: but then these are now admitted to be supposititious; passages, too, there were from sundry Fathers, but these too have turned out to be unauthentic. Had the keen mind of the Angelic Doctor been possessed of the documents which were not then to be had, but are now open to inspection, the authentic proceedings of Ecumenical Councils, the genuine letters of the early Pontiffs, and the treasures stored up in the Greek Fathers, would he not have spoken otherwise than he has done concerning the Papal power? But Roman Catholic writers, in defending the Papal Monarchy from the remains of antiquity now allowed to be genuine, instead of being able, clearly and historically, without subterfuge and ingenious expedients, to prove their doctrine, are reduced to the predicament which one of their own Communion thus expresses. "If the question be concerning the Pope's Supremacy, he diligently collects from Councils and the holy Fathers the strongest proofs for the Pope's Primacy, which Primacy was not in discussion. If the Papal infallibility be controverted, he writes out those passages in which the Councils and holy Fathers have expressed high and reverential feelings about the First See, though they were not acquainted with its infallibility. Those who use such a mode of arguing do not find it difficult to get the patronage of the holy Fathers for their errors. Yet how easy it is to see that they nefariously abuse their abilities, and violate faith with the public, and religion itself. Yet thus did Bellarmine, and whatever other adversaries the Gallican doctrine found."

Præf. in Def.  
Cler. Gall.,  
p. 8.

Others, again, remind one, I am constrained to say, of that celebrated feat in which a single rider vaults alternately from one horse to another at full speed. He rides both, but keeps fast to neither, shewing his skill by the

CHAP.  
V.

dexterity with which he changes his position. Just so they manage the Papal and the Patriarchal power of the Roman Bishop. When that Bishop is seen in early times to exercise great authority, not standing alone, but at the head of his Council, or representing all the Bishops of the West, as in the case of the appeal of St. Athanasius, or of Eutyches, or of St. Flavian, or at the Council of Chalcedon itself, this is put to his credit simply as Head of the Church. And a similar authority exercised by other Bishops, especially that of Constantinople, nay, solemnly committed to him at the largest Ecumenical Council, is carefully put out of view. Here the disputant stands on the Papal claim. But when on the other hand the ancient Canons, as those called of the Apostles, those of Nicea, Sardica, Constantinople, Carthage, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and the five Provincial Councils taken into the code of the universal Church by this last, exhibit the several Provinces, or Patriarchates of the Church, forming indeed one body, but self-governed in their several parts, and having no centralizing power in the whole body; or when the language of great Doctors and Saints, such as St. Cyprian, St. Basil, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostome, St. Cyril, Pope St. Gregory himself, is alleged, as generally ignoring such a power, or, it may be, resisting what seems anything like its control, or, as in the last case, expressly disclaiming it, the reply is, In this view the Pope is regarded as Bishop or as Patriarch: it leaves untouched the question of his supreme power. As Patriarch he had nothing to do with the Eastern empire: but as Pope all the Eastern Patriarchs yielded him obedience.

Canons of  
Chalcedon,  
9. and 17.

It is hard, certainly, to be convinced by those who take up such a line as this. Fully aware as I am that it is a question of salvation, I am not at all persuaded by their mode of proceeding: nay, I have to struggle against a continual feeling of bad faith in those who pursue it, which I am most loath to impute to any. But, if inexorable history would allow them to be honest, surely they injure their own cause: as ours has been injured by concealing the original and legitimate power of the Roman Bishop as occupant of the first, and that St. Peter's See.

A great exception to the above-mentioned unfair mode

of dealing is found in Möhler's profound and admirable treatise on unity. But then his admissions are in favour of the argument of this book. Thus while Ultra-montane writers distort all the facts of history to get the Supremacy out of the first three centuries, he in his summing up, observes: "From the whole previous discussion it is apparent that the Primacy in the first three centuries, even in the last times of them, does not begin to raise its head above its first deposits, that it still broods without shape, *that when we come to definite proofs where and how it has shewn itself as such in facts, it must be confessed that it never appears alone, but is always only active in conjunction with other Bishops and Churches, but that it yet begins to take a peculiar stamp, and as it were only waits for a call to appear.*"

SECT.  
VI.Möhler,  
Die Einheit  
in der  
Kirche, §  
71. p. 247.

But he would meet the demand I have made above, thus: "Whilst the Apostles were scattered abroad, Peter could neither exercise acts of Primacy, nor will any one believe that it would have been necessary, had he been authorized to do it. But during the time that Christianity was grounding itself in its several communities, and in which the unity of all single Churches was occupied in its first formation, the Primacy of one Church and its Bishop could by no means shew itself. For if we would grasp the Idea of the Primacy, we must, as said before, represent it as the personified reflex of the unity of the whole Church: but it was not possible that the unity of the collective Church should make itself an object of reflection, and present a personal image as its offspring, before unity itself had interpenetrated all. Those therefore who require unanswerable historical proofs for a Primacy before that period which we have earlier pointed out as that in which the unity of the Church came forth with the fullest consciousness, (the time of Cyprian,) must be refused, as demanding something unreasonable, inasmuch as according to the law of a true development it is not possible. *As again on the other hand the attempts of those who would find it so entirely formed before that time, or the opinion that they have found it, must appear fruitless and untenable.* The Primacy, like every property of Christianity, is to be treated not as a dead notion, but as life, and

Ibid. § 68.  
p. 239.Gradual  
evolution of  
the Pri-  
macy ac-  
cording to  
Möhler.

CHAP.  
V.

as going forth from life.—It was requisite for needs to form themselves: but these express themselves in history as facts, and out of these is the notion first drawn: or, Church history is, what I have already repeatedly remarked, nothing else but a Christian development of life. What would the dead proposition, ‘You must have a centre of unity,’ even if spoken by Christ, have done, if no needs, lying in the very inmost heart of the faithful, had corresponded thereunto? Never would it, without that, have forced itself into life. We have all in favour of this assertion. Christ came not forth in Judea proclaiming, ‘I am the Son of the living God,’ which proclamation would certainly not have had the least effect. He waited until, through living with Him, and the reception of His life into that of His disciples, higher views had been quickened in them, whose natural expression of itself then was on the first occasion, ‘Thou art the Son of the living God.’”

Result from  
his admis-  
sion.

Now this is a very ingenious and beautiful view, not distorting the facts of history, and exhibiting the true conception of the Church, but then it only holds good against those who deny the Primacy. And it cuts away the Ultramontane ground altogether, that is, those principles upon which the Oriental and the English Church are found guilty summarily of Schism. For the precise reason of the separation of the East and West was the attempt to change the Primacy into a Monarchy: and the exercise of the unlimited Monarchy, the interfering in every possible way with the rights of the Crown, the Bishop, and the Metropolitan, was a main cause of the convulsion of the sixteenth century.

But this is an anticipation. I return to the testimony of St. Gregory the Great.

#### SECT. VII.

St. Gregory  
the Great.

AND, assuredly, if there was any Pontiff who, like St. Leo, held the most strong and deeply-rooted convictions as to the prerogatives of the Roman See, it was St. Gregory. His voluminous correspondence with Bishops, and the most

notable persons throughout the world, represents him to us as guarding and superintending the affairs of the whole Church from the watch-tower of St. Peter, the loftiest of all. Let one assertion of his prove this. Writing to Natalis, Bishop of Salona in Dalmatia, he says, "After the letters of my predecessor and my own, in the matter of Honoratus the Archdeacon, were sent to your Holiness, in despite of the sentence of us both, the above-mentioned Honoratus was deprived of his rank. *Had either of the four Patriarchs done this, so great an act of contumacy could not have been passed over without the most grievous scandal.* However, as your Brotherhood has since returned to your duty, I take notice neither of the injury done to me, nor of that to my predecessor." The following words in another letter will elucidate his meaning here. "As to what he says, that he (a Bishop) is subject to the Apostolical See, *I know not what Bishop is not subject to it, if any fault be found in Bishops. But when no fault requires it, all are equal according to the estimation of humility.*" And again, writing to his own Defensor in Sicily, a part of the Church most under his own control, "I am informed that, if any one has a cause against any clerks, you throw a slight upon their Bishops, and cause them to appear in your own court. If this be so, we expressly order you to presume to do so no more, because beyond doubt it is very unseemly. For if his own jurisdiction is not preserved to each Bishop, what else results but that the order of the Church is thrown into confusion by us, who ought to guard it." Gieseler says, as we have seen above: "They (the Roman Bishops) maintained, that not only the right of the highest Ecclesiastical tribunal in the West belonged to them, but the supervision of orthodoxy, and maintenance of the Church's laws, in the whole Church; and they based these claims, still, it is true, at times, upon imperial edicts, and decrees of Councils, but most commonly upon the privileges granted to Peter by the Lord." And I suppose if the Primacy of Christendom has any real meaning, it must mean this, that in case of necessity, such as infraction of the Canons, an appeal may be made to it. So undoubtedly St. Gregory understood his own rights. What his ordinary jurisdiction was, Fleury thus tells us:—"The

SECT.  
VII.S. Greg.  
Ep., lib. 2.  
52.Lib. 9. 59,  
Gieseler.Lib. 11. 37,  
Gieseler.Gieseler,  
tom. 1.  
part 2. 401.

Liv. 34. 60.

CHAP. V. Popes ordained Clergy only for the Roman (local) Church, but they gave Bishops to the greater part of the Churches of Italy." "St. Gregory entered into this detail only for the Churches which specially depended on the Holy See, and for that reason were named suburbican: that is, those of the southern part of Italy, where he was sole Archbishop, those of Sicily, and the other islands, though they had Metropolitans. But it will not be found that he exercised the same immediate power in the Provinces depending on Milan and Aquileia, nor in Spain and the Gauls. It is true that in the Gauls he had his vicar, who was the Bishop of Arles, as was likewise the Bishop of Thessalonica for Western Illyricum. The Pope further took care of the Churches of Africa, that Councils should be held there, and the Canons maintained; but we do not find that he exercised particular jurisdiction over any that belonged to the Eastern empire, that is to say, upon the four Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople. He was in Communion and interchange of letters with all these Patriarchs, without entering into the particular management of the Churches depending on them, except it were in some extraordinary case. The multitude of St. Gregory's letters gives us opportunity to remark all these distinctions, in order not to extend indifferently rights which he only exercised over certain Churches."

The See of Peter in Alexandria and Antioch one with that of Rome.

S. Greg. Ep., lib. 7.

A letter which I shall first quote will throw light on the observation both of Gieseler and Fleury above cited. It contains a view about the Roman See which assigns to it indeed a very high authority, but is quite incompatible with that theory upon which the Popes sought to govern the Church in the middle ages. It is addressed to Eulogius Bishop of Alexandria, and runs thus: "Your Holiness, who is most agreeable to me, has said much to me in your letters concerning the Chair of St. Peter chief of the Apostles, declaring that he continues to sit in it himself in the person of his successors. Indeed I confess myself for my own part to be unworthy, not merely in the rank of those who rule, but in the number of those who stand. But I have willingly received all that was said, because *he who spoke to me concerning Peter's Chair was the person who*

*occupied it.* And though I no way take pleasure in honour peculiar to myself, *yet I am greatly delighted that your Holinesses give to yourselves, what you bestow on me.* For who is ignorant that the holy Church is established on the firmness of the Chief of the Apostles, who in his name expressed the firmness of his mind, being called Peter from the Rock. Who was told by the voice of the Truth, 'To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' To whom again was said, 'And thou, when thou art converted strengthen thy Brethren.' And again, 'Simon, Son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? feed My sheep.' *And thus, though the Apostles be many, yet the See of the Chief of the Apostles, which belongs to one, though it is in three places, alone prevailed in authority, by virtue of his chiefship.* For it is he who exalted the See in which he also condescended to take his rest, and finish the present life. It is he who adorned the See, to which he sent the Evangelist, his disciple. It is he who established the See in which he sat for seven years, though he was to leave it. Inasmuch then as the See, over which by divine authority *three Bishops now preside*, is one man's, and one; whatever good I hear of you, I lay to my own account. If you believe any good of me, lay this to the account of your own desert, because we are one in Him who saith, 'That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us.'"

Now certainly it is much to be remarked that at the Council of Nicea these three Sees, which stood out from the rest and plainly held all together, one in the West, and two in the East, were all the Sees of Peter, all alleged Peter's authority as their proudest inheritance. But then the same system which set Rome *first*, also set in the same sense Alexandria *second*, and Antioch *third*. No words can do so more plainly than those St. Gregory here uses, and in so doing he excludes beforehand a system which did not shew itself till two hundred years after his departure, which, like his own, did indeed set Rome first, but on an eminence approached by none. Taking his words, I find it impossible honestly to reconcile them with such a system: looking at the matter historically, I find that in fact this system had not yet appeared. The power which he himself claimed over

This view incompatible with a monarchy in Rome.

CHAP.  
V.

Main privilege of the Primacy is to maintain the Canon.

the four Patriarchs, as well as over every Bishop of the Church, was that of vindicating the Canons of the Church when they were broken. To these indeed every Bishop, of however humble a See, might appeal, however influential the aggressor might be: to these the highest Bishops did appeal, as St. Athanasius, and St. Chrysostome: but then it was the special privilege of the Bishop of Rome, in virtue of his Primacy, to insist on their fulfilment. In prosecution of this duty he could, it is true, require explanation from the Eastern Patriarchs, and in disputed questions his voice would rightly be most potential: but thus, and thus only, could he control the East: and this is simply to admit that he was the First Bishop, and not the Second or the Third. It was as defenders of the supreme law of the Church, the Canon, that the Bishops of Rome up to the time of St. Gregory won themselves the respect and admiration of Christendom. While the East was torn to pieces, and the South overwhelmed, and those who sat at Constantinople and Antioch too often dishonoured their high dignity by their unsound Faith, the Bishops of Rome shewed an unrivalled line of Martyrs, Confessors, and Doctors, the Champions of the Church's Faith, the Guardians of her laws.

But to admit and maintain this, (for, whatever others may do, I can never conceal from myself the importance of the Primacy,) is not enough, unhappily, to obtain the Communion of Rome now. Let us then go on to see more of St. Gregory's teaching, and observe how he interprets those three passages of Scripture, on which the peculiar and exclusive Papal claim is now based.

Tom. 1.  
1040. D.  
His interpretation of the two chief passages of Scripture.

Tom. 3.  
532. A.

Commenting on the passage of Job xxxix. 28, 'She dwelleth in the rocks,' he says, "In the sacred writings when the word Rock occurs in the singular number, who else but Christ is understood? as Paul bears witness who saith, 'But the Rock was Christ.'" Accordingly he applies this to Matt. xvi. 16. "Hence the Mediator of God and men Himself says to the Chief of the Apostles, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church.' Himself is the Rock, from which Peter received his name, and upon which He said that He would build His Church." Then, according to that old view of Chrysostome and Au-

gustine and the ancient Church generally, it is the Church which in Peter received the keys. Thus, “‘Whom say ye that I am?’ To whom immediately *Peter answering with the voice of the whole Church* saith, ‘Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.’” And further on, “The Church seeking her Redeemer would not let her hope rest on the ancient preachers by themselves, for she says, ‘It was but a little that I passed from them, but I found Him whom my soul loveth.’ That is, Him She could not have found, had She refused to pass by them. With those watchmen the unbelieving stopped, who believed that Christ the Son of God was some one of them. Therefore *the Holy Church by the voice and faith of Peter* passed by the watchmen whom She found, for She despised taking the Lord of the prophets for one of the Prophets.” This he expresses in another place,

“‘He hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of His servant David.’ What is the horn of salvation but the height of Ecclesiastical power? For what is nowhere said to those of old is now said to the universal Church, ‘Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.’” The same occurs again in a passage where he introduces the Rock with a remarkable application:

“For it is She alone, (the Church,) through whom the Lord willingly accepts sacrifice; She alone, who intercedeth with confidence for the erring. Whence too it was that the Lord commanded concerning the sacrifice of the lamb, ‘In one house shall it be eaten: thou shalt not carry forth ought of the flesh abroad out of the house.’ For in one house the Lamb is eaten, because in one Catholic Church the true Host of the Redeemer is immolated. Concerning whose flesh the divine law forbids that it be carried out, because it forbids the holy thing being given to dogs. For it is She alone in whom the good work is done to good effect, whence too they only who had laboured within the vineyard received the reward of a penny. It is She alone who guards those within her bosom by the strong embrace of charity. Whence also the water of the deluge raised the ark aloft, but destroyed all whom it found without the ark.

SECT.  
VII.  
Tom. 1.  
595. B, D.

Tom. 3.  
387. E.

The whole  
Church re-  
ceived the  
promise of  
the keys.

Tom. 1.  
1148. E.

CHAP.  
V

It is She alone in whom we contemplate heavenly mysteries under a true aspect. Wherefore also the Lord saith to Moses, 'There is a place by Me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock.' And presently, 'I will take away My hand and thou shalt see My back parts.' For because truth is beheld out of the Catholic Church alone, the Lord saith, 'There is a place by Me' from which He may be seen. Moses is put in the rock to contemplate the beauty of God: because if a man hold not the firmness of faith he doth not recognise the divine presence. Concerning which firmness the Lord saith, 'Upon this Rock I will build My Church.'"

Again, in the passage John xxi. St. Peter is viewed as representing the Church. "When fish so great had been taken, 'Simon Peter went up and drew the net to land.' I believe that your Charity already perceives what it means that Peter draws the net to land. It is that the holy Church is committed to him; to him especially is said, 'Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? feed My sheep.' What therefore is afterwards disclosed in words, is now set forth in deed. Therefore because the preacher of the Church separates us from the waves of this world, it is necessary that Peter should draw to land the net full of fishes. For it is he who draws the fishes to the security of the shore, because by the voice of holy preaching he shews to the faithful the stability of their eternal country. This he did by words, this by letters, *this he doth daily by the signs of miracles*. So often as through him we are converted to the love of the eternal rest, so often as we are separated from the tumult of earthly things, what else is it but that, being put as fish within the net of faith, we are drawn to the shore." That he meant to take Peter here as the great type of the Apostolic ministry is shewn I think by another place:

"It is because the Teacher of the holy Church ought to have these three ornaments of distinguished beauty, *that Peter is taken for all*, and is asked a third time whether he loves the Redeemer." Again, on the words, 'They ran both together, and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre, but ventured not to enter in. But Peter came afterwards and entered in.' "Brethren, what does this running signify? Is so minute a description of the Evan-

Tom. 1.  
1542. B.  
Peter in  
John xxi.  
the type of  
the apo-  
stolic min-  
istry.

Tom. 3.  
383. D.

Tom. 1.  
1680. D.

gelist to be believed to be without hidden meanings? Certainly not. For John would not say that he had gone first, and had not entered, if he had believed that there was no hidden meaning in that trepidation of his. What then is signified by John but the Synagogue? What by Peter but the Church."

SECT.  
VII.  
Mysteriis.

Other passages mark that Ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction are lodged in the twelve collectively, and therefore, unless the contrary be said, in the successors of the twelve collectively. On Job xxxviii. 10, 11, 'I brake up for it my decreed place, and set a bar (Vulg.) and doors, and said, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed,' he observes,

Jurisdiction of the Church in the Apostles and their successors.

"What is signified by doors, but holy preachers: what by the bar, but the incarnate Lord? . . . For because those doors of the holy Church were strengthened by this bar set behind them, they might indeed be beaten by the waves, but could not be broken through. . . Not without reason are they called doors, because they both give way to the faithful, and again bar the passage to the faithless. Consider what a door of the Church was Peter, who received Cornelius searching after the Faith, who repelled Simon offering a price for miracles. Saying to the former, 'Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons,' he graciously opened the secrets of the kingdom: saying to the latter, 'Thy money perish with thee,' he bars the passage of the heavenly court by a sentence of severe condemnation. What are all the Apostles, but doors of the holy Church, when they hear by the voice of their Redeemer, 'Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them: and whose ye retain, they are retained.' As if they were told openly, Through you they shall enter in to Me, to whom you open yourselves; and they be repelled, to whom you bar the way." Again, on the words, 'The heavens are the works of His hands.'

Tom. 1.  
911. D.

"For the Doctors of the Church are called heavens, because the Lord presides in their persons, while through them He pronounces His judgments. For to whom He gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to them He gave the power of binding and loosing. Through them therefore He judges, because He binds whatever has been bound by them. Now

Tom. 3.  
532. E.

CHAP. we know that sitting marks the judge: and the Lord Him-  
 V. self says by the Prophet, 'Heaven is My seat.' If there-  
 Isaiah 66. fore heaven is the seat of God, and the Lord judges in the  
 persons of the Rulers of the Church, as sitting is the mark  
 of a judge, it necessarily follows that the Rulers of the  
 Church are called heavens."

St. Gre-  
 gory's ordi-  
 nary teach-  
 ing in ac-  
 cordance  
 with the  
 following  
 particular  
 testimonies.

Assuredly in these two passages St. Gregory views all  
 jurisdiction and power in the Church as vested in the Apo-  
 stles and their successors, not in the successors of the chief  
 of the Apostles exclusively. In other words, his teaching is  
 that of St. Augustine and St. Chrysostome, St. Basil, and  
 St. Cyril, of the whole six centuries which he closes, and  
 not that of the later Roman Church. With him, moreover,  
 Christ is the Rock, and the promises made to Peter, are  
 made to the Church in his person. He does not venture to  
 restrict these passages to the Roman Pontiffs: it never  
 comes into his mind to build an Ecclesiastical Monarchy  
 upon them. He makes no attempt to push the power of  
 St. Peter himself beyond the text of Scripture: with him  
 St. Peter is indeed the chief of the Apostles, the elder Bro-  
 ther, the mouth-piece of the band, the type of unity, and of  
 the Church, but they too are his brethren, they derive no  
 authority from him, they are Ecumenical Doctors, in the  
 words of St. Cyril, as well as he. He is not in the place of  
 Christ to them, but Christ is in the midst of the twelve,  
 visibly reigning through them, as He is in the Bishops of the  
 Church universal. St. Gregory does not blink the reproof  
 of St. Peter by St. Paul. "He yielded himself to consent to  
 his *younger Brother*, and in that same matter became the  
 follower of his junior, that in this too he might have the  
 pre-eminence: that he who was first in the rank of the Apo-  
 stolate might be first also in humility." . . "Which of us, I  
 pray you, had he done even the least miracle, were he cen-  
 sured by his *younger Brother*, would listen with patience to  
 the words of censure."

Tom. 1.  
 1868. B.

In fine, St. Gregory, like those who went before him, con-  
 sidered the promises made in Matt. xvi. 16, and xviii. 18,  
 and in John xx. 21-3, as made to the whole Church in the  
 person of her rulers. And I suppose that if the Canon of  
 St. Vincent as to the testimony of the Church of the first six

centuries may be rigorously carried out in any one point, it is in this, that the supreme power of the Church, which includes Jurisdiction and Mission as well as Orders, was held to be vested in the Apostles, and the Bishops their successors. As the Council of Trent has at least set forth exactly the same rule for the interpretation of Scripture as St. Vincent, I can only account for the late attack upon his Canon by the strong consciousness which is felt, that it tells with overwhelming power against an Ecclesiastical monarchy.

I have thought it important to shew that the general teaching of St. Gregory on the points in discussion was in harmony with certain more special testimonies to which a particular incident gave rise. It might be argued, though I think unfairly, that, whatever the *prima facie* appearance of these testimonies might be, St. Gregory could not have held such principles as they seem to convey, because those principles would be in opposition to his own general conduct and teaching. But this discrepancy between his general conduct and teaching and the following particular testimonies does not really exist. He neither acted as, nor claimed to be, in quality of St. Peter's successor, Supreme Ruler of the Church, but only her first Bishop. And now for this discussion itself, which arose in his time, and served to draw forth statements on his part most remarkably bearing on the present claims of the See of Rome. In the year 589, Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch, accused of a grievous crime, appealed to the Emperor and his Council. He accordingly went to Constantinople, and was tried. All the Patriarchs of the East, in person, or by their deputies, attended this trial, the Senate likewise, and many Metropolitans; and the cause having been examined in several sittings, Gregory was absolved, and the accuser flogged through the city and banished. At this Council John the Faster, Patriarch of Constantinople, took the title of Universal Bishop, as his predecessors are repeatedly styled Ecu-  
menical in the laws of Justinian. Immediately the Roman Pontiff Pelagius heard of it, he sent letters by which, of St. Peter's authority, he annulled the acts of this Council, save as to the absolution of Gregory, and ordered his Deacon,

SECT.  
VII.

Contest  
about the  
title Ecu-  
menical.

CHAP.  
V.

the Nuncio, not to attend the mass with John. But he left the contest about the name Ecumenical, or Universal, Bishop or Patriarch, to his successor Gregory. We have many letters of Gregory on the subject, of which I will give extracts. The Pope foresaw the great danger there was that the Patriarch of Constantinople would reduce completely under him the other three Eastern Patriarchs, and perhaps attempt to gain the Primacy of the whole Church; for this, among other reasons, neither St. Leo, nor any of his successors, had ever allowed in the West the 28th Canon of Chalcedon, giving him the next place to Rome. And now this title of Ecumenical, combined with the fact that the Bishop of that See was, from his position, the intermediary between all the Bishops of the East and the imperial power, seemed to point directly to such a consummation. He was the natural president of a Council continually sitting at Constantinople, which might be said to lead and give the initiative to the whole East. Accordingly St. Gregory appears in this matter the great defender of the Patriarchal equilibrium. "Gregory to Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, and Anastasius, Bishop of Antioch." . . . "As your venerable Holiness is aware, this name Universal was offered *during* the holy Synod of Chalcedon to the Pontiff of the Apostolic See, a post which by God's providence I fill. But no one of my predecessors ever consented to use so profane a term, because plainly, if a single *Patriarch is called Universal, the name of Patriarch is taken from the rest.* But far, far be this from the mind of a Christian, that any one should wish to claim to himself that by which the honour of his brethren may seem to be in any degree diminished. Since, therefore, we are unwilling to receive this honour when offered to us, consider how shameful it is that any one has wished violently to usurp it to himself. Wherefore let your Holiness in your letters *never call any one Universal, lest in offering undue honour to another you should deprive yourself of that which is your due . . .* Let us, therefore, render thanks to Him, who, dissolving enmities, hath caused in His flesh, that in the whole world there should be one flock and one fold under Himself the one Shepherd. . . . For because he is near of whom it is written, 'He is king over

Ep. S.  
Greg., lib.  
5. 43.

Per.

The term  
Universal  
an injury  
to all the  
Patriarchs.

all the children of pride,' what I cannot utter without great grief, our Brother and fellow-Bishop John, despising the Apostolic precepts, the rules of the Fathers, endeavours by this appellation to go before him in pride. . . . So that he endeavours to claim the whole to himself, and aims by the pride of this pompous language *to subjugate to himself all the members of Christ, which are joined together to the one sole Head, that is, Christ.* . . . . By the favour of the Lord we must strive with all our strength, and take care lest by one poisonous sentence the living members of Christ's body be destroyed. For if this is allowed to be said freely, *the honour of all the Patriarchs is denied.* And when, perchance, he who is termed Universal perishes in error, presently no Bishop is found to have remained in the state of truth. Wherefore it is your duty firmly, and without prejudice, to preserve the Churches as you received them, and let this attempt of diabolic usurpation find nothing of its own in you. Stand firm, stand fearless; *presume not ever either to give or receive letters with this false title of Universal.* Keep from the pollution of this pride all the Bishops subject to your care, that the whole Church may recognise you for Patriarchs, not only by good works but by your genuine authority. But if perchance adversity follow, persisting with one mind, we are bound to shew, even by dying, that we love not any special gain of our own to the general loss." So, likewise to the Bishops of Illyricum he says—"Because as

Lib. 9. 68.  
The term Universal an injury and disruption of the whole Church; destroys the position of other Bishops, and the Faith.

CHAP.

V.

Lib. 5. 19.

Lib. 7. 33.

Term Uni-  
versal an  
anticipa-  
tion of An-  
tichrist.

Deum.

afterwards his successor—"For to consent to this nefarious name, is nothing else but to lose our faith." "Gregory to the Emperor Mauricius" . . . . "Concerning which matter, my Lord's affection has enjoined me in his commands, saying that scandal ought not to grow between us, for the term of a frivolous name. But I beg your Imperial Piety to consider, that some frivolities are very harmless, some highly injurious. When Antichrist at his coming calls himself God, will it not be very frivolous, but yet cause great destruction? If we look at the amount of what is said, it is but two syllables, if at the weight of iniquity, it is universal destruction. *But I confidently affirm that whoever calls himself, or desires to be called, Universal Priest, in his pride goes before Antichrist*; because through pride he prefers himself to the rest. And he is led into error by no dissimilar pride, because, like that perverse one, he wishes to appear God over all men; so, *whoever he is who desires to be called sole Priest*, he lifts up himself above all other Priests. But since the Truth says, 'every one who exalteth himself shall be abased,' I know that the more any pride inflates itself, the sooner it bursts."

Lib. 5. Ep.  
20.Peter re-  
ceived the  
charge of  
the whole  
Church but  
not the  
name Uni-  
versal.

"Gregory to the Emperor Mauricius." . . . . "But since it is not my cause, but God's, and since not I only, but the whole Church, is thrown into confusion, since sacred laws, since venerable Synods, since the very commands even of our Lord Jesus Christ are disturbed by the invention of this haughty and pompous language, let the most pious Emperor lance the wound, &c. . . . *For to all who know the Gospel it is manifest, that the charge of the whole Church was entrusted by the voice of the Lord to the holy Apostle Peter, chief of all the Apostles.* For to him is said, 'Peter, lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep.' To him is said, 'Behold, Satan hath desired to sift you,' &c. To him is said, 'Thou art Peter,' &c. *Lo, he hath received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the power of binding and loosing is given to him, the care of the whole Church is committed to him, and the Primacy, and yet he is not called Universal Apostle.* And that holy man, my fellow-Priest, John, endeavours to be called Universal Bishop. . . . Do I, in this matter, most pious Lord, defend my own cause? is it a private injury that I pursue? the cause of Almighty

God, the cause of the Universal Church. Who is he, who, in violation of the statutes of the Gospel, in violation of the decrees of Canons, presumes to usurp a new name to himself? *Would that he who desires to be called Universal may exist himself without diminution to others!* . . . . If, then, any one claims to himself that name in that Church, as in the judgment of all good men he has done, the whole Church (which God forbid!) falls from its place, when he who is called Universal falls. But far from Christian hearts be that blasphemous name, *in which the honour of all Priests is taken away, while it is madly arrogated by one to himself!* Certainly, to do honour to the blessed Peter, chief of the Apostles, this was offered to the Roman Pontiff during the venerable Synod of Chalcedon. But no one of them ever consented to use this singular appellation, *that all Priests might not be deprived of their due honour by something peculiar being given to one.* How is it, then, that we seek not the glory of this name, though offered us, yet another presumes to claim it, though not offered?"

SECT.  
VII.

If such an one falls, the whole Church falls with him.

Per.

Bellarmino, as Launoy has observed, striving to prove the inerrancy of the Pope, says, "Thirdly it is proved from that passage in the last of John, 'Feed My sheep.' For I have shewn above, lib. i. ch. 14, 15, 16, that in these words the Pontiff is appointed Pastor and Doctor of the whole Church. Hence then the following argument is derived. The Pontiff is the Doctor and Pastor of the whole Church: therefore the whole Church is bound to hear and follow him: *therefore if he errs, the whole Church will err.*" So that Bellarmine uses in favour of the Pope's inerrancy the self-same argument, which appeared to Pope St. Gregory so inexpressibly shocking, that the thing which it implied was invented by the first apostate. Moreover this tends powerfully to shew, that the system which St. Gregory so strenuously repudiated, and Bellarmine so strenuously upholds, are one and the same. Another proof I find in the fact that Durandus, Bishop of Mende, in the treatise, which by order of Clement the Fifth he composed at the Council of Vienne, A.D. 1307, lays down, that "the Lord Pope should not be called Universal Pontiff of the Church, since Gregory forbids this."

De Rom. Pont., lib. 4. cap. 3.

Argument of Bellarmine compared with that of St. Gregory.

Above, line 8, and p. 358. line 16.

Quoted by Pereira, Tent. Theol., Landon's transl. p. 63.

CHAP.  
V.

Lib. 7. 27.  
Term Uni-  
versal a  
profane  
appellation  
invented by  
the first  
Apostate.

John had been succeeded by Cyriacus at Constantinople: and he writes further, "Gregory to Anastasius, Bishop of Antioch . . . . I thought it not worth while on account of a profane appellation to delay receiving the synodical letter of our Brother and fellow-Priest Cyriacus, that I might not disturb the unity of the holy Church: nevertheless, I have made a point of admonishing him respecting that same superstitious and haughty appellation, saying that he could not have peace with me unless he corrected the pride of the aforesaid expression, *which the first apostate invented*. But you should not call this cause of no importance; because, if we bear this patiently, we corrupt the Faith of the whole Church. For you know how many, not only heretics, but even heresiarchs, have come forth from the Church of Constantinople. And, not to speak of the injury done to your honour, if one Bishop be called Universal, the whole Church tumbles to pieces, if that one, being universal, falls<sup>k</sup>. But far be such folly, far be such trifling, from my ears. But I trust in the Almighty Lord, that what He hath promised, He will quickly perform: every one that exalteth himself shall be abased." In another most interesting letter he communicates to the Bishop of Alexandria, that "while the nation of the English, placed in a corner of the world, was remain-

Lib. 8. 30.

<sup>k</sup> I cannot but consider St. Gregory's words to contain one of the most remarkable prophecies to be found in history; for this assuming the title and exercising the power of universal Pope has actually led not only to the concentration of all executive power in the Roman See, but to the conviction, among its warmest partisans, that the whole existence of the Church depends on the single See of Rome. Take the following from De Maistre: "Christianity rests entirely upon the Sovereign Pontiff."—"Without the Sovereign Pontiff the whole edifice of Christianity is undermined, and only waits, for a complete falling in, the development of certain circumstances which shall be put in their full light."—"What remains incontestable is, that if the Bishops, assembled without the Pope, may call themselves the Church, and claim any other power but that of certifying the person of the Pope in those infinitely rare moments when it might be doubtful, unity exists no

longer, and the visible Church disappears."—"The Sovereign Pontiff is the necessary, only, and exclusive foundation of Christianity. To him belong the promises, with him disappears unity, that is, the Church."—"The supremacy of the Pope being the capital dogma without which Christianity cannot subsist, all the Churches, which reject this dogma, the importance of which they conceal from themselves, are agreed even without knowing it: all the rest is but accessory, and thence comes their affinity, of which they know not the cause."—Du Pape, Discours Préliminaire; Liv. i. ch. 13; Liv. 4. ch. 5. Could we have any stronger witness to the antagonism between the Papal and the Patriarchal or Episcopal System? Or can any words be spoken more opposed in tone than these to the writings of Fathers and decrees of ancient Councils? Or are they who say such things wise defenders of the Church or promoters of unity?

ing up to this time in unbelief, worshipping stocks and stones, by the help of your prayers I determined, that I ought to send over to it a monk of my monastery, by the blessing of God, to preach there. After permission from me, he has been made a Bishop by the Bishops of Germany, and, assisted by their kindness, reached the aforesaid nation at the end of the world; and even at this present moment I have received accounts of his safety and labours; for either he, or those who have gone over with him, are distinguished among that nation by so great miracles, that they seem to imitate the powers of Apostles by the signs which they shew forth. On this last feast of the Lord's Nativity more than ten thousand English are reported to have been baptized by this our Brother and fellow-Bishop, which I mention that you may know what you are doing among the people of Alexandria by your voice, and in the ends of the world by your prayers."—"Your Blessedness has also taken pains to tell me, that you no longer write to certain persons those proud names, which have sprung from the root of vanity, and you address me, saying, *as you commanded*, which word *command* I beg you to remove from my ears, because I know who I am, and who you are. For in rank you are my Brother, in character my Father. I did not, therefore, command, but took pains to point out, what I thought advantageous. I do not, however, find that your Blessedness was willing altogether to observe the very thing I pressed upon you. For I said that you should not write any such thing *either to me or to any one else*, and lo! in the heading of your letter, directed to me, the very person who forbad it, you set that haughty appellation, *calling me Universal Pope*. Which I beg your Holiness, who are most agreeable to me, to do no more, because *whatever is given to another more than reason requires is so much taken away from yourself*. It is not in appellations, but in character, that I wish to advance. *Nor do I consider that an honour by which I acknowledge that my brethren lose their own*. For my honour is the honour of the Universal Church. My honour is the unimpaired vigour of my brethren. Then am I truly honoured, when the due honour is not denied to each one in his degree. *For if your Holiness calls me Uni-*

Pope Gregory desires not to be called Universal Pope.

CHAP. V. *versal Pope, you deny that you are yourself what you admit me to be, Universal.* But this God forbid. Away with words which inflate vanity, and wound charity. Indeed, during the holy Synod of Chalcedon, and by the Fathers subsequently, your Holiness knows this was offered to my predecessors. Yet none of them chose ever to use this term; that, while in this world they entertained affection for the honour of all Priests, in the hands of Almighty God they might guard their own."

Whether given by the Council of Chalcedon.

Part 1. liv. 1. ch. 11.

Mansi 6. 1006, 1012, quoted by Gieseler.

Tom. 5. 477.

As to what Gregory says about this title being offered at the Council of Chalcedon, for it is remarkable that he does not say *by* it, but *during* or *in* it, using *per*, and *in*, but not, *a*, Thomassin says, "It authorized at least by its silence the title of Ecumenical (Patriarch), which was given to Pope Leo in several requests there read." It appears these requests really were the complaints of two Alexandrian Deacons against Dioscorus. How very different it was to pass over without reprobating a title bestowed in documents which came before it, from itself conferring that title, is plain at once. In just the same way it had been given at the Latrocinium to Dioscorus, which Thomassin will have to go for nothing, but Van Espen says, "It is probable that these accusers of Dioscorus wished to oppose the fore-named title to a similar title which had been given to Dioscorus in the pseudo-Council of Ephesus, the Acts of which had been already recited at Chalcedon in the first session, where Olympius Bishop of Evadum in his note for Eutyches had said, 'Our most holy Father and universal Archbishop Dioscorus of the great city of Alexandria.'" However, the title Ecumenical has been constantly since, and is now, borne by the Patriarch of Constantinople; no doubt a very innocent meaning may be given to it. The remarkable thing is, that Gregory has pointed out in such precise unmistakable language a certain power and claim, which he inferred, rightly or wrongly, would be set up on this title Ecumenical, and which he pronounces to be a corruption of the whole constitution of the Church.

Perhaps, however, the most remarkable passage remains yet to be quoted. It is in a letter to the Patriarch John himself. "Consider; I pray you, that by this rash presump-

Lib. 5. 18.

tion the peace of the whole Church is disturbed, *and the grace, poured out upon all in common, contradicted.* And in this, indeed, you yourself will be able to increase just so much as you purpose in your own mind; and become so much the greater, as you restrain yourself from usurping a proud and foolish name. And you profit in the degree that you do not study to arrogate to yourself by derogating from your brethren. Therefore, most dear Brother, with all your heart love humility, by which the harmony of all the brethren and the unity of the holy universal Church may be preserved. Surely the Apostle Paul, hearing some say, 'I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas,' exclaimed, in exceeding horror at this rending of the Lord's Body, by which His members attached themselves, as it were, to other heads, saying, 'Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?' If he then rejected the members of the Lord's Body being subjected to certain heads, as it were, besides Christ, and that even to Apostles themselves, as leaders of parts, what will you say to Christ, *who is, as you know, the Head of the Universal Church, in the examination of the last judgment,—you, who endeavour to subject to yourself, under the name of Universal, all His members?* Who, I say, in this perverse name, is set forth for imitation but he, who despised the legions of angels joined as companions to himself, and endeavoured to rise to a height unapproached by all, that he might seem to be subject to none, and be alone superior to all. Who also said, 'I will ascend into heaven: I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, on the sides of the North. I will ascend above the height of the clouds: I will be like the Most High.'

"For what are all your brethren, the Bishops of the Universal Church, but the stars of heaven? Whose life and language together shine amid the sins and errors of men, as among the shades of night. And while you seek to set yourself over these by a proud term, and to tread under foot their name, in comparison with your own, what else do you say, but 'I will ascend into the heaven. I will exalt my throne above the stars of God?' Are not all the Bishops clouds, who rain down the words of their preaching, and

SECT.  
VII.

Christ the  
Head of the  
Church:  
the term  
Universal  
an invasion  
of His  
rights and  
an imita-  
tion of the  
Devil.

CHAP.  
V.

shine with the light of good works? And while your Brotherhood despises them, and endeavours to put them under you, what else do you say but this, which is said by the old enemy: 'I will ascend above the heights of the clouds?' And when I see all these things with sorrow, and fear the secret judgments of God, my tears increase, my heart contains not my groans, that that most holy man, the Lord John, of such abstinence and humility, seduced by the persuasion of those about him, hath proceeded to such pride, that in longing after a perverse name, he endeavours to be like him, who, desiring in his pride to be as God, lost even the grace of that likeness to God which had been given him; and so forfeited true blessedness, because he sought false glory. *Surely Peter, the first of the Apostles, is a member of the holy Universal Church; Paul, Andrew, John, what else are they but the heads of particular communities? and yet all are members under one Head.* And to comprehend all in one brief expression, the saints before the law, the saints under the law, the saints under grace, all these making up the Body of the Lord, are disposed among members of the Church, and no one ever wished to be called Universal. Let, then, your Holiness acknowledge how great is your pride, who seek to be called by that name, by which no one has presumed to be called who was really holy.

Peter, Paul,  
Andrew,  
John,  
equally  
members  
of the  
Church un-  
der the One  
Head.

Per.

"Had not, as your Brotherhood knows, *during* the venerable Council of Chalcedon, the Prelates of this Apostolical See, whose servant by God's disposition I am, the honour offered them of being called Universal? But yet no one ever chose to be called by such a name; no one claimed to himself this rash appellation; lest, should he claim to himself *the glory of singularity in the rank of the High-Priesthood*, he might seem to have denied it to all his brethren." Is not the claim of giving jurisdiction to the whole Church precisely that *glory of singularity* here by anticipation condemned? . . . "We know that our Creator descended from the height of His exaltation, to bestow glory on the human race; and we, that are created out of the lowest things, *glory in the lessening of our brethren.*" . . . "What therefore, dearest Brother, will you say in that terrible examination of the judgment to come, you who covet to be called in the

world *not merely Father but common Father?* Beware then of the bad suggestion of the wicked: avoid every instigation to offence. 'Offences indeed must come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh.' Lo, by this abominable expression of pride the Church is cut in two: the hearts of all the brethren are provoked to offence." . . . "Again it is written, 'Giving honour one to another;' and you endeavour to take that honour from all, which you illicitly desire to usurp for yourself singly." In these striking words one seems to have that fatal division of the East and West, the cause of all subsequent calamities, brought before the mind.

SECT.  
VII.

Condemnation of the title Common Father.

St. Leo IX., writing to Michael Cerularius four hundred and fifty years after the date of this letter, repeats the observation that this name Universal was offered to St. Leo at the Council of Chalcedon, adding, "And to whom after Jesus Christ could this name be more fitting than to the successor of Peter? But the humility of those venerable Pontiffs, worthy of imitation, considering that the Chief of the Apostles himself is not found called Universal Apostle, utterly rejected that proud name, *by which their equality of rank seemed to be taken away from all Prelates throughout the world, in that a claim was made for one upon the whole.*"

Mansi 19.  
640. C.

Now had these passages occurred in the writings of some ancient Saint, who was generally opposed to the authority of the Roman See, had they belonged to a Patriarch of Antioch, or Constantinople, jealous of his own rights, they would surely have had their weight, as testimonies to a fact, not mere opinions of the speaker. They would have borne witness to no such thing as they reprobate having, till then, been allowed or thought of. Or, had they been isolated statements, not borne out by contemporaneous or antecedent documents, but standing alone, uncontradicted indeed, but unsupported, they would still have told. How, then, are we to express their weight, or the full assurance of faith which they give us, as being the deliberate, oft-repeated, official statements of a Pope, than whom there never was one more vigorous in defending or in exercising the rights of his See? As being supported and borne out, and in every possible way corroborated by the facts of history, the decrees of Councils, the innumerable testimonies of all parts of the world, the

Inference from these expressions.

CHAP.

V.

Mr. Newman's assertion about the Pope being universal Bishop, and retraction.

every-day life of the living, breathing Church for six hundred years? In an early work, Mr. Newman had said, "What there is not the shadow of a reason for saying that the Fathers held, what has not the faintest pretensions of being a Catholic truth, is this, that St. Peter, and his successors, were and are universal Bishops; that they have the whole of Christendom for their own diocese, in a way in which other Apostles and Bishops had and have not."

Proph. Office, p. 221. Development, p. 10.

In his last work he has retracted, saying, "Most true, if, in order that a doctrine be considered Catholic, it must be formally stated by the Fathers generally from the very first; but, on the same understanding, the doctrine also of the Apostolic succession in the Episcopal order has not the faintest pretensions of being a Catholic truth."

What Councils and Fathers say of it.

Now these words of Mr. Newman seem to imply that the expressions of Fathers, or the decrees of Councils, look towards this presumed Catholic truth, tend to it, and finally admit it, as a truth which they have been all along implicitly holding, or unconsciously living upon, and at last recognised and expressed. On the contrary, to my apprehension, they hold another view about the See of Rome, and express it again and again. It is not a point on which there is variation or inconsistency among them. I have as clear a conviction as one can well have that St. Augustine did *not* hold the Papal theory. I think the words that I have quoted from him prove this. Moreover, the Fathers generally express a view about other Bishops which is utterly incompatible with this theory as now received, which by no process of development can be made to agree with it. And I confess that I am unable to understand the meaning of words, if this so-called "Catholic truth" of the Pope being the Universal Bishop, is not distinctly considered in these passages of St. Gregory, formally repudiated for himself as well as for others, and the very notion declared to be, in any case whatsoever, *that of the Pope being specially named*, blasphemous and Antichristian. Could heretics say anything of the kind against the doctrine of the Apostolical succession, out of the first six centuries, they would have an advantage against the Church, which, thank God, they are far from possessing.

And it is of no small importance, that we have here speaking a Pope, one to whom twelve centuries have given the name of Great, one who, with St. Leo, stands forth out of the ancient line of St. Peter's heirs as an especially legislative mind. Every Catholic is bound to take his words without suspicion. Now St. Gregory asserts, as we have seen, the right of his See to call *any* Bishop to account, even the four Patriarchs, in case of a violation of the Canons; declaring at the same time that, when the Canons are kept, the meanest Bishop is his equal in the estimation of humility. Even while arguing against this title he says, "To all who know the Gospel is manifest that the charge of the whole Church was entrusted by the voice of the Lord to the holy Apostle Peter,"—"and yet he is not called Universal Apostle;" but this title, he asserts, and the theory implied in it, is devilish, an imitation of Satan, an anticipation of Antichrist. What else can we conclude but that which so many other documents prove, that this Primacy over the whole Church, the ancient and undoubted privilege of the Bishop of Rome, was something quite different from what he is here reprobating? For St. Gregory, least of all men, was so blind as to use arguments which might be retorted with full force against himself. And yet, any one reading these words of his, and not knowing whence they came, would suppose they were written by a professed opponent of the present Papal claims. For in these letters St. Gregory acknowledges all the Patriarchs as co-ordinate with himself, acknowledges our Lord to be sole Head of the Church, declares the title of Universal Bishop blasphemous and Antichristian, expressly on the ground that it is a wrong done to the Universal Church, to every Bishop and Priest: "If one is universal, it remains that you are not Bishops;" declares, moreover, that St. Peter himself is only a member of the Universal Church, as St. Paul, St. John, St. Andrew, were other members, the heads of different communities, and alleges the wish to be called common Father as a crime. This may be said to be the precise logical contradictory of De Maistre's assertion, that "the Pope" is "the Church," in which he assuredly only expresses the Papal Idea. Rarely

SECT.  
VII.

The bearing of St. Gregory's words on this.

Summary of the above letters.

See also Mr. Thompson, as quoted in the Preface.

CHAP.  
V.

indeed, is it that any controversy, appealing to ancient times, can have a testimony on all its details so distinct, and specific, and authoritative as this: and yet it may be said no more than to crown the testimony of the six centuries going before it. That during this period the Bishop of Rome was recognised to be first Bishop of the whole Church, of very great influence, successor of St. Peter, and standing in the same relation to his brethren the Bishops that St. Peter stood in to his brother Apostles; this, on the whole, I believe to be the testimony of the first six centuries, such as a person, not wilfully blind, and who was not content to take the witness of a Father when it suited his purpose and pass it by when it did not, would draw from Ecclesiastical documents. I have set it forth to the best of my ability, as well where it seemed to tell against the present position of the Church of England, as in those many points in which it supports her.

Defence of  
the Church  
of England  
hence  
arising.

What then is our defence on her part against the charge of schism? It is simply this. That no one can now be in the Communion of Rome without admitting this very thing which Pope Gregory declares to be blasphemous and Anti-christian, and derogatory to the honour of every Priest. This is the very head and front of our offending, that we refuse to allow that the Pope is Universal Bishop. If the charge were, that we refuse to stand in the same relation to the Pope that St. Augustine of Canterbury stood in to this very St. Gregory, that we refuse to regard and honour the successor of St. Gregory with the same honour with which our Archbishops, as soon as they were seated in the government of their Church, and were no longer merely Missionaries but Primates, regarded the occupant of St. Peter's See, I think both the separation three hundred years ago, and the present continuance of it on our part, would, so far as this question of schism is concerned, be utterly indefensible. But this is *not* the point. It may indeed be, and frequently is, so stated by unfair opponents. The real point is, that, during the nine hundred years which elapsed between 596 and 1534, the power of the Pope, and his relation to the Bishops in his Communion, had essentially

altered : had been, in fact, placed upon another basis. That from being first Bishop of the Church, and Patriarch, originally of the ten Provinces under the Vicar of the Præfectus Prætorio of Italy, then of France, Spain, Africa, and the West generally, he had claimed to be the source and channel of grace to all Bishops, the fountain-head of jurisdiction to the whole world, East as well as West ; in fact, the 'Solus Sacerdos,' the 'Universus Episcopus,' contemplated by St. Gregory. There is a world-wide difference between the ancient signature of the Popes, 'Episcopus Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Urbis Romæ,' and that of Pope Pius at the Council of Trent, 'Ego Pius Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Episcopus.' It has been no longer left in the choice of any to accept his *Primacy*, without accepting his *Monarchy*, which those who profess to follow antiquity must believe that the Bishops of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, Augustine and Chrysostome, the West and the East, would have rejected with the horror shewn by St. Gregory at the first dawning of such an idea. And, whereas holy Scripture and antiquity present us with one accordant view of the Universal Church governed by St. Peter and the Apostolic College, and, during the times of the seven Ecumenical Councils at least, as the Bishop of Rome is seen to exercise the Primacy of St. Peter, so his brother-Bishops stand to him as the College of Apostles stood to St. Peter : instead of this, which is the Church's divine hierarchy, instituted by Christ Himself, the actual Roman Church is governed by one Bishop who has an Apostolical independent power, whilst all the rest, who should be his brethren, are merely his delegates, receiving from his hand the investiture of such privileges as they still retain. If St. Gregory did not mean this by the terms 'Solus Sacerdos,' 'Universus Episcopus,' what did he mean ? That the Pope should be the only Priest who offered sacrifice, or the only Bishop who ordained, confirmed, &c. is physically impossible. Nor did the title of the Bishops of Constantinople tend to this : but to claim to themselves jurisdiction over the co-ordinate Patriarchs of the East, as the Popes have since done over the Bishops of the whole world. We have no need to

SECT.  
VII.

Ancient  
and modern  
signature of  
the Popes.

CHAP.  
V.

consider what is the amount of this difficulty to Roman Catholics themselves : the same Providence, which has placed them under that obedience, has placed us outside of it. Our cause, indeed, cannot be different now from what it was at the commencement of the separation. If inherently indefensible then, it is so now. But if then 'severe but just,' the lapse of three centuries in our separate state may materially affect our relative duties. I affirm my conviction, that it is better to endure almost any degree of usurpation, provided only it be not Antichristian, than to make a schism : for the state of schism is a frustration of the purposes of the Lord's Incarnation ; and through this, not only the English, and the Eastern Church, but the Roman also, lies fettered and powerless before the might of the world, and bleeding internally at every pore. How shall a divided Church meet and overcome the philosophical unbelief of these last times ? or, the one condition to which victory is attached being broken, crush the deadliest attack of the old enemy ? But the schism is made ; let those answer for it before Christ's tribunal who made it. Now that it is made, I see not how a system, which is not a true development of the ancient Patriarchal constitution, but its antagonist, according to St. Gregory's words, can be forced upon us, on pain of our salvation, who have the original succession of the ancient Bishops of this realm, if any such there be, and the old Patriarchal constitution, '*sua tantum si bona norint.*' I ground our present position simply on the appeal to tradition and the decrees of all the Ecumenical Councils.

## CHAPTER VI.

## SECT. I.

FOR greatly as the power of the Pope in the West, and his influence over the whole Church, had increased in the seventh century, and much as the authority of the Eastern Churches had been diminished, first by the prevalence of the Nestorian and Eutychean heresies, and afterwards by the rise of the Arabian false Prophet, so that the Sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, were oftentimes in the power of the infidels, yet does this same century, at its close, not only present to us the whole Church acting together under the same constitution which it possessed at the great Nicene Council, but likewise supplies us with a fact which had never before occurred, of a Pope condemned and anathematized, and that more than forty years after his death, as having connived at and favoured the Monothelite heresy, condemned and anathematized by an Ecumenical Council, and that condemnation and anathema accepted and repeated by successive occupants of St. Peter's See. It would seem as if such a fact had been providentially allowed in that illustrious line of orthodox Pontiffs, in order to stamp with the infallible authority of a General Council the doctrine that the Roman See by itself may, like others, fall, and to pronounce a judgment of the whole Church against Ultramontane pretensions before they had arisen. The fact is of still more importance, coming so late as it does, when the power and influence of the Roman See had been so greatly consolidated, and when its general maintenance both of the Faith and of the liberty of the Church, standing as it did singly at the head of the West, and representing it to the East, had won for it many an advantage over the Eastern Patriarchs, so often divided among themselves, so often, first one and then another, involved in heresy, so often yielding a most dangerous subservience to imperial power. The See of Athanasius and Cyril had never recovered the blow given

The sixth Ecumenical Council. Balance of power in the Church altered, but the same constitution as at the Council of Nicea.

CHAP.  
VI.

to it by the condemnation of Dioscorus, and the succeeding divisions. The See of Chrysostome had been too often disgraced and weakened by imperial favourites who became heresiarchs. The See of Antioch had fallen to more than one most unworthy possessor. In the East the Nestorian, in the South the Monophysite, heresies had paved the way for the triumph of the false Prophet. Yet, after all this, at a time when the Oriental Church was greatly weakened, an Ecumenical Council tries and pronounces judgment on a Roman Pontiff, a judgment of condemnation, received, confessed, promulgated, and sworn to, by his successors.

Bossuet has set forth these facts with his wonted clearness, and with even more than his wonted decision.

Def. Cler.  
Gall., lib. 7.  
c. 21, &c.

Importance  
of this  
Council to  
our cause.

“As the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Councils passed judgment on the decisions of Roman Pontiffs, and only approved of them after inquiry, so the Sixth Council is known to have done: and that course is common to all Councils. But since the condemnation of Pope Honorius, together with his letters, in that Council, yields a peculiar support to our cause, Baronius and Bellarmine leave no stone unturned to make the Acts of the Sixth Council appear falsified by Greek corrupters of the copies: the two letters moreover of Leo the Second, confirming the Council, and condemning Honorius, falsified, or rather supposititious; and further, that Honorius himself should seem to have deserved most excellently of the Church. They add, that even if Honorius erred in the highest degree, it was as a private man, not as Pope and Teacher of the Church. This is what they say, but their conjectures will fall to the ground, not through any arguments of mine, but by merely reading the Acts.

“The following points, then, will be made clear by the Acts. First, what letters Honorius wrote, for what reasons, and whether as a private Doctor. Secondly, why the Sixth Council considered it necessary to condemn those letters which Roman Pontiffs, successors of Honorius, seem to have excused. Thirdly, whether the Acts of the Sixth Council, or the letters of Leo the Second, can be charged as falsified with at least any probable conjecture.

“We are to remember that the Monothelite heretics, though they admitted Two Natures of Christ, yet granted

only One Will, One Operation, not Two: that, the Church being disturbed by this novelty, Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, endeavoured to cloak the error, and wished both words, of One or Two Operations, to be abstained from; quite as those Eutycheans, who, confessing that Christ was perfect God and perfect man, yet set themselves with the greatest eagerness against One and Two Natures alike. That Sergius was unsound in much the same way: that he then composed his *Ecthesis*, or exposition, which was published under the name of his protector, the Emperor Heraclius, and suppressed equally both terms. That Pyrrhus of Constantinople followed this. That after the death of Heraclius an edict was issued by Constans the son of Heraclius to the same effect; it was called the *Typus*, and composed by Paul, Patriarch of Constantinople, successor of Pyrrhus. That Pope Honorius, so early as the time of Sergius, had been deceitfully drawn into that dissimulation. As the difficulty lies in the last point it must be set forth more distinctly.

“In the year 633, then, Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, was the first of all to issue a decree, and set forth one theandric operation in Christ. Thus wrote the Synod of Alexandria, held under him, in its seventh Anathema. Cyrus put forth this under pretence of peace, as though by that decree he should be able to reconcile the Eutycheans to the Church. Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, immediately takes up this doctrine; and no wonder, as he was the secret promoter of it. But Sophronius, a most holy and learned man, at that time a monk, but shortly after raised to the See of Jerusalem, declared his abhorrence of these tenets as new and impious. Nor would he listen to Sergius supporting Cyrus, nor admit any compromise in a matter of Faith, but he demanded plainly of Sergius, that the expression, One Operation, in the decrees of the Alexandrine Council, should be erased. Next, when made Patriarch of Jerusalem, he issued a Synodical letter, and proved that the force of this expression led to a confusion of the Two Natures of Christ, since each Nature must have its own Operation.

“But Sergius, perceiving the attention of Catholics to be roused, and that they would not admit of One Operation, though put upon them under the name of peace, after the

SECT.

I.

Insidious attempts of the Monothelite heresy leading to it.

CHAP.  
VI.

fashion of heretics betook himself to fraud, and wrote to Cyrus to allow the expression neither of One nor Two Operations, inasmuch as One Operation disturbed some, while Two were abhorrent from the sentiments of the Fathers. He wrote a full account to Honorius of these transactions with Sophronius and Cyrus, and his letter is extant in the twelfth action of the Sixth Council.

“That letter of Sergius was condemned by the Sixth holy Council as heretical, nor did any one excuse it. Let us see therefore whether Honorius, who most warmly approved that letter, can be excused.

The Pope approves the doctrine of Sergius.

“There is given in this same twelfth action the first letter of Honorius to Sergius, in which he answers Sergius, beginning thus :

Mansi 11.  
587. C.

“‘We have received the letter of your Fraternity, by which we learn that certain contentions and new questions about words have been introduced by a certain Sophronius, then a monk, but now, as we hear, made Bishop of Jerusalem, against our Brother Cyrus, the Prelate of Alexandria, who sets forth to those converted from heresy One Operation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Which Sophronius, coming to your Fraternity, and laying a complaint to you of this kind, being at great length instructed by you, begged to have your instructions distinctly set down for him in writing. Of which letter sent to the same Sophronius we having received a copy from you, and having read it, praise your Fraternity, that with great providence and circumspection you have removed that novelty of expression, which might give offence to the more simple.’ At the end is written, ‘Let your Fraternity set forth this together with us, as we too set forth that, being of one mind with you.’” “Let our opponents declare what this setting forth is: we, according to the custom of all antiquity, maintain that in that expression is comprehended doctrine itself, the Faith itself, in its whole consistence and certitude. But Honorius himself makes a boast that he sets forth with one mind the same Faith as Sergius the heretic and heresiarch. So that it is absolutely necessary either that the letter of Sergius be acquitted, or that of Honorius condemned.

Bossuet, ut  
sup.

“We have another letter of Honorius to Sergius inserted

in the thirteenth action of the Sixth Council. First he declares 'that he wrote to Cyrus, Prelate of the Church of Alexandria, to refute the newly-coined expression of One or Two Operations;' and again, 'That the newly introduced expression of One or Two Operations may be removed from the preaching of the Faith. For what do they who thus speak conceive, save, according to the expression of One or Two Natures, so likewise One or Two Operations of Christ our God? About which holy Scripture writes plainly. But it is utterly vain to conceive or state that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator of God and men, is or was of One or Two Operations.'" Of other words of Honorius which Bossuet adds, he says, "granting them to be entirely orthodox, yet it is not easy to distinguish them from very similar expressions of the Monothelites. . . . But we wish to fix what is certain.

SECT.  
I.  
Mansi 11.  
579. B.

"And first, this is certain, that Honorius gave this answer when he was consulted by three Patriarchs. For he declares that he wrote to Cyrus of Alexandria in the same sense as to Sergius of Constantinople. To these two Patriarchs we must add the third, Sophronius of Jerusalem, who held the right view about the Two Operations, and was therefore approved by the Sixth Ecumenical Council, concerning whom Honorius says in his second letter to Sergius, 'We have instructed the Legates of our afore-mentioned Brother and fellow-Bishop Sophronius not to preach henceforth the expression of Two Operations, which they most earnestly promised that he would do, if also our brother Cyrus would desist from the expression of One Operation.' The Legates of Sophronius did indeed promise this, but it is known that Sophronius persevered in the right view, and that his Legates only, having been most badly instructed by Honorius, whom they had duly come to consult, promised what was wrong and injurious to the Faith.

The Pope  
gives a  
wrong an-  
swer to all  
the three  
Patriarchs.

"It is objected, that in the letters of Honorius there is no mention of any Council held by him, and no declaration of anathema. There is indeed no mention of a Council, as neither is there in the letter of Celestine to Cyril, nor in that of Leo to Flavian, nor in that of Innocent in answer to the African Councils, nor in many others, which nevertheless we esteem as genuine decrees of the Apostolic See.

His answer  
a proper  
decretal  
letter.

CHAP.  
VI.

“Doubtless there is no anathema: what then? there is none in the Apostolic decree of Jerusalem in Acts xv.; there is none in the letter of Sophronius, which yet he calls himself synodical; there is none in very many decretals of the Apostolic See, even issued *de fide*: for neither in the first letters of Gregory the Second to Leo the Isaurian, nor in many others, is the sword of anathema drawn at once. Doctrine, resting on the simple truth, goes first: anathemas follow against the obstinate. Nor is error only committed when the truth is condemned, but when falsehood is approved; and this it is beyond all question that Honorius did, when he supported Sergius and Cyrus and their perverse letters. And it is quite certain that Honorius made this answer, when he was consulted *de fide* by three Patriarchs, Sergius, Cyrus, and Sophronius, who sent Legates for the purpose of being instructed: nor is it less certain that these decrees of Honorius were carried to the Churches, and spread through the whole East. Hence were issued Expositions and Forms, which forbad equally One or Two Operations. Hence Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, most obstinate of Monothelites, gave his confession in the Sixth Council in these words: ‘We consent as well to the Five Councils, as to Honorius, taught of God, to Sergius, Paulus, and Peter:’ and again, ‘I reject also Maximus, and his impious dogma of division, which too of old our Fathers rejected, that is, Honorius, Sergius, and Cyrus, and the other Doctors and Prelates of the Churches,’ always prefixing the name of Honorius.

Mansi 11.  
350. B.  
358. B.

“But what means that expression of Honorius to Sergius, ‘Let your Fraternity teach this with us,’ but a declaration of the Faith to be preached to the people by Sergius? What that of the same Honorius, when supporting Cyrus, ‘who preached to those converted from heresy one Operation of our Lord Jesus Christ?’ What means this, I repeat, but an approval of the heresy which Cyrus was preaching, and of the heretical profession which he was delivering? Thus he confirms Cyrus, not indeed in the Faith, as he was requested, but in that very heresy which Cyrus was instilling into men’s minds.

And is so  
considered  
by the  
Sixth  
Council.

“But these writings of Sergius, Honorius, and Sophronius, which we have mentioned, are called in the Sixth Council dogmatic or synodical, and under that name are praised or

condemned by the holy Council after previous examination: **SECT.**  
 . . . so that it cannot be doubted that these letters of Ho- **I.**  
 norius, consulted by the Patriarchs, were considered as an  
 answer of the Apostolic See."

Bossuet then proceeds to censure what he calls the  
 "evasion" of Bellarmine and Baronius, that Honorius had  
 thus written out of economy for the sake of peace, until he  
 should define the matter more exactly, and adds: "Indeed  
 we are too favourable to the name of Honorius, if we defend  
 these things, which can only be defended with the worst  
 results. Where, in fine, is that obscurity in the question,  
 which required a definition to be put off, whether there are  
 Two Operations or One in the two Natures of Christ? With  
 equal right might Leo the Great have dissembled whether  
 there were Two Natures or One in Christ, or pronounced that  
 both were devoid of sense, and by so disgraceful a com-  
 promise have held peace with Eutyches and Dioscorus. Far  
 other was the judgment of the Fathers. Wherefore the  
 Roman Pontiffs, the immediate successors of Honorius,  
 Severinus, John IV., Theodorus, St. Martin, and others, and  
 St. Agatho, proscribed with a like sentence those who named  
 One Operation, and those who declared that silence was to  
 be kept about Two as well as One.

Vain de-  
 fence of the  
 conduct of  
 Honorius  
 by Bellar-  
 mine and  
 Baronius.

"Indeed Martin, the heroic martyr, exposed in the Lateran  
 Council the secrets of that senseless heresy; how the Mono-  
 thelites had first preached One Will and One Operation:  
 presently, to escape condemnation, had suppressed the term  
 One and Two alike. After this exposition he and the holy  
 Council condemn the Ecthesis of Heraclius, and the Type of  
 Constans: distinctly assert Two Wills and Two Operations,  
 and strike with the same anathema those who state what is  
 false, and those who suppress what is true.

The La-  
 teran Coun-  
 cil under  
 Pope Mar-  
 tin con-  
 demns Pope  
 Honorius  
 tacitly.

"Hear the Council itself. The holy Council said, 'The  
 Typus altogether disagrees with the rule of the Catholic  
 Church, in which certainly that alone which is opposed to  
 the Faith is ordered to be buried in fitting silence; but not  
 that which is orthodox to be denied together, or received  
 together, with its contrary. . . For it is unchristian to sup-  
 port impiety together with the right Faith, and not to dis-  
 tinguish good from evil.' This sin Honorius entirely com-

Mansi 10.  
 1084. E.

CHAP. VI. mitted, who declared the expressions of One and Two Wills to be equally novel, equally senseless, equally removed from the right Faith.

“This was in the fourth sitting of the Lateran Council held by Pope St. Martin. In the 18th Canon of the fifth sitting, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, Patriarchs of Constantinople, Cyrus of Alexandria, and Theodorus of Pharan, were condemned for the reason, that they either asserted One Operation, or forbad Two and One alike: by which Canon who does not see that Honorius was condemned, though his name was suppressed? But now let us come to the Acts of the Sixth Council.”

Mansi 10.  
1158. E.

Two main  
points.

In the following remarks Bossuet has two main points in view: first, that the Sixth Council was held after the most express and accurate definition of the matter it discussed by Pope St. Martin, and that it deliberated on the letter of Pope St. Agatho, and the Western Council. Secondly, the condemnation of Pope Honorius.

I. The  
Sixth  
Council  
held after a  
most ex-  
press defi-  
nition of  
the matter  
which it  
discussed  
by Pope  
Martin.

As to the first. “The Lateran Council of St. Martin (A.D. 649) was very celebrated by the African and many Oriental Churches sending Legates to it, and agreeing to the Faith it set forth: there were besides the subscriptions of a hundred and twenty-five Bishops who sat in judgment with him. Then there was an Encyclical letter of the holy Council sent to all the Faithful of Christ in the whole world. A very great point must be added, that the holy Pontiff endured much for that statement, and even crowned his orthodox Faith with martyrdom.

“Yet after that statement, when the whole East was thrown into confusion by the Emperors, and the Patriarchs of Constantinople were preaching heresy, and Macarius, too, Patriarch of Antioch, passed over to that side, it was thought necessary under Pope St. Donus, and, when he was dead, under St. Agatho, that the Sixth Ecumenical Council should be convoked by the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, and held at Constantinople.

“Here there meet us first the two letters of Pope Agatho written to the Emperor, which were to be read in the General Council, one of Agatho himself and the Apostolic See, the other in the name of the Western Council which Agatho

had summoned to Rome. They were therefore read at the beginning of the Council in the fourth action. Here may be seen the settled and everywhere acknowledged tradition of the holy Councils as to the order and manner of deliberating. For the letters of St. Agatho are approved in the Sixth Council precisely after the same order and manner as those of St. Cyril and St. Leo were approved in the Third and Fourth Councils." " Paul the imperial secretary said, 'Your sacred majesty remembers, that George, most holy Archbishop of this heaven-protected royal city, and Macarius most holy Archbishop of Antioch, and the venerable Bishops with them, having received at their own request in our former session copies of the two reports directed to your sacred majesty by Agatho most holy and blessed Pope of Elder Rome, and his Council, promised to read them, and afterwards return a fitting answer.' The most pious Emperor Constantine said, 'Let George most holy Archbishop of our heaven-protected royal city, and Macarius most holy Archbishop of Antioch, and the Council under them, declare if they agree with the sense of the reports sent by Agatho, most holy Pope of Elder Rome, and the Council under him.' George, most holy Archbishop of Constantinople said, 'My good Lord, having inspected the full force of the reports sent to your sacred person by Agatho most holy Pope of Elder Rome, and the Council with him, and having examined the books of the holy and approved Fathers, which are kept in my venerable patriarchal house, I have found all the quotations of the holy and approved Fathers, contained in the said reports, to be correct, and in no respect disagreeing with those holy and approved Fathers, and I agree with them, and so confess and believe.' . . . Sisinnius, Bishop of Heraclaea, said, 'I have found nothing in them disagreeing with the holy Fathers, and I confess,' &c. Domitius, Bishop of Prusias, said, (I give his words to shew how little the Primacy involves a monarchy,) 'The reports sent by our Father Agatho, Archbishop of the Apostolic and Chief Throne of Elder Rome, to the sacred Emperor—I receive and embrace as the dictation of the Holy Ghost by the mouth of the holy Peter Chief of the Apostles, and written by the finger of the aforesaid most blessed Pope Agatho.'" &c.

SECT.  
I.

Letters of  
Pope Aga-  
tho exam-  
ined, as  
those of  
St. Leo.  
Mansi 11.  
385. B.  
389. A.

CHAP.  
VI.

Mansi 11.  
294. D.

“To the same effect,” says Bossuet, “all speak one by one, and only after that examination were the letters of St. Agatho and the whole Western Council approved. Agatho indeed, and the Western Bishops put forth their decrees” thus: ‘We have directed persons from our humility to your valour protected of God, which shall offer to you the report of us all, that is, of all the Bishops in the Northern or Western Regions, in which too we have summed up the confession of our Apostolic Faith, yet not as those who wished to contend about these things as being uncertain, but, being certain and unchangeable, to set them forth in a brief definition, suppliantly beseeching you that, by the favour of your sacred majesty, you would command these same things to be preached to all, and to have force with all.’ “Undoubtedly, therefore, so far as in them lay, they defined the matter. The question was, whether the other Churches throughout the world would agree, and a matter so great was only made clear after Episcopal examination. But the high, magnificent, yet true expressions, which St. Agatho had used of his See, namely, that resting on the promise of the Lord it had never turned aside from the path of truth, and that its Pontiffs, the predecessors of Agatho, who were charged in the person of Peter to strengthen their brethren, had ever discharged that office, this the Fathers of the Council hear and receive. But not the less they examine the matter: they inquire into the decrees of Roman Pontiffs, and, after inquiry held, approve Agatho’s decrees, condemn those of Honorius: a certain proof that they did not understand Agatho’s expressions as if it were necessary to receive without discussion every decree of Roman Pontiffs even *de fide*, inasmuch as they are subjected to the supreme and final examination of a General Council: but as if these expressions taken as a whole, in their total, hold good in the full and complete succession of Peter, as we have often said, and in its proper place shall say at greater length.”

Here it may be remarked, that not every thing which is received in the Acts of a General Council, is either accepted or rejected by it: for instance, the fact that certain petitioners addressed St. Leo at the Council of Chalcedon as

Ecumenical Patriarch, by no means proves that the Council warranted that title: nor does a general approval of Pope Agatho's letter involve an approbation of every expression which he had used about his own See. SECT.  
I.

We proceed to Bossuet's second point. "Whether now the Sixth Council condemned Honorius so severely, the Acts themselves shall speak out. That indeed the Roman Pontiffs, successors of Honorius, spared his name, is plain enough. Likewise John the Fourth, the third after Honorius, excused him, as well as he could, in his apology issued to the Emperor Constantine, which Maximus, an illustrious confessor of this age against the Monothelites, praises. Now John excused Honorius, because he seemed to have named One Will in a good sense: but he does not even touch on the point of his rejecting One and Two equally. But Agatho attempts to soften down this likewise: for thus he speaks in the letter to the Emperor which he sent to be read in the sacred Council. 'From the time that the Prelates of Constantinople have endeavoured to introduce heretical novelty into the spotless Church of Christ, my predecessors have never neglected to exhort them to desist, at least by keeping silence, from erroneous doctrines, lest from this they might make a beginning of dissension in the unity of the Church, by asserting that there was in our one Lord Jesus Christ One Will and One Operation of Two Natures.' He extenuates, as well as he can, the silence ordered by Honorius, yet not so as openly to defend Honorius, or to venture to approve before the Council that the expression of Two Wills was suppressed by him as much as that of One. II. Con-  
demnation  
of Pope  
Honorius  
by the  
Sixth  
Council.  
  
Mansi 11.  
243. A.

"But the reasons, why the successors of Honorius before the Sixth Council spared his memory, were these: first, that he had in other respects maintained an admirable Pontificate, and had died in the peace of the Church, and seemed to have done nothing with bad intention, nor likely to have been contumacious. Then, in excusing Honorius, they thought they were supporting the Catholic Faith, by denying heretics such a patronage. Lastly, there seemed no necessity to condemn the letters of Honorius in the West, because, being written to the Easterns, they were scarcely,

CHAP. or at least very little, known in the West, where there were  
 VI. then either few or no Monothelites at all.

“When however it was evident that the letters of Honorius had been spread far and wide in the East, and wonderfully boasted of by the Monothelites, that many had been seduced by the majesty of the Pontiff’s name, and Macarius of Antioch been heard in the eighth action to call on every occasion ‘Honorius, taught of God,’ his champion and leader, the Orientals and the Sixth Council decreed that Honorius and his letters could by no means be passed over in silence. And so in the twelfth and thirteenth actions those letters were read, and it was determined in the thirteenth action that the letters of Honorius, equally as those of Sergius, Pyrrhus, and others, should be declared ‘foreign to the Apostolical decrees, and to the definitions of holy Councils, and of all approved Fathers, and to follow the false doctrines of heretics: we therefore utterly reject them, and execrate them as soul-destroying. . . . But together with these (Sergius, Pyrrhus, Peter, and Paul, of Constantinople, and Cyrus of Alexandria,) we order that Honorius, who was Pope of ancient Rome, be cast out of the holy Church of God, and anathematized, because we find by his writings to Sergius, that he has in all things followed his mind, and confirmed his impious dogmas.’ All which was done without any opposition on the part of the Legates of the Apostolic See, nay, with their agreement and consent.

“Nor did the Fathers regard it, if Honorius had stated some points well, inasmuch as in dogmatic writings complete and full integrity is required, nor must the possible, but the obvious, sense be sound: and what is composed by Pontiffs for the exposition of the common Faith ought to be understood in no fine-drawn, but in its popular, meaning.

“After passing sentence, the Fathers, according to the custom of Councils, give an account of what was done to Agatho: ‘We have slain with an anathema, according to your sentence passed before upon them—Theodorus of Pharan, Sergius, Honorius, Cyrus, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter.’ But you will say, Agatho had written nothing about Honorius: nay, seemed to wish to defend him at any rate. Certainly, but since, after the example of his predecessor Martin, he

Mansi 11.  
554. D.  
555. C.

Mansi 11.  
683. D.

had condemned others, and expressly proscribed not only those who said One Will, but those who said neither One nor Two, the Fathers understood that Honorius, their follower and supporter, had incurred a like sentence: and it was set to the honour of Agatho, that what they had added might also seem to be done by his authority.

“Honorius is likewise mentioned in the salutation of the Emperor with other heretics. ‘Anathema to Theodore of Pharan. Anathema to Sergius and Honorius. Anathema to Pyrrhus and Paulus. Anathema to Cyrus and Peter.—Anathema to all heretics.’”

S E C T.  
I.

Mansi 11.  
655. C.

“Also in the imperial edict Honorius is marked in these words: ‘Those sacrilegious Priests who governed the Churches perversely, such as were, Theodorus formerly Bishop of Pharan; Sergius formerly Bishop of this heaven-protected royal city; moreover Honorius, formerly Pope of Elder Rome, supporter of the heresy, and inconsistent with himself,’” &c.

Mansi 11.  
699. A.

Pope Leo the Second, successor of Agatho, to whom the Acts of the Council were sent for confirmation, writes back, “We anathematize alike those inventors of new error, that is, Theodore Bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, plotters against, rather than Prelates of the Church of Constantinople; and also Honorius, who did not illumine this Apostolical Church with the doctrine of Apostolical tradition, but by a foul betrayal attempted to subvert its spotless Faith.”

Pope St.  
Leo II. re-  
ceives this  
condemna-  
tion,  
Mansi 11.  
731. C.

The same Pope Leo, writing to the Bishops of Spain an account of this Council, says, “They who had fought against the purity of the Apostolic tradition, being departed, have been punished with eternal condemnation, that is, Theodorus of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, of Constantinople, together with Honorius, who did not, as it became the Apostolical authority, extinguish at its beginning the flame of heretical doctrine, but by his negligence fanned it.”

and repeats  
it to the  
Spanish  
Bishops,  
and the  
King of  
Spain.  
Mansi 11.  
1052. A.

Pope Leo repeats these expressions in his letter to Ervigius king of Spain.

Mansi 11.  
1057. B.

The Patriarch Tarasius in his letter to the Roman and other Patriarchal Sees in the Seventh Council, which is

CHAP. VI. acknowledged by the Roman Legates, says, "I subject to anathema Cyrus, Sergius, Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and all their followers."

Mansi 12.  
1124. E.

Mansi 13.  
377. E.

It is re-  
newed by  
the Seventh  
Council;  
and sworn  
to by the  
Roman  
Pontiffs in  
the Liber  
Diurnus.  
Def., lib. 7.  
c. 26.

The Seventh Council itself in its decretal letter repeats, "As the Sixth Council in Constantinople exclaimed, excommunicating Sergius, Honorius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Macarius."

In the Liber Diurnus of the Roman Pontiffs is that profession of Faith which the Pontiffs elect were wont to make, in which among the rest that are condemned with anathema Honorius is mentioned. "The same," says Bossuet, "was read in ancient Roman Breviaries, up to our time, in the life of St. Leo the Second. But they suppress, as far as they can, the Liber Diurnus: they have erased this from the Roman Breviary. Have they therefore hidden it? Truth breaks out from all sides, and these things become so much the more evident, as they are the more studiously put out of sight."

It scarcely seems necessary to repeat Bossuet's arguments against Baronius and Bellarmine, who, after these documents had been received without dispute for nine hundred years, simply assert that they were falsified by the Greeks. As Bossuet says, "A cause is utterly desperate, which must be defended by such fictions." We may take Bossuet's conclusion. "This we find to be certain. Honorius, duly questioned by three Patriarchs *de fide*, gave the worst answer: was condemned with anathema by the Sixth Council: was excused by Roman Pontiffs before the supreme sentence of the Council, after that sentence was condemned with the same anathema: Bellarmine and Baronius have betaken themselves to fictions, being unable to defend Honorius otherwise."

Bossuet's  
summing  
up.

The act of  
the Council  
in con-  
demning  
Pope Ho-  
norius cor-  
responds  
with the  
language of  
St. Angus-  
tine.

Now in reading this history I am at once reminded of St. Augustine's words quoted by me above. He was contemplating a case of false accusation made against four Popes. But he proceeds to suppose what would have resulted, had it been true. "Assuredly of whatever character were Marcellinus, Marcellus, Sylvester, Melchiades, (Bishops of Rome,) Mensurius, Cecilianus, (Bishops of Carthage,) and others against whom they object what they please in behalf of their dissension, no hurt arises to the Catholic Church

spread throughout the whole world. If they be innocent, we in no degree share their crown: if they be guilty, we in no degree share their guilt. If they were good, in the threshing of the Catholic floor as grain they have been winnowed: if they were bad, in the threshing of the Catholic floor as straw they have been crushed.”

SECT.  
I.

As St. Augustine wrote, the Sixth Council acted: when the case at length occurred, they blotted out of the Church of God an heretical Roman Bishop, with as little hesitation as the Bishops of Alexandria or Constantinople, the partners of his crime. St. Leo II. received their sentence. The next Ecumenical Council recorded it afresh. The Roman Pontiffs swore to it before their accession. At length the Roman See assumed powers greatly enlarged, and prerogatives which the first Leo or Gregory never even imagined. Then this fact must be put out of sight. The struggles of Bellarmine, and Baronius, and Pagi, and Garnier, and the Ballerini, tell us what a blow this condemnation gives to the Papal theory. For whereas all Roman Catholics believe that the decree of an Ecumenical Council, received by the Pope, is infallible, and an Ecumenical Council, so received, has condemned the decretal letter of a Pope as heretical, and anathematized his person, it follows, therefore, nay, it is *de fide*, that a Pope, speaking with all the power of his chair, is fallible. In other words, the infallibility of the Church lies not in any one Bishop, though he be the first in ministerial dignity, but in the consent of all. And this bears the strongest witness to the true and ancient constitution of the Church set forth in the Seven Ecumenical Councils, and against the Papal Monarchy.

Result from the condemnation of a Pope's decretal letter by an Ecumenical Council.

At the end of the Sixth Council, the Emperor demanded “If the definition read be consented to by all the Bishops.”

Mansi 11.  
655. A.

The Council replied, “We all thus believe, we have one Faith.” The Council requests the Emperor to confirm their Acts by his subscription. After he had done this, they request that exact copies may be sent with his subscription to the five Patriarchal Sees, namely,

Acts of the Council sent to the five Patriarchal Sees.

“To the Apostolical See of the holy Peter chief of the Apostles, that is, to Agatho most holy Pope of Elder Rome.

Mansi 11.  
682.

“To the most holy See of the Catholic and Apostolic great

CHAP. Church of Constantinople, that is, to George most holy and  
 VI. blessed Patriarch.

“To the Apostolic See of the holy Evangelist Mark, who is honoured in the great city of the Alexandrians, by the Monk Peter, most reverend Presbyter and Legate.

“To the See of the great city of Antioch, or Theopolis, by Theophanes, the venerable and most holy Patriarch.

“To the holy See of the Resurrection of Christ our God, that is, Jerusalem, Theodorus most reverend Presbyter being Vicar of that most honourable See, by George, Monk and Presbyter of Sebaste.”

#### SECT. II.

The Council  
 in Trullo:  
 its purpose.

Fleury, liv.  
 40. 49.

WE now come to that code of Canons by which the Oriental Church has been governed for eleven hundred and fifty years. I shall quote such as have a bearing on the Roman controversy. “As the two last General Councils, (in 553 and in 681,) had not made any Canons, the Orientals judged it suitable to supply them eleven years after the Sixth Council, that is to say, the year 692, fifth indiction. For that purpose the Emperor Justinian convoked a Council, at which 211 Bishops attended, of whom the principal were the four Patriarchs, Paul of Constantinople, Peter of Alexandria, Anastasius of Jerusalem, George of Antioch. Next in the subscriptions are named John of Justinianopolis, Cyriacus of Cesarea in Cappadocia, Basil of Gortyna in Crete, who says that he represents the whole Council of the Roman Church, as he had said in subscribing the Sixth Council. But it is certain otherwise that there were in this one Legates of the holy See. This Council, like the Sixth, assembled in the dome of the palace called in Latin Trullus, which name it has kept. It is also named in Latin Quinisextum, in Greek Penthecton, as one might say, the fifth-sixth, to mark that it is only the supplement of the two preceding Councils, though properly it is a distinct one.

See the  
 words of  
 the Council  
 itself, Mansi  
 11. 984. B.

“The intention was to make a body of discipline to serve thenceforth for the whole Church, and it was distributed

into 102 Canons." "It mostly," says Gieseler, "issued in the form of laws the older Ecclesiastical customs, and repeated more ancient Canons. It seems that here, as at Chalcedon, the Greek Bishops had the express purpose to remind of his limits the Roman Patriarch, lately afresh exalted through his new victory," viz., that he appeared at the Sixth Council to overthrow the Monothelite heresy, much as his predecessor St. Leo, at the Fourth, to condemn its parent the Eutychean.

SECT.  
II.

Gieseler,  
tom. 1.  
§ 129.

This purpose is, I think, unquestionable: it is chiefly conspicuous under the four following heads.

Four heads  
in which it  
limits the  
pretensions  
of the Ro-  
man See.

1. The code of Canons and decretal letters which are to be received.

2. The rules respecting the marriage of Clergy.

3. The rank of the See of Constantinople in relation to that of Rome.

4. The Roman custom of fasting on Saturday.

The Council begins by acknowledging its maintenance of the Apostolic Faith, and the Six Ecumenical Councils: and by condemning by name the errors and persons condemned by them, among whom Pope Honorius is not forgotten.

The second Canon is very important. It says, "It has also seemed good to this holy Council, that the eighty-five Canons, received and ratified by the holy and blessed Fathers before us, but also delivered down to us in the name of the holy and glorious Apostles, should from this time forth remain firm and unshaken for the cure of souls and the healing of disorders." It then excepts the Clementine constitutions enjoined in those Canons to be received, because they had been adulterated, and proceeds, "But we set our seal likewise upon all the other holy Canons set forth by our holy and blessed Fathers, that is, the 318 holy God-fearing Fathers assembled at Nicea, and those at Ancyra, further those at Neocæsarea, and likewise those at Gangra, and, besides, those at Antioch in Syria: those too at Laodicea in Phrygia: and likewise the 150 who assembled in this heaven-protected royal city: and the 200 who assembled the first time in the metropolis of the Ephesians, and the 630 holy and blessed Fathers at Chalcedon. In like manner those of Sardica, and those of Carthage: those also who again assem-

Mansi 11.  
938. E.

1. The  
code of  
Canons  
and decra-  
tal letters  
which are  
to be re-  
ceived.

Mansi 11.  
940-1.

CHAP.  
VI.

bled in this heaven-protected royal city under Nectarius its Bishop, and Theophilus Archbishop of Alexandria. Likewise too the Canons (i. e. the decretal letters) of Dionysius, formerly Archbishop of the great city of Alexandria; and of Peter, Archbishop of Alexandria and Martyr; of Gregory the wonder-worker, Bishop of Neocæsarea; of Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria; of Basil, Archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; of Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa; of Amphilochius of Iconium; of Timothy, Archbishop of Alexandria; of Theophilus, Archbishop of the same great city of Alexandria; of Cyril, Archbishop of the same Alexandria; of Gennadius, Patriarch of this heaven-protected royal city. Moreover the Canon set forth by Cyprian, Archbishop of the country of the Africans and Martyr, and by the Synod under him, which has been kept only in the country of the aforesaid Bishops, according to the custom delivered down to them. And that no one be allowed to transgress or disregard the aforesaid Canons, or to receive others beside them, supposititiously set forth by certain who have attempted to make a traffic of the truth. But should any one be convicted of innovating upon, or attempting to overturn, any of the aforesaid Canons, he shall be subject to receive the penalty which that Canon imposes, and to be cured by it of his transgression."

Here then the whole Eastern Church declares the immutability of that whole system of Church government and discipline which had been sanctioned, as delivered down to it, by the Council of Chalcedon two hundred and forty years before: a code of laws which it needs but to read to see its utter contrariety with the Papal Idea. But further, while it inserts in that code the Canonical letters of its own great Fathers, current in the East, it excludes the decretal letters of the Popes, from Siricius downwards, which for three hundred years had been equally current in the West, and which are quoted by Roman writers to prove the Papacy now, while those letters of the Eastern Fathers, and the perpetual references made to them, are put out of sight. Lastly, the Eastern Church significantly threatens with punishment *any one* who attempts to innovate upon any of these Canons. *Any one*, interpreted, means the Roman Patriarch. As for

Decretal  
letters of  
Eastern  
Primates  
inserted:  
those of  
the Popes  
excluded.

the Canon of St. Cyprian, quoted in so marked a manner, "it is difficult," says Fleury, "to understand what it is, unless it be the preface of the Council of St. Cyprian, where he says that no one pretends to be a Bishop of Bishops, or oblige his colleagues to obedience by tyrannical fear."

S E C T.  
II.

Quoted  
above, p.  
44.

2. The Oriental view about clerical marriage is contained in four Canons, which it is necessary to quote at large.

2. Oriental  
view of  
clerical  
marriage.

"Since our pious and Christian Emperor has addressed this holy and Ecumenical Council, in order that it might provide for the purity of those who are in the list of the Clergy, and who transmit divine things to others, and that they may be blameless ministrants, and worthy of the sacrifice of the great God, who is both Offering and High-Priest, a sacrifice apprehended by the intelligence: and that it might cleanse away the pollutions wherewith these have been branded by unlawful marriages: now whereas they of the most holy Roman Church purpose to keep the rule of exact perfection, but those who are under the See of this heaven-protected and royal city keep that of kindness and consideration, so blending both together as our fathers have done, and as the love of God requires, that neither gentleness fall into licence, nor severity into harshness; especially as the fault of ignorance has reached no small number of men, we decree, that those who are involved in a second marriage, and have been slaves to sin up to the fifteenth of the past month of January, in the past fourth indiction, the 6109th year, and have not resolved to repent of it, be subjected to canonical deposition: but that they who are involved in this disorder of a second marriage, but before our decree have acknowledged what is fitting, and have cut off their sin, and have put far from them this strange and illegitimate connection, or they whose wives by second marriage are already dead, or who have turned to repentance of their own accord, having learnt continence, and having quickly forgotten their former iniquities, whether they be Presbyters or Deacons, these we have determined should cease from all priestly ministration or exercise, being under punishment for a certain time, but should retain the honour of their seat and station, being satisfied with their seat before the laity, and begging with tears from the Lord that the transgression

Third Canon, Mansi  
II. 941-2.

Second marriage subjects to deposition. Marriage after ordination, or with a widow, censured.

CHAP.  
VI.

of their ignorance be pardoned them: for unfitting it were that he should bless another who has to tend his own wounds. But those who have been married to one wife, if she was a widow, and likewise those who after their ordination have unlawfully entered into one marriage, that is, Presbyters and Deacons, and Sub-deacons, being debarred for some short time from sacred ministration, and censured, shall be restored again to their proper rank, never advancing to any further rank, their unlawful marriage being openly dissolved. This we decree to hold good only in the case of those that are involved in the aforesaid faults up to the fifteenth, as was said, of the month of January, of the fourth indiction, decreeing from the present time, and renewing the Canon which declares, that he who has been joined in two marriages after his Baptism, or has had a concubine, cannot be Bishop, or Priest, or Deacon, or at all on the sacerdotal list; in like manner, that he who has taken a widow, or a divorced person, or a mistress, or a servant, or an actress, cannot be Bishop, or Priest, or Deacon, or at all on the sacerdotal list."

Apostolical  
Canons 17,  
18.

Canon 6.

None of  
the order  
of Sub-dea-  
cons, and  
upwards,  
allowed to  
marry  
after ordi-  
nation.

Another Canon says, "Since it is enjoined in the Apostolical Canons, (26th,) that, of those who are advanced to the Clericy unmarried, readers and singers alone may marry, we also, maintaining this, decree that from the present time Sub-deacon, Deacon, or Presbyter, should on no account after his ordination be allowed to contract marriage. But if any one venture to do this, let him be deposed. But if any one of those advanced to the Clericy desire to contract marriage, let him do this before his ordination to the Diaconate, Sub-diaconate, or Presbyterate."

Canon 12.

Bishops  
not to live  
with their  
wives un-  
der pain of  
deposition.

"This also has come to our knowledge, that in Africa, and Libya, and other places, the most reverend Bishops do not avoid, even after their consecration, the company of their wives, giving thereby offence and scandal to their people. Being very anxious, therefore, to do every thing for the good of the flocks committed to us, we have determined that henceforth such a thing should by no means be: this we say not to annul or subvert what has been enacted by the Apostles, but out of regard to the salvation and greater advance of the people, and not to cause blame to the sacerdotal order. For the holy Apostle says: 'Do all for the glory of God: be

without offence both to Jews and Greeks, and to the Church of God: even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved. Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.' But if any one be caught doing such a thing, let him be deposed." SECT.  
II.

"But since we know that it is maintained as a Canon in the Church of the Romans that they, who are about to be ordained Deacon or Priest, should declare that they no longer keep company with their wives, we, following the original Canon of Apostolical perfection, and order, decree that the lawful marriages of those occupied in holy things should hold good from the present time, by no means dissolving their union with their wives, or depriving them of each other's company at fitting times. So that if any one be found worthy to be ordained Sub-deacon, or Deacon, or Presbyter, let such an one by no means be prevented from receiving such rank, living with his lawful wife. Nor in the time of ordination let him be required to declare, that he will desist from lawful intercourse with his own wife, that we may not by this be forced to throw a slight on marriage, ordained by God, and blessed with His own presence, as the voice of the Gospel cries, 'What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder:' and the Apostle teaches, 'Marriage is honourable, and the bed undefiled;' and, 'Art thou bound to a woman, seek not to be loosed.' But we know, how also they who assembled at Carthage, out of regard to seemliness of life in ministrants, declared that Sub-deacons, handling the holy mysteries, and Deacons, and Presbyters, at proper times should observe continence with their wives, that we too may equally maintain what has been handed down by the Apostles, and prevailed from antiquity itself, knowing that there is a time for every matter, and especially for fasting and prayer. For it behoves those who sit beside the altar to be in all things continent at the time of handling holy things, that they may be able to obtain what they ask sincerely from God. *If any one, therefore, urged beyond the Apostolical Canons, should venture to debar any of sacerdotal rank, that is, Presbyters, or Deacons, or Sub-deacons, of company and union with their lawful wife, let him be deposed:* and in like manner if any Presbyter or Dea-

Canon 13.  
Roman Canon and practice censured, under pain of deposition.

CHAP.  
VI.

con under pretence of piety expels his own wife, let him be excommunicated, and, if he persist, be deposed."

The Canon of Carthage, the 25th of the Codex Ecclesiæ Africanæ, enjoins absolute, not temporary, continence, on Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and Sub-deacons, "according to former statutes."

The above Canons of the Council in Trullo are those by which the Oriental Church is at present governed, and are the most indulgent, as to the marriage of Clergy, which are to be found in the whole Church, up to the sixteenth century.

I quote these Canons here to mark the censure of an acknowledged Roman Canon, the declaration that it is contrary to Apostolic exactitude, and its prohibition for the future. Again, the "any one" is the Roman Patriarch.

3. Rank of the See of Constantinople. Recognition of the 3rd Canon of the 2nd Council, and of the 28th Canon of Chalcedon.

As to the third chief point mentioned above, the 36th Canon says, "Renewing the decrees of the 150 holy Fathers assembled in this heaven-protected royal city, and those of the 630 Fathers assembled at Chalcedon, we decree that the See of Constantinople should enjoy equal privileges with the See of Elder Rome, and be magnified as it in Ecclesiastical matters, being second after it, next to which let the See of the great city of the Alexandrians rank, then that of Antioch, and then that of Jerusalem."

Incompatibility of this with the Papal Idea.

Here the famous 28th Canon of Chalcedon is referred to as part of the decrees of that Council. By which, as well as by the whole intervening history, we may see the utter untruthfulness of the assertion that it was given up through the opposition of St. Leo. And of course the utter incompatibility of this Canon with the present Papal Idea is plain at once. It sets clearly before the eyes the enormous and world-wide difference between Primacy and Supremacy. It comes to us on the sanction of two Ecumenical Councils, and a third intended to be so, and which, though not so, has remained the living rule of one half of the Church for 1150 years. But further, we have St. Leo's own authority for saying that the Roman Church in his day knew nothing of the Canons of the 2nd Ecumenical Council: so that from 381 to 451 the whole East was governed by Canons never even carried to the Pope; and though St. Leo absolutely refused to receive, and did all he could to annul, the 28th Canon of Chalcedon, yet his Legates at that very Council

found Anatolius in full possession of the second place among the Patriarchs, did not attempt to disturb him in it, nay, made it a charge against Dioscorus that he had pushed Flavian of Constantinople down to the fifth place. In fact, from the Council of 381 the Patriarch of Constantinople is found acting as Second Bishop of the Church; he was so at Chalcedon in 451, he was so at Constantinople in 553, and again in 681. And he was so *in spite* of all the Pope could do against him. A more complete case of refutation of the Supremacy cannot be well imagined than that involved in the rank given to the Bishop of Constantinople; a case the stronger in that the Nicene Canons certainly were on the side of the Popes.

SECT.  
II.

---

As to the fourth chief point the 55th Canon says, "Since we have heard that in the city of the Romans in the holy fast of Lent the fast is kept on the Sabbaths, (i. e. Saturdays,) contrary to the Ecclesiastical custom delivered down to us, it hath seemed good to the holy Council that even in the Church of the Romans that Canon should absolutely hold good which says, 'If any Clerk be found fasting on the holy Lord's day, or the Sabbath, save the one and single Sabbath, (holy Saturday,) let him be deposed; but if a layman, severed from Communion.'"

4. A Roman custom ordered to be abrogated in Rome itself.

This abrogation of a Roman custom in Rome itself, with the declaration that it was unapostolical, speaks for itself.

It is said that Papal Legates were present, and signed these decrees; which if they did, they were very unlike Papal Legates. Pope Sergius, it is needless to say, would not agree to them, when they were brought to him, and the Emperor in vain tried to force him. But, like the decrees of 381, and the 28th Canon of Chalcedon, in spite of rejection in the West they became the law of the East, nay, are quoted in the Seventh Council before the Roman Legates as Canons of the Sixth Council.

Now this code of laws, the actual living code of the Oriental Church, only sets forth and exhibits very strongly what the student of history must observe all along, that while the growing pretensions of Rome, from the first privilege of ordering in certain cases a revision of Episcopal causes given to that See in the Council of Sardica, in 347,

Inference from the Code of the Council in Trullo.

CHAP. VI. over and above its inherent Primacy, were looked upon with jealousy, so any attempts to exercise authority over themselves never were admitted by the Greeks. If they are schismatics now, schismatics they have been from the beginning, and St. Basil the Great, St. Chrysostome, and St. Cyril, the Doctors of the world, are their ringleaders.

## SECT. III.

The Seventh Ecumenical Council. Relative power of the See of Rome and the Eastern Sees. How the Ecumenical Councils, being Eastern, lead to a great increase of power in the Roman See, as representing the whole West.

THE Acts of the last Ecumenical Council assembled in 787 give the same view of the Constitution of the Universal Church as the Six preceding Councils. The relative power and influence indeed of the two great portions of the Church had much altered. The great advantage accruing to St. Peter's See from being the *only* Apostolical See of the West is more and more apparent. It told in this way. All the Ecumenical Councils were held in the East: there were seldom many Western Bishops present, often none, save the Legates of the Roman See, who thus represented the whole West. It had happened that at the First Nicene Council Pope Silvester, on account of his age, was not present in person, but by his Legates Vitus and Vicentius. The second Ecumenical Council was a purely Eastern one, at which no Papal Legates, nor any Western Bishops were present, save the Bishop of Thessalonica, who was summoned as an Eastern. Thus at the Council of Ephesus, in 431, the Popes found two precedents for not appearing in person, as they were summoned by the Emperor, like other Metropolitans, and they readily perceived the advantage of sending Legates to represent them instead, from which it followed that, while the same respect was paid in the Council itself to their Legates, as would have been to their own person, when the Acts of the Council were afterwards brought to them to be communicated to the whole West, they could confirm them or not, or confirm a part, and refuse their consent to the rest. We know from St. Augustine's express words, that the Eastern Churches did not write to the Western save through the Bishop of Rome. Thus both in the ordinary intercourse of East and West, and on the extraordinary

occasions of Councils, the Roman See was more and more regarded as representing the West, itself one half of the whole Church. And so there was gradually added to the weight of Rome's original Primacy, and the rank of the imperial city, the influence of the whole West in representation; an influence which, belonging naturally to so great a number of Bishops and Provinces, came to be associated more and more, in process of time, with that particular See which gave it voice and expression. Nor was this all. The Roman Legates went forth with express directions from the Pope: tried and chosen men, but two or three in number, they could act upon the heterogeneous elements of an Eastern Council with the decision of unity and the force of numbers at once: for the chair of Peter had supplied their instructions, and the West with its many hundred Bishops spoke in their voice. In the second Council of 381 the Eastern Bishops were full of contentions with each other, as we learn from St. Gregory's most artless account. At the third Council John of Antioch with his Bishops was at daggers drawn with St. Cyril and his, and perhaps would have succeeded in overthrowing him and saving Nestorius, but for the power of the whole West thrown into the other scale. Do not mix yourselves up, said Pope Celestine to his Legates, with the contentions of the Bishops; if there is a difficulty, consult Cyril, for he is faithful: you are to judge of the Bishops' views without entering into dispute. When the Acts of the Latrocinium of Ephesus, a regularly called and in all formal respects Ecumenical Council, were brought to St. Leo by his Legate who had escaped, he saved the Church, by refusing his assent to them, which was the assent of the whole West. At the Council of Chalcedon all the four Eastern Patriarchs were more or less in fault: none of them according to the strict letter of the Canon could have held their Sees. Thus the advantage of Rome, speaking singly, yet representing the whole West, came out more and more strongly in contrast with the divisions and rivalries of the four Eastern Patriarchs. From the Council of Chalcedon downwards, indeed, the Patriarch of Constantinople took a very decided lead in the East, yet, with all the influence which the imperial city gave him, Alexandria, Antioch, and

S E C T.  
III.

Disadvan-  
tageous  
position of  
the Eastern  
Patriarchs  
in compari-  
son.

CHAP.  
VI.

Practical  
wisdom  
shewn by  
the Roman  
Bishops in  
the times  
of the  
Seven  
Councils.

Jerusalem, remained Apostolical Sees, which his was not, nor could he ever hope to present a unity in the East to match and counterbalance the Roman unity in the West. I must confess a profound admiration for the wisdom and skill in government shewn by the long line of Pontiffs during the 460 years which comprise the times of the Ecumenical Councils. By shewing the capacity for rule they deserved to rule. More truly by far, and in a far higher subject matter, as the soul is superior to the body, may the words of the Roman Poet be applied to them, than to the conquering republic which the Poet had in thought, or the despotic empire which succeeded him. Surely he prophesied of St. Peter's See,

*Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,  
Hæ tibi erunt artes, pacisque imponere morem,  
Parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos.*

Earthly states have had single conquerors or legislators, a Charlemagne here, a Philippe Auguste there: in Rome alone has the spiritual ruler dwelt for ages, smiting the waters of the flood again and again, with the mantle of Elijah, and making himself a path through them on the dry land. The gradual ascent of the Roman See from the Council of Sardica is to me the most remarkable fact of all history. Once, and once only, at the Ecumenical Council of 553, was an advantage won over the Papal See. Vigilius, to whom I fear Gieseler does no wrong in calling him, originally at least, a creature of the abominable Empress Theodora, was himself at Constantinople in circumstances of extraordinary difficulty, the West ready to desert him, if he gave up the three Chapters, and the Council to anathematize him, if he did not. Yet even then, though pressed in every possible manner by the Emperor and Council to sit with them, he refused under one pretext or another. He issued indeed contradictory decretals, and at last subscribed, with expressions of contrition, the Council which had censured him, but he escaped with his life, and, what was more, the life of the Roman See, preserved, though sorely threatened. At the Sixth Council of 681 the balance had turned greatly in favour of Rome. The West was united under it; the great African Church had long sunk in ruins, and the few suc-

cessors of Aurelius, Augustine, and their 500 brethren, could no longer defend the liberties of Africa against a hand to which they looked for support from the barbarian and heretic. In the mean<sup>d</sup> time, in the East the Sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, were in captivity to the infidel, and Constantinople itself shorn of its lustre, as well by four successive heretical Patriarchs, as by the dangers which threatened the Empire. But yet more was this the case in 787, when, after a long succession of cruel and persecuting Emperors, Irene and Constantine called the last Ecumenical Council. Scarcely could the three Apostolic Sees of the East send by stealth, and at peril of their lives from the Musulman oppressors, two monks to represent them jointly. Besides, Iconoclast Emperors had made Iconoclast Patriarchs of Constantinople. Tarasius, just consecrated from a layman, stood, though orthodox, at great disadvantage before the West, yet more consolidated under the Popes, whose Patriarchate had been increased by the conversion of Britain, and that of Germany under St. Boniface, their most zealous supporter, while their power and influence had been largely augmented by the rising Carlovingian family. Rome was on the point of throwing off completely and for ever the dominion of the Eastern Emperors: she spoke with a consciousness of her strength, as the recognised head of the West, and with the power of Charlemagne to back her. Great, then, as was the moral preponderance of the West in the last Ecumenical Council, it is much to find that the Acts bear the most indubitable witness to the ancient and Patriarchal constitution of the Church, and that the Spouse of Christ, so long as her voice was one, acknowledged no such powers in the Papal See as it now claims under penalty of excommunication to those who deny them.

The Seventh Ecumenical Council was called by the Emperor Constantine and his mother the Empress Irene, to deliver the Church from the impieties of the Iconoclast Emperors, and to declare that honour was due to images and pictures of our Saviour, the holy Mother of God, and the saints. It met at Nicea the twenty-fourth of Sept., 787. In the Acts we find repeatedly stated what an Ecumenical Council is, viz., that it cannot be held without the consent

SECT.  
III.

State of  
the East  
at the  
calling of  
the Seventh  
Council.

An Ecume-  
nical Coun-  
cil one

CHAP.  
VI.

sanctioned  
by the  
Patriarchs.  
Mansi 12.  
992. A.

Mansi 12.  
1003. A.

Mansi 13.  
208. E.

Mansi 12.  
1008. B.

Mansi 12.  
1008. E.

of the several Patriarchs: so the Emperor to the Council speaks of his "having in especial care the good order of the holy Churches of God, and purposing to procure by every means the unity of the Priests, of North, South, East and West," and he congratulates the Council that by God's good pleasure Legates were present from all the Patriarchs, "for that is from the beginning the Synodical law of the Catholic Church, which from one end of the world to the other hath received the Gospel." So in the sixth action it is said of the Iconoclast Council held at Constantinople in 754, "How was it great and Ecumenical, which the Prelates of the other Churches neither received nor agreed with, but anathematized? It had not the co-operation of the then Pope of the Romans, or the Priests about him, neither by his representatives, nor by his encyclical letter, as is the law of Councils. Nor had it the agreement of the Patriarchs of the East, of Alexandria, Antioch, and the holy City, or of the Ministrants and High-Priests with them." And the Emperor orders the letter of Adrian, most holy Pope of Elder Rome, to be read to them according to the law of Councils, and the letter of the Oriental Patriarchs, and "by them you will know what is the sense of the Catholic Church." So just afterwards Basil, Bishop of Ancyra, is received on his repentance, and expresses himself thus: "I, Basil, Bishop of Ancyra, purposing to be united to the Catholic Church, to Adrian most holy Pope of Elder Rome, and to Tarasius most blessed Patriarch, and to the most holy Apostolic Sees, that is, of Alexandria, Antioch, and the holy City, and also, to all orthodox High-Priests and Priests, make this my present written confession, and offer it to you who have received the power from Apostolic authority. And in this I beg pardon of your Blessedness that is collected together by God," &c.

In the second action, at the Emperor's desire, the letters of the Pope, and in the third that of the Eastern Patriarchs is read.

But the letter of the Pope to the Emperor is read in a very curious way. Instead of being completely translated, and read, they took the liberty to leave out a good deal which they did not like, and to alter many expressions so as to turn aside the plain drift of the Pope. The alterations

are so remarkable that I must give them, for they shew on the one hand a pretension which the Pope wished to establish, and on the other a resolution equally marked to reject it. The Pope's own words are, "If you persevere in that orthodox Faith in which you have begun, and the sacred and venerable images be by your means erected again in those parts, as by the Lord, the Emperor Constantine of pious memory, and the blessed Helen, who promulgated the orthodox Faith, and exalted the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church your spiritual mother, and with the other orthodox Emperors venerated it as the head of all Churches, so will your Clemency, that is protected of God, receive the name of another Constantine, and another Helen, through whom at the beginning the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church derived strength, and like whom your own imperial fame is spread abroad by triumphs, so as to be brilliant and deeply fixed in the whole world. But the more, if following the traditions of the orthodox Faith, you embrace the judgment of the Church of blessed Peter chief of the Apostles, and, as of old your predecessors the holy Emperors acted, so you too, venerating it with honour, love with all your heart his Vicar, and if your sacred majesty follow by preference their orthodox Faith, according to our holy Roman Church. May the chief of the Apostles himself, to whom the power was given by our Lord God to bind and remit sins in heaven and earth, be often your protector, and trample all barbarous nations under your feet, and everywhere make you conquerors. For let sacred authority lay open the marks of his dignity, and how great veneration ought to be shewn to his, the highest See, by all the faithful in the world. For the Lord set him who bears the keys of the kingdom of heaven as chief over all, and by Him is he honoured with this privilege, by which the keys of the kingdom of heaven are entrusted to him. He therefore that was preferred with so exalted an honour was thought worthy to confess that Faith on which the Church of Christ is founded. A blessed reward followed that blessed confession, by the preaching of which the holy universal Church was illumined, and from it the other Churches of God have derived the proofs of Faith. For the blessed Peter himself,

SECT.  
III.

Mansi 12.  
1056. E.  
Letter of  
the Pope  
to the Em-  
peror as it  
was writ-  
ten.

CHAP.  
VI.

the chief of the Apostles, who first sat in the Apostolic See, left the chiefship of his Apostolate, and pastoral care, to his successors, who are to sit in his most holy seat for ever. And that power of authority, which he received from the Lord God our Saviour, he too bestowed and delivered by divine command to the Pontiffs his successors," &c.

Significant  
alteration  
of it, as  
read to the  
Council.

The Greek translation, which alone was read and approved by the Council, thus modifies this: "If the ancient orthodoxy be perfected and restored by your means in those regions, and the venerable icons be placed in their original state, you will be partakers with the Lord Constantine, Emperor of old, by God's will, and the Empress Helen, who made conspicuous and confirmed the orthodox Faith, and exalted still more your holy spiritual mother the Catholic and Roman Church, and with the orthodox Emperors who ruled after them, and so your most pious and heaven-protected name likewise will be set forth as that of another Constantine and another Helen; being renowned and praised through the whole world, by whom the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church is restored. And especially if you follow the tradition of the orthodox Faith of the Church of the holy Peter and Paul the chief Apostles, and embrace their Vicar, as the Emperors who reigned before you of old both honoured their Vicar, and loved him with all their heart: and if your sacred majesty honour the Roman most holy Church of the chief Apostles, to whom (the Apostles) was given power by God the Word Himself to loose and to bind sins in heaven and earth. For they will extend their shield over your power, and all barbarous nations shall be put under your feet: and wherever you go they will make you conquerors. For the holy and chief Apostles themselves, who set up the Catholic and orthodox Faith, have laid it down as a written law that all, who after them are to be successors of their seats, should hold their Faith, and remain in it to the end."

Thus, by the association of St. Paul with St. Peter, calling them both the chief Apostles, and declaring that power to bind and remit sins was given to *them* by God the Word Himself, the Easterns turned aside that *exclusive* application of the passage of Matthew, which from the time of St. Leo

the Popes most constantly inculcated. For it is much to be observed that the fault of the Roman claim is not that it assumes powers which were never given, but that it would *restrict* to itself what was given to all the Apostles.

But when the Pope went on to censure the election of Tarasius from a layman, and the title of Ecumenical Patriarch given to him, they would neither read this in the Council, nor have it put in the Acts, but left out the whole conclusion of his letter altogether. What he says about this title of Ecumenical is remarkable. "We greatly wondered that in your imperial commands, directed for the Patriarch of the royal city, Tarasius, we find him there called Universal: but we know not whether this was written through ignorance, or schism, or the heresy of the wicked. But henceforth we advise your most merciful and imperial majesty, that he be by no means called Universal in your writings, because it appears to be contrary to the institutions of the holy Canons, and the decrees of the traditions of the holy Fathers. For he never could have ranked second, save for the authority of our holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, as is plain to all:" (Pope Adrian apparently forgot the denunciations of St. Leo, and how Pope Gelasius called the Bishop of Constantinople a Suffragan of Heraclea, nor has he informed us *when* the Roman Church granted what the Eastern Church *took* from the date of her own Canon of 381.) "Because if he be named Universal, above the holy Roman Church which has a prior rank, which is the head of all the Churches of God, it is certain that he shews himself as a rebel against the holy Councils, and a heretic. Because, if he is Universal, he is recognised to have the Primacy even over the Church of our See, which appears ridiculous to all faithful Christians: because in the whole world the chief rank and power was given to the blessed Apostle Peter by the Redeemer of the world Himself: and through the same Apostle, whose place we unworthily hold, the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church holds the first rank, and the authority of power, now and for ever; so that if any one, which we believe not, has called him, or assents to his being called, Universal, let him know that he is estranged from the orthodox Faith, and a rebel against our holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

SECT.  
III.

The Pope censures the election of Tarasius, and the term Ecumenical: all which the Greeks leave out. His remarks on the term Ecumenical opposed to the Papal Idea.

Mansi 12.  
1073. A.

CHAP.  
VI.

Mansi 12.  
1078. B.

The rebel, who soonest fell under this ban of the Pope, was the Deacon and notary Cosmas, who, as soon as the Pope's letter, thus altered and abbreviated, had been read to the Council, and acknowledged by his Legates, informed the Council that another letter had been sent "from the most holy Pope of Elder Rome to Tarasius, our most holy and Ecumenical Patriarch, and as your holy assembly bids, it shall be done with it also. The holy Council said, 'Let it be read.'"

Head an  
ambiguous  
expression.  
See Mr.  
Thomp-  
son's Book  
passim.

I only stop here to remark that the phraseology of the Pope himself about the title Universal cannot possibly be reconciled with a spiritual monarchy, and that the expression "*Head* of all the holy Churches," appears from it to mean *the First*. It was by using the expression Head, which was originally given with this meaning, in that other and infinitely higher meaning in which our Lord is said to be Head of the Body, that the Primacy became a Supremacy, and the Vicarius Petri was turned into the sole Vicarius Christi.

The Pope's  
letters con-  
firmed by  
Tarasius,  
and by the  
Council.

After the Pope's letter to the Patriarch Tarasius had been read, his Legates inquired of Tarasius, if he agreed with it and the other. Tarasius replied that he agreed with and confirmed them, very carefully limiting his agreement to the particular matter in hand, of the images or icons, and saying that the Pope had maintained the ancient tradition of the Catholic Church, and that he had himself carefully searched the Scriptures, and been instructed by the teaching of the Fathers in forming his conclusion.

Mansi 12.  
1086. C.

Thereupon the Legates inquired if the whole Council received the letters. They replied that they received them. On which John, Legate of the Eastern Patriarchs, says, "Now is it seasonable to sing in the Psalmist's words, 'Mercy and Truth have met together, Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other.' We know that our Lord Jesus Christ is Mercy and Truth. But the most holy Patriarchs and Pastors of the world are so, and are called so, by participation. For Mercy and Truth have met together, in that Adrian, most holy Pope of Elder Rome, and Tarasius most blessed Patriarch of royal Constantinople, are of one mind and confession." The several Bishops then in order express their consent, for which that of Basil of Ancyra may stand as a

sample. "According to the contents of the letters of the most holy Adrian Pope of Elder Rome, and the sense of our most holy Father and Ecumenical Patriarch, I think, and hold, and will teach."

SECT.  
III.

This is that synodical examination of the Roman Pontiff's letter on which Bossuet lays so much stress, the Council's "definition being not that of the single Roman Pontiff, but resting on the consent and authority of the whole Catholic Church." And in giving its decision the Council itself says, "That the divine tradition of the Catholic Church may be ratified by a common decree. Therefore, having with all diligence searched and considered, and following the intention of the truth, we take nothing away, we add nothing, but we guard without diminution all that is of the Catholic Church."

Bossuet,  
Def., lib. 7.  
c. 30.

Mansi 18.  
376. B.

In the third session Constantine, Bishop of Constantia, requested, that as the letters of the Roman Bishop had been read and approved, so the letters of the Eastern Patriarchs to Tarasius might be read, "in order that we may know, if the Pope of Elder Rome, and the most holy Ecumenical Patriarch Tarasius, who presides over this royal city, are of the same mind, and hold the same doctrine, with the Bishops of the East." The letters were accordingly read and approved, and the Bishops severally express their consent to them: in most of these consents, as likewise in the letter of the Eastern Patriarchs, Tarasius is styled Ecumenical Patriarch.

The like  
honour  
given to  
the letters  
of the  
Eastern  
Patriarchs.  
Mansi 12.  
1119. B.

And the question before the Council is considered to be terminated by the consonance of these several letters and the declaration of Tarasius together, and their joint reception by the Council. "All the holy Council which is assembled by the grace of Christ our true God, and the pious command of our most serene and orthodox Emperors, receives and agrees to the report made to our orthodox Emperors by Adrian Pope of Elder Rome, and the paper now read, the orthodox declaration of the most holy and blessed Ecumenical Patriarch Tarasius, and the letters sent from the East to his Blessedness by the High-Priests."

Décision of  
the Council  
fixed by the  
agreement  
of the five  
Patriarchal  
Sees.  
Mansi 12.  
1154. B.

In this Seventh Council reference is several times made to the Canons of the Council in Trullo, as being those of the

CHAP. VI.

Mansi 18.  
39. E. 219.  
B. 472.

Sixth Ecumenical Council. Tarasius so quotes the twenty-second in his letter to the Pope. And Honorius is repeatedly mentioned in the list of the heretics condemned by preceding Councils.

SECT. IV.

The Council of 869-70, called the Eighth, but not Ecumenical.  
Mansi 81.  
552-3.

I AM about to quote the Eighth Council, held in 869-70, not as Ecumenical, for it is rejected by the Greeks, and at the Council of Florence, in the sixth session, after that in the fifth session the documents of the Seven Ecumenical Councils had been read, Cardinal Julian requested the Bishops of Ephesus and Nicea to lend the book of the Eighth Council. The Bishop of Ephesus replied, "We are not bound to number among the Ecumenical Councils another Council which was not approved, but rather rejected. This Council contains the acts against Photius in the time of Pope John and Adrian. Another Council was afterwards celebrated, which restored Photius, and abrogated the former. . . . Wherefore it is altogether unfitting to produce abrogated Acts." Cardinal Julian rejoined: "I desire to free you from this fear, that you be not afraid lest anything be read out of the Eighth Council. Yet we ask you to have the book which we want brought. For we wish to see something in the Sixth and Seventh Council: and we say nothing of the Eighth." *And the Eighth Council was tacitly surrendered at the Council of Florence*, a concession on the part of the Latins which perhaps exceeded any made on the side of the Greeks: for thus all the acts against Photius were silently given up; and if the Ecumenicity of the Eighth Council, at which Papal Legates, and those of the three Eastern Patriarchs, and the Patriarch of Constantinople in person, attended, and which the Pope confirmed, could not be maintained, much more the succeeding Western Councils could not be maintained to be Ecumenical. *I know of no concession equal to this made by the Roman Church during eighteen hundred years*; and it may be considered quite providential, as opening the way to future union. Accordingly the Council of Florence was called in the first editions of the Council, the Eighth Ecu-

Tacitly surrendered at the Council of Florence.

menical: which Baronius bitterly complains of in his Annals, tom. xv. anno 869, No. 64. I suppose the Ultra-montanes, seeing how ruinous this was to their theory, have taken care to alter this since. But they cannot alter the fact that the Eighth Council of 869 was surrendered at the Council of Florence, and its Acts passed over in silence.

SECT.  
IV.  
Mansi 16.  
516. D.

The Acts then of this Council of 869-70, held at a time when the Pope was no longer a subject of the Eastern Emperors, when the three Eastern Patriarchates were reduced very low indeed by the oppression of the Mahometans, and in order to restore Ignatius to the See of Constantinople, and to confirm the deposition of Photius which Pope Nicholas with his Council had decreed, held that is under circumstances all most favourable to the Roman Pontiff's influence, yet do most remarkably illustrate and confirm the previous constitution of the Church. We do not possess the original Greek copy of the Acts, but a translation made by Anastasius, Librarian of Rome, in the preface to which, maintaining its Ecumenicity, he says, "Because since Christ has placed in His Body, which is the Church, so many Patriarchal Sees as senses in every one's mortal body, nothing in truth is wanting to the wholeness of the Church, if all those Sees be of one will: as nothing is wanting to the body's motion, if all the five senses are of complete and common soundness: amongst which Sees as the Roman is pre-eminent, it is not without reason compared to the sight, which truly excels all the senses, being more acute than they are, and having communion with all as none of the others has." Now this Idea, that the unity of the Church consists in the union of the Five Patriarchates, runs all through, and gives tone to, the Acts: a fact much more remarkable than it would have been four hundred years before at the Council of Chalcedon, because three of those Sees had become in fact so powerless. Yet each of the Five are considered completely independent and integral members of the Church, in no sense under the dominion or jurisdiction of any other. Thus the Legate of Michel, Patriarch of Alexandria, making his appearance only at the ninth session, the Roman Legates say that they receive him as such, and ask the Legates of the Oriental Sees, and the rest of the Bishops,

Illustrates and confirms the previous constitution of the Church.

Præcellit.

Independence of the five Patriarchal Sees, shewn by the conduct pursued to the Legate of Alexandria;

CHAP.  
VI.

whether they receive him likewise. Then the Senate inform him that eight sessions had taken place before his arrival, and ask if he is acquainted with what had passed. He assents. They then ask, "Do you then agree to what the most holy Legates of Elder Rome, and of the Oriental Sees, have judged?" He replies, "I agree to every Ecclesiastical act and disposition of the most holy Legates of Elder Rome, and of the Oriental Sees." He then offers to read his written judgment, observing that "for the rest I will both say and do, as by the grace of Christ I shall know what is just, and holy." The Roman Legates desire his judgment to be read, after which the whole Council says, "The letter read hath certified us in all things that it agrees with the judgment of the holy Roman Church, and of the Oriental Sees." And he is counted as if he had been present from the beginning.

Mansi 16.  
147-9.

Mansi 16.  
78-9.  
and by the  
words of the  
Legates of  
Antioch  
and Jeru-  
salem.

The Legates of Antioch and Jerusalem, in the fifth action, observe: "You know that in former times it was the Emperors who convoked Councils, and collected Legates out of the whole world for the arrangement of such causes: after whose manner too our pious Emperor has made this Universal Council, not hidden, nor clandestine, but plain and open, that is, the college of the most holy Legates of Elder Rome and of ourselves." . . . "But since I have been for the last seven years Synchel of the Church of Jerusalem, I am quite sure that we have neither received letters from Photius, nor sent them to him: but likewise you have many times heard what the most holy Thomas Metropolitan of Tyre has said, who now too affirms that the See of Antioch has neither received letters from Photius, nor ever sent any: and much before have you been informed of the decree of the holy Roman Church concerning him, and have known what the most blessed Pope Nicholas has promulged, and in like manner his successor Adrian. But this we have both said and shewn in our former acts, and therefore I also now say it before him and in his face, his eyes beholding it, and his ears hearing it. *That is, he is condemned who is not received by any of the Patriarchal Sees.*"

On account of this previous condemnation of Photius by Pope Nicholas, the Papal Legates were for carrying matters

with a very high hand, and refused to have him heard at all, that is, they wished the Pope's decision should terminate the matter, and a general Council not enter into the grounds of it. The Princes said by Bahanes the Patrician, "Our sacred Emperors have sent us their servants, who are called the Senate, . . . to be accurate hearers of these Acts. If therefore you wish, according to the order of Councils, at the end of this holy and universal Council to ask of us our subscriptions, . . . all my brethren and fellow-nobles say to our most holy Lord the Patriarch, and to the most holy Legates as well of Elder Rome as of the Oriental Sees, that unless we hear both from Photius himself standing before us, and from his Bishops, and from those, who having been consecrated by the most blessed Methodius, and most holy Ignatius, have apostatized, so that in our sight their mouths may be stopped, according to the precepts of Canons and Councils, our hand shall not write a single letter in that Council. Let them hear the judgment passed by Elder Rome in our sight, and if they can make no answer, the world will be healed by their agreement. But if this be not done, we know that you do not require us to subscribe at the end of your Acts. For how can we subscribe in a judgment of this kind, while they cry out and say, 'Let us hear our deposition, let us be condemned in our hearing, as justice demands,' and yet they are not heard? This is not just, as we think. Do therefore what seems good to you. For we, even before your Holiness came to the heaven-protected city of our sacred Emperors, held the same opinion, as well respecting the judgment of the most blessed Pope Nicholas, as its reception by the most holy Pope Adrian, and the establishment and confirmation of the honoured Priest, the most holy Lord, our Patriarch. But, after the Legates of the East, we saw you likewise, and received you as holy Apostles. We therefore request that these who are sick be healed, and that we correct those who are not sure of the truth, and raise up those who are fallen. For unless all these matters be discussed, men's consciences will not be healed.' Metrophanes, most beloved of God, Metropolitan of Smyrna, rising said: 'The divine Apostle speaks thus: Despise not prophecysings: prove all things: hold fast that which is good. Receiving

SECT.  
IV.

Mansi, tom.  
16. 55-6.  
The Roman  
Legates de-  
sire that  
the depo-  
sition of  
Photius by  
Pope Ni-  
cholas  
should hold  
good with-  
out exami-  
nation, but  
are over-  
ruled.

CHAP.  
VI.

therefore the most holy Legates of Elder Rome as prophets, we by no means despise them. But, approving the words of the most illustrious Princes, we find them just and fitting: and therefore likewise all the Bishops, and this holy Council, accede to the request of the most noble Princes, that they be examined and questioned, if they receive them for judges: and place of satisfaction being allowed them, if they be justified, that we all willingly receive them, if condemned, that all acquiesce. Therefore let them now be required to confess by writing, if they admit this holy and Universal Council, and its judgment, and let them enter, as is right.' The most holy Legates of Elder Rome said, 'And are they, whom you wish to be introduced, ignorant what sentence the holy Roman Church has passed?' Bahanes, most noble patriarchian and president, said; 'They are; for not being there, nor having heard your deed face to face, what certitude do you wish they should have by hearsay of their own condemnation?' Donatus and Stephen, the Bishops most beloved of God, and Marinus most reverend Deacon of the holy Roman Church, most holy Legates of Elder Rome, said: 'It is not in our power to rescind a judgment of the holy Roman Pontiffs: for this is contrary to the laws of the Canons: since being present there by their own messengers, and remaining at Rome, they both heard and well knew the sentence pronounced against themselves, and the condemnation against Photius, and his imposition of hands. But, *in order to make plainer to them the just judgment of the holy Roman Church, let them enter, and hear read the decrees of the Council, and the judgment of the most blessed Pope Nicholas, and let them be more and more assured.*' The most noble and illustrious Princes said, 'This is good and excellent; let them hear the judgment of the most blessed Pope Nicholas in our sight, *and if they have anything to say against it, let them say it, or, being persuaded, let them acquiesce: but if they have anything, let them undertake to speak against their own condemnation: but if they do not undertake this, then what seems good to the Canons shall be done.*'" Thus they go on, the Legates aiming at an unexamined reception of the Roman judgment: the rest of the Council insisting on their being heard: and heard they are, though they would not

acknowledge the competency of the tribunal. Cardinal Cusa has dispensed with our assigning the meaning of all this: he has done it for us very plainly. "On this are founded those texts of Nicholas, which say that a Pope's sentence can be reconsidered by no one: but *if it were unjust, it would be reconsidered, and in the case of doubt examined by an Universal Council.* Whence, in the fourth action of the Eighth Universal Council, when the Legates of the Apostolic See resisted the judgment once given by Pope Nicholas being reconsidered in the Council, the Princes and Senators obtained it, who said that they would not subscribe as witnesses, unless those judged in the Roman Council were admitted to reply against such judgments. And Metrophanes, Metropolitan of Smyrna, rose and said, 'Approving the words of the most noble Princes we find them just and fitting; all the Bishops and this holy Council agree to this.' Here, by the decree of an Universal Council, the judgment of Pope Nicholas and his Council on Photius was again examined and cleared in an Universal Council, in spite, too, of the Legates of Elder Rome: from which is apparent the superiority of an Universal Council to the Pope and his Patriarchal Council."

SECT.  
IV.

Explanation of this by Cardinal Cusa, lib. 2. de Concord., cap. 20. quoted by Richer, Hist. Council, tom. 1. 365.

At the commencement of the sixth session the same Metrophanes rose and said, that God "had made great lights, that is, the five Patriarchal heads, for the illumination of the whole earth, to be set over the day and night, and to separate between light and darkness:" and again, "The rivers of the flood thereof make glad the city of our God, that is, the holy Church. That river now severs his streams into four heads, namely, the most holy Legates of Elder Rome, and Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, imitator of God, and the most holy Legates who have come from the two Sees of the East:" the Legate of Alexandria not being yet come. So Elias, Legate of Theodosius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, says, "The Emperor, *knowing that judgment had been pronounced by Elder Rome* for the most holy Ignatius, and against Photius, brought back again to his proper See by a legitimate and just sentence him who had been unjustly and lawlessly deposed from his own See, and assigned his proper place according to order to the invader Photius.

Mansi 16. 82-3. The Patriarchs of the East judge co-ordinately with the Roman Patriarch.

CHAP.  
VI.

But, being just and most pious, *and wishing the truth to be confirmed more perfectly and clearly, he well judged to collect hither Legates from all the Patriarchates likewise.* The Lord God hath given effect to his good intention, *that what is better and more suited to Ecclesiastical order may be, that is, by the assembling hither of the most holy Legates of Elder Rome, and our Humility.*" . . . "For we believe that the Holy Spirit, who has spoken in the holy Church of the Romans, has also spoken in our Churches." . . . "But the most holy Legates of Elder Rome and we, who are the Legates of the other Sees, annul all these things to-day, by the grace of Jesus Christ, who hath given to us the power of the High-Priesthood, justly and fittingly to bind and to loose, since all was done by violence and compulsion." . . . "We have therefore declared our sentence and judgment, before the Emperor beloved of Christ, and the holy Council."

Mansi 16.  
85-7.

Where the  
Five Patri-  
archs agree,  
there is  
truth.

The Emperor Basil said to the Photian Bishops, "Lo, you have heard the sense of the Patriarchs, both of Rome, and Jerusalem, and Antioch." . . . "You, holding irregular Councils by the power of the Emperor, alone and by yourselves without the Patriarchal Sees, dared to call them holy, and blush not to detract from this one, which is held by all the Patriarchal Sees, by God's co-operation and grace, who hath entrusted us with the Empire. Both you, and the whole world beneath the sun, certainly know, that by the protection of our true God the five Patriarchates of the world hold the right view, and cannot break the Faith: and therefore whatsoever they judge you must receive." . . . "Zachary, ordained by Photius Bishop of Chalcedon, said, 'The Canon is superior both to Pope Nicholas and the other Patriarchs, and they, who act according to that, do nothing beyond what they teach. But when they do beyond this Canon, whether it be Pope Nicholas, or any one else, we acquiesce not.'"

Principes  
est.

Mansi 16.  
99. C.

Again, Bahanes, by the Emperor's order, said to Photius and his Bishops, "Whence are you? from heaven, or the deep, or of the earth on which we live? And shew at this hour that, whether any heresy has arisen, or schism sprung up in any part, any one has held an opinion contrary to the Four Patriarchs, and been safe, and I hear you. To-day the Four Patriarchs, rather the Five, utterly condemn you. What

have you to say to this? Who can help you? Declare.' The Bishops of Photius said: 'The Canons of the holy Apostles and the holy Councils.' Bahanes . . . said, 'Declare what Canon helps you, and where the Lord hath put the Canons: in His Churches, or in any other place: and where are the Churches to-day, and where is the Gospel preached? Is there any other place beside that which those most holy Legates hold?'"

SECT.  
IV.

Bahanes, again, being sent by the Council to Theodorus, says, "God hath placed His Church in the Five Patriarchates, and declared in His Gospels that they shall never utterly fall, because they are the heads of the Church. For that saying, 'and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it,' meaneth this, when two fall, they run to three: when three fall, they run to two: but when four perchance have fallen, one, which remains in Christ our God the Head of all, calls back again the remaining body of the Church. But now, as the whole world is in agreement, you have no manner of excuse."

Mansi 16,  
140. E.

The Canons of this Council were passed in the presence of the Roman Legates, a very unusual thing, for they generally avoided being present at any Canons, in order that their Church might not be bound by them. It is remarkable that they fully confirm the independence of the Five Patriarchs, which has appeared so strongly in the above extracts.

Canons of the Eighth Council set forth the independence and co-ordinate authority of the Patriarchal Sees.

The Second Canon says, "*We decree and ratify* all which has been set forth synodically and promulged" by the Popes Nicholas and Adrian respecting the matter of Ignatius and Photius.

The Tenth, "This holy Universal Council decrees and appoints that no layman, monk, or clerk, separate himself from the Communion of his own Patriarch before diligent examination and Synodical sentence, although he pretend to know any criminal cause whatsoever against him, nor refuse to name him at the divine mysteries and offices."

The Seventeenth, "The holy and Universal first Nicene Council orders the ancient custom to be observed in Egypt and the Provinces subordinate to it, so that the Bishop of Alexandria have authority over all these, saying, 'Because this custom hath also prevailed in the city of the Romans:'

CHAP.  
VI

for which reason this also great and holy Council orders the ancient custom to be in all things maintained, as well in Old and New Rome, as in the See of Antioch, and Jerusalem, so that their Prelates have authority over all Metropolitans who are promoted by them, and who receive the confirmation of their Episcopal dignity either by the imposition of hands, or the giving of the pall, that is, to call them together, in case of necessity, to Synodical meetings, or even to restrain and correct them, when report has perhaps accused them of any crimes."

The Twenty-first, "Believing that the word of the Lord, which Christ said to His holy Apostles and Disciples, 'Whoso receiveth you, receiveth Me, and whoso despiseth you, despiseth Me,' was said to all likewise who after them have been made according to them Supreme Pontiffs and Heads of Pastors in the Church Catholic, we decree that no worldly potentate whatsoever should fail in honour to any one of those who preside over the Patriarchal Sees, or attempt to move him from his own throne, but count them worthy of all reverence and honour: first indeed the most holy Pope of Elder Rome, but next the Patriarch of Constantinople, then him of Alexandria, and of Antioch, and of Jerusalem: but that neither any person whatsoever should collect writings and words against the most holy Pope of Elder Rome, and put them together under pretence, as it were, of any reported crimes: which both lately Photius did, and long ago Dioscorus. But whoever uses such boasting and boldness, as, after the pattern of Photius or Dioscorus, in writing or without writing to spread any injuries against the See of Peter, chief of the Apostles, let him receive equal and the like condemnation with them. But if any one enjoying this world's power attempts to expel the above-mentioned Pope of the Apostolic See, or any one of the other Patriarchs, let him be Anathema. Moreover if an Universal Council be assembled, and any ambiguity or controversy arise even about the holy Church of the Romans, it behoves respectfully and with fitting reverence to inquire into the proposed question, and to accept or promote solution of it, or advance towards it, but not *audaciously* to issue sentence against the supreme Pontiffs of Elder Rome."

The Twenty-sixth orders that any Presbyter or Deacon, not acquiescing in the judgment of his own Bishop, may appeal to the Metropolitan of the Province: who shall call that Bishop and others of his Council, and confirm or annul the sentence. So Bishops may appeal from their Metropolitan "to the Patriarchal Head," who with his Metropolitans shall pronounce definitive sentence, and without appeal.

The whole testimony, therefore, of this Council is in favour of the Patriarchal system, and acknowledging as it does the Five Patriarchs as so many independent centres of jurisdiction, it utterly contradicts and falsifies the Ultra-montane theory, which, when pressed to its ultimate issue, makes the indefectibility and infallibility of the Church to reside in the single person of the Roman Pontiff. On the other hand the Council in its encyclical letter speaks of the condemnation of Photius thus: "Wherefore . . . as he was disobedient and resisted this holy and Universal Council, we have rejected and anathematized him, and severed him from the whole Catholic and Apostolic Church *by the power given unto us in the Holy Spirit by our first and great High-Priest, Deliverer, and Saviour of all.*"

Summing  
up of this  
Council's  
testimony.

Mansi 16.  
199. B.

This Council was held six years after Pope Nicholas, in 864, received a copy of the false Decretals, by the aid of which, disseminating them as authentic letters of the oldest Popes, he began to beat down the old Metropolitan constitution of the Church in the West, and paved the way for the rise of a spiritual monarchy in his own Patriarchate, of which more hereafter.

An allocution of Pope Adrian, in his Council at Rome against Photius, quoted in this Council, says, in reference to Photius having excommunicated Pope Nicholas, "We read indeed that the Roman Pontiff has passed judgment on the Prelates of all Churches: but we do not read that any one has passed judgment on him: for although Honorius was anathematized by the Orientals after his death, yet it is to be observed, that he had been accused of heresy: for which alone inferiors may resist the motions of their superiors, and freely reject their bad judgment: although even in that case it would not have been lawful for any of the Patriarchs, or

Observa-  
tion of Pope  
Adrian on  
the con-  
demnation  
of Pope  
Honorius.  
Mansi 16.  
126. A.

CHAP. VI. any other Prelate, to pass sentence on him, unless the authority of the consent of the Pontiff of the said First See had preceded."

S. Hil.,  
p. 1337.

Had Pope Adrian ever heard the "Anathema to thee Liberius, and again, Anathema, and thrice I say, Anathema, O Traitor," of St. Hilary? Has not Bossuet shewn that the Popes succeeding Honorius did all they could to screen him before the decree of the Sixth Council, to which they afterwards consented? A late Ultra-montane "evasion," however, as Bossuet says, makes it desirable to know from the mouth of a Pope that Honorius was condemned *for heresy* itself, and not merely as a favourer of heresy. For even to this distinction has the subtlety of controversy descended, to save, if possible, the infallibility of a Roman Pontiff, in so desperate a case.

#### SECT. V.

The Sixth Council not received by the Spanish Bishops till after a Synodical examination, before which they did not consider it Ecumenical.  
Bossuet, Def., lib. 7. c. 29.

WITH regard to the Sixth and Seventh Councils two very important facts exist, which have a direct bearing on our own present position as to the Council of Trent, and moreover very clearly elucidate how little the authority of Bishops was then thought to depend upon the Pope. "No Spanish Bishops had been present at the Western Council called by Agathon, nor were they acquainted with the Sixth Council, nor had they even been invited to it. And so Leo II. writes to them the letter which we have often mentioned; at the same time he sends them the decree and termination of the holy Council with the promise to send also the Acts of the whole Council, if they would be pleased with them. Having received all these, under Benedict II. Leo's successor, and the king Ervigius, they determined that a general Council of all Spain should be held at Toledo, in order that these Acts might be approved by all the Councils and Provinces of the kingdom. They pass a decree in these terms. 'We have received the Acts of the Council, and with the Acts likewise the invitatory letters of Leo Pontiff of Old Rome, by which the whole order of the Acts, and the Acts

Mansi 11.  
1087. D.  
words  
omitted.

of the orders, have been plainly set forth to us. By which letter the Prelates of Spain were invited, that the aforesaid decrees of the Council might have force, as supported by the authority of our power.' Here in plain words the authority of the Spanish Prelates is required. Afterwards, 'We then determined, for the satisfaction of the Roman Pontiff, to confirm those said Acts.' And presently, 'That both Acts may pass through a Synodical examination, and be ratified by a distinct authority of (Spanish) Councils.' And this it is their will should be, after, as they say, 'they have been again passed in review by Synodical examination, or approved by the common judgment of all the Councils.' In fine, 'Comparing the aforesaid Acts with the ancient Councils, we have approved them, . . . and therefore the Acts of the aforementioned Council are to be venerated by us, and shall be received and enforced, in so far as they depart not from the before-mentioned Councils,' (those of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.) Here is deliberation: here is an exact examination according to a certain rule, viz., the Faith of the Fathers and the ancient Councils: and after that examination, not otherwise, the Acts are *confirmed*. What more can be wanted?

"You prove too much, they reply, for you subject to the examination of particular Councils not only the decrees of the Pontiff, but of Universal Councils. This is easily solved. No one ever subjected to examination or retractation the doctrine and faith of Universal Councils which are recognised as such. But the Spanish Fathers by no means recognised as Universal this Council, of which they had neither heard, nor been invited to it. Hence they never call it an Universal Council, but say, 'The Acts of a Council were brought to them, in which a great and illustrious multitude of Pontiffs were assembled at Constantinople, by mediation of the pious Emperor Constantine.' And if one considers it, the whole series of Acts will shew, that the Spaniards were impatient at not having been invited. But also, by so often repeating the mention of examination they seem to have provided against any one's imagining that Spain, so large a part of the Church, was bound by the authority of such a Council, as being Universal, even though not summoned

CHAP. VI. to it. But though unwilling to recognise the Council as Ecumenical, yet none doubted about the sentence of the Apostolic See, which they read expressed in the letters both of Agatho and Leo. For Leo expressly called the Sixth Council as the other Five, Universal, and repeated the anathemas passed in the Sixth Council, as we have seen above. Wherefore they subject to examination an even acknowledged decree of the Roman Pontiff *De Fide*, and approve it after legitimate cognizance: nor do they fear to say that it was even *confirmed* by them. So great an authority they understood to belong to unity itself, and common consent."

Note on Bossuet, Def., lib. 8. c. 18.

Spanish Bishops at the Council of Trent reject a proposed decree, that the Episcopal authority derived its origin from the Papal.

Ib., Def., lib. 7. c. 31.

The Gallican Bishops very long rejected the Ecumenicity of the Seventh Council, though supported by all the Pope's authority.

Moreover, "the Spanish Bishops brought to Trent this doctrine which they had received from their Fathers. For, the Italians being very urgent that the Council should issue a decree, and declare that the Episcopal authority derived its origin from the Papal, the Spanish Bishops firmly resisted this being decreed, to whom our Gallic Bishops joined themselves: or rather by the Holy Spirit, who presided over this Council, it was not allowed that this decree should pass, which would have directly contradicted the sacred statutes of the ancient Councils."

As to the Seventh Council, the reason why "the Prelates of the Gallican Church resisted its decrees was, not that they doubted about the authority of an Ecumenical Council, but because they did not recognise as Ecumenical the Second Nicene, to which they had not been summoned. Nay, in the Council of Francfort, assembled out of the Churches of France and Germany, they rejected it even in the presence of the Legates of the Roman Church, a point which we should most carefully consider, as it has the strongest bearing on our subject.

"As to the matter indeed itself, the reverence paid to images, it is not my purpose to defend the opinion of our ancestors: perceiving, as I do, that they might easily have agreed with the Nicene Fathers themselves, had they paid sufficient attention to their decrees, as was afterwards done. . .

"Nor only in the time of the Council of Francfort did they reject the Second Nicene Council, being nearly ignorant of its Acts, but also during the whole reign of Charle-

magne, and very long afterwards. In the mean time it was a known fact that the Roman Pontiffs had agreed with the Second Nicene Council, and that Adrian had issued a decretal letter on that matter, and sent it to the Council, to which the Council had assented. The matter was afterwards discussed in writings on both sides, and books were published against the Nicene Council, called from Charles Caroline. Adrian himself answered these in defence of the Nicene decrees: but not the less our countrymen, together with Charlemagne, remained firm in their judgment. Nor were they in the mean time held as heretical or schismatical, though they differed on a point of the greatest moment, that is, the interpretation of the precepts of the first table, because they seemed to inquire into the matter with a good intention, not to contend with obstinate party spirit. And Charlemagne lived in the closest union with Adrian I., not only as to religious regard, but with a singular and intimate bond of friendship: and during this interval was often called upon to assist Leo III., and was adorned with the imperial crown: to such a degree was it an admitted fact, that what seemed to concern the Faith lay not in the authority of the single Roman Pontiff, but in the consent of the Universal Church.

“The judgment, which had settled in the minds of our countrymen during the reign of Charlemagne, continued under Louis the Pious (814—40). . . .

“And very long afterwards the French retained their judgment. In the mean time, receding as they did from so many decrees of Roman Pontiffs, they boasted not the less that they remained in the Communion and Faith of the Roman Church. So careful were they to separate dubious decrees, not yet received by common consent, from those which were certain and tried. Nor did they maintain that the Roman Church had erred, though it adhered to its Pontiffs, because they believed in the absence of that ‘irrevocable obstinacy,’ which they feared at the last in Eugenius. Nor, while they openly dissented, was the authority of the Second Nicene Council, or of the Roman Pontiffs, who had decreed the same thing, or even approved the Nicene Council, objected to them as infallible: because it was well known

CHAP. VI. — that they had not been summoned, and, what the Nicene Council itself had laid as a foundation, was received as a law: 'that the common Faith was to be established by common consent.' Wherefore the authority of the Seventh Council held good at once amongst the Easterns, who agreed with one another after a thorough inquiry; but gained footing among our countrymen by the gradual disclosure of facts, and the consent of the Churches. To such a degree were our countrymen persuaded, and the Roman Pontiffs themselves confessed, that it was the tradition of their ancestors for definitions of the Faith to hold good by the consent of the Catholic Church."

#### SECT. VI.

So then it appears, that as the letter of St. Cyril was read and approved in the Third Council, and that of Pope St. Leo in the Fourth, so that of Pope St. Agathon was read and approved in the Sixth, and that of Pope Adrian the First in the Seventh, A.D. 787. But here it may be well to give Bossuet's summary. "This tradition" (i. e. that the supreme authority in the Church resides in the consent of the Bishops) "we have seen to come down from the Apostles, and descend to the first Eight General Councils; which Eight General Councils are the foundation of the whole Christian doctrine and discipline, of which the Church venerates the first Four, in St. Gregory's words, no less than the four Gospels. Nor is less reverence due to the rest, as, guided by the same Spirit, they have a like authority. Which Eight Councils, with a great and unanimous consent, have placed the final power of giving decisions in nothing else but in the consent of the Fathers. Of which the Six last have legitimately examined the sentence of the Roman Pontiff even given upon Faith, and that with the approval of the Apostolic See, the question being put in this form, as we read in the Acts—'Are these decrees right or not?' . . . .

"But we have seen that the judgment of a General Council never was so reconsidered, but that all immediately

Bossuet,  
Def. Cler.  
Gal., lib. 7.  
c. 33.  
Summary  
of the testi-  
mony of the  
Ecumenical  
Councils as  
to the su-  
preme au-  
thority in  
the Church.

yielded obedience to it. Nor was a new inquiry ever granted to any one after that examination, but punishment threatened. Thus acted Constantine; thus Marcian; thus Celestine; thus Leo; thus all the rest, as we have seen in the Acts. The Christian world hath acknowledged this to be certain and indubitable.

“To this we may add the testimony of the admirable Pope St. Gelasius: ‘A good and truly Christian Council once held neither can nor ought to be unsettled by the repetition of a new Council.’ And again: ‘There is no cause why a good Council should be reconsidered by another Council, lest the mere reconsideration should detract from the strength of its decrees.’ Thus what has received the final and certain judgment of the Church, is not to be reconsidered; for that judgment of the Holy Spirit is reversed, whenever it is reconsidered by a fresh judgment. But the judgment put forth by a Roman Pontiff is such, that it has been reconsidered. It is not therefore that ultimate and final judgment of the Church.

“Nor is that sentence of Gregory the Great less clear, who compares the Four General Councils to the four Gospels, with the reason given; ‘Because being decreed by universal consent, whoever presumes either to loose what they bind, or bind what they loose, destroys not them but himself.’

“So then our question is terminated by the tradition of the ancient Councils and Fathers. All should consent to the power of the Roman Pontiff, as explained according to the decree of the Council of Florence, after the practice of General Councils. The vast difference between the judgment of a Council and of a Pontiff is evident, since after that of the Council no question remains, but only the obedience of the mind brought into captivity; but that of the Pontiff is upon examination approved, so that, if occasion be, it may be reversed:—which was to be proved.”

Elsewhere he says, “This custom, therefore, and this authority in General Councils, prevailed during eight hundred years. For in the First, Second, and Fifth Council no decrees of the Apostolic See had preceded, which could be examined: in the Third, Fourth, Sixth, and following Councils, the certain practice of the Church became evident. I remember,

Bossuet,  
Def. Prev.  
Diss. No.  
64.

Supreme  
and inhe-  
rent power  
which they  
exercised,  
and that

CHAP.  
VI.over the  
writings of  
Popes.

indeed, that Bellarmine, overcome by the authority of the Council's examination, has laid it down that St. Leo's letter, which others have considered in the light of an infallible decree, was only an instruction, though it both bears upon it equal authority with the rest, and was received and read exactly as the rest. We must therefore judge of all equally, that they were issued by the Roman Pontiffs of their full authority, and were approved by Councils only after examination." . . . . The Councils "put in practice their judgment, and claimed it not by any one's permission and indulgence, but of their own right, by no other authority, as we have heard from the Councils themselves, but that of the Holy Spirit. Nor did they therefore . . . . doubt about the Faith: God forbid: but whether the Pontiffs themselves were acting in sufficient accordance with tradition, whether they were truly expressing the ancient Faith, so that it was the Pontiff's office to set the lead to the whole Church, and issue the Apostolic sentence. But, as Leo himself openly professed, the final, complete, and indefectible force was added to the Pontiff's decrees by means of the Synodical examination, by the consent of the Fathers and the whole Church. Hence it was, that, after the decrees of the Pontiff, inquiry was held at least by Ecumenical Councils, but after a Council no question, no examination, ever remained. Thus all the Ecumenical Councils before it, even to the first ages, supported the Council of Constance."

Contradiction of the Ultra-montane Theory as set forth by Bellarmine de Pont Rom., lib. 4, cap. 24, 25.

Here the real question at issue is, whether the Bishop of Rome be First Bishop, or Monarch of the Church. Now I have endeavoured to delineate, from the Fathers and from Councils, what the true Primacy of the Roman See is. What is now required from us to admit as terms of Communion is — "That the ordinary jurisdiction of Bishops descends immediately from the Pope;" "the government of the Church is monarchical, therefore all authority resides in one, and from him is derived unto the rest;" "there is a great difference between the succession to Peter and that to the rest of the Apostles; for the Roman Pontiff properly succeeds Peter not as Apostle, but as ordinary Pastor of the whole Church; and therefore the Roman Pontiff has jurisdiction from Him from whom Peter had it: but Bishops

do not properly succeed the Apostles, as the Apostles were not ordinary, but extraordinary, and as it were, delegated Pastors, to whom there is no succession. Bishops, however, are said to succeed the Apostles, not properly in that manner in which one Bishop succeeds another, and one king another, but in another way, which is two-fold. First, in respect of the holy Order of the Episcopate; secondly, from a certain resemblance and proportion: that is, as, when Christ lived on earth, the twelve Apostles were the first under Christ, then the seventy-two Disciples: so now the Bishops are first under the Roman Pontiff, after them Priests, then Deacons, &c. But it is proved that Bishops succeed to the Apostles so, and not otherwise; for they have no part of the true Apostolic authority. Apostles could preach in the whole world, and found Churches . . . . this cannot Bishops." . . . . "Bishops succeed to the Apostles in the same manner as Priests to the seventy-two Disciples." Again: "But, if the Supreme Pontiff be compared with the rest of the Bishops, he is deservedly said to possess the plenitude of power, because the rest have fixed regions over which they preside, and also a fixed power; but he is set over the whole Christian world, and possesses, in its completeness and plenitude, that power which Christ left on earth for the good of the Church." He proceeds to prove this by those passages of Scripture:—"Thou art Peter," &c.; "Feed My sheep," &c.: which we have seen St. Augustine explaining as said to St. Peter in the person of the Church, while he expressly denies that they are said to him merely as chief Apostle. "These keys not one man but the unity of the Church received:" "he was not the only one among the Disciples who was thought worthy to feed the Lord's sheep," &c. The statement of the Papal Idea by Thomassin comes to the same thing. "In fact Theologians and Canonists agree, that, the Son of God having rendered His Apostles depositaries of His plenitude of spiritual power, it follows thence that their jurisdiction had no other limits but those of the earth. Bishops have indeed succeeded Apostles, but they have not received the entire inheritance of this universal power. It is the sole Apostolic See of Peter which has received with the name Apostolic all the succession of the uni-

Ib., lib. 1.  
cap. 9.

Agreement  
of Thomassin  
therein.  
Disc. de  
l' Eglise.  
Part 1. liv.  
1. c. 6.

CHAP.  
VI.

Logical necessity of this theory to justify the Roman Church in her course of action.

versal power of the Apostles, and above all of St. Peter, who was in possession of this with advantages altogether special." What Bellarmine here says, is, assuredly, both the true Roman view, and moreover *absolutely necessary to justify that Church in the attitude she assumes and the measures she authorizes towards other parts of the Church. And if it be the ancient Catholic doctrine, it does justify her.* For I must observe that the Ultra-montane theory of the Papal Monarchy is not one which the Roman Catholic convert may either hold or reject indifferently. True though it be that the Gallican view has always been tolerated, however much it has been disliked by the governing power in the Roman Communion, yet equally certain it is, that nothing short of the extreme claim put forth by Bellarmine will either constrain all persons on pain of their salvation to belong to the Communion of the Roman Pontiff, or bear out that Pontiff in his acts since the time of Pope Gregory VII. The Primacy, even developed as it was at the end of eight hundred years, will do neither the one nor the other: it will neither make it a clear duty to sacrifice every other consideration to the one necessity of Communion with Rome, nor will it prove the right to be on the side of the Roman Pontiff in his dealings with the Eastern and the English Church. No shield is broad enough or strong enough to cover him, but the ægis of complete sovereignty belonging to the sole Vicar of Christ. No authority, short of absolute inerrancy in his single See, will cut short the difficulties which surround a thoughtful mind at the disturbed state of the Church, and give a clear and certain preponderance to the Papal scale. But this inerrancy of the Papal See, however much it is longed after, and secretly rested in, by Roman writers, is yet no dogma of the Roman Communion. The Roman theory, the whole system of Roman doctrine and discipline, rests upon it logically, yet has never dared to make it *de Fide*. Thus a Roman writer "is fully satisfied that the infallibility of the Pope, and the consequent duty of implicit and unreserved submission to his authority, are necessary conclusions from his Supremacy." When therefore Roman writers, specially converts, boast, that, if they argue with us on the Ultra-montane ground, they do more than is necessary, more than

their position requires, they affect to be generous while they are not just. Their cause *does* require all that its most extravagant defender has ever maintained, namely, that the infallibility of the Church, when pushed to its ultimate point, resides in the single person of the Roman Pontiff, and that he is the source of jurisdiction to every Bishop in the world; so that, however Catholic the doctrine any Communion holds, however unimpeachable its Apostolic descent, however rightful the circumstances of its case, if it be not in actual Communion with the Roman Pontiff, it does not belong to the Church of God. The treatment which the Eastern and the English Church have for hundreds of years received from the Roman Pontiff, the war of extermination which he has carried into their territories, the denial of all Christian membership to them, require no less than this to justify them. If he is monarch in the Church, they are schismatical and heretical bodies, on the ground of their not being in Communion with him, and of their differing from him in doctrine: *if he is not*, the fact of their non-Communion with him proves neither schism nor heresy in them.

But if there is one part of the Ultra-montane theory which more than another is contrary to the whole spirit of antiquity, and is nullified by every act of the ancient Church, it is that claim of being the fountain-head of jurisdiction to the whole Church. Let us hear what even Bossuet says of it. "One objection of theirs remains to be explained, that Bishops borrow their power and jurisdiction from the Roman Pontiff, and therefore, although united with him in any Ecu-  
menical Council, can do nothing against the root and source of their own authority, but are only present as his Counsellors; and that the force of the decree, as well in matters of Faith as in other matters, lies in the power of the Roman Pontiff. Which fiction falls of itself to the ground, even from this, that it was unheard of in the early ages, and began to be introduced into theology in the thirteenth century; that is, after men preferred generally to act upon philosophical reasonings, and those very bad, before consulting the Fathers.

"But to this innovation is opposed, first, what is related in the Acts of the Apostles respecting that Council of Apostles, which the letter of St. Celestine to the Council of Ephesus, and

SECT.  
VI.

Declared  
by Bossuet  
to be a fic-  
tion of the  
thirteenth  
century.

Def., lib. 8.  
cap. 11, 12.

CHAP.  
VI.

the interlocution of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, proved to be as it were repeated and represented in all other Councils. But if any one say that, in this Council, the Apostles were not set by Christ to be true judges, but to be the counsellors of Peter, he is too ridiculous<sup>1</sup>.

“Secondly, is opposed that fact which we have proved, that the decrees and judgments of Roman Pontiffs *de Fide* were suspended by the convocation of an Ecumenical Council, were reconsidered by its authority, and were only approved and confirmed after examination made and judgment given. Which things undoubtedly prove that they sat there not as Counsellors of the Pope, but as judges of Papal decrees.

“And they must indeed be legitimately called together, that they may not meet tumultuously; but, when once called together, they judge by the authority of the Holy Spirit, not of the Pope; they pronounce anathemas, not by authority of the Pope, but of Christ; and we have seen this so often pressed upon us by the Acts, that we are weary of repeating it.

“Add to this that expression of the first Council of Arles to St. Sylvester: ‘Had you judged together with us, our assembly had exulted with greater joy:’ and in the very heading of the Council to the same Sylvester: ‘What we have decreed with common consent, we signify to your Charity.’ Relying then on this authority of their Priesthood, they judge concerning most important matters; that is, the observation of the Lord’s passover, that it may be kept on one day all over the world: concerning the non-iteration of Baptism, and the discipline of the Churches. Instances of this kind occur everywhere. But it is a known fact, that even by particular Councils, where the Pope presided, his decrees, even when present, were examined and confirmed by consent; the Fathers equally with him judged, decreed, defined, and we have seen this a thousand times written on the Acts.

<sup>1</sup> Bossuet is very moderate. St. Chrysostome says, (on Acts, Hom. 33,) “James was Bishop in Jerusalem, and so speaks last;” and presently, “There was no pride in the Church, but much good order. And see, after Peter,

Paul speaketh, and no one rebukes him: James waits and starts not out of his place, for he was entrusted with the government.” What would St. Chrysostome say to Bellarmine’s doctrine?

“But in a matter so clear, they have only one thing to object drawn out of antiquity, the saying of St. Innocent, ‘that Peter is the author of the Episcopal name and honour.’ And again, ‘whence the Episcopate itself and all the authority of that name sprung.’ And of St. Leo, ‘If He willed that anything should be enjoyed by the other heads (that is, the Apostles) in common with him (Peter), He never gave save through Peter whatever He denied not to the rest.’ And elsewhere also, ‘that Christ granted to the rest of the Apostles the ministry of preaching on this condition, that He poured into them, as into the whole body, His gifts from Peter, as from the head.’ Whence also came that expression of Optatus of Milevi: ‘For the good of unity, the blessed Peter was thought worthy to be preferred to all the Apostles, and alone received the keys of the kingdom of heaven to be imparted to the rest,’—and that of Gregory of Nyssa, ‘Through Peter He gave to the Bishops the keys of heavenly honours.’ And that of St. Cæsarius of Arles to Pope Symmachus: ‘As from the person of the blessed Apostle Peter the Episcopate takes its beginning, so is it necessary that by suitable rules of discipline your Holiness should plainly shew to every Church what they ought to observe.’

SECT.  
VI.Ep. S. Innoc.; in  
Op. S. Aug.,  
tom. 2. 618;  
see above,  
p. 123.  
Ibid.  
quoted  
above, p.  
122.S. Leo.  
Serm. in  
Anniv.  
Assumpt.,  
quoted  
above.  
Ep. 10.  
Optat. l. ix.  
contra Parmen.Greg. Nyss.,  
t. 2. 746.Cæsar. Arl.  
Epist. ad  
Symm.

“If they push these and such like expressions to the utmost, they will come to assert that the Apostles were appointed by Peter, not by Christ, or by Christ through Peter, but not by Him immediately and in person: as if any other but Christ called the Apostles, sent them, and endued them with heavenly power by the infusion of His Spirit; and Peter and not Christ said: ‘Go ye, teach, preach, baptize, receive, &c., and, As My Father sent Me, even so send I you.’

“I am aware that John of Turrecremata, and a few others, thinking that the words now quoted of St. Leo and others cannot be defended by them sufficiently, unless the Apostles also received their jurisdiction from St. Peter, have been hurried away even into this folly against the most manifest truth of the Gospel. Which fiction Bellarmine himself has confuted.

“But this being the greatest absurdity, it will appear

CHAP. VI. that merely what follows is the teaching of the Fathers quoted.

In what sense the ancients said that the Episcopate was from and through Peter.

John 20.  
22.  
Matt. 18.  
18.  
Matt. 16.  
19.

“First; the Episcopal authority and jurisdiction is contained in the keys, and in the power of binding and loosing, which is clear of itself.

“Secondly; it is evident from the Gospel History that Peter was the first in whom that power was shewn forth and appointed. For, although Christ said to all the Apostles, ‘Receive the Holy Ghost,’ and ‘whatsoever ye bind,’ &c., ‘whatsoever ye loose,’ &c., yet, what He said to Peter had gone before, ‘I will give to thee the keys,’ &c.

“Thirdly; both these two, that is, both what was said to Peter and what was said to the Apostles, proceed equally from Christ: for He who said to Peter, ‘I will give to thee,’ and ‘Whatsoever thou shalt bind,’ said also to the Apostles, ‘Receive ye,’ and ‘Whatsoever ye shall bind.’

“Fourthly; that is therefore true which Optatus says of Peter; ‘For the good of unity, he alone received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to be imparted to the rest.’ For, in truth, these which were given to Peter in Matt. xvi., were to be imparted afterwards to the Apostles, Matt. xviii. and John xx., but to be imparted not by Peter, but by Christ, as is clear.

“Fifthly; that also is true which Cæsarius says, ‘The Episcopate takes its beginning from Peter:’ he being the first in whom, through the ministry of binding and loosing, the Episcopal power was shewn forth, begun, entrusted.

“Sixthly; hence also is true what Innocent says,—‘that the Episcopate, and all the authority of that name, sprung from Peter,’ because he, first of all, was appointed or set forth as Bishop.

“Seventhly; for this cause Peter is called by the same Innocent the author of the Episcopate; not that he instituted it,—not that the Apostles received the power of binding and loosing from him,—for the Scriptures everywhere exclaim against this: but that from him was made the beginning of establishing that power among men, and of appointing or marking out the Episcopate.

“Eighthly; that the Apostles appointed, ordained, and consecrated Bishops and Presbyters to govern the Churches

through the whole world, by the authority not of Peter but of Christ: and that this is the source of the Episcopate communicated, as well as of ordinary jurisdiction.

“Ninthly; to make this clearer, and that it may be easily perceived what means that expression, ‘through Peter,’ which we read in Leo, we must review the tradition of the ancient Church, drawn from the Scriptures themselves.

“It is plain, then, that when the Lord asked the Apostles, ‘Whom say men that I, the Son of Man, am?’ Peter, the chief of all, answered in the person of all, ‘Thou art the Christ:’ and afterwards Christ said to Peter, thus representing them, ‘I will give to thee,’ . . . ‘Whatsoever thou shalt bind:’ by which it appears that, in these words not Peter only, but in Peter, their chief, and answering for all, all the Apostles and their successors were endued with the Episcopal power and jurisdiction.

“All which Augustine includes when he writes, ‘All being asked, Peter alone answered, Thou art Christ, and to him is said, I will give to thee, &c., as if he alone received the power of binding and loosing, the case really being, that he said that singly for all, and received this together with all, as representing unity.’ Than which nothing can be clearer.”

He then quotes passages from St. Cyprian, “St. Augustine’s guide in this,” which I have already brought; adding, “In Peter, therefore, singly, Cyprian acknowledges that all Bishops were instituted; and the Episcopate, as he everywhere attests, being one in the whole world, was not without reason instituted in one. And this was done to establish the ‘origin of unity beginning from one,’ as the same Cyprian teaches.

“But most of all does Augustine set forth and inculcate the common tradition. For, not content with having said that once in the place above mentioned, he is very full in setting forth this view of that doctrine. Hence he says, ‘In Peter was the sacrament of the Church;’” and other passages which I have already quoted. “Whence, everywhere in his books against the Donatists, he says, ‘The keys are given to Unity.’

“The sum then, is this. The Apostles and Pastors of

Quoted  
above,  
p. 117.

Doctrine  
of SS. Cyp-  
rian and  
Augustine  
on this.

CHAP.  
VI.

Churches being both one and many,—one, in ecclesiastical Communion, as they feed one flock ; many, being distributed through the whole world, and having allotted to them each their own part of the one flock ; therefore, power was given to them by a two-fold grant of Christ : first, in that they are one, and that was done in Peter their chief, bearing the figure and the person of unity, to which has reference that saying in the singular number, ‘I will give to thee,’ and ‘Whatsoever thou shalt bind,’ &c. : secondly, in that they are many, in the plural number, to which that has reference, ‘Receive ye,’ and ‘Whatsoever ye shall bind :’ but both, personally and immediately from Christ ; since He who said, ‘I will give to thee,’ as to one, also said, ‘Receive ye,’ as to many : nevertheless, that saying came first, in which power is given to all, in that they are one ; because Christ willed that unity most of all should be recommended in His Church.

“By this all is made clear ; not only Bishops, but also Apostles, have received the keys and the power from Christ, in Peter, and, in their own manner, through Peter, who, in the name of all, received that for all, as bearing the figure and the person of all.

Continuity  
of the Tra-  
dition in  
the middle  
ages.

“This tradition descended to posterity. It was comprehended in few words by Christian Drutmar, an eminent writer of the ninth century, in his exposition of Matthew, at that very place, ‘Whatsoever thou shalt bind,’ &c. ‘This we rightly believe was granted as well to Peter, as to all the Apostles, and their successors, who hold the same place in the Church.’ After proving this by the words of the Gospel he adds, ‘But that this commission appears to be said as if to Peter singly, is done, because he spoke for all, and in him all were answered.’

Fathers of  
Châlons.

Mansi 17.  
299. D.

“The Fathers of Châlons, following this tradition, towards the end of the same century, that is in the year 875, . . . thus decree : ‘By the authority which we in the person of blessed Peter have received from the Lord Jesus Christ our High-Priest.’ Which we find repeated in so many words in the year 878, in the confirmation of the same privilege, with the subscription of Hincmar of Rheims and others.

Ib. 15.  
App., 594.  
A.

“We read the same in the capitulars of Charlemagne col-

lected by Anseghisus. 'We order that no one, which God forbid, act against Bishops lightly,' that is, without reverence, 'or severely,' that is, with contumely, 'which involves the danger of all our Empire: that all may recognise the name, power, vigour, and dignity of the Priesthood, which may be easily understood by the words of the Lord, in which He speaks to blessed Peter, whose place Bishops hold, Whatever thou shalt bind,' &c. Bishops are said to hold the place of Peter, because, receiving their power in the person of Peter, they are considered to have the office and place of Peter, as the Roman Pontiffs themselves act in the office and place of Peter, and everywhere call themselves Vicars of Peter, with a power greater than others, but not in truth more derived from Christ."

So Archbishop Hincmar says in his instructions to Archdeacons, "The blessed Apostle Peter, whose stead in the Church Bishops discharge."

"Whence Bishops, who say that they are in the place of Peter, also call themselves everywhere Vicars of Christ, not with the same extent as the Roman Pontiffs, but with a power equally derived from Christ. Hence they excommunicate 'by virtue of the Holy Spirit, upon the authority of the blessed Apostle Peter,' understanding that what was said to Peter was said likewise to themselves. It is irksome to enumerate innumerable such passages, which occur on all sides in reading: from which it is indeed evident, that all Bishops received from Christ the power which they hold in the person of Peter representing them all. Nor would you therefore say that Peter received nothing above the rest, because he only prefigured the rest, for we must remember what Augustine said, 'That Peter bore the person of the Church on account of the Primacy which he held among the Disciples.' And elsewhere, 'Peter bearing the figure of the Church, holding the first rank of the Apostolate,' &c., which he carefully inculcates, and the other Fathers with one mouth proclaim. For this he had in distinction from others, that, being the chief of all, he received himself, and transmitted to his successors in principal right that common deposit of power flowing directly and immediately from Christ: so that all other Bishops must remember, that as

SECT.  
VI.  
Capitulars  
of Charle-  
magne.

Hincmar.  
Quoted by  
Launoy,  
Ep., lib. 3.

Council of  
Vienne,  
Can. 1.  
Mansi 18.  
p. 121. D.  
anno 892.

CHAP. VI. they were first in Peter's person, as the head of unity, designated, formed, and appointed, so they are to preserve unity and peace by reverencing and respecting Peter's successor: a duty, I suppose, which can only be suspended by the successor of Peter assuming to himself the place of Christ.

## SECT. VII.

The "invention" of Bishops receiving their jurisdiction from the Pope.  
Lib. 8. cap. 14.

HE then shews that this tradition had gone down even to his own times: "This holy and Apostolic doctrine of the Episcopal jurisdiction and power proceeding immediately from, and instituted by, Christ, the Gallic Church hath most zealously retained." "Therefore, that very late invention, that Bishops receive their jurisdiction from the Pope, and are, as it were, vicars of him, ought to be banished from Christian schools, as unheard of for twelve centuries.

"How strong and ancient our own view is, the vain attempts of others shew, and especially of that anonymous writer on the Liberties. For, in order to leave no means of vilifying the Episcopal dignity untouched, he has occupied the whole of his eighth book with this question, searching on all sides for authors who follow this degenerate view. And schoolmen indeed and authors of the latest period he easily finds, and praises abundance of them, but from antiquity he has produced nothing at all save those expressions about Peter which I have quoted: and all learned men see how wide of the point these are.

John of Ravenna's words, S. Greg., tom. 2. p. 668. E.

"He quotes indeed John of Ravenna, who writes to St. Gregory of the Roman Church, 'which transmits its rights to the Universal Church.' But these words mean nothing else, than that the rights of all Churches are also protected by the authority of the Roman Church, and that all whose rights are injured recur thither, which is indisputable. But should any one think that these words mean, that the rights of the Episcopate flow from the Pope, not from Christ, assuredly he would suppose that John of Ravenna gives more to Gregory, than Gregory claims for himself: for he claims

nothing else for Peter his founder, than that 'the care of the whole Church and its Chiefship be committed' to him by Christ: that is, that he rule the whole Church in the mode that it was ordered by Christ: not surely that he imagine all the rights of the Church to be transmitted from himself, not from Christ. The same Gregory writes thus of himself, and the rest of his brethren, the Bishops of the Churches: 'What therefore do we Bishops say, who have received the place of honour from the humility of our Lord, and yet imitate the pride of the enemy himself?' That is, he numbers himself among the rest, who equally receive from Christ the place of honour: he pretends not to be one who assigns all their rights to the rest. Where likewise he writes, 'Surely Peter, the first of the Apostles, is a member of the holy Universal Church; Paul, Andrew, John, what else are they but the heads of particular communities,' appointed surely by Christ, not by Peter, whence he adds, 'And yet all are members under One Head.' From which Head, that is, Christ, they derive all their power, not from Peter, who, though in his own manner the head of all, yet, in respect of Christ, is a member together with them; and virtue and authority are given by Christ to all alike, and though not in an equal *degree* to all, yet to all in an equal *manner*.

S E C T.  
VII.  
Ibid., 748. B.  
And those  
of St. Gre-  
gory.

Ibid., p.  
744. 743.

"Let them not, therefore, think that they honour the Roman Pontiff in wishing that Bishops should owe to him, rather than to Christ, that heavenly jurisdiction which they exercise. Let them remember Gregory's words: 'Nor do I consider that an honour, by which I acknowledge that my brethren lose their own: for my honour is the honour of the Universal Church. . . . Then am I truly honoured, when the true honour is not denied to each one in his degree.'

Ibid., 919.  
D.

"Nothing to the purpose is that which the anonymous author writes about the Patriarchate of Alexandria and Antioch set up by the Apostle Peter. . . .

Groundless  
Ultra-mon-  
tane asser-  
tions.

"He states, that Metropolitan Churches, specially in Gaul, derived their authority from the Supreme Pontiff. How does this help his cause? Paul surely appointed Titus Metropolitan in Crete, and ordered him to place Bishops in the several Churches. Must Peter have interposed here also?

CHAP. Did Peter set up the Sees of Ephesus, Cesarea, Heraclea,  
 VI. and other Primatial Sees in the East, which had a great number not merely of Bishops, but of Metropolitans, under them ?

“ But for his assertion, that the Episcopate was propagated through the whole world by Peter alone and his successors, it is an assertion without proof: as if the other Apostles did nothing. For his assertion, that the distribution into Dioceses, and the assigning of a peculiar flock to every Pastor, was done only by the authority of Peter; that whatever the rest of the Apostles, even Paul in Crete, did and ordered, had force through the express, or tacit, consent of Peter and his successors, this I think more worthy of contempt than refutation, and wonder that a serious person could give utterance to it, where learning is so cultivated.

“ Now for his delighting in such reasonings as these, Bishops are subject to the Pope; Bishops may be deposed and restored by the Pope, so that, however, he maintain the Canons; the Episcopal jurisdiction may be separated from the bare Orders or Character, therefore it is from the Pope; Bishops receive an unequal jurisdiction, and one not the same with that of the Pope; therefore they receive it not from Christ: as if Christ might not have tempered and distributed by different measure and manner, and in a certain order, the honour and power diffused immediately from himself: this is not worthy even of being mentioned.

“ Nor is the following of a better stamp. ‘ In a monarchy the supreme prince distributes their offices to others, even though princes, and confers on them jurisdiction.’ For the point to be proved was, that the Ecclesiastical monarchy, set up under Christ the chief Monarch, was regulated entirely according to the form of a secular monarchy, which is most false. This, I say, was the point to be proved by Scripture and tradition: and not the form of the Christian commonwealth to be shaped out of one’s own imagination, and by unsubstantial reasonings.

“ But far the most absurd is what he presently states, that ‘ jurisdiction is from him who confers the title:’ also that it is derived from the Apostles and their successors, who made the distribution into dioceses or parishes, founded

Churches, established Pastors, assigned a people. For to whom is it not plain, that countries were divided and persons appointed by the Apostles and Apostolic men: but that jurisdiction was conferred by Christ Himself? But if we make a play of words, and contend that what is by the instrumentality of men is not immediately from Christ, then it follows that the Papal jurisdiction is not from Christ. For the Roman Pontiff is elected by men, is ordained by men, as much as the rest. But who assigned to him the Roman Diocese, of which he is the proper Bishop? From whom received he this Episcopal jurisdiction? Was it from Peter, and from predecessors already taken to heaven? or, I suppose, from himself as Pope, but not from Christ? Away with the dreams of madness: let these groundless reasonings vanish.

“Bellarmine mentions Pontifical Bulls given for the institution of Bishops. Nor does he produce anything else:” (i. e. of weight:) “but he does not remember how modern and of the last period these are; nor that they do not apply to the Greeks, nor the other Orientals, whom the” (Roman) “Catholic Church has so often received without the condition of their afterwards accepting the Bulls: nay, whom she has left to their ancient custom.

“Not that I shrink from the expression of Felix III.: ‘By whom, that is, the Apostolic See, through the gift of Christ the dignity of all Priests is strengthened;’ not that it instituted all the Bishops, which is most false; but because by a sort of privilege it rejected from its Communion those who were instituted wrongly and contrary to Canonical rule, while by communicating with them it strengthened them.

“As for the objection about the three Patriarchs being confirmed by the Apostolic See, who were then to confirm the rest of their Bishops, even were it most certain and ancient, and derived from the very origin of Christianity, what has it to do with us? it being certain that the Church of Carthage, and those of Ephesus, Heraclea, and Cesarea in Capadocia, before they were subjected to the See of Constantinople, and others, enjoyed the right of an absolutely free ordination. And that this was enjoyed likewise by the

CHAP. Gallican and Spanish Churches will prove itself to equitable  
 VI. judges, if they search the ancient Canons of both Churches. But let them say if these had force, or not.

“We have often seen the election and institution even of Roman Pontiffs, on the casual arising of any uncertainty, acknowledged and confirmed by the consent, authority, and decree, of Councils and Churches, and that many Pontiffs, intruded, simoniacal, and null, by the confession of Baronius himself, yet exercised the highest authority: because the Catholic Church at least with tacit consent approved their institution and acts, and held them valid. Shall we therefore say that the Roman Pontiff’s jurisdiction is from the Church? But I stay longer than is needed on a plain point. For I am assured that no one who has any smattering of antiquity will dissent; and that there never would have been men, who derived all jurisdiction in the Church from the Pope’s person, had there not also been men, who, affecting to hold and exercise all powers extraordinarily, felt that they must at all costs diminish the power of Bishops.”

Bearing of  
 this ques-  
 tion of  
 jurisdiction  
 on our sub-  
 ject.

Now it is precisely “this very late invention, unheard of for twelve centuries,” this claim which, according to Bossuet, St. Gregory did not make, but reject, which “he wonders that any serious person could give utterance to,” which “is not worthy even of being mentioned,” which is “a dream of madness,” “a shaping of the Christian commonwealth out of one’s own imagination,” which the original rights of the Oriental Church, such as were not even sought to be altered by the Roman, utterly nullified, which “no one who has a smattering of antiquity” can maintain, this, and no other, is the very claim which is urged against the Church of England, and is so set forth at present in all its enormity. Unless this be true, the position of the Church of England in itself, supposing her to be clear of heresy, with which at present I have nothing to do, is impregnable.

Such is the most Catholic interpretation by which Bossuet sets in harmony with the teaching of all antiquity a few expressions, which are all that I have been able to find that are even capable of being forced into accordance with the present Papal system, and which, as soon as they are so

forced, contradict the whole history of Councils, and the whole life of the most illustrious Fathers. SECT.  
VII.

## SECT. VIII.

ANOTHER great authority, the Canonist Van Espen, says :  
 “ We must observe, that the Lord Christ, in instituting His Apostles, did not separate from each other Episcopal Order and Episcopal Jurisdiction, but willed that the exercise of that spiritual Jurisdiction and power should dwell even primarily in them. ‘ Receive,’ He says, ‘ the Holy Ghost : as My Father sent Me, even so send I you. Go ye, and teach all nations : whose sins ye remit, they are remitted to them.’

Tom. 5.  
p. 451.  
Edit. 1777.  
Colonie.  
Episcopal  
Order and  
Jurisdiction  
united by  
Christ.

“ Which rule the Church subsequently observed in ordaining Bishops, successors of the Apostles : whence even to this day, in the consecration of a Bishop, the book of the holy Gospel is delivered to him by the ordainer with this salutary and necessary warning : ‘ Receive the Gospel, and go, preach to the people committed to thee.’ And the consecrating Pontiff himself thus prays to God in the Preface, as it runs in the Roman Pontifical, and also in the Roman Ordinal : ‘ Give to him, O Lord, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that he may use, not boast of, the power which Thou givest to edification and not to destruction. Whatsoever he shall bind on earth, &c. Grant to him, O Lord, the Episcopal chair, for the *ruling* of Thy Church, and *people committed to him*. Be Thou to him authority, and power, and strength.’ Would it not in truth be mocking God, if such charges were given at consecration in the solemn rite of ordaining, and asked of God in prayers poured forth and directed with a loud voice to heaven ; and in the mean time neither the Pontiff ordaining, nor the Bishop to be ordained, should intend to become, or to do, what is ordered, or to obtain of God what they pray for ? Observe likewise that it is hence not obscurely inferred, that Bishops receive their Jurisdiction from God Himself, but not from the Roman Pontiff.

Proof from  
the Roman  
Ordinal.

“ Moreover, for ten or eleven centuries, the Episcopal Order or Character, and the Episcopal Jurisdiction, or spiritual power and authority to rule the Church of God, were

This during  
ten or  
eleven  
centuries  
was un-  
doubted.

CHAP.  
VI.

considered so united, and, so to speak, indivisible, that by the sacred Canons those ordinations were termed *null* and *void*, in which, though the Episcopal Character was impressed, yet, on account of their faultiness, Episcopal Jurisdiction or authority was withdrawn by the Church from those faultily ordained. So that these Bishops, though truly ordained, were degraded to the rank of the Laity, and were not considered Bishops even so far as the name.

“Thus the Fathers of the Nicene Council decreed in their 6th Canon. If any one, they say, be made a Bishop contrary to the vote of the Metropolitan, the great Council hath decreed that he *should not be a Bishop*. Where those holy Fathers wish these two things to be synonymous, not to have Episcopal rule or Jurisdiction, and not to be a Bishop.

“Therefore the holy Fathers thought that Episcopal Order should not be conferred without Jurisdiction, being things which the Lord Christ seemed to have closely joined together. Moreover the name itself of Bishop has more a sound of Jurisdiction than of Order: for it signifies, the inspecting, watching over, caring for, a thing: and thus the holy Fathers called him one set over, presiding. . . .

“And this discipline of not separating Order and Jurisdiction even in the eleventh century so prevailed, that Cardinal Humbert bears witness, that he who had not a Clergy and people to preside over, was called not a true but a false Bishop.”

Elsewhere he says, “And thus those places, ‘I will give to thee the keys,’ and ‘Feed My sheep,’ understood as they ought to be according to the unanimous consent of the holy Fathers, not only do not favour that opinion about the plenitude of the Pontiff’s power, but utterly destroy it.

“For it is well known that, according to the holy Fathers, and specially St. Augustine, in places innumerable, and particularly on John, . . . ‘Peter, when he received the keys, signified the holy Church,’ and again . . . ‘The Lord gave power to Peter, as a type of unity.’ So that the Lord spake not to Peter singly, because He gave to him a greater power of the keys than to the rest of the Apostles, but in order that the Church, whose figure, and person, as it were, Peter was then bearing, might be shewn to be one.

Tom. 5.  
458, 459.  
The pas-  
sages of  
Scripture  
do not  
favour the  
Papal plen-  
itude of  
power.

“And this the holy Fathers well understood from the very text of the Gospel, for, when the Lord speaks to Peter, He promises to give Him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and yet, when He fulfils this promise after the resurrection, He speaks no longer to Peter singly, but to all the Apostles in common, and gives the keys, saying, ‘As My Father sent Me,’” &c.

SECT.  
VIII.

See the  
preface.

He goes on to prove this from passages of St. Cyprian and Pope Gelasius which I have already quoted, adding, “The Roman Pontiff therefore hath not received from Christ that plenary power, which, though it be parted into streams, remains for ever in him as the supreme head of the Church and the fountain of Jurisdiction, but this belongs to the Church alone, according to St. Cyprian . . . ‘The Church is one,’ &c. St. Cyprian in express terms . . . assigns everywhere the one and only Church as the head, origin, mother, and source, from which all streams spring: of which Church he elsewhere pronounces, that she alone holds and possesses *all the power* of her Spouse and Lord.”

Ep. 73.

A little further on he adds: “The sum of what has been adduced in this section is, that the Lord in promising the keys to Peter, and charging him to feed His sheep, did not appoint the supreme Pontiff the source of all Jurisdiction, whence it is derived to inferior ministers, but the Church herself, His Spouse, of whom Peter was the figure: that all Bishops in the person of the Apostles received from Christ an equal power of feeding the flock, under the authority, however, of the Church our mother, who, divinely instructed by her Bridegroom, prescribes to every one the manner and order of executing his ministry: that therefore, saving the pre-eminence of the First See, all the Prelates of the Church are equally the Vicars of Christ, taking care of the whole flock each according to their own measure, all succeeding to the Apostles, all being leaders and rams of the flock, prime members of the Shepherd, High-Priests, Fellow-Priests, Fellow-Ministers, and Brethren.”

Tom. 5.  
462.

Statement  
of the true  
doctrine.

Van Espen sets himself to prove at length that the Ultramontane Papal Idea is the very thing rejected by St. Gregory, and called by him profane and antichristian.

“They utterly take away and destroy that parity of the

Tom. 5.  
p. 473.

CHAP.  
VI.

The Ultra-  
montane  
Papal Idea  
that which  
was reject-  
ed by St.  
Gregory.

Episcopal dignity which was instituted by Christ. For according to their principles and maxims there is no longer any appearance of unity in the Episcopate, and in all Bishops, who, whether the Roman, or of some other place, are in that quality equal.

“For, if you regard origin, they assert that the Roman Pontiff in the person of Peter received the fulness of power of the keys, and original authority ; but that from the Pontiff, as from an ever-flowing fountain, all Jurisdiction is divided into streams, and dispensed to all other Bishops, while in the mean time the plenitude of the power received from Christ remains in him undiminished. But as to the exercise of the Episcopal Order and Power, that the rest of the Bishops had not, nor ever had, authority to institute or ordain other Bishops, except by permission of the Roman Pontiff, whose supreme power to set up, confirm, or ordain Bishops through the whole earth has never been called into doubt. That every Bishop receives from the Pontiff such and such a territory and particular diocese, within the limits of which his power is confined, but that to the Roman Pontiff alone the whole Church, or the whole flock of Christ, is committed. That, wherever he goes, he acts as immediate Pastor of all the faithful, as if he were in his own Church. That Jurisdiction is assigned and marked out by the supreme Pontiff to every Bishop : while his own Episcopal authority cannot be limited even by General Councils. Lastly, that no Bishop preserves Jurisdiction or pastoral power against the good pleasure of the Roman Pontiff ; that no one without his will can exercise Pontifical rights, but that he can everywhere, even against the will of Bishops, discharge the Episcopal function in the diocese of all, either by himself, or by others, can suppress or exalt Bishops, as his reason dictates.”

Now no reader of history can doubt that the above is a faithful expression of that one consistent Idea, admirable for its energy and completeness, which began to be set forth by the great Pontiff Nicholas I., was systematized by Pope Gregory VII., culminated in Pope Innocent III., but, however attacked and struggled against within the Roman Communion itself, has remained ever since the real basis

This the  
real Papal  
Idea: its  
merit and  
defect.

and principle of action in the governing power: an Idea great, large, magnificent, giving scope to the warmest affections, concentrating in a marvellous unity the efforts of its adherents, rested in by numberless devoted minds, defended by the blood of many a true martyr, which has created the Dominican and Franciscan Orders, and found its most terrible champion in the Great Company, but of which, if there be truth in the first eight hundred years of the Church's history, one thing must be said, that it is founded on usurpation and falsehood.

SECT.  
VIII.

Let us consider one or two particulars. "There is no one, Van Espen proceeds, "who does not see that according to such opinions and views all Prelates throughout the world, not merely as to their Episcopate, that is, setting apart the adventitious prerogative of the Primacy, are not equal to the Roman Bishop, but likewise, in comparison of the Roman Pontiff, who is gifted with such a plenitude of Episcopal power, vanish into nothing, inasmuch as out of that brimming ocean they only receive a few streamlets: whence Desirant, a friend of my opponents in this matter, who was rewarded in the city, (i. e. Rome,) did not hesitate to assert in a thesis, May 11, 1683, concerning the Church and *the Pontiff of the city and the world*, that a hundred thousand assembled Bishops would not equal the authority of the single Roman Pontiff."

It destroys the equality of the Episcopate.

This is no exaggeration, but follows most simply and logically from the Papal Idea.

Now "there are two manners in which the term Universal Bishop may be understood, one, that he who is called Universal be understood to be sole Bishop of all Christian cities, so that the rest be not Bishops, but only Vicars of him, who is styled Universal Bishop, and in this sense the name is truly profane, sacrilegious, and antichristian, and of this sense Gregory speaks. . . In another sense he may be called Universal Bishop, who has the cure of the whole Church, but a general one, so as not to exclude particular Bishops. And in this sense it is proved that it may be applied to the Roman Pontiff according to Gregory's mind."

Papendrecht, quoted from Belarmino. Van Espen, tom. 5. 479. Two senses of the word Universal Bishop.

"Now our opponents" (those who hold the statements I have quoted above, i. e. the real Papal Idea) "set forth the

CHAP.  
VI.

Proof that  
the Papal  
Idea re-  
quires the  
reprehensi-  
ble sense to  
be taken.

1. Vicars  
are insti-  
tuted by  
their Prin-  
cipal.

Roman Pontiff as Universal Bishop in such a sense that all the rest, though, so far as name goes, they be called proper and ordinary Bishops of each Diocese, yet in reality are nothing else but Vicars of the Roman Pontiff.

“1. It belongs not to Ordinaries, but to Vicars, to be instituted by their principal, in whom dwells the property of the Jurisdiction bestowed on them, and its original authority, and so, according to our opponents, all Bishops are the Vicars of the Roman Pontiff, who alone possesses original authority to institute Bishops everywhere in the world. But, according to the conclusion of the learned, all Bishops are Vicars of Christ, and Vicars of the Church, as of her who received from Christ her husband the property of the keys, and in whose hands the original authority resides.

2. Depend  
on their  
Principal's  
disposal.

“2. In like manner it belongs not to Ordinaries, but to Vicars, to depend on the will and disposal of their Principal in the exercise of the charge conferred on them. Now all Bishops, if we believe our opponents, have not only received the Episcopate from the supreme Pontiff, but depend on his will and disposal in the exercise of their Episcopal charge. For according to them no one can duly exercise Pontifical rights without his pleasure, ‘whom the Lord Christ, the Founder of the Church, willed to be on earth His representative and manager: whose authority,’ according to Vaira, ‘is as great as that of Christ, and who is pre-eminent as Christ, in the whole world and in the whole Church.’ As therefore all Bishops are Vicars of Christ, so our opponents must admit that they are at the same time Vicars of the supreme Pontiff.

“But, according to the conclusion of the learned, as all Bishops in the government of their own diocese depend on Christ, and the Church His Bride, to whose rules and canons all, even the Roman Bishops, are equally subject; so all are Vicars of Christ and the Church.

3. Receive  
a derived  
Jurisdic-  
tion.

“3. It belongs not to Ordinaries, but to Vicars, to be called only to a part of the charge, and to receive a certain derived Jurisdiction, while the source itself and plenitude of power remains with their Principal. But now this is the very thing which our opponents will have to hold good in the case of all Bishops, unto whom from the Roman Pontiff, as

from a perpetual fountain, Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction is derived and parted into streams, while in the mean time the plenitude itself of power remains without diminution in that Supreme Head. Consequently, according to our opponents, Bishops are mere Vicars of the Roman Pontiff.

S E C T.  
V I I I.

“On the contrary, according to the proofs in the conclusion of the learned, since not the Roman Pontiff, but the Church, is the fountain of all Jurisdiction and spiritual power, all Bishops who receive their authority from that fountain are Vicars not of the Roman Pontiff, but of the Church.

“4. It belongs not to Ordinaries, but to Vicars, to be liable to deposition at the will of their Principal. Since therefore, according to the opinion of our opponents, the Roman Pontiff can suppress Bishops at his pleasure, when he shall see it to be for the good of the Church, it follows that they are all Vicars of the Roman Pontiff.

4. Are  
liable to  
be deposed  
by their  
Principal.

“On the contrary, according to the conclusion of the learned, all are Vicars of the Church, who alone has the original power of removing them from the Episcopate, so that not even the supreme Pontiff can do anything against the rights of his fellow-Bishops, confirmed by the Canons of the holy Church.”

A most striking illustration of the above proof is furnished by the deposition of eighty French Bishops by Pope Pius VII. in his concordat with Napoleon. They were in full and undoubted Canonical possession of their Sees: they were all confessors: but the Pope judged it to be for the good of the Church that they should within ten days, without remonstrance or deliberation, resign their Sees, and successors be nominated to them by the civil power. He ordered them to do so, and those who did not were accounted schismatics.

The Pope's Bull runs, “With the advice of many of our venerable brethren, the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, we expressly deprive of force<sup>1</sup> every agreement whatsoever of the legitimate Archbishops, Bishops, and Chapters of the respective Churches, and of all other Ordinaries whatsoever; and we interdict them for ever from all exercise whatsoever of any whatsoever Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; declaring to be of no force whatsoever any of them may attempt; to the effect that those Churches, and their respective dioceses,

See L'Abbé  
Baruch.  
Sul Papa  
ed i suoi  
diritti reli-  
giosi, &c.  
Tom. 4.  
p. 11.  
Venezia,  
1804.

<sup>1</sup> Deroga-  
mas.

CHAP.  
VI.

whether whole or in part, shall be considered, and shall be, absolutely free, according to the new limits to be assigned to them, in order that we may appoint concerning them in the manner we shall hereafter indicate."

5. Must give way to their Principal.

"5. It belongs not to Ordinaries, but to Vicars, to be bound to give way to their Principal, when present, in the discharge of the functions of the office entrusted to them. But our opponents will have it that the Roman Pontiff acts in the whole world as in his own diocese, whom no Bishop in his own diocese can refuse without a crime, or anticipate or hinder him in the exercise of the keys. Therefore they are mere Vicars of the Roman Pontiff.

6. And to those whom he delegates.

"6. Again, it belongs not to Ordinaries, but to Vicars, to be hindered in their charge by another afterwards delegated by their Principal. Now our opponents maintain that the Roman Pontiff can exercise pastoral acts according to his pleasure by others, who hold his commission, in the dioceses of other Bishops, even against their will. It follows then that all other Bishops are mere Vicars of the Roman Pontiff.

7. Act in a diocese not properly their own.

"7. Further, according to our opponents, *the Universal Church* is committed to the Roman Pontiff alone, he is everywhere *immediate* Pastor and *Ordinary*. Therefore, according to them, if they would speak candidly and sincerely, all other Bishops act as in a diocese not their own, and exercise only a Vicarial power, inasmuch as the same diocese, according to the holy Canons, can by no means receive more than one *immediate* and *ordinary* Bishop. In reality, therefore, our opponents make all other Bishops Vicars of the Roman Pontiff: and so, according to the interpretation which Baronius and Bellarmine give, and their own, of the term Universal, in the sense in which it is profane and antichristian, they rush upon that precipice of ruinous presumption, from which St. Gregory and so many venerable Pontiffs before and after him recoiled with horror, rejecting even utterly that very term of ambiguous meaning, lest they might seem in any way to detract from the rank of their fellow-Bishops."

## CHAPTER VII.

## SECT. I.

Now there is no doubt that Bellarmine's doctrine is the true logical development of the Papal Theory; it alone has consistency and completeness; it alone is the adequate expression of that prodigious power which was allowed to enthroned itself in the Church during the middle ages: it would fain account for it and justify it. Grant but its postulate, that the Pope is the sole Vicar of Christ, and all which it requires must follow. On the other hand, that school which ranks Bossuet at its head, and which sought to limit, in some degree, by the Canons the power of the Roman Pontiff, and maintained that Bishops were, *jure divino*, successors of the Apostles, in a real, not in a fictitious sense, however well founded in what it maintained on the one side, was certainly inconsistent. It gave either too much or too little to the Roman See;—too much, if its own declarations about the succession of Bishops and the authority of General Councils be true, and founded in antiquity, as we believe; too little, if the Pope be indeed the only Vicar of Christ on earth, and the supreme Ruler of His Church; for then these maxims put their partisans very nearly into the position of rebels, and, in truth, brought the Gallican Church to the brink of a schism, in 1682. However this may be, that school is extinct; the Ultra-montane theory alone has now life and vigour in the Roman Church. It seems to absorb into itself all earnest and self-denying minds, while the other is left to that treacherous conservatism, which would use the Church of Christ as a system of police, for the security of worldly interests. What the Ultra-montane theory is, we see from Bellarmine. It proclaims that the government of the Church is a monarchy, concentrating in one person all the powers bestowed by Christ upon the Apostles. In this the student of history is bound to declare, that it stands in point-blank contradiction to the decrees of General Councils,

Bellar-  
mine's doc-  
trine the  
true logical  
develop-  
ment of the  
Papal  
Theory.  
Inconsist-  
ence of  
Bossuet's  
school.

Bellar-  
mine's doc-  
trine con-  
trary to the  
practice of

CHAP.  
VII.  
the Church  
in the times  
of the Seven  
Ecumenical  
Councils.  
Bossuet,  
Def., &c.  
lib. 8.  
cap. 20.

to the sentiments of the Fathers, and to the whole practice of the Church during the times of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, that is, so long as the East and West acted together. Well may Bossuet ask, "if the infallible authority of the Roman Pontiff is of force by itself before the consent of the Church,—to what purpose was it that Bishops should be summoned from the farthest regions of the earth, at the cost of such fatigues and expense, and Churches be deprived of their Pastors, if the whole power resided in the Roman Pontiff? If what he believed or taught was immediately the supreme and irrevocable law, why did he not himself pronounce sentence? Or if he pronounced it, why are Bishops called together and wearied out, to do again what is already done, and to pass a judgment on the supreme judgment of the Church? Whereas this is not done without reason. But all Christians have imbibed with their very Faith the conviction, that, in important dissensions, the whole Church ought to be convoked and heard. All therefore understand that the certain, deliberate, and complete declaration of the truth is seated not in the Pope alone, but in the Church spread everywhere." "This too is certain, that when General Councils have been holden, the sentence of the Roman Pontiff has generally preceded them; for undoubtedly Celestine, Leo, Agatho, Gregory the Second, Adrian the First, had pronounced sentence, when the Third, Fourth, Sixth, Seventh Councils were held. What was desired therefore was, not a Council for the Pontiff about to give judgment, but, after he had given judgment, the force of a certain and insuperable authority."

To which we may add, that, as the above-mentioned Councils passed judgments in accordance with the previous sentence of the Roman Bishops, so the Fifth Ecumenical Council, held against the will of Pope Vigilius, passed a judgment opposed to his already promulgated: to which contrary judgment that Pope, admitting his own error, afterwards consented.

See the deposition of the French Bishops above, p. 439.

Of course I quote Bellarmine not as an individual, but as the exponent of the Ultra-montane Idea, *the truth of which is necessary to justify the Roman See in its Acts*, and according to which the Roman Communion has been actually

governed, since the great victory which the Papacy obtained over the Episcopate at the Council of Trent. From that time, by the cessation of General Western Councils, and by the increasing secularization and hostility of the European governments, more and more power has been accumulated in the hands of the Pope, until it can no longer be doubted that the Latin Communion, whatever remnant of the old spirit be still struggling for existence within it, is become a pure monarchy. Yet was this victory not won without a severe struggle. All through the middle ages, alongside of that vast development of Papal power, a strong sense of the Church's original government, and of the supreme authority belonging to General Councils, was kept alive: and, little more than a hundred years before the Council of Trent, it seemed as if the Episcopate would reassert its dormant rights. The great Council of Constance, esteemed by Roman Catholics Ecumenical, and wanting no authority which the Pope's assent and confirmation can give it, has condemned in absolute terms the Ultra-montane Idea: it has declared that the government of the Church is *not* a monarchy, for that the Bishop of Rome owes *obedience*, like every other Bishop, to the decree of his brethren assembled in a General Council. Every Ultra-montane writer would erase from the Church's archives a Canon affirming that great truth, though it be that of a Council which he believes to be Ecumenical, and knows to have been confirmed by the Pope. It runs thus:

The Ultra-montane Theory formally condemned by the Council of Constance.

“In the name of the holy and undivided Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

“This holy Synod of Constance, making a General Council, legitimately assembled in the Holy Ghost, unto the praise of Almighty God, for the extirpation of the schism itself, and the union and reformation of the Church of God in its head and members, in order to obtain more easily, securely, and freely, the union and reformation of the Church of God, orders, defines, decrees, and declares, as follows:

“And first it declares, that being itself legitimately assembled in the Holy Ghost, forming a General Council, and representing the Catholic Church, *it holds its power immediately*

CHAP. VII. *from Christ, which power every one of whatsoever rank, or dignity, even though it be the Papal, is bound to obey in these things which pertain to Faith, and the extirpation of the aforesaid schism, and the reformation of the aforesaid Church in its head and members.*

“It also declares that every one, of whatsoever condition, rank, or dignity, even the Papal, who contumaciously despises *obedience* to the commands, statutes and rules, or precepts of this sacred Synod, *and of whatsoever other General Council legitimately assembled*, on the aforesaid points, or on what pertains to them, either done, or to be done, be, unless he repent, subjected to fitting penitence and duly punished, even by recurring, if need be, to other lawful remedies.”

Supreme and infallible power is here denied to the Roman See, and obedience is declared to be due from it *to every General Council*. The Ultra-montane Theory says, “The ordinary jurisdiction of Bishops descends immediately from the Pope:” “the government of the Church is monarchical, therefore all authority resides in one, and from him is derived unto the rest.” The Council of Constance decrees that it “holds its power immediately from Christ, which power even the Pope is bound to obey:” at least on certain points, which are the very points at issue. It need hardly be said, that the Council of Constance expresses in a very modified form the powers of General Councils; but it is surely in the highest degree providential, that an absolute condemnation of the Ultra-montane Theory should have been past by a purely Western Council in the fifteenth century, and the ancient government of the Church, as set forth in the Ecumenical Councils, been attested so many hundred years after the full Papal claim had been advanced and exercised.

If we accept it, we reject the whole history of the Church during eight hundred years.

As to antiquity, not one fact, but the continuous history of eight hundred years exhibits this claim of monarchy as a most monstrous and unfounded usurpation. According to it, as we have seen above, St. Cyprian, St. Firmilian, St. Hilary of Arles, St. Basil the Great, St. Meletius and Flavian, Patriarchs of Antioch, Theophilus and St. Cyril, Patriarchs of Alexandria, the African Bishops in 426, the Fathers of Chalcedon in 451, in passing their famous twenty-

eighth Canon, the Fathers of Ephesus, in passing their eighth, the Fathers of Constantinople in 381, in passing their second and third Canons, and most of those same Fathers in the synodal letter addressed the next year to the Pope and the Western Bishops, the Fathers of Nicea in passing their sixth, the Fathers of the Fifth Ecumenical Council, first sitting without the Pope, and then passing a decree against his, the Fathers of the Council in Trullo, publicly censuring points of Roman discipline, and the Roman Pontiff by implication, nay, all ancient Councils whatever, in all their form and mode of proceeding, were the most audacious of rebels. But what are we to say about the language of St. Gregory? Did he then betray those rights of St. Peter, which he held dearer than his life? When he wrote to Eulogius of Alexandria, "If your Holiness call me Universal Pope, you deny that you are yourself what you admit me to be—Universal. But this God forbid:" are we to receive Thomassin's explanation, that he meant, as Patriarch, he was not Universal, but, as Pope, he was, all the time? or that "when he made such fierce invectives against the quality of Ecumenical Patriarch, and protested that the Roman Pontiffs had never taken the title of Universal Bishop, *he had only in view the abuses which might be palliated, and, as it were, authorized by that universality of power?*" or when he says to the same Patriarch, "in rank you are my brother, in character my father," was Eulogius at the same time, as Bellarmine will have it, merely his deputy? "In the beginning, Peter set up the Patriarch of Alexandria, and of Antioch, who, receiving authority from the Pontiff (of Rome), presided over almost all Asia and Africa, and could create Archbishops, who could afterwards create Bishops." And this, it appears, is the key which is to be applied to the whole history of the early Church. Those Bishops, Metropolitans, Exarchs, and Patriarchs, throughout the East, who had such a conviction of the Apostolic authority residing in themselves as governors of the Church, who shewed it in every Council in which they sat, who expressed it so freely in their writings and letters: St. Augustine, again, in the West, himself a host, who speaks of a cause decided by the Roman Pontiff being reheard, of "the wholesome authority of General

Thomassin,  
 part 1. liv. 1.  
 c. 6.

De Rom.  
 Pont., lib. 4.  
 cap. 25.

CHAP.  
VII.

Councils," who assents to St. Cyprian's proposition, that "every Bishop can no more be judged by another, than he himself can judge another," with the single limitation, "certainly, I imagine, in those questions which have not yet been thoroughly and completely settled;" who, in a question of disputed succession, which more than any other required such a tribunal as the Papal, had it existed, appeals not to the authority of the Roman See, but to the testimony of the whole Church spread everywhere, not mentioning that See pre-eminently; or when he does mention "the See of Peter, in which Anastasius now sits," mentioning likewise "the See of James, in which John now sits:"—all these were nothing more, at the same time, than the Pope's delegates, and received through him their jurisdiction.

Develop-  
ment, p. 28.

Can a claim be true which is driven to shifts such as this for its maintenance? Or can the truth of Christianity and the unity of the Church rest upon a falsehood? Is infidelity itself in such "a hopeful position," as regards Christianity, that it is really come to this, that we must either receive a plain and manifest usurpation, or be cast out of the house and kingdom of God? That we must reject the witness and history of the first eight hundred years of the Church's life on the one hand, or be plunged into the abyss

The Church of England appeals to that constitution of the Church Catholic, which St. Leo declared to be perpetual.

of infidelity on the other? If it be true that the Pope is Monarch of the Church, which is the present Papal theory, the Church of England is in schism. If it be not true, she is at least clear of that fatal mark. All that is required for her position is the maintenance of that Nicene Constitution, which we have heard St. Leo solemnly declare was to last to the end of the world, viz., that every Province of the Church be governed by its own Bishops under its own Metropolitan. And who then but will desire that the successor of St. Peter should hold St. Peter's place? Will the Patriarch of Constantinople, or the Archbishop of Moscow, or the Primate of Canterbury, so much as think of assuming it? Be this our answer when we are accused of not really holding that article of the Creed "one Catholic and Apostolic Church." Let the Bishop of Rome require of us that honour and power which he possessed at the Synod of Chalcedon, *that, and not a totally different one under the*

*same name*, and we shall be in schism when we do not yield it. At present we have no farther separated from him than to fall back on the constitution of the Church of the Martyrs and the Fathers.

SECT.  
I.

---

SECT. II.

BUT, it may be said, is the Catholic Church unanimous on the one hand, and the Anglican Communion, restricted to one small Province, left alone in her protest on the other? Did not she, whom they would call "the already decrepit rebel of three hundred years," submit from 596 to 1534 to that very authority which she now denies? It would be quite beyond my present limits to trace, as I had first purposed, the Roman Bishop's power from that point at which it stood, when St. Gregory sent our Apostle Augustine into England, to that point which it had reached in the thirteenth century, and which it strove to maintain in the sixteenth. I can only now very briefly point out a few of the steps in that most wonderful rise. The two centuries, then, which succeeded St. Gregory, were even more favourable to this growth than those which went before. While the confusion and violence of secular governments by the breaking in and settlement of the various northern tribes were greater than ever,—while the ecclesiastical constitution was all that yet held together the scattered portions of the shattered Western empire—the single Apostolical See of the West, whose Bishop was in constant correspondence with the spiritual rulers of these various countries, whose voice was ever and anon heard striving to win and soften into mercy and justice those temporal rulers, would be, as it were, "a light shining in a dark place." The Bishops, everywhere miserably afflicted by their own sovereigns, found a stay and support in one beyond the reach of the feudal lord's violence. The benefit they thus derived from the Roman Patriarch was so great, that they would be disposed to overlook the gradual change which was ensuing in the relation between themselves and him, the deference which was deepening into subjection. Or, if here and there, what

Circumstances which led to the rise of the proper Papal power.

CHAP.  
VII.

Leo would have called "a presumptuous spirit," such as Hincmar of Rheims, or our own Grossetête, in after times, set himself against the stream, it would all be in vain. However good his cause might be, if he did not yield, he would be beaten down like St. Hilary of Arles. Moreover, as the great heresy of Mahomet invaded and hemmed in three of the Patriarchal Sees of the East, their counterpoise to the originally great influence of the Roman See was removed. Political separation from the East, and the difficulty of communication, would of themselves greatly tend to this result. To this must be added the great increase of power, which the house of Charlemagne, for their own political purposes, bestowed on the Roman See; it was worth while building up a popedom for an imperial crown. De Maistre says, "The Popes reign since the ninth century at least." But it is a somewhat naïve confession, "The French had the singular honour, one of which they have not been at all sufficiently proud, of having set up, humanly, the Catholic Church in the world, by raising its august head to the rank indispensably due to his divine functions; and without which he would only have been a Patriarch of Constantinople, miserable puppet of Christian sultans, and Mussulman autocrats." So that indeed Pope Paul I. wrote to King Pepin and his sons, "If all the hairs of our head were made tongues, they would not be able to return you due thanks for your great kindnesses." Just, too, when it was most difficult to detect imposture, and to refer to the acts of ancient Councils, that singular counterfeit of the false Decretals made its appearance, which so wonderfully helped the Roman Patriarchs in consolidating the manifold structure of their authority. This, indeed, assailed the Bishops of the West by their most reverential feelings, and added to the force of a great present authority, almost always beneficially exercised, the weight of what seemed an Apostolical tradition.

Du Pape,  
liv. 2. ch. 6;  
and Dis-  
course Pré-  
liminaire.

Quoted by  
De Marca,  
de Concor.,  
lib. 3. c. 10.  
§ 3.

Vast and  
permanent  
effect of the  
false Decre-  
tals.

But the effect of the false Decretals on the whole subsequent history of the Church has been so great and permanent, that they well merit a distinct, and somewhat detailed, consideration. It will be found that, in addition to all the proofs from the first eight centuries which have been ad-

duced against the Papal Monarchy, and in illustration of that Patriarchal system which in the West it gradually superseded, Roman Catholic theologians have themselves set forth the very time when this change began to take place, and the very means by which it was accomplished, that is, what is now on all sides acknowledged to have been a fraud.

“Under the second dynasty of our kings,” says Archbishop de Marca, “a new canonical jurisprudence began to be introduced into the Gallican Church as well as into the other Provinces of the West, by the invention for that purpose of those supposititious letters of the ancient Roman Pontiffs, in which there are a great number of regulations altogether opposed to the statutes of the ancient Canons. These were edited in a collection of Canons which is commonly attributed to Isidore Mercator, which Riculph, Bishop of Mayence, brought from Spain into Gaul. Hence it has arisen that a great many places have been quoted in the Capitulars of the kings out of those false letters.”

SECT.  
II.

De Concor.,  
lib. 7. c. 20.  
Introduc-  
tion of a  
new Canon-  
ical juris-  
prudence  
by means  
of them.

“It is indeed certain, and altogether beyond doubt, according to the judgment of all learned men, and also the Cardinals Baronius and Bellarmine, that those letters of the ancient Pontiffs, namely, Clement, Anterus, Euaristus, Telesphorus, Callistus, Julius, Damasus, and generally all those which precede the times of Siricius (384—398) and Innocent, were fabricated by this Isidore. This is inferred not only from the barbarous style and ignorance of antiquity, but also from the great difference between the discipline of the ancient Church, and that contained in these letters. Add to this the authority of Dionysius Exiguus, who has attached to his collection of Canons the Decretal letters of Roman Pontiffs, but makes no mention of those which are contained in this collection of Isidore. And although Leo and Gelasius often praise the letters of their predecessors, they make no mention of the Isidorian letters.” . . . .

Proofs of  
their  
forgery.

“At the same time came forth a collection of eighty Capitules, some say there were only seventy-two, under the name of the Capitules of Pope Adrian, which was given by him to Enguerran Bishop of Metz, in the year 785. This was taken out of the ancient Canons and genuine letters of Roman

Capitules  
of Pope  
Adrian.

CHAP.  
VII

Pontiffs, as also out of the laws comprehended in the Theodosian Code, or rather out of the breviary of those laws. But in these Capitules sometimes not a little is added to the ancient Canons, while at other times words of great moment are omitted, as seemed to conduce to raise the authority of the Roman Pontiff. But the estimation of these Capitules was so great, that they are also frequently quoted in the Capitulars of our kings, and Isidore Mercator has used them to adorn that collection of apocryphal letters which I have mentioned."

Account of  
the forgery  
and its  
proofs by  
Fleury 44.  
22.

Fleury's account somewhat varies here. He says that "other copies state that it was Enguerran who presented this collection to the Pope, which is more probable, looking at the difference there is between it and the code of Canons which Pope Adrian gave to King Charles about ten years before. The principal difference consists in those extracts from the false Decretals of Isidore, with which the collection of Enguerran is filled, and it is the first time we find these Decretals employed." . . . "They bear visible marks of falsity. All are in the same style, which suits the eighth century much better than the first three: long and full of common places, and, as has been discovered in examining them carefully, full of different passages from St. Leo and St. Gregory, and other authors posterior to the Popes whose names they bear. Their dates are almost all false.

"The matter of these letters further shews their forgery. They speak of Archbishops, Primates, Patriarchs, as if these titles had been received from the beginning of the Church. They forbid holding any Council, even Provincial, without the Pope's permission, and represent appeals to Rome as ordinary. There are complaints of frequent usurpations of the temporal goods of Churches. It is a maxim in them that Bishops fallen into sin may, after having done penance, exercise their functions as before, contrary to what I have adduced in different places. In fine, the principal subject of these Decretals is the accusations of Bishops: there is scarcely one which does not speak of them, and which does not give rules to make them difficult. Likewise Isidore makes it plain in his preface that he had this point much at heart. He there maintains that there were more than twenty Canons

of the Nicene Council, and speaks of the Sixth Council held in the year 680, which shews that he cannot be, as some have believed, St. Isidore of Seville. SECT.  
II.

“Besides the Decretals of the Popes, Isidore’s collection contains the Canons of the Eastern Councils from a version more ancient than that of Dionysius Exiguus, and several Canons of Councils of Gaul and Spain. *Nevertheless his fraud, gross as it was, imposed on the whole Latin Church. His false Decretals have passed for true during eight hundred years,* and scarcely have they been given up in the last century. It is true that there is not now a man moderately instructed in these matters, who does not admit their falsity.” Held to be authentic for eight hundred years.

De Marca proceeds. “We must now inquire thoroughly what new jurisprudence, as to the Canonical judgments of Bishops, these two collections introduced. For first, it is there laid down that no Bishop can be judged save in a Council convoked by the Supreme Pontiff. ‘Let no Bishop, save canonically summoned, and in a legitimate Council convoked by Apostolical authority at its proper time, be heard or attacked, as charged with any crimes whatsoever.’ For these are the very words of the third chapter of Adrian’s collection, whence Isidore Mercator copied his under the name of Pope Julius. But this place of Adrian is praised in the second addition of Louis the Pious, ch. 12. De Marca, as above. Summary of their contents. 1. No Bishop to be judged but in a Council convoked by the supreme Pontiff.

“This new jurisprudence is opposed to the Nicene, Antiochene, African, and Sardican Canons, and to the letters of Innocent, Leo, Gregory, and the other Roman Pontiffs, who decree that the first cognizance of charges against Bishops be taken by the Provincial Council, which the Metropolitan shall convoke without the authority of the Roman Pontiff. The Sardican Council supplied the opportunity for this new regulation, because it orders a Bishop to be deposed in a Council to be assembled by the Pontiff’s delegation: but that is decreed only in the case of an appeal, for revision of the first judgment. But that Capitule of Adrian was composed for the purpose of devolving the whole authority for deposing Bishops on the Apostolic See, so that even the first cognizance of the cause should be ordered by the Pontiff’s authority, and that what belongs by ordinary right to

CHAP.  
VII.

Bishops should only take place by the Pontiff's delegation. Yet in the points following that collection does not pass the limits appointed by the Nicene Council. For in Capitules 5, 9, 12, and 20, it is ordered that the first judgment should be made by the Bishops of the Province, which is to be put into execution, if the condemned Bishop does not appeal to the Apostolic See. But that is copied in the fourth addition of Louis the Pious, ch. 8, and in the sixth book of the Capitulars, ch. 287, and also in the seventh book, ch. 234, and 275.

2. Innovation as to deposed Bishops.

“Secondly, a vast innovation was attempted as to the Bishop deposed, when appealing to the Apostolic See. For the twentieth Capitule orders him to be judged by the Supreme Pontiff: ‘Let him be judged by the Pontiff of the Roman See.’ Then in the twenty-third it is written, ‘Let his sentence hold good,’ which is copied in the seventh book of the Capitulars, ch. 234 and 235. But in that chapter no slight fraud is committed: namely, that is turned into a perpetual law which before was only a condition; while colour for this new regulation was sought for from the Canon of Sardica, of which however an abbreviation only is quoted, and that far wide from the Canon’s meaning. For Adrian I. in the epitome of Canons, which in the year 773 he sent to Charlemagne, abbreviated the third Canon of Sardica in these words: ‘If the condemned appeal to the Roman Pontiff, his sentence is to hold good.’ And yet that Canon of Sardica, although it assigns the supreme authority to the Roman Pontiff if the Bishop appeals, nevertheless appoints it with the intention that he use that authority only to judge, whether the first sentence is to be confirmed, or a revision ordered. In which case he is to send the cause back to a second Council of the Province, sending likewise a Legate, if he thinks good. Moreover in Adrian’s Capitules this part of the Sardican Canon is not omitted, that is, the power of decreeing that matters judged in a Council be examined afresh, but it is there disjoined from the matter treated of, and constitutes a separate Capitule. For in the forty-second Capitule are the words of Adrian’s abbreviation, taken from the seventh Sardican Canon, which are also quoted in the Capitulars, lib. vii. ch. 267.

“Thirdly, it is ordered that, if perchance the accused suspect his judges, it shall be at his option whether he choose his cause to be judged by the Roman Pontiff, or by the Primate of the Diocese; as is plain from ch. xx. of this collection, which is quoted in the Capitulars, book vii. ch. 234. The Sardican Canons, improperly understood, gave opportunity for this innovation. For the ninth and tenth permit that the cause of a Metropolitan be judged by the Primate of the Diocese, that is, the Patriarch, or the See of Constantinople. And so that collection perverts the intention of these Canons, in that it orders that Bishops, by whom the Metropolitan or other Bishops are suspected, may carry their cause before the Primate of the Diocese, that is, according to the meaning of that collector, before the more ancient Metropolitan, or the Roman See. The rescript likewise of the Emperor Gratian, quoted above in the eleventh chapter of this book, gave occasion for this innovation: for in it power is given to an accused Bishop to appeal to a Council of fifteen Bishops, or to the Roman Bishop, if he conceives either the Metropolitan, or the other judges, to be suspected by him. But this law could not hold good after the reception of the Sardican Canons as authority, which appointed another rule as to the judgment of Bishops, and permitted an appeal from sentences of deposition decreed in Councils: whilst on the other hand Gratian’s law forbids any one’s appealing from the judgment of a Provincial Council, who has consented to be judged by it.”

Elsewhere he says, “The ancient jurisprudence, confirmed by the consent of the universal Church, was succeeded by a new jurisprudence, which began to be published from the year 836, and by the efforts of Nicholas the First and the other Roman Pontiffs gradually gained authority by custom through the Provinces of the West. That jurisprudence is contained in the collection of Isidore.” “This one reason persuaded Nicholas the First to maintain to the utmost those letters, in order more easily to subject the Bishops immediately to the Roman See. For out of them he establishes that new rule unknown to the ancient Canons, namely, that a Bishop, though he has not appealed to the Roman See, cannot be deposed by a Provincial Council,

SECT.  
II.  
3. Appeal  
of Bishops  
to Rome,  
in case the  
metropoli-  
tan is sus-  
pected.

See above,  
p. 81.

De Concor.,  
lib. 3. c. 5.  
Gradual in-  
troduction  
of this new  
jurispru-  
dence from  
the year  
836.

Ibid., lib. 3.  
c. 6.

CHAP.  
VII.

Efforts of  
Pope Ni-  
cholas I. to  
that effect.

Two chief  
points of  
this new  
jurispru-  
dence.

without consulting the Roman Pontiff. These are the words of Nicholas in his letter to the Bishops of Gaul concerning the cause of Rothade Bishop of Soissons: 'Although he had not appealed to the Apostolic See, yet ought you on no account to put forth your statutes against so many and such great Decretals, and depose a Bishop without consulting me.' To the same effect he had summed up in the Roman Council, when he restored Rothade: 'Although had he never appealed, yet he never ought at all to have been deposed without our knowledge; because the sacred statutes and venerable decrees have committed the causes of Bishops, as the more important matters, to our judgment for determination.' Those decretal statutes which Nicholas mentions are to be referred to the letters of Victor, Sixtus, Marcellus, Zephyrinus, Julius, and other Pontiffs. By them two points are especially guarded against. First, that no Provincial Council terminate the criminal causes of Bishops without consulting the Roman See. Secondly, that no Council be called together save by the authority of that See. In these two heads is contained the chief difference between the old and new jurisprudence. Whence it was brought about, that the dignity of the Metropolitans, and the authority of Provincial Councils, whose vigour lay in the decreeing of Canons, or issuing of judgments, was very greatly weakened, and so new sorts of business, which are wont to spring up daily, were no longer discussed and decided in Gallican Councils, as was wont according to ancient custom, but in Roman Councils first, then by the Pontiffs alone: although the Gallican Bishops refused to renounce altogether the assembling of Provincial Councils, and the power of passing Canons. On this matter I have more largely treated in my dissertation on Councils of Dioceses. It is not therefore to be wondered at that the Gallican Church so rigidly rejected the collection of Isidore, so far as regards those points, and most constantly asserted the ancient Canons against the new rules of the Decretals, in its discussion with Adrian II. and John VIII., after the death of Nicholas, respecting the judgment of Bishops and the power of Provincial Councils, as I have shewn in my treatise on the Canonical Judgment of Bishops.

“ At length, however, it came to this, that the rulers of the Gallican Church likewise, together with the rest of the Bishops, yielded to such great names of ancient Pontiffs: and in the Council of Rheims, convoked by Hugo and Robert kings of the Franks, in the year 992, they gave as much weight to the letters of Anacletus, Julius, Damasus, and other Pontiffs, in the cause of Arnulph, as if they had been received into the rank of Canons. For this reason Burchard, Bishop of Worms, in setting forth a new collection of Canons about the year 1020, augmented it, according to the judgment of his age, with the letters of the first Pontiffs: to which he also added select quotations from Augustine, Jerome, Gregory, and Isidore. Ivo of Chartres followed the same plan in that collection of Canons which he published for the use of the Gallican Church about the year 1100. But he was superior to Burchard in this, that, before the promulgation of the Civil Law, (which was brought about by the zeal of the Countess Mathilda after the death of Lothaire II.,) he introduced into his collection a great many transcripts from the Digests, Codex, and Novells; so that after the pattern of John Scholasticus and Photius, Patriarchs of Constantinople, he united the Civil with the Canon Law. The Church indeed in old times had been using the laws of the Emperors for the regulation of trials, and the Bishops of the Gauls followed the Theodosian code, as Hincmar has informed us. But in the West the first collection of both laws is owing to Ivo of Chartres, who also did not leave out Canons issued in Provincial Councils. Gratian succeeded, who arranged indeed the body of decrees after a new method, but by his diligence moulded into one body the collection both of Dionysius Exiguus, Isidore, and Ivo, which had been broken into parts, and amplified it by certain laws, new constitutions of Pontiffs and Councils, and quotations of Fathers, about the year 1150. Gratian's Decree is publicly recited in the Schools, and daily commented on. But, as the most learned Antonius Augustinus has rightly pointed out, as Gratian's collection was set forth by private zeal, the testimonies of authors contained in it have no greater authority than they had before. So that the extracts from Canons and Pontifical Constitutions

SECT.  
II.

The Gallican Bishops at last yield submission to the false Decretals, supposing them to be genuine.

Burchard makes use of them.

And Ivo of Chartres in 1100.

Gratian's Decretum follows about 1150.

CHAP.  
VII.

have supreme authority among all. But all cannot take what is received from Provincial Councils, or books of the Fathers.

Decretals of  
other Popes  
and of Gre-  
gory IX.

“Gratian’s Decree was followed by five collections of Decretal Letters of Alexander III., Innocent III., and Honorius III. Then came the last of Gregory IX., of which Matthew Paris speaks: ‘At this time Gregory IX., seeing the tedious prolixity of the Decretals, ordered them to be elegantly abridged and collected, and solemnly and authentically read and published through the whole world.’ After Gregory, Boniface VIII. published the sixth book of Decretals, Clement the Clementine Constitutions, John his Extravagantes, and some one else the Extravagantes Communes: which are called Extravagantes from being at large out of Gratian’s Decretum. In these volumes are comprehended the chapters of the Councils of Lateran, Lyons, and Vienne, which are scattered under various heads according to their subject matter.

Power  
taken from  
Provincial  
Councils  
and be-  
stowed on  
the Su-  
preme  
Pontiff.

“It is wont to be asked how it came about that the Canon Law, which during eight hundred years was contained in a single volume, and that not very large, grew to such bulk that it requires strength of arm as well as strength of head to peruse those volumes, and whether the new jurisprudence has greatly altered from the old. It is indeed a difficult question, which would require great length to discuss according to its importance. But I will give my judgment briefly, as far as concerns my present purpose. I have already stated the chief point, in which the new jurisprudence differs from the old, to be, that the supreme power which Provincial Councils held in the judging of most causes was altogether extinguished, and given to the Supreme Pontiff alone, and that which belongs to the making of Canons was so diminished, that the burden of making constitutions lay on the Pontiff alone, by which he prescribed the form of those matters which were to be discussed before him. Hence followed a new order of Ecclesiastical judgments, to establish hearings in the Provinces by the rescripts of Pontiffs. Whence emanated so many constitutions about rescripts, delegated judges, the office of the judge ordinary, dilations, exceptions, sentences, and

appeals, and, to speak generally, the whole order of judgments.”

SECT.  
II.

Hear again the Doctor Antonio Pereira. “None of the learned in these days are ignorant that the false Decretals of Isidore Mercator, introduced in the ninth century, by the efforts of Pope Nicholas I., were the beginning of the decay of the primitive discipline and of the perversion of the whole hierarchical order in the Church, to the great prejudice of the rights of the Episcopacy, and extreme injury of the authority of the Provincial Synods. . . . From these same Decretals arose in a great measure the ‘Dictates’ of St. Gregory VII., of which Baronius speaks in his history, A.D. 1076, xxxi., certain privileges of the Roman Pontiff, which, as so many Divine rights, that Pope left to us in writing. It is enough to read through some of them to see that they are as false as Fleury and Van Espen, after Gervais and Bossuet, have declared. From these Decretals also were chiefly formed the collections of Burchard, Bishop of Worms, and of Ivo of Chartres, in the eleventh century, and in the twelfth that of Gratianus commonly called Decretum. *A collection, which, although made with no higher authority than that of a simple Benedictine monk, however learned, full of false Decretals and of Councils that never were held, full of authorities which were but ill understood, was, owing to the ignorance of the times, and the sanction given to it by the university of Bologna, raised gradually to such a pitch of estimation, that for five hundred years the Canonists drew from this Decretum, as from a Body of Public Law, or an authentic repository of the Canons of the Church, almost every citation from the Councils and Fathers to be found in their writings.* From this Decretum arose the chapter ‘Nunc autem,’ and from it the celebrated axiom, ‘The supreme See shall not be judged by any,’ which, as taken from the pretended Council of Sinuessa, becomes in the mouth of the Canonists a dogmatical definition; hence also arose the gloss in the Decretals of Gregory IX., ‘In these matters whatsoever the Pope wills, his will to him stands in the place of a reason, nor is there any one who can say to him, Why doest thou thus?’ Moreover from this Decretum proceeded the chapter ‘Synodum,’ and the chapter

Tentativa  
Theologica,  
Landon’s  
Translation,  
p. 54  
—57.

Effects of  
the false  
Decretals  
according  
to Pereira.  
Dictates of  
Gregory  
VII. Bur-  
chard’s and  
Ivo’s col-  
lection  
taken from  
them.

The latter  
the sole  
authority  
of the Ca-  
nonists for  
five hun-  
dred years.

Growth of  
Papal prin-  
ciples.

Dec. Grat.,  
Part I.  
Dist. 21.  
fol. 98.

Dec. Greg.  
IX. p. 203.

Book I.  
tit. 7. c. 3.

CHAP.  
VII.

Dec. Grat.,  
Part 1.  
Dist. 17.  
cap. 1, 2.  
fol. 64.

Decret.  
Grat., Part  
2. Causa 2.  
cap. 12.  
fol. 653.

Dictum of  
St. Leo  
given to  
Pope Vigi-  
lius, and  
wrought  
into a Papal  
axiom by  
the De-  
cretum.

Quoted by  
me above,  
p. 261.

P. 125.

Præf., p.  
125, 127.

‘Regula Vestra,’ taken from the false Decretals of Marcellus I., and Julius I., from which Gratianus infers that the constitutions of Bishops cannot have the force of laws without the confirmation of the Apostolic See: ‘The Synods of Bishops, as appears from what has preceded, are powerless to define and enact.’ And on this same doctrine, contrary to all Ecclesiastical antiquity and to the Council of Trent itself, the congregation of Cardinals, Interpreters of the Council, drew up the following resolution in the year 1594. ‘Decrees made in Provincial Synods may not be published without the consent of the Roman Pontiff.’ Hence, again, proceeded the Chapter, ‘Qui se scit,’ which is the most ancient document in which [is found] the other celebrated principle of the Papal Chair, viz. ‘The Pope alone possesses the plenitude of power: but others are called by him to participate in his care.’ From which Fagnanus endeavours to infer, that the Pope alone holds his power of jurisdiction immediately from Christ, and that the other Bishops receive it only from the Pope; and others, that the Pope is ‘the Bishop of Bishops,’ and ‘Ordinary of Ordinaries,’ able to exercise his Episcopal functions in every place, as possessing the whole Church for his Diocese.” Pereira then goes on to shew that Isidore applied what he read in the letter of St. Leo, *speaking as Patriarch of certain Provinces*, to one who was his Vicar or Delegate, to the letter of Vigilius *speaking as Pope to all the Bishops*, and that then out of Pope Vigilius’ letter Gratian made it a maxim. The letter of Vigilius is in Mansi ix. 33, and all that part of it which contains this quotation from St. Leo, is, according to Mansi, of very questionable authenticity, that is, probably put together from different letters. Coustant, in his learned preface to the letters of the Roman Pontiffs, states that this was Isidore’s doing. So the fraud has two stages: St. Leo’s words with a particular application are given to Vigilius with a general one by Isidore; and out of Isidore Gratian turns them into an axiom, on whose ample basis the Papal Monarchy may repose.

The above Coustant seems to give the most accurate information about these false Decretals. “Isidore collected the letters of the Pontiffs from Clement to Gregory the Great

inclusive. All the genuine that he found he either edited entire, or interpolated with his own fictions. He invented many supposititious ones, so as not to pass over any Prelate of the Apostolic See without decrees. So you may truly call his collection a mass of genuine, interpolated, and supposititious records." Thus he put two genuine letters of Damasus among the supposititious ones down to Pope Sircius: but then he mixed not a few spurious with the genuine ones of that Pope's successors. Nor did he stop here. "Not content to mix the true with the false, he polluted the true themselves, which is a greater crime, partly by interpolations, partly by additions or diminutions." "But it can scarcely be said what ruin he wrought to the Church by this fraud. By this the sinews of discipline were thoroughly weakened and broken, the rights of Bishops thrown into confusion, the laws of trials done away with, or at least miserably crushed. By this an immense harvest sprung up of discord, seditions, and law-suits, which fructified so many centuries to the disgrace of the Church, and the offence of the faithful."

SECT.  
II.  
Father  
Coustant's  
account of  
the false  
Decretals,  
and their  
effects on  
discipline.

Fleury quite agrees with this. "Of all these false documents the most pernicious were the Decretals attributed to the Popes of the first four centuries, *which have inflicted an incurable wound on the discipline of the Church, by the new maxims which they introduced concerning the judgments of the Bishops, and the authority of the Pope.*"

Troisième  
Discours.  
§ 2.  
Fleury's  
testimony  
to the same.

"It is undoubted," says Van Espen, "that the Roman Curia supported this collection of false Decretals with the utmost zeal, and laboured in order that these decretal letters might everywhere be received as authentic, and as emanating from those early and most holy Pontiffs, and that the authority claimed in them for the Roman Pontiffs, might be recognised by all."

And Van  
Espen's,  
tom. iii.  
478. Co-  
loniæ 1777.

He then quotes a great Papal advocate, Christian Wolf, to this effect: "At that time the majesty of the Apostolical See and all Ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been exceedingly harassed and depressed, in Gaul and Germany by the Franks, in Spain by the Saracens, in Italy and Illyria by the Lombards and Greeks: and thus to raise these from their depression some one of the faithful *forged*, under the name of those

Admission  
by Wolf.

CHAP.  
VII.

Ancient  
discipline  
how af-  
fected by  
the false  
Decretals.

New prin-  
ciples in-  
troduced by  
them.

ancient Roman Pontiffs, these Decretal letters." On these words Van Espen cites the remark of another 'learned author.' . . . "Truly it is an admirable piety and fidelity to father upon the most holy Bishops of the Apostolic See, and the noblest martyrs of the Christian religion, a spurious progeny of letters regarding the government of the whole Church: to pluck up the statutes of the first and most excellent General Councils: to lay the surest foundations for the abolition of ancient Ecclesiastical law, and the introduction of monarchical sway into the Christian commonwealth: to eradicate the evangelical discipline instituted by Christ and observed by His Apostles: to bring about a total confusion and overthrow of all things. For although the story of the spurious Decretals has now been clearly detected by all learned men, yet the new Decretals of the Pontiffs, which drew their origin from those old supposititious ones, have not been abolished: and these rest for their chief foundation on those rotten pseudo-Isidorian trumpeting, in the matter of legislation, the bestowing of priestly offices, granting of dispensations, conceding indulgences, in fine, in almost the whole government of the Church."

"And in truth," goes on Van Espen himself, "many had already remarked that the primitive discipline of the Church, preserved during eight centuries at least in the Church, was broken down, and even abolished, by the authority of these forged Decretals: and lately Claude Fleury shewed at length, that in the Greek or Oriental Church even to this day the ancestral discipline has rather been preserved than in the Latin, because the Oriental Church has hitherto not received these Decretals, that is, the Isidorian collection.

"But as fragments of these Epistles are inserted here and there in Gratian's Decretum, in my commentary thereon I have noted each instance, *how by this forgery and reception of the Decretals the discipline of the Fathers was broken down, and that moreover the Roman Pontiffs inserted into their own Decretals, and willed to be taken for law, the new principles asserted in these Decretals, as if they had been transmitted to us by Apostolical tradition.*

"But the authority of the Apostolic See in judging and determining the causes of Bishops and other *majores causæ*

is especially urged in these Decretals, and these are claimed to be reserved to the aforesaid See privatively.”

SECT.  
II.

The idea contained in this word *privatively* is of great importance in the whole Roman controversy. The monarchy has been built up not so much by claiming powers which did not belong to the Roman See, as by *restricting* to that See powers which resided in the whole Episcopate.

“While therefore the forging and false ascription of these Decretals was not yet detected, nay, nor even a suspicion of such fraud occurred, Roman Pontiffs did not hesitate to claim them for the defence and assertion of the authority of the Apostolic See, especially to claim privatively for the Apostolic See authority to judge and depose Bishops. ‘These,’ says Wolf, ‘Nicholas I. most warmly defended, and reduced it to a rule, not permitting any Bishop thenceforward to be deposed without his previous consent, though he did not appeal to the Roman See. And so he severely inveighed against Hincmar Metropolitan of Rheims for having, according to the ancient authority of Councils, degraded Rothade Bishop of Soissons. He maintained that the degradation of Bishops was one of the *majores causæ*, and so according to the ancient law of the Church could not be attempted without a previous reference to the Roman See.’” . . .

Their gradual establishment by the Roman Pontiffs, and admission by Councils and Collectors of Canons.

“While therefore nobody called into doubt the genuineness and authenticity of these Decretals, and, besides, the Roman Pontiffs most strenuously pressed their authority, and Bishops moreover frequently used them as true and precious monuments of antiquity, and willingly accepted them in so far as they were not contrary to later Canons, it was at length brought about that the Bishops, yielding to so many names of primitive Pontiffs and Martyrs, received as if with one consent their authority, and the discipline contained in them.” . . .

“Moreover all the Councils which were celebrated in this (the tenth) and the succeeding centuries used these Epistles and the other testimonies set forth in this collection. The collectors of the Canons themselves, Burchard of Worms, Ivo of Chartres, and Gratian himself, followed, whose Decretum is full of fragments of the Decretal letters, and of other things taken from that collection. And when this Decretum began to be publicly lectured on in the schools,

CHAP.  
VII.

and illustrated by the commentaries of the learned, *all polemical and scholastic Theologians everywhere, and all interpreters of the Canon Law, for more than four hundred years, almost to our own time, as with one consent praised the testimonies of all these in confirmation of the Catholic dogmas, and in defence of the Church's discipline, and filled their books with them, which is too plain to need any setting forth.*"

Vol. 2. § 20.  
Gieseler's  
statement  
of the  
motives  
which led  
to the for-  
gery.

Gieseler seems to state correctly the views of the forgers of the false Decretals themselves: "Their aim in general was directed, by exhortations, instructions, and regulations, compiled mostly out of the Church literature at hand, to counterwork the oppression and wild state of the Clergy, as likewise Ecclesiastical disorders generally, which were the consequence of the political parties and disturbances under the successors of Charlemagne. But these false Decretals of Isidore have historical importance only through the new principles of Canon law, by which, giving full form to a tendency which had earlier arisen in the Church amid the weakness and want of unity of the civil power, they sought to make the Church independent of the State, and to give an absolute point of support to it in the Roman Chair. Exaltation of the Episcopal office, numerous regulations to protect the clergy, and specially the Bishops, against attack, limitation of the Metropolitans, often very dependent on the civil power, raising of the Primates to be the chief instruments of the Popes, and, particularly, extension of the rights of the Roman Chair, form the chief substance, as to Canon Law, of these inventions of Isidore. They must have arisen between 829 and 845 in the East of France, and first appeared in Mayence in the time of the Archbishop Autcarius, 826—847, in a pretended Isidorian collection, which Archbishop Riculph, 786—814, was said to have received from Spain. They were soon spread about in several collections, were innocently admitted in public transactions, and made use of under the Popes by Nicholas I., first of all, but as soon as he came to the knowledge of them in 864, without opposition being raised to their authenticity, and they remained in unweakened estimation, until the Reformation gave occasion to the discovery of the cheat. As these false Decretals formed the ground of Papal omnipotence in the Church, so

was the Donation of Constantine, somewhat earlier invented, but soon taken into them, the first step from which the Papacy strove to raise itself even above the State." SECT.  
II.

In several of these false letters the title "*Universalis Ecclesie Episcopus*," is given to the Pope. But the various particulars by which they built the Supremacy upon the Primacy are so lucidly set forth by Fleury, and are of such importance to my argument, that I cannot refrain from quoting him at length.

## SECT. III.

"THOSE, who have read with some attention the part already given of this history, have doubtless remarked a great difference between the discipline of the first ten and that of the three following centuries. It was indeed greatly weakened from the tenth century, but this was hardly ever but from ignorance, and by actual transgressions, which were condemned immediately that men opened their eyes to recognise them. It was ever a settled point that the Canons and ancient tradition were to be followed. *It is only from the twelfth century that new foundations have been built on, and principles unknown to antiquity followed. Even then antiquity was believed to be followed, while it was departed from: the evil is come from an error of fact, and from having taken for ancient that which was not so.* For in general it has always been taught in the Church that the tradition of the first centuries was to be kept to, as well for discipline as for doctrine. I have spoken of the false Decretals attributed to the Popes of the first three centuries, which are found in the collection of Isidore Mercator, and which appeared at the end of the eighth century, and I have marked the proofs which demonstrate their falsity. Here was the source of the evil: ignorance of history and of criticism caused these Decretals to be received, and the new principles they contain to be taken for the doctrine of the purest antiquity. Bernald, Priest of Constance, writing at the end of the eleventh century, says on the faith of these Decretals, that, according to the discipline of the Apostles and their

Fleury,  
Quatrieme  
Disc. § 1—  
8, 11, 13-16.  
Antiquity  
believed to  
be followed  
in the De-  
cretals,  
while it was  
departe l  
from.

CHAP.  
VII.

successors, Bishops ought never or very hardly to be accused, admitting still that this discipline does not agree with the Nicene Council. And allowing that this Council has forbidden the translations of Bishops, he opposes to it the Popes Euaristus, Callistus, and Anteros, who permitted them.

Principles  
of the De-  
cretals car-  
ried out by  
St. Leo IX.  
and his  
successors.

“After the Roman Church had groaned a hundred and fifty years under many unworthy Popes who profaned the holy See, God, casting a look of kindness on that first of Churches, gave to it Leo IX., whom his virtue has caused to be ranked in the number of the Saints, and who was followed, during the rest of the eleventh century and in all the ensuing, by many other virtuous Popes, zealous for the restoration of discipline, as Gregory VII., Urban II., Pascal II., Eugenius III., Alexander III. But the best intentions without enlightenment cause great faults, and the faster one runs on a dark road, the more frequent and dangerous are one's falls. These great Popes, finding the authority of the false Decretals so established that nobody thought of contesting it any longer, believed themselves obliged in conscience to maintain the principles there read, persuaded that it was the pure discipline of the Apostolic times, and of the golden age of Christianity. But they did not perceive that they contain many principles contrary to those of genuine antiquity.

Opposition  
of these  
principles  
to those of  
genuine an-  
tiquity on  
the follow-  
ing points.  
1. No Coun-  
cil to be  
held with-  
out the  
Pope's per-  
mission.

“It is said in the false Decretals, that it is not allowable to hold a Council without the order, or at least permission, of the Pope. You, who have read this history, have you seen there anything like it, I do not say in the first three centuries, but up to the ninth? I know that the authority of the Pope has always been necessary for General Councils, and thus is to be understood what the historian Socrates says, that there is a Canon which forbids the Churches to make any rule without the consent of the Bishop of Rome; and Sozomen says that the care of all the Churches belongs to him on account of the rank of his See. But as to Provincial and ordinary Councils, the Roman correctors of Gratian's Decretum have admitted, that the authority of the Pope is not necessary for them. In fact is there the least trace of permission or consent of the Pope in all those Councils of which Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and Eusebius make mention, whether about Easter, the reconciliation of

penitents, or the baptism of heretics? Was there mention of the Pope in those three great Councils of Alexandria, which were held on the matter of Arius before the Nicene Council? Was there mention of him in the Council of Constantinople, convoked by the Emperor Theodosius in 381? And yet the Pope St. Damasus and all the West consented to its decisions; so that it is counted for the Second Ecu-  
menical Council. And I speak not of so many national Councils held in France, principally under the kings of the second race, and in Spain under the Gothic kings. When the Nicene Council ordered two Councils to be held yearly in each Province, did it suppose that they would send to Rome to ask permission? And how could one have sent so frequently thither from the furthest points of Asia or Africa? The holding of Provincial Councils was counted among the ordinary practices of religion, just as the celebration of the holy Sacrifice every Sunday. Nothing but the violence of persecutions interrupted the course of it; as soon as the Bishops found themselves at liberty, they recurred to it as the most efficacious means of maintaining discipline. Mean-  
while, in consequence of that new principle, scarcely any Councils have been held from the twelfth century save those at which Papal Legates have presided, and the custom of holding Councils has insensibly gone out.

“It is said in the false Decretals that Bishops cannot be judged definitively save by the Pope alone, and that principle is often repeated there. Nevertheless you have seen a hundred examples of the contrary; and to take one of the most illustrious, Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, the first See of St. Peter, and the third city of the Roman Empire, was judged and deposed by the Bishops of the East and the neighbouring Provinces, without the participation of the Pope, whom they contented themselves with informing of it after it was done, as is seen by their synodal letter; and the Pope did not complain of it. Nothing is more frequent in the first nine centuries than the accusations and depositions of Bishops: but their trial took place in Provincial Councils, which were the ordinary tribunal for all Ecclesiastical causes. One must be absolutely ignorant of the history of the Church, to imagine that at any time or in any country it has ever

SECT.  
III.

2. Bishops not to be judged definitively, but by him.

See above, p. 67.

This contrary to all antiquity, and indeed impossible.

CHAP.  
VII.

been impossible to judge a Bishop, without sending to Rome, or causing a commission to come from the Pope.

“Without even knowing the facts it only wants a little good sense to see that the thing was impossible. From the fourth century there was a prodigious number of Churches in Greece, in Asia, in Syria, in Egypt, and in Africa, without speaking besides of the West: and the greater number of Bishops were poor, and unable to make great journeys: so that the Emperors defrayed their costs for the General Councils. How could they have been made come to Rome, and not only they, but their accusers, and the witnesses, yet for the most part poorer? This, however, is what the author of the false Decretals must have supposed; and the absurdity of the supposition has appeared clearly, when the Popes wished to reduce it to practice. For instance, Gregory VII., sincerely persuaded that he alone was the judge competent for all Bishops, made them come daily from the end of Germany, France, or England. They had to quit their Churches for whole years, in order to go to Rome at great expense, to defend themselves against accusers who often did not appear there: delay was granted upon delay; the Pope gave commissions to take information on the spot, and after many journeys and long procedures he issued his definitive judgment, against which they came back under another pontificate. Often likewise the Bishop cited to Rome did not obey, either through incapacity to make the journey by sickness, poverty, or other impediment, or because he felt himself guilty: he despised the censures pronounced against him, and if the Pope chose to give him a successor, he defended himself by force. You have seen examples of this; and here are the inconveniences of wishing to reduce to practice what has never been practised, nor practicable.

“It is true that, on rare occasions of a manifest oppression or a crying injustice, Bishops condemned by their Councils could have recourse to the Pope, as the superior of all Bishops, and maintainer of the Canons: and this is the order of the Council of Sardica. But it directs that the Pope, whether he send a Legate or not, make the cause be reheard on the spot, because it is easy to impose on a distant judge. This is what St. Cyprian takes up in speak-

ing of Basilides, a Spanish Bishop, who, having been deposed in his Province, had obtained from Pope St. Stephen, by concealing from him the truth, letters for his restoration, to which the Council of Africa paid no regard. And some years before, the same St. Cyprian, writing to Pope St. Cornelius respecting the schismatic Fortunatus, says these remarkable words: 'It is a rule among us that every guilty person be examined on the spot where the crime has been committed. Those then who are under us must not run hither and thither, and put disunion between the Bishops; let them plead their cause on the spot where they can have accusers and witnesses.' Thus it is that St. Cyprian speaks to the Pope himself, to whom Fortunatus had carried his complaints. After all this, recourse to the Pope, permitted by the Council of Sardica, regarded chiefly extraordinary matters, and the Bishops of the greatest Sees, as St. Athanasius, St. John Chrysostome, St. Flavian of Constantinople, who had no other superior to whom to address themselves.

S E C T.  
III.

See above,  
p. 56.

See above,  
p. 38.

See their  
cases above.

"It is further the false Decretals, which have attributed to the Pope alone the right to translate Bishops from one See to another. Nevertheless the Council of Sardica and the rest, which have so severely forbidden translations, have made no exception in favour of the Pope; and when, in very rare cases, some translation has been made for the evident utility of the Church, it was made by the authority of the Metropolitan, and the Council of the Province. We have an illustrious example of this in the person of Euphronius of Colonia, whom St. Basil translated to the See of Nicopolis. Far from the Pope authorizing translations, the Roman Church was the most faithful in observing the canons which forbade them: during nine hundred years we do not find any Bishop translated to the See of Rome: Formosus was the first; and this was one of the pretexts for disinterring him after his death. But since the false Decretals have been followed, translations have been frequent in the West where they were unknown; and the Popes only condemned them when they were made without their authority, as we have seen in the letters of Innocent III.

3. Power to  
translate  
Bishops  
ascribed to  
the Pope.

"It is the same with the erection of new Bishoprics: ac-

CHAP.  
VII.

4. And the  
erection  
of new  
Bishoprics.  
Cod. Ecc.  
Afric., Can.  
98.

According to the false Decretals this belongs to the Pope alone : according to the ancient discipline it belonged to the Council of the Province, and there is an express Canon for it in the Councils of Africa. Namely, 'it was agreed that communities, which have never had Bishops of their own, are not to receive them, save it be decreed by a plenary Council of each Province, and the Primate, and with the consent of him to whose diocese the said Church belonged.' And certainly, to consider only the progress of religion and the advantage of the faithful, it was much more reasonable to refer it to the Bishops of the country, to judge of the cities which had need of new Bishops, and to choose the proper persons, than to refer the judgment to the Pope, so distant, and so little able to inform himself well of it. It is all very well to name commissioners, and take informations as to utility and inutility: these proceedings are never worth ocular inspection, and knowledge acquired by oneself. So when St. Augustine caused the new See of Fussala to be erected, he did not send to Rome, he only addressed himself to the Primate of Numidia: and if the Pope heard about it, it was only on account of the personal faults of the Bishop Antonius: but he did not complain that the erection of this Bishopric had been made without his participation. Nor had St. Remi any more recourse to the Pope to found the Bishopric of Laon: but he did it, says Hincmar, by the authority of the Council of Africa, that is to say, of the Canon I have quoted. The reason is, that the Decretals, which give this right to the Pope, were not yet fabricated.

5. The  
union and  
extinction  
of Bi-  
shoprics.

"As to the union or extinction of Bishoprics, I see no other reason for attributing them to the Pope alone, but certain authorities of St. Gregory alleged by Gratian. But he did not observe that Gregory only acted so in the southern part of Italy, of which Rome was the metropolis; or in Sicily and the other islands, which depended particularly on the holy See.

6. The  
founding of  
Metropoli-  
tanical Sees.

"In the first centuries Metropolitan Sees were rare in proportion to the number of Bishoprics, in order that the Councils might be numerous, for the principal function of Metropolitans was to preside in them. But since the Popes have been in possession of the power to found them, they

have created, principally in Italy, a great number of Metropolitans without necessity, merely to honour certain cities. The Nicene Council, which doubtless had power to assign new prerogatives to Churches, says simply that their privileges shall be preserved according to ancient custom. This shews that the distinction of Metropolitans and Patriarchal Churches had already been confirmed by a long possession. The Popes since the eleventh century have not only made Metropolitans, but even Patriarchs and Primates, all on the foundation of the false Decretals, that is, of the first letter attributed to St. Clement, of the second and third of Pope Anacletus, where it is said that the Apostles and their successors established Patriarchs and Primates in the cities, where, according to the civil government, the chief magistrates lived, and where the pagans had their archflamens, a barbarous word only found in these Decretals. Now you have seen that in the first centuries even the title of Archbishop was unknown: men said, the Bishop of Rome, or of Alexandria, as of the least city, and in their letters they treated each other as brethren with a perfect equality, as is seen by the inscription of the letters of St. Cyprian. In proportion as charity grew cold, titles and ceremonies increased. The Bishop of Alexandria was the first, as is believed, who took the name of Archbishop: the Bishop of Antioch took that of Patriarch, and the name of Primate was peculiar to Africa. But the author of the false Decretals did not know so much, and he makes no mention of the title of Exarch so famous in Asia.

“Nevertheless it was only on the faith of this author that Gregory VII. established or rather confirmed the Primacy of Lyons, since he refers in his Bull to the words of the Decretal of Anacletus. It is on this same foundation that other Popes have pretended to found so many other Primacies, in France, in Spain, and elsewhere, supposing them ancient by an error of fact, as I have shewn of each in particular. These erections being contrary to ancient possession have produced great contests. You have seen with what vigour the Bishops of France rejected the Primacy which John VIII. had given to Anseghisus Archbishop of Sens; you have seen how they resisted afterwards the Primacy of

CHAP.  
VII.

Lyons, which a long possession has at length established : and how the Bishops of Spain opposed those of Toledo and Braga, which have never been well authorized. So it is not to be imagined that a Bull given without knowledge of the cause, as that of Calistus II. for the Primacy of Vienne, is sufficient to change at once the state of Churches, in spite of the parties interested.

7. Vast extension of appeals to the Pope.

“ One of the greatest wounds which the false Decretals have inflicted on the discipline of the Church is the having infinitely extended appeals to the Pope. It appears that the forger had this point greatly at heart, by the care he has taken to diffuse through all his work the principle, that not only every Bishop, but every Priest, and in general every person, who finds himself harassed, may on every occasion appeal directly to the Pope. He has made as many as nine Popes speak on this subject, Anacletus, the first and second Sixtus, Fabian, Cornelius, Victor, Zephyrinus, Marcellus, and Julius. But St. Cyprian, who lived in the time of St. Fabian, and St. Cornelius, not only opposed appeals, he has further shewn solid reasons for not yielding to them; and in the time of St. Augustine the Church of Africa did not yet receive them, as it appears by the letter of the Council held in 426 to Pope Celestine. In fine up to the ninth century few examples are seen of these appeals in virtue of the Council of Sardica, save, as I have said, on the part of Bishops of the great Sees, who had no other superiors beside the Pope.

See above, p. 139.

“ But, since the false Decretals became known, nothing but appeals were seen through all the Latin Church. Hincmar, better instructed than the rest in the ancient discipline, vigorously opposed that novelty, maintaining that this remedy ought not to be granted but to Bishops at the most, not to Priests. You have seen afterwards the complaints of Ivo of Chartres, and of St. Bernard, against these abuses, which in their times had already reached their height. They shewed that this liberty of appealing to the Pope in all matters, and at every stage of the cause, utterly enervated discipline: that bad Priests, and other impenitent offenders, had thereby a sure means to elude correction, or at least to defer it: that the Pope was often ill-informed, and obliged to retract the judgments which he had given by surprise: in

Ivo of Chartres and S. Bernard deplore this.

fine, that the Bishops, repelled by the length of the proceedings, by the expense and the fatigue of journeys, and by so many other difficulties, lost courage, and endured the disorders they could not hinder. The Popes found even themselves incommoded by that liberty of appeal on every occasion, which often retarded the execution of their orders, and hence comes the clause, notwithstanding appeal, which passed into a phrase in their Bulls.

“ If St. Bernard rose with such vigour against that abuse, while supposing the necessity of appeals, what would he not have said had he known that their use was novel, and founded on false documents? How much stronger would he have spoken against that multitude of business with which the Pope was burdened? He knew that, according to the principles of the Gospel, a Bishop and a successor of the Apostles ought to be disengaged from temporal affairs, to give his time to prayer and the instruction of the people, but the authority of custom held him back, and for want of sufficient acquaintance with antiquity, and of knowing how the Popes had fallen into that embarrassment of business, he dared not speak boldly, and advise Eugenius to revert to the simplicity of the first centuries.

“ Nevertheless the description which this holy Doctor has left us of the court of Rome, makes us see, how much this new jurisprudence of the false Decretals had injured the holy See, under pretence of extending its authority. For St. Bernard represents to us the consistory of Cardinals as a parliament, or a sovereign tribunal, occupied with judging processes from morning to evening; and the Pope who presided there so overwhelmed with business, that he had scarcely a moment to breathe: the court of Rome full of advocates, solicitors, pleaders, empassioned, artful, and interested, seeking only to surprise each other, and enrich themselves at the expense of others. We form the same notion of it by the history of the Popes of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and by their letters, specially those of Innocent III., where we see so prodigious a detail of the affairs of all Christendom. These letters alone were a terrible occupation: for even if the Pope did not compose them himself, it was at least necessary for him to have account of them

Description  
by the latter  
of the  
Papal Curia.

CHAP.  
VII.

given him, and to take cognizance of the most important matters. And how could a Pope so occupied find time for prayer, for the study of the holy Scriptures, for preaching, and the other essential duties of the Episcopate? I do not speak here of the cares which his rank as a temporal prince gave him : I shall come to that in course.

“I see well that, by extending without measure the authority of the Pope, it was believed that a great advantage was gained for him, and his Primacy made to tell the more. One must have been then absolutely ignorant of the history of the Church, or have supposed that the greatest Popes, as St. Leo and St. Gregory, had neglected their rights, and suffered their dignity to be set at nought. For it is very certain in fact that they never exercised the authority marked in the Decretals of Isidore. But let us go a little deeper into things. Had not those holy Popes good reasons to act so? Had they not higher thoughts and a more perfect knowledge of religion, than Gregory VII. and Innocent III.? Vulgar men only seek their private interests : philosophers, who carry their thoughts further, see by merely natural reason that in every society the interest of each individual, even of him who governs, ought to yield to the interests of the whole society. Now we may not think that Jesus Christ has established His Church on principles less pure than those of the pagan philosophers: so He has not proposed to those who govern His flock faithfully any advantage in this life, but only an eternal recompense proportioned to their charity.

“Let us then candidly admit, that the Popes of the five or six first centuries had reason to consider the advantage of the Church Universal preferably to that which might appear serviceable to their person or their See. Let us further admit, that the advantage of the Church required, that all matters should be judged on the spot by those who could do it with the greatest knowledge and facility : that the Bishops, especially their chief, should be turned aside as little as was possible from their spiritual and essential functions ; and that each one of them should remain fixed in the Church where God had put him, given up continually to instruct and sanctify his people. Can one compare to such real

The Primacy of S. Leo and S. Gregory a very different thing from this.

goods the sorry advantage of rendering the Pope terrible through all the earth; and of causing to come to Rome from all sides Bishops and Clergy, either through fear of censures, or for hope of favours?

SECT.  
III.

“ I know that that crowd of Prelates, and other foreigners, whom divers interests drew to Rome, brought thither great riches, and that its people fattened at the expense of all others: but I am ashamed to mention such an advantage in a matter of religion. Was then the Pope established at Rome to make it rich, or to make it holy? And did not St. Gregory fulfil the duty of common Father better, when by his alms he spread so abundantly through all the Provinces the immense revenues of the Roman Church? Now those Popes who made Rome rich did not make it holy: it seems even that they despaired of being able to do it, according to the frightful picture St. Bernard has given us of the Roman people in his day. Nevertheless it was the first duty of a Pope, as their Bishop, to labour for their conversion: and he was more obliged to this, than to judge so many processes between foreigners.

Riches brought to Rome by this abuse of appeals not to be considered.

“ *Gratian's Decretum completely established and extended the authority of the false Decretals, which are found scattered everywhere there; for during more than three centuries no other Canons than those of this collection were known, no others were followed in the schools and tribunals. Gratian had even gone beyond these Decretals, to extend the authority of the Pope, maintaining that he was not subject to the Canons: which he says on his own warrant, and without adducing any proof of authority. Thus was formed in the Latin Church a confused idea that the power of the Pope was without limits: that principle once laid down, many corollaries have been drawn from it beyond the points formally expressed in the false Decretals: and the new theologians have not sufficiently distinguished these opinions from the essential of the Catholic Faith, touching the Primacy of the Pope, and the rules of the ancient discipline.*

The authority of the false Decretals established by Gratian's Decretum, which even went beyond them.

“ Besides what regards the Pope, Gratian has put into his Decretum new principles respecting the immunity of Clerks, who cannot, as he maintains, be judged by the laity in any case: and to prove it he cites several articles of the false

Immunity of Clerks.

CHAP.  
VII.

Decretals, and the pretended law of Theodosius adopted by Charlemagne to extend excessively the jurisdiction of Bishops. He joins to them a maimed citation from a novell of Justinian, which, when complete, asserts just the reverse. Nevertheless this constitution so altered was the principal ground, on which St. Thomas of Canterbury resisted the king of England with a firmness, which drew upon him persecution, and at length martyrdom. The principle was false at the bottom: but it passed for true with the most skilful Canonists.

“You have just seen into what inconveniences men fell from having believed in false documents. It became a custom besides to receive without selection all sorts of narrations, for want of principles to distinguish them; and thence came so many fabulous legends, so many false miracles, so many visions and frivolous stories, as we see amongst others in the dialogues of the monk Cesarius.

Pope Innocent's answer on this to the Emperor of Constantinople.

“The principles cited by Gratian touching the immunity of Clerks are the foundation of the answer, which Pope Innocent III. made to the Emperor of Constantinople at the commencement of his pontificate, and from which is drawn a celebrated Decretal. In this letter the Pope gives forced explanations to the passages of St. Peter, alleged by the Emperor to shew, that all Christians without exception ought to be subject to the temporal power. The Apostle, says he, spoke thus to excite the faithful to humility: the king is sovereign, but only of those who receive from him temporal things, that is to say, the laity: as if the Church had not also received her temporalities from the secular power. The Pope continues: that the prince has not received the power of the sword over all the wicked, but only over those who, using the sword, are subject to his jurisdiction. By which he understands still laymen alone, to procure for criminal Clerks exemption from temporal punishments, that is to say, impunity. He adds that no one ought to judge the servant of another, supposing that Clerks are not the servants of the prince. In fine he cites the allegory of the two great luminaries which God has placed in the heaven, to signify, says he, the two great dignities, the pontifical and the royal: as if in a serious discussion it was allowable to advance as a

principle an arbitrary allegory, which one has only to deny in order to refute. Thus it is that the most formal authorities of the Scriptures were eluded, in order to support prejudices drawn from the false Decretals.

SECT.  
III.

“Now Pope Innocent III. could not address himself worse than to a Greek Emperor, in order to set forth these principles unknown to antiquity. The Latin princes, ignorant for the most part to the degree that they could not read, believed in these matters all that the Clerks told them, of whom they took counsel; and these Clerks had all studied in the same schools, and drawn from the same source, the Decretum of Gratian. Among the Greeks all respectable persons studied, laymen as well as Clerks; and instructed themselves in the original books, Scripture, the Fathers, the ancient Canons; but they were not acquainted with the false Decretals fabricated in the West and written in Latin: *so they had preserved the ancient discipline on all the points which I have here marked. You have seen that all their Bishops, and their Patriarchs even, were judged and often deposed in Councils: that permission was not asked of the Pope to assemble them, nor appeal made to him from their judgments. He was not applied to for the translations of Bishops, or the founding of Bishoprics: the Canons comprised in the ancient code of the Greek Church were followed.* I do not say that this Church was exempt from abuses; I have marked many on different occasions, and I know that the Patriarchs of Constantinople had claimed an excessive authority by the favour of the Emperors, who had even much encroached on the Ecclesiastical power; but still the ancient formalities were always outwardly maintained, the Canons were known and respected.

These principles quite unknown to the Greeks.

“You will say perhaps, one must not be astonished that the Greeks did not apply to the Pope, either for appeals, or for all the rest, since from the time of Photius they no longer recognised him as head of the Church. *But did they apply to him before? And in the times when they were most united with the Roman Church did they observe anything of that which I call the new discipline? They were not so heedless as to do it, since the Latins themselves did it not, and this discipline was yet unknown to all the Church.* More-

At the time of their greatest union with Rome they knew nothing of this new discipline.

CHAP.  
VII.

over, do not deceive yourself in that, the schism of the Greeks is not so ancient as is commonly believed: I will shew it in another discourse: but in the mean time I remark to you, that it scarcely took shape before the taking of Constantinople by the Latins. Besides I do not see that in the disputes we have had with the Greeks, from the time of Leo IX., and Michael Cerularius, we have reproached them with holding Councils without the Pope's permission, and the rest of the points in question: and I do not see any more that Gregory VII. and his successors have cited to Rome Greek Bishops, and treated them as they treated the Latin: they knew well that they would not have obeyed. . . .

System of Legations, arising from the increase of the Pope's power drawn from the false Decretals.

"The spiritual power of the Pope having extended itself to such a degree by the conclusions drawn from the false Decretals, he was obliged to commit his powers to others: for it was impossible that he should go everywhere, or cause every body to come to him. Hence came the Legations so frequent from the eleventh century. Now the Legates were of two sorts, Bishops or Abbots of the country, or Cardinals sent from Rome. Legates taken on the spot were further different: the one established by a particular commission of the Pope, the other by the prerogative of their See, and these called themselves *Legati nati*, as the Archbishops of Mayence, and Canterbury. The Legates come from Rome called themselves Legates *a latere*, to mark that the Pope had sent them from his person, and this expression was drawn from the Council of Sardica.

"The *Legati nati* did not willingly endure the Pope's naming others to the prejudice of their privileges, but the Pope had more confidence in those he had chosen, than in Prelates with whom he was little acquainted, or who suited him not. Now amongst those whom he chose, the most favourable were they whom he took on the spot, because they were more capable of judging and ordering with knowledge of the cause, than foreigners come from a distance. So you have seen with what urgency Ivo of Chartres begged the Popes not to send these foreign Legates. They were not received in England, any more than in France, unless they had been asked for by the king. The Bishops hardly endured seeing themselves presided over by foreign Bishops, still less by a

Cardinal Priest or Deacon, under pretext of his being Legate, for until then all Bishops took rank before Cardinals which were not so. SECT.  
III.

“ But what rendered the Legates *a latere* more odious was their pride, luxury, and avarice. They travelled neither at their own expense, nor that of the Pope, but of the country whither they were sent; and they went in great pomp, that is, with a suite of at least twenty-five horses, for to this the third Council of Lateran had limited them. Wherever they passed, they caused themselves to be treated magnificently by the Bishops and Abbots, to such a degree that the monasteries were sometimes reduced to sell the sacred vessels of their Churches to provide for such expenses. You have seen complaints of this. Nor was this all: they must have presents made them besides: they received such from the princes to whom they were directed, and often from the parties to whom they rendered justice: at least the expeditions were not gratuitous. In fine the Legations were golden mines for the Cardinals, and they returned from them generally laden with riches. You have seen what St. Bernard said of it, and with what admiration he speaks of a disinterested Legate. Pride,  
luxury, and  
avarice of  
the Legates.

“ The most ordinary result of a Legation was a Council, which the Legate convoked at the place and time that he judged suitable. He presided there, and decided the affairs which appeared, and published certain rules of discipline, with approbation of the Bishops, who for the most part did nothing else but applaud: for it does not appear that there was much deliberation. Thus were insensibly abolished the Provincial Councils, which each Metropolitan was bound to hold every year according to the Canons: the dignity of the Archbishops, overshadowed by that of the Legates, degenerated into titles and ceremonies, such as having a pall and a cross borne before them: but they had no longer authority over their suffragans, and Councils of Legates only were now seen. Now, to remark it in passing, I doubt not that frequent Legations have been the source of the distinguished rank which the Cardinals of the Roman Church have since held: for each Church had its own, that is to say, Priests and Deacons attached to certain titles. But as in Legatine  
Councils  
held instead  
of Provin-  
cial.

CHAP. VII. these Councils the Cardinal Legates were seen above not only Bishops, but Archbishops, Primate, and Patriarchs, men became accustomed to join to the title of Cardinal the idea of a dignity which only yielded to that of the Pope. The state dress of the Cardinals confirms this thought: the cape and hat were the dress on a journey, which belonged to the Legates: red was the colour of the Pope, and it was the better to represent him that the Legates wore it, according to the remark of a Greek historian.

Diminution of the authority of Metropolitans.

“Here however is one of the greatest changes which the discipline of the Church has suffered, the cessation of Provincial Councils, and the diminution of the authority of the Metropolitans. Was then that beautiful order, so wisely established from the birth of the Church, and so advantageously practised during eight or ten centuries, to be overturned without deliberation, without inquiry, without cognizance of cause? But what reason could have been alleged for it? Were foreign Legates, who knew not either the manners or the language of the country, and who only sojourned there in passing, more proper than the ordinary pastors, to judge in differences, and establish discipline? And when they had published fine rules in a Council, could they be assured that these would be observed after their departure, if the Bishops did not lend their hand to it? Let us conclude upon this point as upon the rest, the ancient discipline has not been changed to establish a better. Thus we do not see that, during the frequent Legations, religion has been more flourishing.

Desire of Bishops and Metropolitans, to obtain Legatine powers.

“The Bishops and Metropolitans were so ignorant of their rights, that they sought with eagerness for the powers of Legates, not considering the advantage of a proper and independent, though less, authority, over one more extended, but borrowed and precarious. It seemed they could do nothing any longer by themselves, unless the authority of the Pope supported them: and the Pope willingly granted them these favours, which they could have done without, and which always extended his power. It is the same, in proportion, with the custom, so frequent then, of causing agreements made between Churches, and donations to their profit, to be confirmed by the Pope: as if these acts would have

been less valid without the confirmation. Right is assumed by favours asked without necessity: and claims are so made to render them necessary. . . . .

SECT.  
III.

“I well feel that it is sad to direct notice to these unedifying facts: and I fear that those who have more piety than enlightenment may derive thence occasion of offence. They will perhaps say, that these facts should have been dissembled in the history, or that, after having reported them, they ought not to have had attention drawn to them in a treatise. But truth is the foundation of history: and to suppress a part of it is not to recount it truly.” . . . “*If these disorders had in such sense ceased, that no vestige of them any more remained, perhaps they might have been left buried in eternal oblivion: but we see only too much their fatal consequences. The heresies which for two (three) hundred years have been rending the Church, the ignorance and superstition which reign in some Catholic countries, the corruption of morality by the new principles, are but too sensible effects of them. And is it not useful to know whence evils so great have come?*”

Fatal and continued effects of the aforesaid abuses.

. . . “Can one still, in the light of this century, maintain the donation of Constantine and the Decretals of Isidore? And if these documents cannot be defended, can one approve the results drawn from them? Let us then candidly admit that Gregory VII. and Innocent III., deceived by these documents, and the bad reasonings of the theologians of their times, have pushed their authority too far, and have rendered it odious by stretching it: and let us not attempt to support excesses, of which we see the causes and the fatal effects. For at last, whatever one may say, it is evident that the first centuries furnish us with a greater number of holy Popes than the last, and that the manners and discipline of the Roman Church were much purer. *Now it is not credible that the Popes have commenced knowing their rights, and exercising their power in its full extent, only since their life has been less edifying, and their especial flock less well regulated.* This reflection supplies a disagreeable prejudice against the new principles.

“Of all the changes of discipline I see none, which has brought the Church into greater disrepute, than the rigour

Rigour exercised against

CHAP.  
VII.

heretics  
contrary to  
ancient  
practice.  
Abuse  
of Indul-  
gences.

exercised against heretics and other excommunicated persons." He then shews how utterly this was opposed to ancient practice.

"I finish these sad reflections by the change introduced into penitences. Public penitences were turned into torments and temporal penalties." . . . "It is true that the multitude of indulgences, and the facility of gaining them, were a great obstacle to the zeal of the most enlightened confessors. It was difficult to persuade a sinner to fast and discipline himself, who could buy off this by a trifling alms, or the visit of a church. For the Bishops of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries granted these indulgences to all sorts of pious works, as the building of a church, the maintenance of an hospital, in fact every public work, a bridge, a causeway, the pavement of a high road. These indulgences were indeed but a part of the penitence, but if several of them were joined, the whole might be bought off. . . . .

This alteration of the Church's discipline introduced by negligence and ignorance.

"Here I end by remarking what I think I have proved, that *the changes, which have happened to the discipline of the Church in the last five or six hundred years, have not been introduced by the authority of Bishops and Councils, to correct the ancient practice: but by negligence, by ignorance, by error, founded on false documents, as the Decretals of Isidore, and on the bad reasonings of the scholastic Doctors.* God grant that we may profit by the favour He has shewn us of being born in a more enlightened age; and that, if we cannot bring back the ancient discipline, we may at least know how to esteem it, revere, and regret it."

Power attributed to the Pope by the Ultra-montanians grounded on the maxims of the Decretals and of Gratian.

"The unlimited power," says the justification of Fleury, "which the Ultra-montanians attribute to the Pope, is at the bottom only founded on these maxims, (of the Decretals and Gratian:) if then it is proved evidently that they are new, and that they have been unknown to all antiquity, it is demonstrated that this power is a chimera, and that it ought not to be admitted. It is nevertheless not the less certain that the Pope has by divine right the Primacy in the Church. . . . What can we conclude thence, save that this Primacy ought to be carefully distinguished from that absolute authority, which has been ascribed to the Pope in these last times." . . . .

“All would have been in order in respect to the government of the Church, if things had remained on the footing on which they were in the first five or six centuries, and so long as the authority of the Popes was contained in its just limits. But the false Decretals changed the face of things, and made great breaches in the discipline of the Church, as M. Fleury often complains, by the new rights that they ascribed to the Popes. . . . There are some of these new rights which have always been contested, but there have been also others which have not been: thus one should regard these latter as acquired to the Pope by custom, and by the concession of the other Bishops and Princes, *until that it please the Church assembled in General Council to recall things to their first state.*”

“One cannot believe how much such writers (Ultra-montane) injure religion under pretext of wishing to defend it. In fact if the Primacy, which we recognise in the Pope as being of divine right, has nothing real without one’s recognising that he is sole judge of Bishops, that he alone can depose them, and that his power is without limits: proved as it is that these are new principles, invented by the author of the false Decretals, by Gratian, and by the flatterers who have gone beyond these first two, it will follow that the Protestants have reason not to recognise this Primacy, and that one does ill in proposing it to their belief, when they re-enter the bosom of the Church.”

Necessity of distinguishing the Primacy from this power.

“*It is not indeed to be dissembled,*” says Archbishop de Marca, “*that that administration of the Church, which is claimed for Bishops by divine right, has not been taken away by any Decretals; although the manner of exercising that power according to the circumstance of the times be variously ordered by various regulations. And therefore should such times arise, that the necessity of ruling the Church compel the Bishops to depart from more recent rules, nothing forbids the natural and divine right from holding good, omitting those formulas which are prescribed by the new right. For instance, if a vacancy of the Roman See should be protracted during many years, if the roads should be occupied by hostile arms, so that the Roman Pontiff cannot be approached securely, or if any other like or graver cases should arise, the Church*

De Concordia, lib. 3. cap. 6.

Bishops, according to De Marca may resume the power which they have so ceded.

CHAP. *must be administered by the Right Divine, or that ancient Ec-*  
 VII. *clesiastical Right."*

SECT. IV.

Conclusion  
 from these  
 statements  
 of De  
 Marca,  
 Coustant,  
 Pereira,  
 Van Espen,  
 and Fleury.

Now let us only consider the gravity and the extent of these statements. De Marca, and Father Coustant, Pereira, Fleury, and Van Espen are not Protestants, nor had they in view the justification of the English Church. They concur in stating, and they point to indisputable proofs for their statements, that a great change of principles as to the government of the Church began in the middle of the ninth century, and was received by the end of the tenth, by means of forged documents, the evident intent of which was to raise a Papal Monarchy out of that Primacy which the Pope had hitherto possessed. They declare that the succeeding centuries exhibit the application of these principles to a still greater extent: that, the basis of centralization once laid down, the building gradually arose upon it. Very remarkable indeed it is, as Fleury observes, that this monarchical system is strictly limited to the West: the East never accepted it, and knew nothing of the documents on which it was built. When the Western Church awoke in the sixteenth century to the knowledge that those documents were false, she found herself fettered by the chains which the custom of five hundred years had bound round every limb. Yet, de Marca says, she may one day cast them off.

Tom. 5.  
 462.

Summary  
 of the argu-  
 ment of  
 this book,  
 in Van  
 Espen's  
 language.

"Above we have seen," observes Van Espen, "that not only the opinion of our opponents derives no strength from the Gospel, but that the quotations from this rather destroy it. We have now to inquire, whether from the Epistles of the Supreme Pontiffs quoted in Gratian's Decretum they can have any ground for thinking, that all spiritual jurisdiction dwells in the Roman Pontiff as in an exuberant fountain-head, whence it is parted into streams and derived to the inferior ministers of the Church, so that the Roman Pontiff according to his pleasure has committed all the authority which they hold to all Bishops and Pastors, and can

‘freely deprive any one of jurisdiction, as he shall see more expedient for the government of the Church, and can exercise it of his own right either personally, or commit it to another to be exercised in his name.’ For these are the views of our opponents, on which the whole matter properly turns. *But I reply that such assertions by no means agree with the decrees of the holy Fathers and the primitive discipline of the Church, and that this plenitude of Papal power, which our adversaries pretend, was utterly unknown for seven centuries and more: nor did the Roman Pontiffs during all that time claim it. But I grant of my own accord that this plenitude of power was gradually attributed by certain Canonists to the Roman Pontiff, on the authority of the false Decretals, and specially of Gratian’s Decretum: and that afterwards the Pontiffs themselves claimed it, as given to them by Christ in the person of Peter.*”

SECT.  
IV.

See this right exercised in the case of the French Bishops, p. 439, above.

The above passage may be taken as a summary of my whole argument; I did not fall in with it till my own conclusion was completely formed.

In another place he says: “It is therefore, I conceive, plainly demonstrated, that the pretended plenitude of Pontifical power is by no means proved by the modern usage of instituting, confirming, and ordaining Bishops: because so far from the truth is it that this practice and custom flowed from the original authority of the Roman Pontiff granted to him by Christ, that it has been rather introduced contrary to the primitive and constant discipline of eleven centuries, supported by no Canons, but in opposition to the ancient Canons, not without bitter complaints of Catholics, and of Councils themselves, who had at heart venerable antiquity and their forefathers’ discipline, which had flowed down to them from a pure source: while at the same time those very great inconveniences and evils, which accompanied the new practice, were the utmost grief to them.”

Tom. 5.  
476.

The present institution, confirmation, and consecration of Bishops, contrary to the practice of the first eleven centuries.

The false Decretals, still further carried out by Gratian, and the various Extravagantes, would seem of themselves sufficient to account for the immense difference between that government under which St. Augustine, St. Chrysostome, and St. Cyril lived, and that which is now attempted to be forced on all Christians at the peril of their salvation. Yet besides

The system of the false Decretals accounts for the difference between the government of the Church in

CHAP.  
VII.

our own  
time, and  
in that of  
St. Augus-  
tine.

these, and those circumstances of Western Europe, (as Gieseler, quoted above, remarks,) which led to their forgery, the Popes found in the several monastic orders throughout Europe the most unceasing and energetic pioneers of their power. From the very first there appears to have existed a desire to exchange the present superintendence of the local Bishop for the distant authority of the Pope. The great Orders, indeed, were themselves so many suspensions of the Episcopal system. With reason do the statues of their founders adorn the nave of St. Peter's, not only as witnesses of the Church's exuberant life, but as those whose hands, more than any others, have helped to rear that colossal central power, of which that fane is the visible symbol.

Ninth cen-  
tury period  
of the  
transition  
from the  
Primacy to  
the Papal  
claim.

So then in the ninth century, which is the period of transition from the legitimate influence and authority of the First See and the Primacy, as understood and admitted by the Universal Church, to that Papal claim which has gradually extended itself over the Western Church, and absorbed the Western Episcopate into itself, I find the following various but connected causes working to bring about this consummation.

Causes se-  
verally  
tending to  
this:  
1. Gradual  
subtraction  
of allegi-  
ance from  
the Eastern  
Emperors.

First, the Episcopate of Popes Gregory II. (715-31) and III. (731-41) prepares the way for a subtraction of allegiance from the Eastern Emperors. At length Pope Stephen III., (752-7,) seeing that there was no hope of help from the imperial power, invokes the aid of Pepin against Astulphus the Lombard. After Pepin's victory over the latter, the Roman Bishop and Nobles confer the Patriciate of their city on Pepin and his sons: while Pepin on the other hand confers on the Pope the whole power which the Eastern Exarchs of Ravenna had enjoyed. Thus for a time the Frankish Monarchs and the Pope hold the joint Patriciate of Rome, a dignity which did not absolutely exclude the paramount authority of the Eastern Emperors. Pope Adrian I. in the Seventh Council still addressed Constantine and Irene as his Lords, and was summoned by them to it. But his successor Leo III. and Charlemagne change their joint Patriciate into a supreme dominion in 796, Leo being the first Pontiff who was called our Lord, Dominus Noster, by the Romans. And when four years later on Christmas-day

800, the Pope suddenly bestowed on Charlemagne the imperial crown, and entitled him great and pacific Emperor of the Romans, the very name of allegiance was finally withdrawn by the Bishops of Rome from Constantinople. Charles the Bald, declared Emperor by Pope John VIII., crowned the benefactions of the Frank sovereigns to the Roman See in the year 876, by conferring the supreme power over Rome and its dependent Provinces on the Pontiff *alone*, so that the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenneta writes in 904, that "the Pope for the time being exercised a supreme and despotie power over Rome." St. Leo III. therefore, and his successors, ceasing to be subjects, and speedily becoming sovereign princes, naturally assumed a different and higher tone towards the imperial power at Constantinople from that always held by their most influential and courageous predecessors, such as St. Leo I., and St. Gregory I., and this altered relation to the sovereign could hardly fail to affect the relation to the See of Constantinople, as well as the other Patriarchal Sees of the East.

SECT.  
IV.

Vid. De  
Marca, lib.  
3. c. 10.

But, secondly, this wonderful increase of temporal authority, as it had sprung out of the spiritual power of the See of Rome, so it acted greatly to extend that power. Scarcely can one estimate the advantage accruing to Rome from being the *sole* Apostolic See of the West, a privilege that was shared in the East by the Sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, as it was vainly sought after by Constantinople, which would fain have traced the series of its Pontiffs from St. Andrew. Thus Pope Gregory II. wrote in the year 726 to the Emperor Leo: "All the West casts its eyes upon our Humility, not that we are such (as St. Martin,) but they put great trust in us, and in that image which you threaten to pull down and destroy of the blessed Peter, whom all the kingdoms of the West hold for a God upon earth. . . . All the West sends in its faith offerings to the holy Chief (of the Apostles.) . . . You ought to know and be assured that the Chief Priests, who from time to time sit in Rome, are a wall of partition between the East and West, and the arbiters of peace." Such, at the end of seven centuries, was the time-honoured and legitimate position of the Roman Pontiffs. While they still respected the

2. Increase of temporal power leads to increase of spiritual, supported by the Carolingian race for their own purposes.

Mansi 12.  
971. D. E.  
A.

CHAP.  
VII.

rights of their brother Bishops, yet had they no spiritual peer on a like eminence near them. Now full ready were Pepin and Charlemagne to acknowledge in the Bishop of Rome the supreme spiritual power, which was to be the very instrument for depositing in their own hands the supreme temporal dominion. It is hard to say whether they gave or received most, inasmuch as on their side they added to the weight of material force an influence vested in the hearts and consciences of men, while the Pope on his, recognising an imperial power in the West, delivered himself from the last remains of subjection to the East, and even while he enthroned a temporal superior, (for as soon as Pope Leo had crowned Charlemagne, "he adored him after the manner of the ancient Emperors,") seemed himself yet more exalted, in that this power was received from his hand, and sanctioned by his blessing.

Eginhard, probably an eye-witness, quoted by De Marca.

3. The right of the Pope to crown the Western Emperors.

Thirdly, the crowning of Charlemagne and his immediate successors by the Bishop of Rome seemed to symbolize, as it were, to all the West this relationship between the two powers. For, inasmuch as the Emperor stood undeniably at the apex of the Feudal System, and all temporal authority was derived from him in the medieval imagination, so when that Emperor was seen receiving his crown from the single hand of the Bishop of Rome, not only was the temporal seen to be in submission to the spiritual power, but that Bishop appeared to stand in the like relation to other Bishops as the Emperor to his great vassals. The Monarchical Idea gradually expelled the Patriarchal: the Pope still called the Bishops, he calls them even now, his venerable Brethren, but he treated them more and more as subjects, who were to have no will but his, and no law but obedience.

4. Separation of intercourse between the East and West

Fourthly, there was a growing separation of intercourse between the East and West. As the Eastern Emperors lost the dominion of Southern Italy, one great bond of connection was snapped in twain. The universal disorder of the time effected the rest. From the earliest ages there had been jealousy between these two great divisions of the Church. In truth the East never was minded to receive theological decisions, much less rules of government, from

the West. The language of St. Firmilian and St. Dionysius of Alexandria, in the third century, the conduct of the Antiochene Bishops, the very plaints of St. Basil, and still more the acts of the Second Ecumenical Council in the fourth century, the demeanour of St. Cyril and his brother Patriarchs in the schism which arose out of St. Chrysostome's affair, the passing of the twenty-eighth Canon at Chalcedon, the conduct of Acacius, indeed the whole policy of the See of Constantinople, almost from the time that city became the imperial capital, the scope of which seems to have been to wrest the Primacy from Rome, are but indications of this ill-subdued feeling. As for the fourth century, indeed, the numerous great Councils held during the struggle with Arianism, from 325 to 381, at Antioch, Sardica, Sirmium, Arles, Milan, Ancyra, Seleucia, Ariminum, Constantinople, and Alexandria, nay, the express words of Popes Julius and Liberius, shew how utterly alien to the principles of Church government then universally received was the thought of any supremacy lodged singly in the chief See of the West. But after the Second Nicene Council in 787 no really Ecumenical Council was held, the Eighth not being received by the East. And in the Councils of the West, called by themselves, and in fact their Patriarchal Councils, the Popes of course had a decided predominance, being no longer kept in check by the influence of the other Patriarchs. The Council of Chalcedon, more favourable than any preceding Ecumenical Council, by the admission of Roman controversialists, to the influence of that See, yet passed a Canon which altered the original and fundamental precedency of the Patriarchal Sees against the will of the First Patriarch: and in whatever terms of compliment it might address him to win his compliance, its Canon was ever observed in the East in opposition to his decision: but in the Councils of the West, called General, which succeeded the great division of East and West, there was no power existing to balance the influence of St. Peter's See, or to prevent deference towards an elder Brother from passing into obedience towards a Lord: nay, as soon as the Church was restricted to one Patriarchate, the Patriarchal relations might themselves lead to the Papal: and the Western

SECT.  
IV. —

Independent spirit  
of the East  
from the  
beginning.

Uncon-  
trolled  
power of  
the Roman  
Patriarch  
in the  
West.

CHAP. Bishops ceased to be Apostles, as the First Bishop assumed  
VII. the place of Christ rather than of Peter.

5. The influence of the great monastic orders.

Fifthly, there is, as observed above, the monastic influence, contemporaneously with all this, acting ever in one direction to the exaltation of the central See of the West. However distinct might be the particular aims of the founders and great Saints of the various religious orders, these associations, as they were not to be confined to one diocese, but spread through all, naturally acknowledged their head in him whose supervision extended over all, maintained themselves by his authority, and in consequence spread that authority from the very inmost sanctuaries of self-denial and devotion in the Western Church to its utmost bounds. When St. Bernard in France wrestled all night in prayer for a newly founded convent of his order in Portugal, destined in after ages to be the light of that Southern realm, how could he but regard with reverence the Bishop whose eye was directed over North and South alike, who "wielded the pastoral staff with grey-haired might" from the forests of Norway to the rock of Gibraltar? How could he but seek to extend an influence which alone seemed able to control the highest powers, and reach to the farthest point, of Christendom. The first exemption of a monastic house from Episcopal jurisdiction is said to have been granted by Pope Adeodatus (672-6) to the Abbot of St. Martin of Tours: and in granting it he stated that such exemption was foreign to the custom of the Roman Church. "So that it was only after inspecting the privilege which Crothbert, Bishop of Tours, had bestowed, and the Gallican Bishops had confirmed by their subscriptions, that he interposed the authority of the Apostolic See. Thus he did not exempt the Abbot from the Bishops against their will, but confirmed by his decree their accordant wishes."

De Marca,  
de Concor.,  
lib. 3. c. 16.  
§ 4.

6. The system of the false Decretals.

Lastly, we find all these causes indefinitely strengthened by a successful fraud, which, invented in Germany as a defence against the oppression of the State, but quickly laid hold of and improved at Rome, passes into the medieval mind, becomes its Idea, governs its hierarchy, and moulds its theology, according to the witness of eminent Roman Catholic historians, for five hundred years. No disparage-

ment is it to the great and glorious Saint I have just mentioned, nor to the Angelic and Seraphic Doctors, nor to the master Spirits of medieval times, powerful in doing and in suffering, keen in thought, patient in execution, deniers of self, exalters of God, moulding to the sway of religion the rude Northern and Western tribes, men, the fruit of whose labours we enjoy, saints, who have left a long train of light behind them, not to be extinguished till it melts away into the second coming of their Lord,—no disparagement to them, if they were deceived where reference to the elder records of the Church could no longer be made; no undutifulness in us, if we, with documents before us which they had not, deny a claim which they in ignorance maintained. We but act as they under like circumstances would have acted. If St. Thomas believed the genuineness of the documents contained in Gratian's Decretum, how could he speak of the Papal authority, but as he has spoken? Had he known that the authorities there quoted were forgeries, had he had before him the Canons and Decrees of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, how could he have come to any other conclusion than that which forces itself on every mind at liberty to judge, which evidently has been the conclusion of great modern writers in the Roman Church herself, who from their position could only speak half their thought? nay, the Père Tranquille says, "The Popes who claimed that authority only did it because they believed these Decretals were true; and that their predecessors had enjoyed, from the beginning of the Church, the rights which they saw that these Decretals assigned to them. But in that they were deceived by an error of fact, not knowing that they were supposititious documents." We have the whole process by which the Papal power attained its enormous growth set forth. I do not see what answer can be made save by surrendering the whole ground of Tradition, i. e. historical Truth, which the Roman Church has ever claimed, and nowhere more decidedly than at the Council of Trent, and by taking up in its stead the still shifting treacherous position of a never-ending Development. But surely what originated in a fraud, cannot develop, by any intellectual theory, into a Divine Right.

Fleury,  
Opusc.,  
tom. 4.  
Justification,  
p. 31.

CHAP.  
VII.

How far  
their fraud  
extended.  
1. The Pri-  
macy of  
Rome in-  
contestable.

Here, however, I must draw an important distinction: I must endeavour to shew what I mean by the fraud, and how far it extends.

Assuredly I do not mean the Primacy of Rome. I find as a fact at the Nicene Council that there were three Primatial Sees of the Church, two of them Sees of Peter himself, and one of his disciple St. Mark, and that, of these three, Rome again was first in dignity. And the Council of Chalcedon pointedly recognises the Bishop of Rome as first Bishop of the world. At the same time, however, it formally erects Constantinople, which had been merely a suffragan See of Heraclea, to the second rank in the Church, degrading thereby the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch to the third and fourth place. And, besides, in so doing it declares as strongly as words can speak, that the prerogatives of Rome did not differ *in kind* from those it was conferring on Constantinople. From the beginning indeed there seems to have been a difference of view in the East and West as to the principles on which the hierarchical order of the Church was built, the East founding it on the rank of Metropolitan cities, the West on the dignity of Apostolic Sees. So the Fathers at Chalcedon say: "for the Fathers properly allowed the privileges to the throne of the Elder Rome, because that was the imperial city." To make this Canon square with indisputable facts, I should suppose it not to speak of the Primacy itself, which the Nicene Council found subsisting, but of privileges attached to it, which the Church might enlarge or diminish according to circumstances: for no trace whatever of the Primacy itself having been granted to the See of Rome by any Council exists. The Nicene Council found it first, as Alexandria was second, and Antioch third. If the above words include the Primacy itself, the words "allowed" or "granted the privileges" can only mean by tacit consent: i. e. they would assert that the Primacy is Ecclesiastical, not Divine.

ἀποδεδώ-  
κασι τὰ  
πρεσβεία.

2. The  
Scripture  
promises  
to Peter,  
the giving  
of the keys,  
and the  
commis-

But as to the two great Scripture promises made to Peter, the giving of the keys, and the commission to feed the flock of Christ, there is, as I think I have proved above, a consent of the great Fathers in considering that these promises were made to Peter in the person of the Church, i. e. as the type

of the Bishop, or governing power. They did not consider them as made to any one Bishop *exclusively* of the rest. St. Leo's language, and that of other Popes his successors, stands out in this as opposed to contemporary Fathers, and generally to the tradition of the East, of which I have noted a remarkable proof in the Acts of the Seventh Council: far as that language is itself from the overstrained interpretation put in later times.

History then teaches us that as a fact the Primacy of Rome has always existed: and reverence would suggest that what has always been admitted by the Church of Christ, His Bride, was intended and foreordered by Him, with whose voice she speaks. But the same reasons teach us that the powers and privileges exercised by the Primacy may differ, and have in fact very largely differed, at various times, and depend on the consent of the Church, and the concession of other Bishops. The notion of universal jurisdiction is not at all involved in the original Primacy: as St. Peter exercised none over his brother Apostles, but on the contrary was *sent* by them together with John to the Samaritan converts, and as the decree of the Apostolic Council, the type of all that were to be, ran, "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," not to Peter. Nay: the See of Rome is the See of Peter and Paul, and St. Chrysostome at least revered it quite as much for one as for the other. Accordingly the power of receiving appeals, under particular circumstances, and to a limited degree, is found to have been first *conferred* on the Roman Pontiff by the great Council of Sardica. And on the inordinate development of this power, the successive steps of which De Marca has pointed out, the whole present Papal Supremacy has been built. It cannot therefore be too strongly impressed on the student of Church history, that this power itself *was the gift of a Council*, and that, not Ecumenical, but whose Canon was afterwards rejected by St. Aurelius, St. Augustine, and all the Bishops of Africa: "to this Council is owed the first origin of the right of the Supreme Pontiff as to the Canonical judgments of Bishops." Nay, the discipline of Sardica was even in Gaul received entirely only in the ninth century, according to Fleury. If then at the time of the Seventh and last Ecumenical Council we find the power and influence of the Bishop of Rome practically

S E C T.  
IV.  
sion to feed  
the flock,  
not inter-  
preted by  
the Fathers  
of the See  
of Rome.

Existence  
of the Pri-  
macy from  
the begin-  
ning, but  
great vari-  
ation in the  
amount of  
power at-  
tached to it.  
Universal  
jurisdiction  
not com-  
prehended  
in it.  
Power of  
receiving  
Episcopal  
appeals  
granted  
by Council  
of Sardica.

De Marca,  
de Concor.,  
lib. 7. c. 3.  
§ 6.

CHAP.  
VII.

much greater than it was at the first, nevertheless, it is the same *kind* of power: it was the same system of discipline which still prevailed over the Church: the First See was as much subject to the Canons as the humblest, and indeed bound in an especial manner, as its greatest occupants tell us, to see them fulfilled. And the great increase of power in the Roman See was paralleled by an almost equal increase in that of Constantinople, which from a simple suffragan Bishopric had risen to be the second Patriarchal See, and to which larger authority in cases of appeal was assigned by the Council of Chalcedon, than was ever given by any Ecumenical Council to the See of Rome.

3. The system of the false Decretals developed in a complete overthrow of the ancient discipline, and in the substitution of a Monarchy for a Primacy. The Monarchy, therefore, in contra-distinction to the Primacy based upon a fraud. The Saints of the middle ages deceived on this point.

But, thirdly, it will be clear at once that the system introduced by the false Decretals, and based in them on supposititious documents, led, when it was carried out, to the complete overthrow of this ancient universally received discipline, to the withdrawal of the term Vicar of Christ, and the Idea conveyed by it, from Bishops generally, for the exaltation of one; to the substitution in short of a Monarchy for a Primacy, with all the prodigious changes following thereon. Had it been allowed to prevail in the East, the Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Patriarchal thrones themselves would have sunk into mere delegations of the imperial central power, and a Cardinal Deacon of the Roman Church, as Fleury complains, would take precedence of the Patriarch of Alexandria, whose predecessor presided in his own right in an Ecumenical Council in preference to the Papal Legates specially sent thither. It is then the Idea of the Pope as a Monarch, standing singly in the place of Christ, not in conjunction with, but in exclusion of, his brethren, which, following Roman Catholic Theologians, I have stated above to be based on a fraud; so that the middle ages, their Saints and Doctors, in the West, received as upon the testimony of antiquity, what was in truth most opposed to that antiquity. We may sympathize with them as Churchmen, we may reverence them as Saints, without following them in what was to them, reasoning upon false data, an act of obedience, but would be to us a shutting of our eyes to the truth. All that the Word of God, all that the voice of Ecumenical Councils, through whom He speaks on earth, all that the ancient tradition of the East and West, both

with regard to doctrine, and to the due power and pre-  
 dence of the Roman See, declare, let us both hold and teach,  
 nor surrender one iota thereof to the powers of darkness, or  
 to the fury of a people demanding iniquity, or to the usur-  
 pations of the State. It is as well to affirm most distinctly  
 that the Church of England, neither by her articles, nor her  
 Canons, nor her oath imposed at ordination, rejects either  
 the Primacy of the See of Rome, or such powers and privi-  
 leges as were conceded to that See by Ecumenical Councils,  
 or the universal practice of the Church: but, simply, the  
 power arrogated by that See in defiance of the yet subsisting  
 Canons of those Ecumenical Councils. And it may be added  
 that the destruction of the government of each Province by  
 its Metropolitan and his Council, the intolerable thralldom  
 which the system of Legates had introduced, the perpetual  
 interference with the internal government of every Diocese,  
 the shameless exertion of spiritual authority to obtain grants  
 of money,—Annates and Peter's pence,—in fact those vari-  
 ous acts of tyranny which led the civil power among us to  
 desire and attempt a separation from the control of the  
 Papal See, all these belonged to the exercise not of the ori-  
 ginal and proper Primacy, still less of the Patriarchal power,  
 but of the Supremacy built on the false Decretals. Never,  
 it may be most confidently said, never would that separation  
 have taken place, had the Popes of the middle ages been  
 content with the influence and power exercised by the first  
 Leo, and the first Gregory. Whatever be the crimes of that  
 miserable crisis on both sides, this truth at least I see most  
 clearly: it may be a comfort to those, whom the tale of  
 sacrilege and confusion, the disorder of all holy things, the  
 turning of a Catholic hierarchy into a State's police officers,  
 the tearing down of cloisters, and the pollution of altars,  
 pierce to the heart. Let us grant all this with sorrow and  
 confusion of face. It remains that the English Church has  
 been excommunicated by the Latin for demanding the  
 privileges which the Church of St. Augustine enjoyed: for  
 denying a claim which did not begin to be made till eight  
 centuries had passed away. During all this time history  
 with its multitudinous and imperishable voice is on our  
 side.

SECT.  
 IV.

The power  
 of the Ro-  
 man Pontiff  
 denied by  
 the English  
 Church is  
 not his  
 Primacy,  
 nor the au-  
 thority al-  
 lowed him  
 by the  
 Seven Ecu-  
 menical  
 Councils,  
 but his  
 Monarchy.

CHAP.  
VII.

Even then the Papal structure was so gradually built upon the Patriarchal, that no one age could accurately mark where the one ended and the other began, but all may see the finished work. It requires no microscopic eye to distinguish the authority of St. Leo or St. Gregory from that of St. Innocent the Third. The poet spake of a phantom what is true of a great reality:—

“*Mobilitate viget, viresque acquirit eundo,*

*Ingrediturque solo, et caput inter nubila condit.*”

Great Saints who have maintained and illustrated the Papacy as the champion of the liberties of the Church.

That power, for which the heroic and saintly Hildebrand died in exile<sup>m</sup>, if exile there could be to him who received the heathen for his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for his possession; for which our own St. Anselm, forced against his will to the Primacy, stood unquailing in the path of the Red King, most furious, if not the worst, of that savage race, whose demon wrath seemed to justify the fable of their origin; for which St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers in age, but equal to the first in glory, wrote and laboured, and wore himself out with vigils, and wrought miracles; for which our own St. Thomas shed that noble blood, which sanctifies yet our primatial Church, an earnest of restoration and freedom to come: that power, for which St. Francis, the spouse of holy poverty, so long neglected since her First Husband ascended up on high, and St. Dominic—

*l' amoroso drudo*

*Della fede Cristiana, il santo atleta,*

*Benigno a' suoi, ed a' nemici crudo;—Dante, Paradiso, xii. 55.*

and one greater yet, the warrior saint, Ignatius, raised their myriads of every age and of both sexes, armed in that triple mail of poverty, chastity, and obedience, “of whom the world was not worthy;”—that power, to which have borne witness so many saintly Bishops, poor in the midst of riches, and humble in the exercise of more than royal power,—so many scholars, marvellously learned,—so many, prodigal of labour and blood, who are now counted among the noble army of martyrs,—so many holy women, who have hidden themselves under the robe of the first of all saints, and followed the

<sup>m</sup> See the account of his death in Bowden's *Life*.

Virgin of virgins in their degree;—that power, is, indeed, the most wondrous creation which history can record, and one to which I am not ashamed to confess that I should bow with unmingled reverence, had not truth a yet stronger claim upon me, and did not the voice of the early Church, its Fathers, Councils, and Martyrs, the voice of the East and West, so long as it was one, sound distinctly in my ears another language. Still, human and divine, ambition and Providence, are so mingled there, that I would not utter a word more than truth requires. I should even be compelled to give up the strongest individual conviction, acknowledging the weakness and liability to err of any private judgment; acknowledging, moreover, that a single Province of the Church, if opposed to all the rest, is certain to be in error, were it not that, besides the voice of antiquity, we have witnesses the most legitimate, the most time-honoured, the most unswerving in their testimony,—witnesses who take away from our opponents their proudest claim,—nay, a claim which, if real, would be irresistible,—that of being, by themselves, the Catholic Church.

SECT.  
IV.

Yet they do not annul the testimony of the Ecumenical Councils and the undivided Church.

## SECT. V.

LET it never, then, be forgotten, that any argument which would prove the Church of England to be in schism would condemn likewise the Eastern and Russian Church. It is not the Catholic Church against a revolted Province, as our adversaries would have us believe; it is the one Patriarch of the West, with part of his Bishops, against the four Patriarchs of the East, with theirs, and that great and, as yet, unbroken phalanx of the North, which Constantinople won to the Faith of old, and which now promises to beat back the tide of heresy and infidelity from the beleaguered Sees of the East. On this point of schism, at least, they bear witness with us. The causes, adverted to above, which were so influential in exalting the great fabric of Roman power in the West, did not act upon the East,—nay, acted in the inverse direction. The See of Constantinople still remains where the Council of Chalcedon placed it, where the Emperor Justinian recog-

This testimony of antiquity corroborated by a witness existing from the earliest times to present, the Oriental Church.

CHAP.  
VII.

nised it to be, the second See of the world: and it has ever since refused to admit that Rome was *first* in any sense in which itself was not *second*. This may serve to set in a clear light the vast difference between the legitimate power of the First See, and the claim to give jurisdiction to all Bishops, between the discipline which was once universal in the West, as well as in the East, and existed there till the introduction of the false Decretals, on the one hand, and, on the other, that vast system of centralization, which has been built up in the West by their assistance, claiming to itself in the concrete a divine right, which at the most could only belong to the original Primacy, as understood and received by the Universal Church. The systems, of which these are expressions, are in truth antagonistic. Constantinople maintains still that constitution of the whole Church which St. Gregory accused its Bishops of undermining. The evil which he foresaw has come from his own successors: "the cause of Almighty God, the cause of the Universal Church," the privileges and rights of Bishops and Priests, as against one "Universal Pope," are borne witness to now, as they have ever been, by the immutable East. Here, at least, are no sympathies with the heresiarchs of the sixteenth century: the Synod of Bethlehem has anathematized Luther and Calvin as decidedly as the Council of Trent. Here was no Henry the Eighth fixing his supremacy on a reluctant Church by the axe, the gibbet, the stake, and the laws of premunire and forfeiture: no State using that Church as a cat's-paw for three hundred years, and ready now to offer it up a holocaust to the demon of liberalism. Here is the ancient Patriarchal system, the thrones of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, subsisting still. Here is the same body of doctrine, the same seven sacraments, the same Real Presence, the same mighty sacramental and sacerdotal system, which Latitudinarian and Evangelical, statesman and heretic, dread while they hate, as being indeed the visible presence of Christ in a fallen world,—the residence of a spiritual power, which controls and torments the worldling, while it disproves and falsifies the heretic. Here is all that the Roman Catholic claims as tokens of the truth for himself: but there is one thing more, the same

Force of her  
unbroken  
descent,  
and un-  
changed  
dogmatic  
system.

protest that we make against the monarchical, as distinct from the patriarchal, power, the same appeal back to early Councils, and the unambiguous voice of those who cannot be silenced or corrupted, the Fathers of the Church. In the Fathers of the undivided Church, the East and the North and the West, so long severed, meet: we are not alone, who have with us, on the very point which divides us from our Mother Church, the still unbroken line of successors from St. Athanasius and St. Chrysostome. There is no break in the descent or in the doctrine of the Eastern Churches. There is the same dogmatic, the same hierarchical fabric subsisting now, as when St. Gregory addressed Anastasius of Antioch, and Eulogius of Alexandria. It may suit the purposes of unfair Roman controversialists to brand them as schismatics, and overcome, by calling them a name, their own most formidable opponents; but history cannot be so overcome. They have *never* admitted the Papal sway, any more than the Fathers who passed the 28th Canon of Chalcedon: they have, indeed, admitted the Roman *Pri-macy*, as those same Fathers admitted it; for the very system for which they are witnesses is not complete without the Bishop of Rome stands at the head of it: the *due* honour of Rome is involved in the due honour of Constantinople; and, we may add, the due honour of Canterbury: the same temper, the same persons, who reject the one, hate the other. What we say they never have admitted is, that which has really worked the disunion of the Universal Church, as St. Gregory foretold it would, the doctrine which is the centre of the present Papal system, which alone makes all its parts cohere, and justifies all its acts, and triumphs over all appeal to argument, and all testimonies of antiquity, viz., that "the Pope is set over the whole Christian world, and possesses in its completeness and plenitude that power which Christ left on earth for the good of the Church." They have never for a moment admitted that the Bishops of the Universal Church were the Pope's delegates, and received their jurisdiction from him. *We* fight, it must be admitted, at some disadvantage with our opponents. The long subjection which our Church yielded to Rome, the manifold obligations under which we lie to her, the complete

She denies, and ever has denied, the Monarchy, as strongly as we.

Bellarmino, quoted above.

CHAP.  
VII.

unsettling of the ecclesiastical and doctrinal system in the sixteenth century, the horrible vices of those who effected the change, the connection with those whose doctrine has now worked itself out into Socinianism, infidelity, and anarchy, the inability we have ever since been under of shaking ourselves completely clear of them, the thoroughly unsatisfactory position of the State towards us, as a Church, at present,—all these things are against us,—all these things tell on the mind which really lives and dwells on antiquity, and looks to the pure Apostolic Church. Still, though they weaken, they do not overcome our cause. But from all these objections the witness of the Eastern Churches is free.

Stands in a free and equal position towards Rome.

They were never subject to Rome, but to their own Patriarchs; they derived not their Christianity from her, but she from them, as holy Basil said of old: the Priesthood, and the pure unbloody Sacrifice, and the power to bind and to loose, remain undisputed among them: the Eastern mind cannot conceive a Church without them. They have received no reformation from those whose lives were a scandal to all Christian men: they are not mixed up with the Lutheran or Calvinistic heresy: nor has Erastianism eaten out their life. Yet, if we are schismatics, so are they, and on the same ground. Moreover the Roman Church has again and again treated with them as parts of the true Church. It is only in comparatively modern times, that, as the hope of re-union became fainter, the line of denying their being members of the One Body has been taken up. I have seen even so late as the time of Clement the Eighth a letter of that Pope to the Czar, in which he treats him as already belonging to the Church. Moreover the Eastern Church has put forth the best and most convincing sign of Catholicity, *life*: to her, *since her separation from Rome,*

The Russian Church, born since the separation, an un-

<sup>n</sup> This fact does not at all suit modern Roman views: so it is denied. I am indebted to the Rev. W. Palmer, of Magd. Coll., for the unambiguous testimony of one who produces original and authentic proofs of the fact. It is contained in the 'History of Christianity in Russia, to the time of Vladimir, to serve as an introduction to the history of the Russian Church, by the Archimandrite Macarius, Inspector and Pro-

fessor of Theological Sciences in the Spiritual Academy at St. Petersburg, 1846.'

At p. 394, there is the following note.

"Here we cannot refrain from expressing our astonishment, that Romish writers still persist in repeating their antiquated nonsense, that our ancestors in the time of Vladimir received from Constantinople their Roman Catholic faith, and adhered to it during the

and to this particular attention must be claimed, is due the most remarkable conversion of a great nation to the Faith

SECT.  
V.

impeach-  
able note of  
life in her.

whole course of the eleventh century: 'Comme les Grecs de Constantinople,' says one of the contemporary historians of the West, 'étaient unis à l'Eglise Romaine dans le dixième siècle, les Russes, qui reçurent d'eux le Christianisme, furent Catholiques au commencement de leur conversion; ils le demeurèrent pendant tout le onzième siècle, ou la foi Chrétienne fait chez eux des progrès encore plus sensibles.' (!?) But this is a trifle: they would have it that the Russians afterwards remained Roman Catholics without intermission from the twelfth even down to the eighteenth century, with the exception of some inconsiderable intervals, when their metropolitans were schismatics, or suspect of heterodoxy. 'Depuis le douzième siècle jusqu'au dix-huitième les Russes furent généralement Catholiques, sauf certains intervalles, on ils eurent des Metropolitains schismatiques ou suspects.' (Histoire Univ. de l'Eglise Catholique par l'Abbe Rohrbacher, Paris, 1844, tom. xiii. p. 238.) These nonsensical fables of Leo Allatius, (De perpetua consens. Eccl. Orient. et Occident.,) Schtilling, (Acta SS. tom. ii. Septembr. de convers. et fide Russorum,) and others, have long ago been completely refuted, (see e. g. Spanheimii de dissensione Eccles. Orient. et Occident., p. iv. § vii. tom. ii. opp.,) though the learned foreigners who refuted them were altogether unacquainted with our native documents, which reach down through the whole succession of centuries, and utterly explode any such idle theory. For ourselves, we may here, against the first part of the above-mentioned theory, make the following remarks:

"1. That those three Patriarchs of Constantinople, Nicholas Chrysoberges, Sisinnius, and Sergius, who were contemporaries with Vladimir, and who sent us our first metropolitans, to plant among us the holy Faith, were so far from being in unity with the Pope, that on the contrary they rose up publicly against him: this the celebrated Leo Allatius himself is obliged to admit, in his work above referred to, though writing with quite a contrary purpose, and so is Baronius, a champion of the papal power still more zealous than Allatius, (Baron. Annal. ad ann. 995. num. 10. Ib. ad ann. 998,

999, et Leonis Allatii de perpet. Cons. Eccles. Orient. et Occident., lib. ii. cap. 8.)

"2. But to shew that it certainly was not the Roman Faith which was then introduced among us, or which was maintained during the course of the eleventh century, we may advert to the following: (a.) The Answer returned by Vladimir to the? ['German,' 'Latin,' or] ["Papal missionaries, 'go away and return; our Fathers received not this from you;'] whether we ascribe this answer to Vladimir himself, as actually made with his own lips, or to the annalist, who lived in the eleventh century; (b.) The Creed delivered to Vladimir on his baptism, in which the Holy Ghost is confessed to proceed 'from the Father' only, and this injunction is expressly given at the same time, 'But receive not from the Latins their doctrine; for their doctrine is perverse:' and then follow some very severe reflexions on the same, with the conclusion, 'God keep thee from this!' (Chron. Lavr., p. 79.) (c.) The Brief of our second Metropolitan Leontius, (A.D. 992—1008,) against the Romans; *περὶ τοῦ ἴτι οὐ δεῖ τελεῖσθαι τὰ ἕξυμα, κ. τ. λ.* (d.) The answer of the venerable Theodosius," [the chief founder of the Pecherskag at Kieff, A.D. 1004—1077,] "to the Great Prince Isyaslaw; 'Of the Varagian [i. e. Latin or Roman] Faith,' in which it is termed, 'an evil Faith,' and 'an impure law,' (Dict. of Eccl. writers, by the Metropolit. Eugenius under the name Theodosius.) (e.) Still earlier, the conversion through the instrumentality of St. Anthony of the Pecherskag, (whose disciple Theodosius was,) of the renowned Varagian chieftain Shimon, with 3000 of his countrymen [Normans] from the Roman ['Latin?'] to the orthodox Faith. (Patericon Pechersk., p. 74—77, and 97.) (f.) The ecclesiastical Canon of the Metropolitan John II., (1080—1089,) in which he seems to regard the Papists ['Latins?'] almost as heathens for their practice of baptising not by immersion but by affusion. (Russ. Memorab., P. i. p. 86.) (g.) The Instruction written to the great prince Vladimir Monomachus by the Metropolitan Nicephorus, (A.D. 1104—1121,) 'Of the Latins, how they have been condemned, and cut off from the Eastern Church.'

CHAP.  
VII.

which has taken place in the last eight hundred years—Russia with her Bishops, her Clergy, her monasteries, her convents, her Christian people, her ancient discipline, her completely organized Church system, her whole country won from Paganism by the preaching of Monks and Missionary Bishops, is a witness to the Greek Church (which who shall gainsay?) that she is a true member of the One Body. The Patriarch of Constantinople exercised that charge which the Council of Chalcedon gave him, and ordained Bishops among the barbarians, and the Spirit of God blessed their labours, and the whole North became his spiritual offspring. Rome cannot shew, since she has been divided from the East, a conversion on so large a scale, so complete, so permanent. And on that great mass she has hitherto made no impression. It is a complete refutation of her claim to be *by herself* Catholic, that there exists out of her Communion that of the Eastern Bishops, a Body of Apostolic descent and government, with the same doctrinal system as her own, with the ascetic principle as strongly developed, with the same claim to miracles,—with all, in fact, which characterizes a Church; a Body, moreover, so large, that, supposing the non-existence of the Roman Communion, the promises of God in Scripture to His Church might be supposed to be fulfilled in that Body°. And this Body, like ourselves, denies that particular Roman claim, for which Rome would have us and them to be schismatic. And it has denied it not merely for three hundred years, but from the time that it has been advanced. Truly all that was deficient on our side seems made up by the Greek Church. And this living and continuous witness of a thousand years is to be added to that most decisive and unambiguous voice of the whole undivided ancient Church.

The Church  
of Christ  
One organ-  
ized body,  
with its  
Head, the  
God-man.

I have, throughout these remarks, considered the Church of Christ to be what at the Councils of Nicea, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, she so manifestly appeared, one organic whole; a Body, with One Head, and many members; as St. Gregory

(Printed in the Memorials of the Russian Literat. of the twelfth century.)  
Enough! to refute the remaining half of the lying fable we have no room here: nor is it necessary."

° I owe this observation to the friend above mentioned, who has had great opportunities of judging about the state of the Russian and Eastern Church.

says, Peter, and Paul, and Andrew, and John; a kingdom with One Sovereign, and rulers, an Apostolic College appointed by that Head, with a direct commission from Himself. I believe that no other Idea about the Church prevailed up to St. Gregory's time. It follows that all so-called national Churches, unless they be subordinate to the law of this kingdom, are so many infringements of the great primary law of unity, in that they set up a member instead of the Body. St. Paul, in the 12th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, has clearly set forth such, and no less, to be the unity of Christ's Body. And so the Saints have ever believed. St. Basil has said very beautifully in words which may apply to the whole state of the English Church: "Be not withheld by this thought that we who inhabit the sea-coast suffer not with the many, and need not the assistance of others: so that why should we require Communion with others? For when the Lord divided the islands from the continent by the sea, he bound the islanders in links of love with the inhabitants of the continent. Nothing separates us from each other, Brethren, if we do not establish that separation by our own purpose. One is our Lord, one our Faith, our hope the same. If ye esteem yourselves the head of the Catholic Church, the head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you. Or whether ye rank yourselves in any other part of the Church's members, ye cannot say to us who are placed in the same body, We have no need of you. For the hands need each other's help: the feet strengthen each other: the eyes by their agreement enjoy a clear vision. For our part we confess our own weakness, and we seek your co-operation. For we know that if ye be not present in body, yet by the help of your prayers ye will do us great service in the most dangerous times. But it is neither seemly before men nor pleasing to God that you should use expressions, which not even the heathen, that know not God, use. For even them we hear, though they may enjoy a country self-sufficient for all its needs, yet for the sake of the future's uncertainty, welcoming alliance with each other, and pursuing free intercourse as advantageous. Shall we then, children of those fathers, whose law it was that the tokens of Communion should be carried about

SECT.  
V.

Definition  
of St. Paul.  
Belief of  
the Saints.

Testimony  
of S. Basil,  
Ep. 208.  
tom. 3.  
p. 301. B.  
applicable  
to the  
English  
Church.

C H A P.  
VII.

in minute characters from one end of the earth to the other, and that all should be fellow citizens and of the same household, shall we now cut ourselves off from the world, and not even be ashamed of our isolation, nor think that the rending asunder of unity carries loss, nor shudder that upon us is come that fearful prophecy of the Lord, who said, that because iniquity shall abound the love of many should wax cold." Let us without hesitation ascribe all the evils that afflict the Latin, the Greek, and the English Communion to our want of unity, knowing who has said, "a house that is divided against itself cannot stand." And above all the great house of human souls, cemented with the Redeemer's blood, is built upon the unity of Faith and Love. Certainly it is a difficulty, that we must admit this essential law to be at present broken. But I do not think it fair to argue against a provisional and temporary state, such as that of the Church of England in respect to non-intercourse with other parts of the Church is confessed to be—which, too, has been forced upon her—as if it were a normal state, one that we have chosen, a theory of unity that we put forth over against the ancient theory, or the present Roman one. Nay, thousands and ten thousands feel, the whole rising mind of the Church feels, that we are torn "from Faith's ancient home," that we groan within ourselves, waiting until God in His good time restore a visible unity to His Church, till the East and the West and the South be one again in the mind of Christ. Who but must view it as a token of that future blessing, that public prayers have been offered up in France and Italy for such a consummation? Let us begin to pray for each other, and we must end by being one. Let us, too, pray that the clouds of error and prejudice, the intense blind jealousy on one side, the cruel and disingenuous temper on the other, may be subdued by the Spirit of God, who in some great and blessed Pentecost shall draw long alienated hearts together, and mould them into a union closer than has ever been, against an attack the last and most terrible of the foretold enemy, the tokens of whose coming are at hand.

The state of  
separation  
provisional  
and tempo-  
rary.

But the Roman Catholic, who seems to escape this difficulty, and points to his Communion as one organic whole,

falls into another. Grant that it is one, but it is at the expense of ceasing to be Catholic: it has lost all the East and the North, and part of the West. Thus, in this choice between difficulties, it seems the least to suppose that the unity of Christendom may be for a time suspended, during which the several parts of Christ's Body retain Communion with the One Head, and thence derive life, though active Communion with each other is suspended. A less difficulty, I say, than to cut off, not merely our own Church, but the seventy millions of the Eastern Church, having a complete inward identity with the Roman, from the covenant of salvation, merely because that intercommunion is prevented by a claim to spiritual monarchy, which was unknown in the best ages of the Church, and has been resisted ever since it was set up. If this view be true, we should expect that the several parts, though living, would yet be languishing, and far from that healthy vigour which they ought to possess; that the Great Head would give manifold warnings of the injury done to His Body. Now, it is very remarkable that the circumstances, no less of the Latin than of the Eastern and the Anglican Church, exactly agree to this expectation. I need not speak on this point of the second and third; but I cannot help thinking that they who have suffered themselves to be driven by fearful scandals out of our bosom, who have brooded over acknowledged but unrelieved wants, till the duty of patient long-suffering has been forgotten, close their eyes to the state of France, Spain, and Italy, under what they have now learnt to call *by itself* the "Catholic" Church. Yet are there tokens abroad which men of less spiritual discernment might lay to heart. Does the "obscene rout" of Ronge and Czarski, bursting forth from the bosom of the Roman Church, awake no misgiving? Fearful when viewed by Scripture and antiquity, as the state of England is, (an argument which is now being used against our Communion with such effect on tender and loving minds,) he must be bold who would venture to say that the relation of the French Church to the French nation in the last century, or its relation even now, greatly as the present French Church is to be admired and sympathized with, does not offer as much ground for fearful

SECT.  
V.

The internal state of the Church's three great divisions answers to what might have been expected.

State of  
France.

CHAP.  
VII.

apprehension, as much reason to dread, lest the terms on which victory is promised to the Church over the world have been essentially broken. I fear there is no doubt that two-thirds of the French capital are not *Christian*, in any sense of the word; and probably the proportion is as great in the larger towns. How did this state of things arise? How has nearly the whole intellect of that country become infidel? From the French Revolution, it will be answered. But how could that great Satanical outburst have ever taken place, had the Church of Christ, free from corruption, as those who have left us believe, and throned in the possession of sixteen hundred years, with its numberless religious houses, its unmarried Clergy, and great Episcopate, been discharging its functions, I do not say aright, but with any moderate efficiency? Surely the acts of the States General were as bad as those of Henry the Eighth; yet its members were Catholics, in full Communion with the Roman See. Surely the Ecclesiastical legislation of Napoleon was as uncatholic as that of a House of Commons; yet it was sanctioned by Concordat with the Pope. But if manifold corruptions did not unchurch the Gallican Communion in the last century,—if the mass of a great nation, which the Church once completely possessed, but has now surrendered to active unbelief, does not invalidate her claim to be a pure Communion at present, why are such things alleged as so fatal a mark against us? God forbid that one should mention such things without the deepest sorrow; but when our troubles, and difficulties, and relations with the State, and the alienated hearts of our people, and the absence of external discipline and inward guidance, and the misery of our divisions, are alleged to prove that we are out of the pale of the Church, these things ought to be weighed on the other side. There ought not to be different measures on different sides of the channel. I forbear to speak of the state of Spain, Portugal, and much of Italy; but I imagine that the worst deeds of the Reformation were at least paralleled by what the Church has had to endure there from the hands of our own children. I believe that our own most sad corruptions have, too, their counterpart among Churches in Communion with the Apostolic See.

State of  
Spain, Por-  
tugal, and  
Italy.

But to conclude. As our defence against the charge of Schism rests upon the witness of the ancient Church, thus fully corroborated by the Eastern Communion, so our whole safety lies in maintaining the clear indubitable doctrine of that Church. I have avoided the whole question of *doctrine* in these remarks, both as leading me into a wider field than that which I am obliged to traverse so cursorily at present, and as distinct from the question of Schism, though very closely connected with it. No one can deny that it is not sufficient for our safety to repel one single charge: but this charge was the most pressing, the most specious, and one which requires to be disposed of before the mind can with equanimity enter upon any other. My conclusion is, that upon the strictest Church principles,—in other words, upon those principles which all Christendom, in its undivided state, recognised for eight hundred years, which may be seen in the Canons and Decrees of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, and more at large in the actions and writings of the Fathers, our present position is tenable at least till the convocation of a really Ecumenical Council. The Church of England has never rejected the Communion of the Western, and still less that of the Eastern Church: neither has the Eastern Church pronounced against her. She has only exercised the right of being governed by her own Bishops and Metropolitans. There is, indeed, much peril of her being forced from this, her true position. I cannot conceive any course which would so thoroughly quench the awakened hopes of the Church's most faithful children, as that her rulers, which I am loth even to imagine, at a crisis like the present, should seek support, not in the rock of the ancient Church, in which Andrewes, Laud, and Ken, took refuge of old,—not in the unbroken tradition of the East and West, by which, if at all, the Church of Christ must be restored,—not in that great system which first subdued and then impregnated with fresh life the old Roman Empire, delaying a fall which nothing could avert, and which lastly built up out of those misshapen ruins all the Christian polities of Europe,—not in that time-honoured and universal fabric of doctrine to which our own Prayer-book bears witness, but in the wild, inconsistent, treacherous sympathies of a Protestantism,

SECT.  
V.

Safety of the English Church lies in maintaining the whole deposit of the ancient Church.

Her claim only that of self-government. An alliance with Protestantism will destroy her.

CHAP.  
VII.

which the history of three hundred years in many various countries has proved to be dead to the heart's core. Farewell, indeed, to any true defence of the Church of England, any hope of her being built up once more to an Apostolical beauty and glory, of recovering her lost discipline and intercommunion with Christendom, if she is by any act of her rulers, or any decree of her own, to be mixed up with the followers of Luther, Calvin, or Zuingli: with those who have neither love, nor unity, nor dogmatic truth, nor Sacraments, nor a visible Church among themselves: who, never consistent but in the depth of error, and the secret instinct of heresy, deny regeneration in Baptism, and the gift of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation and Orders, and the power of the keys in absolution, and the Lord's Body in the Eucharist. That is the way of death; who is so mad as to enter on it? When Protestantism lies throughout Europe and America a great disjointed mass, in all the putridity of dissolution,

“*Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum,*”

judicially blinded, so that it cannot perceive Christ dwelling in His Church, while she grows to the measure of the stature of the perfect man, and making her members and ministers His organs—who would think of joining to it a living Church? Have we gone through so much experience in vain? Have we seen it develop into Socinianism at Geneva, and utter unbelief in Germany, and a host of sects in England and America, whose name is Legion, and who seem to be agreed in nothing else but in the denial of sacramental grace, and visible unity; and all this at the last hour, in the very turning point of our destiny, to seek alliance with those who have no other point of union but common resistance to the tabernacle of God among men? A persuasion that nothing short of the very existence of the Church of England is at stake, that one step into the wrong will fix her character and her prospects for ever, compels one to say that certain acts and tendencies of late have struck dismay into those who desire above all things to love and respect their spiritual mother. If the Jerusalem Bishopric, the still-born offspring of an illicit connection,

*Cui non risere parentes,*

be the commencement of a course of amalgamation with the Lutheran or Calvinistic heresy, who that values the authority of the ancient undivided Church will not feel his allegiance to our own branch of it fearfully shaken? "May that measure utterly fail, and come to nought, and be as though it had never been." The time for silence is past. There is such a thing as "propter vitam vivendi perdere causas." It must be said publicly that such a course will lead infallibly to a schism, which will bury the Church of England in its ruins. If she is to become a mere lurking-place for omnigenous latitudinarianism; if first principles of the Faith, such as baptismal regeneration, and priestly absolution, may be indifferently held or denied within her pale,—though, if not God's very truths, they are most fearful blasphemies,—the sooner she is swept away the better. There is no mean between her being "a wall daubed with untempered mortar," or the city of the living God. I speak as one who has every thing commonly valuable to man depending on this decision; moreover, as a Priest in that Communion, whose constitution, violently suspended by an Enemy for one hundred and thirty years, yet requires that every one of her acts, which bind her as a whole, should be assented to by her Priesthood in representation, as well as by her Episcopacy. To suffer it to be an open question, a matter of doubt, which he who wills may hold, and he who wills may deny, whether or no grace is attached to the acts of the Church, whether or no she has the power and presence of her Lord, whether or no the Body of Christ is really offered on her altars, is a course as intrinsically dishonest and contemptible, as in its effects it must be disastrous. What house with such a rent in it can stand against the first wind that blows? The true position of the Church of England is far other than this. She claimed of old to maintain the Faith of the East and West: her security lies in setting it forth in all its purity, in all its completeness. It is not by dissembling but by exhibiting the truth in its entire cycle, that she must prevail: not by enduring a secret and dishonest compromise between contradictory principles, but by maintaining THE FAITH, that she must fix the hearts of her children, and draw to her those of her opponents. In a

SECT.  
V.

Extreme  
danger of  
allowing  
heresy.

CHAP.  
VII.

negation, in an unreality, no heart can rest. For one rule of life, and no more, hath God given, that which His Apostles preached and planted in all lands: and one bosom only is there in which His children may live in charity and die in peace, that of the Holy Church Catholic. In the hour of need no other support can we find, but that we belong to her who is the Bride of her Lord, the Body whose Head is in heaven, which grows through all times and climes unto the measure of the stature of the perfect man to be revealed in eternity. One temple only is there which gathers in its vast embrace, its long-drawn aisles and central shrine, the worship of all human hearts: which symbolizes even in its outward form the life of all living beings, and the hope of man—the most holy Trinity, and the Cross—God in Himself, and God become man, his Saviour, his Food, and his Reward—the temple of the Church Catholic. Thrice blessed would he be, who was allowed by the labour of his hands, the toil of his mind, or the cost of his blood, to restore one stone which had been displaced in that divine structure. More blessed yet it were to remove a wall which the Enemy has been allowed to draw within the divine enclosure, defacing its fair proportions, and obscuring its sacred symbolism: to join together hearts, which, outwardly divided, feed on the same eternal verity of God made man, and only require the knowledge of each other, of their reciprocal aims and hopes, to be united in outward confession as in inward belief, and to embrace in a never-ending charity.

BOOKS PUBLISHED  
BY JOHN HENRY PARKER,  
OXFORD; AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

---

*Just published, 8vo. 12s.*

JOHN KERRIE M.A.

---

ERRATA.

- P. 15, marg. ref., for 54 read Liv.
- 88, line 2, for avowed read disavowed.
- 88, line 4, for it read at.
- 160, line 1, for successors read successor.
- 189, line 35, for 'The Priests sit in Moses' seat, but in that of Christ,' read  
The Priests 'sit in Moses' seat,' but in that of Christ.
- 193, last line, for just read first.
- 247, line 16, after by little insert and little.
- 335, last marg. ref., erase Mansi 9. 368-70.
- 346, last marg. ref., read S. Greg. Ep. lib. 7. 40.

---

The Edition of the Councils, quoted in this volume, is the last of Mansi, 31 vols. fol. Florence 1759; Venice 1798.

The Editions of the Fathers quoted are the original Benedictine editions, except otherwise specified.

---

By the Rev. CHARLES MARRIOTT, M.A.

Analecta Christiana

In usum tironum. Part 2, completing the work.

By the Rev. EDWARD BURTON, D.D.

The Greek Testament, with English Notes.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED.

CHAP.  
VII.

negation, in an unreality, no heart can rest. For one rule of life, and no more, hath God given, that which His Apostles preached and planted in all lands: and one bosom only is there in which His children may live in charity and die in peace, that of the Holy Church Catholic. In the hour of need no other support can we find, but that we belong to her who is the Bride of her Lord the Redeemer.

BOOKS PUBLISHED  
BY JOHN HENRY PARKER,  
OXFORD; AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

---

*Just published, 8vo. 12s.*

By the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, M.A.

Academical and Occasional Sermons.  
With a Preface on the Present Position of the English Church.

8vo. 12s.

By the Rev. A. PENRHYN STANLEY, M.A.,  
Fellow and Tutor of University College.

Sermons and Essays on the Apostolical Age.

IN THE PRESS,

By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

A New Volume of Sermons.

By the Rev. T. W. ALLIES, M.A.

The Church of England Vindicated from the  
Charge of Schism.

SECOND EDITION, MUCH ENLARGED.

By the Rev. FREDERICK W. MANT, M.A.

Reginald Vere, a Tale of the Civil Wars, in Verse.

By JOHN DAVID MACBRIDE, D.C.L.,  
Principal of Magdalen Hall.

Lectures Explanatory of the Diatessaron.

THIRD EDITION, ENLARGED.

By the Rev. CHARLES MARRIOTT, M.A.

Analecta Christiana

In usum tironum. Part 2, *completing the work.*

By the Rev. EDWARD BURTON, D.D.

The Greek Testament, with English Notes.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED.

BOOKS PUBLISHED BY JOHN HENRY PARKER,

**Library of the Fathers.**

VOLUMES PUBLISHED.

**S. AUGUSTINE.**

CONFESSIONS. *8vo. Third Edition, price 9s.; to Subscribers 7s.*  
HOMILIES on the NEW TESTAMENT. *Two vols. 8vo. Price 28s.;  
to Subscribers 20s.*  
SHORT TREATISES. *Price 16s.; to Subscribers 12s.*  
ON THE PSALMS. Vol. I. *Price 10s. 6d.; to Subscribers 8s.*  
Vol. II. *in the Press.*

**S. ATHANASIUS.**

SELECT TREATISES AGAINST THE ARIANS. *Two vols. 8vo. Price 19s. 6d.;  
to Subscribers 15s.*  
HISTORICAL TRACTS. *Price 10s. 6d.; to Subscribers 8s.*

**S. CHRYSOSTOM.**

HOMILIES ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES. *Vols. 1 to 6, 8vo. Price 3l. 9s. 6d.; to  
Subscribers 2l. 12s. 6d. Vol. VII, on 2 Corinthians, is in the press.*  
———— THE STATUES. *Price 12s.; to Subscribers 9s.*  
———— ST. MATTHEW. *Vols. 1 and 2. Price 1l. 4s.; to Subscribers 18s.*  
———— S. JOHN. *In the Press.*

**S. CYPRIAN'S WORKS.** *Two vols. 8vo. Price 1l. 2s. 6d.; to Subscribers 17s.*

**S. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM.**

CATECHETICAL LECTURES. *Third Edition. Price 10s. 6d.; to Subscribers 8s.*

**S. GREGORY THE GREAT.**

HOMILIES ON THE BOOK OF JOB. *Vols. 1 and 2, Price 30s.; to Subscribers 22s.*  
———— Vol. III. Part 1. *Price 10s. 6d.;*  
*to Subscribers 8s. Vol. III, Part 2. completing the Work, in the press.*

**TERTULLIAN'S WORKS.** Vol. I. *Price 15s.; to Subscribers 11s.*

**SELECT WORKS OF S. EPHREM THE SYRIAN,**

*Translated out of the Original Syriac. With NOTES and INDICES.  
8vo. 14s. to Subscribers to the Library of the Fathers, 10s. 6d.*

Persons sending their names as Subscribers to this Work are entitled to the Volumes as they are published at one fourth less than the Publication price, payment to be made on the delivery of the books, but no annual subscription required.

Persons desirous of becoming Subscribers are requested to transmit their names and the name of their Bookseller to the Publisher, and the Volumes will be forwarded as soon as published.

\*\*\* *A few complete sets may now be had by new Subscribers at the original  
Subscription prices.*

OXFORD; AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

---

BIBLIOTHECA PATRUM ECCLESIAE CATHOLICAE.

S. AUGUSTINI CONFESSIONES. 8vo. Price 9s.; to Subscribers 7s.

3 Vols. 8vo. Price 2l. 2s.; to Subscribers 1l. 11s. 6d.

S. JOANNIS CHRYSOSTOMI HOMILIAE IN MATTHEUM.

Edidit F. FIELD, A.M., Coll. S.S. Trin. apud Cant. nuper Socius.

CHRYSOSTOMI HOMILIAE in S. PAULI Epistolam *primam* ad  
Corinthios. Price 14s.; to Subscribers 10s. 6d.

S. CHRYSOSTOMI HOMILIAE IN D. PAULI EPIST. II. AD  
CORINTHIOS. Price 10s. 6d.; to Subscribers 8s.

The remainder of the Text of S. Chrysostom's Homilies on S. Paul's Epistles will follow in due course; Collations having been obtained for the whole at considerable expense.

---

A COMMENTARY ON THE FOUR GOSPELS,  
COLLECTED OUT OF THE WORKS OF THE FATHERS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE CATENA AUREA OF THOMAS AQUINAS.

Four Volumes in Eight Parts, 3l. 17s.

---

DEVOTIONAL WORKS,

ADAPTED TO THE USE OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH,

FROM THE WORKS OF FOREIGN DIVINES,

EDITED BY THE REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT, AND THE SUPPLEMENT: with THE PATH  
OF PARADISE; or, THE PEACE OF THE SOUL.  
By Scupoli. (From the Italian.) With Frontispiece. 3s. 6d.

THE YEAR OF AFFECTIONS.

Or Sentiments on the Love of God, drawn from the Canticles, for every day  
in the year. By Avrillon. 6s. 6d.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.  
(A Commentary on Thomas à Kempis.) By Surin. 4s. 6d.

A GUIDE FOR PASSING ADVENT HOLILY.  
By Avrillon. With Frontispiece. 6s.

A GUIDE FOR PASSING LENT HOLILY.  
By Avrillon. Second Edition. With Frontispiece. 7s.

PARADISE FOR THE CHRISTIAN SOUL.  
By Horst. 2 vols. 6s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST, IN GLORY.

Daily Meditations from Easter Day to the Wednesday after Trinity Sunday.  
By Nouet. 8s.

---

SOME MEDITATIONS AND PRAYERS

Selected from the Way of Eternal Life, in order to illustrate and explain the Pictures  
by BOETIUS A BOLSWERT. Translated from the Latin, and adapted to the use of the  
English Church.

By the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D.  
1 vol. 8vo. 10s. 6d., with the engravings.

BOOKS PUBLISHED BY JOHN HENRY PARKER,

*A Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.*

*Volumes published 1841 to 1846.*

- BISHOP ANDREWES' SERMONS, 5 vols. 2*l.* 16*s.*  
BISHOP ANDREWES' Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine. 10*s.*  
BISHOP BEVERIDGE'S WORKS. Vol. I. to VIII. 4*l.* 8*s.*  
ARCHBISHOP BRAMHALL'S WORKS. 5 vols. 3*l.* 3*s.*  
BISHOP BULL'S HARMONY OF THE APOSTLES  
ST. PAUL AND ST. JAMES ON JUSTIFICATION. 2 vols. 18*s.*  
BISHOP COSIN'S WORKS. Vols. I. and II. 1*l.* 1*s.*  
BISHOP GUNNING on the Paschal, or Lent Fast. 9*s.*  
HICKES'S TWO TREATISES, On the Christian Priesthood,  
and On the Dignity of the Episcopal Order. Vol. I. 9*s.*  
ARCHBISHOP LAUD'S WORKS. Vol. I. 6*s.*  
MARSHALL'S Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church. 6*s.*  
BISHOP NICHOLSON ON THE CATECHISM. 6*s.*  
BISHOP OVERALL'S CONVOCATION BOOK. 8vo. 8*s.*  
THORNDIKE'S WORKS. Vols. I. and II., 4 Parts. 2*l.*  
L'ESTRANGE'S ALLIANCE OF DIVINE OFFICES. 12*s.*  
HAMMOND'S PRACTICAL CATECHISM. 10*s.* 6*d.*  
JOHN JOHNSON'S WORKS. Vol. I. 12*s.*

*Volumes for 1847.*

- CRAKANTHORP, DEFENSIO ECCLESIAE ANGLICANÆ.  
Ed. Chr. Wordsworth, D.D. 14*s.*  
BISHOP BEVERIDGE'S WORKS. Vol. IX. 10*s.* 6*d.*  
BISHOP WILSON'S WORKS. Ed. Rev. J. Keble, M.A. Vol. II. 10*s.* 6*d.*  
\_\_\_\_\_ Vol. III. 10*s.* 6*d.*

\* \* \* Vol. I. containing Life, &c. will be published last.

- HICKES'S TWO TREATISES. Vol. II. 9*s.*  
JOHN JOHNSON'S WORKS. Vol. II. 9*s.*

*Volumes in preparation.*

- BISHOP BEVERIDGE'S WORKS. Vol. X. and last.  
BISHOP COSIN'S WORKS. Vol. III.  
BISHOP WILSON'S WORKS, edited by the Rev. J. Keble. Vol. IV.  
BISHOP BULL'S DEFENCE OF THE NICENE CREED.  
DR. HAMMOND'S MISCELLANEOUS THEOLOGICAL WORKS.  
ARCHBISHOP LAUD'S WORKS. Vol. II.

Subscribers paying two guineas annually *in advance* are entitled to all the publications without further payment. It is proposed to publish six volumes (of 400 pages on the average) for each year.

Persons wishing to become Subscribers are requested to send their names, and those of their booksellers, to the Secretary and Treasurer, CHARLES CRAWLEY, Esq., under cover, to the Publisher, Mr. PARKER, Bookseller, Oxford.

\* \* \* New Subscribers can select volumes to complete sets.

THE VALIDITY OF ENGLISH ORDINATIONS.  
By P. F. LE COURAYER. *A new Edition, 8vo., 10s. 6d.; to Subscribers 7s.*

OXFORD; AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE the UNIVERSITY of OXFORD. By EDWARD HENRY MANNING, M.A., Archdeacon of Chichester, and late Fellow of Merton College. Second Edition. 8vo. 6s.

SERMONS ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS AND OTHERS. By the Rev. T. W. ALLIES, M.A., Rector of Launton, Oxon, late Fellow of Wadham College, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE the UNIVERSITY of OXFORD, and in OTHER PLACES. By the Rev. C. MARRIOTT, M.A., Fellow of Oriol College, and late Principal of the Diocesan College at Chichester. 12mo. 6s.

SERMONS ON THE FESTIVALS. By the Rev. J. ARMSTRONG, B.A., Priest-Vicar of Exeter Cathedral, and Rector of St. Paul's. 12mo. 6s.

The TEMPORAL PUNISHMENT OF SIN, and other SERMONS. By the Rev. C. H. MONSELL, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford, Prebendary of the Cathedral Church of Limerick. 12mo. 6s.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS. By the Rev. W. JACOBSON, M.A., Vice-Principal of Magdalen Hall. Second Edition. 12mo. 6s.

SERMONS, chiefly Expository, by R. E. TYRWHITT, M.A., E. I. Company's Assistant Chaplain in the Diocese of Bombay, sometime of the Diocese of Salisbury, and formerly of Brasenose College, Oxford. With Notes. In Two Volumes 8vo. £1. 4s.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE MEANS OF GRACE, their Mutual Connection and Combined Use, with Especial Reference to the Church of England; in EIGHT SERMONS preached before the University of Oxford, at CANON BAMPTON'S LECTURE, 1844. By R. W. JELF, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Principal of King's College, London; formerly Fellow of Oriol College. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT WITH OUR SPIRIT.

Illustrated from the eighth chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: in EIGHT SERMONS preached before the University of Oxford in the year M.DCCC XLVI. at the Lecture founded by the Rev. J. BAMPTON, M.A., late Canon of Salisbury. By the Rev. AUGUSTUS SHORT, B.D., Vicar of Ravensthorpe, and late Student of Christ Church, Bishop of Adelaide. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LECTURES ON THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF THE THREE FIRST CENTURIES. By the late EDWARD BURTON, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, &c. Third Edition, complete in one volume 8vo. 15s.

BOOKS PUBLISHED BY JOHN HENRY PARKER,

---

WORKS BY THE REV. WILLIAM SEWELL, B.D.,

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

A JOURNAL OF A RESIDENCE AT THE COLLEGE OF ST. COLUMBA, IN IRELAND. With a Preface. 12mo. 4s.

*Also by the same Author.*

CHRISTIAN POLITICS. 12mo. 6s.

CHRISTIAN MORALS. 12mo. *Third edition.* 5s.

THE FIRST VOYAGE OF RODOLPH THE VOYAGER. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

THE SECOND VOYAGE. 12mo. 6s.

---

WORKS OF

THE MOST REV. RICHARD LAURENCE, LL.D.,

LATE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CASHEL,

*Sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, Canon of Christ Church, &c.*

*Third Edition, 8vo. 10s. 6d.*

AN ATTEMPT TO ILLUSTRATE THOSE ARTICLES  
Of the Church of England which the Calvinists improperly consider as CALVINISTICAL; in Eight Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1804, at the Lecture founded by J. Bampton, M.A.

8vo. 7s. 6d.

LIBRI ENOCH PROPHETÆ VERSIO ÆTHIOPICA,

Quæ seculi sub fine novissimi ex Abyssinia Britanniam advecta vix tandem litterato orbi innotuit.

8vo. *Third Edition, 7s. 6d.*

THE BOOK OF ENOCH THE PROPHET,

Now first translated from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library.

8vo. 9s.

PRIMI EZRÆ LIBRI,

Qui apud Vulgatum appellatur quintus, versio Ethiopica; nunc primum in medium prolata et Latine Angliceque reddita.

8vo. 6s. 6d.

ASCENSIO ISALÆ VATIS,

Opusculum pseudepigraphum, multis abhinc seculis, ut videtur, deperditum, nunc autem apud Æthiopas compertum, et cum Versione Latina Anglicanaque publici juris factum.

Part I. *Second Edition, Price 5s.* And Part II. *Price 5s.*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND UPON THE EFFICACY OF BAPTISM, Vindicated from Misrepresentation.

OXFORD; AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

DISCOURSES ON PROPHECY, in which are considered its Structure, Use, and Inspiration. By the Rev. J. DAVISON, B.D., late Fellow of Oriol College, Oxford. Fourth Edition, 8vo. 12s.

REMARKS ON BAPTISMAL REGENERATION. By the same Author. 8vo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

REMAINS AND OCCASIONAL PUBLICATIONS. By the same Author. 8vo. 15s.

THE ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF G. BULL, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of St. David's. A new Edition, 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE DEFINITIONS OF FAITH, and Canons of Discipline of the Six Œcumenical Councils, with the remaining Canons of the Code of the Universal Church. Translated, with Notes. To which are added, THE APOSTOLICAL CANONS. By the Rev. W. ANDREW HAMMOND, M.A., of Ch. Ch., Oxford. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE GREEK TEXTS OF THE APOSTOLICAL CANONS. With the English Translation, by JOHN JOHNSON, M.A. 8vo. 2s.

PRÆLECTIONES ACADEMICÆ OXONII HABITÆ, a JOANNE KEBLE, A.M., Poeticæ Publico Prælectore. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

LETTERS FROM A TUTOR TO HIS PUPILS. By W. JONES, of Nayland. A New Edition, edited by the Rev. E. COLERIDGE, M.A., Eton College. 18mo. 2s. 6d.; morocco, 5s.

THE PASTOR IN HIS CLOSET;  
Or, a Help to the Devotions of the Clergy. By the Rev. JOHN ARMSTRONG, Vicar of Tidenham, Author of "Sermons on the Festivals." 18mo. 2s. 6d.

PRAYERS AND OTHER DEVOTIONS FOR PENITENTS,  
Compiled by the Rev. J. LEY, B.D., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. 18mo. 1s. 6d.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holydays throughout the Year. *The Thirty-first Edition*, 18mo., 6s.; morocco, 8s. 6d. Also Foolscap 8vo. 7s. 6d.; morocco, 10s. 6d. And 32mo. morocco, 5s.; cloth, 3s. 6d.

LYRA INNOCENTIUM, or Thoughts in Verse on the Ways of Providence towards Little Children. By the Author of the Christian Year. *Fourth Edition*, 32mo. 3s. 6d.; morocco, 5s. Also foolscap 8vo. 7s. 6d. cloth; 10s. 6d. morocco.

THE BAPTISTERY, OR THE WAY OF ETERNAL LIFE.  
By the Author of the Cathedral. *Third Edition*, 8vo. 15s. cloth; 1l. 1s. morocco. Also 32mo. 5s. morocco.

OFFICIUM EUCHARISTICUM. A Preparatory Service to a Devout and Worthy Reception of the LORD'S SUPPER. By EDWARD LAKE, D.D. *The 32nd Edition*, with the COMMUNION SERVICE. 32mo., 2s. 6d. cloth; 5s. morocco.

BOOKS PUBLISHED BY JOHN HENRY PARKER.

THE PRACTICAL CHRISTIAN'S LIBRARY;

A SERIES OF CHEAP PUBLICATIONS, FOR GENERAL CIRCULATION.

	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
LEARN TO DIE.—[SUTTON.]	1	0
PRIVATE DEVOTIONS.—[SPINCKES.]	1	6
THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.—[à KEMPIS.]	1	0
MANUAL OF PRAYER FOR THE YOUNG.—[KEN.]	0	6
THE GOLDEN GROVE.—[TAYLOR.]	0	9
DAILY EXERCISES.—[HORNECK.]	0	9
LIFE OF AMBROSE BONWICKE	1	0
LIFE OF BISHOP BULL.—[NELSON.]	1	6
COMPANION TO THE PRAYER BOOK	1	0
SELECTIONS FROM HOOKER.—[KEBLE.]	1	6
ADVICE TO A FRIEND.—[PATRICK.]	1	6
REPENTANCE AND FASTING.—[PATRICK.]	1	6
ON PRAYER.—[PATRICK.]	2	0
PRACTICAL CHRISTIAN, PART I.—[SHERLOCK.]	2	0
————— PART II.—[SHERLOCK.]	2	0
MEDITATIONS ON THE EUCHARIST.—[SUTTON.]	2	0
LEARN TO LIVE.—[SUTTON.]	1	6
THE HEART'S EASE.—[PATRICK.]	1	6
DOCTRINE OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.—[HEYLIN.]	0	8
HOLY LIVING.—[BP. TAYLOR.]	2	0
HOLY DYING.—[BP. TAYLOR.]	2	0
CONFESSIONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE	2	0

CHEAP BOOKS FOR PAROCHIAL USE.

	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Berens' History of the Prayer Book	2	6
Beveridge's Sermons on the Church	3	0
Beveridge on the Catechism	1	6
Cotton's Explanation of Obsolete Words in the Bible	0	6
Hammond's Parænesis, with a Discourse of Heresy in Defence of our Church against the Romanist	1	6
Henshaw's Meditations, Miscellaneous, Holy, and Humane	1	0
Laud's Speeches on the Liturgy, &c.	2	0
Le Mesurier's Prayers for the Sick	3	0
Scandret's Sacrifice the Divine Service	1	6
Sherlock on the Catechism	0	6
Sparrow's Rationale on the Book of Common Prayer	2	6
Spelman's Rights of Churches	1	6
The Seven Penitential Psalms	0	2
Vincent of Lerins against Heresy	1	6
Wilson's Sacra Privata (entire)	1	6
Wilson on the Lord's Supper (ungarbled edition)	1	0
————— <i>bound, with gilt edges</i>	1	6
Winslow's Remains, or the Catholic Churchman in his Life and Death	4	0
Wither's Hymns of the Church	2	0
————— <i>Select Hymns</i>	1	0

P. 29.  
122

P. 485  
The [unclear]  
a [unclear] [unclear]  
from [unclear]  
jurisdiction.

Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is too light to transcribe accurately.

THE PARISH OF ST. MARY'S

Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is too light to transcribe accurately.

















